

РОССИЙСКАЯ АКАДЕМИЯ НАРОДНОГО ХОЗЯЙСТВА
И ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЙ СЛУЖБЫ ПРИ ПРЕЗИДЕНТЕ РФ
ИНСТИТУТ ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫХ НАУК

ШАГИ

/STEPS

Т.6. №1 2020

Журнал Школы актуальных гуманитарных исследований

Основан в мае 2015 г.

Издается четыре раза в год



РАНХиГС
РОССИЙСКАЯ АКАДЕМИЯ НАРОДНОГО ХОЗЯЙСТВА
И ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЙ СЛУЖБЫ
ПРИ ПРЕЗИДЕНТЕ РОССИЙСКОЙ ФЕДЕРАЦИИ

Москва
2020

ШАГИ
ШКОЛА АКТУАЛЬНЫХ
ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ
ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ

THE RUSSIAN PRESIDENTIAL ACADEMY
OF NATIONAL ECONOMY AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

SHAGI

/STEPS

Vol. 6. No. 1 2020

The Journal of the School of Advanced Studies in the Humanities

Established in May 2015
Issued quarterly



РАНХиГС
РОССИЙСКАЯ АКАДЕМИЯ НАРОДНОГО ХОЗЯЙСТВА
И ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЙ СЛУЖБЫ
ПРИ ПРЕЗИДЕНТЕ РОССИЙСКОЙ ФЕДЕРАЦИИ

Moscow
2020

ШАГИ
ШКОЛА АКТУАЛЬНЫХ
ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ
ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ

Главный редактор

С. Ю. Неклюдов (д-р филол. наук, Российский государственный гуманитарный университет, Москва, Россия; Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте РФ, Москва, Россия; куратор направления «Теоретическая фольклористика»)

Редакция

М. В. Ахметова (канд. филол. наук, зам. главного редактора), *М. И. Байдууж* (зав. редакцией), *Н. П. Гринцер* (д-р филол. наук, куратор направления «Античная культура»), *И. В. Ершова* (д-р филол. наук, куратор направления «Историко-литературные исследования»), *И. А. Женин* (канд. ист. наук, куратор направления «История»), *М. С. Неклюдова* (PhD, куратор направления «Культурология»), *Д. С. Николаев* (канд. филол. наук, координатор редакции), *Д. А. Худяков* (канд. филол. наук, куратор направления «Востоковедение. Сравнительно-историческое языкознание») (Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте РФ, Москва, Россия)

Редакционная коллегия

Х. Баран (PhD, Университет Олбани, США), *Н. Б. Вахтин* (д-р филол. наук, Европейский университет в Санкт-Петербурге, Россия), *Л. М. Ермакова* (д-р филол. наук, Университет иностранных языков города Кобе, Япония), *А. Л. Зорин* (д-р филол. наук, Оксфордский университет, Великобритания; Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте РФ, Россия), *С. Э. Зуев* (канд. искусствоведения, Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте РФ, Россия), *С. А. Иванов* (д-р ист. наук, Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», Россия), *К. Келли* (PhD, Оксфордский университет, Великобритания), *А. А. Кибрик* (д-р филол. наук, Институт языкознания РАН, Россия), *М. А. Кронгауз* (д-р филол. наук, Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», Россия), *С. Ловелл* (PhD, Лондонский университет, Кингс Колледж, Великобритания), *В. А. Мау* (д-р эконом. наук, Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте РФ, Россия), *Ю. Л. Слѣзкин* (PhD, Калифорнийский университет в Беркли, США), *В. Ф. Спиридонов* (д-р психол. наук, Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте РФ, Россия), *Т. В. Черниговская* (д-р филол. наук, д-р биол. наук, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Россия), *А. Шёнле* (PhD, Бристольский университет, Великобритания)

Приглашенный редактор: *Е. В. Илюшечкина*

Научный редактор: *М. В. Ахметова*

Корректор: *Н. В. Сайкина*

Редактор английского текста: *Х. Баран*

Верстка, дизайн: *В. Ф. Лурье*

Веб-сайт: <http://shagi.ranepa.ru/steps>

E-mail: shagisteps-ion@ranepa.ru

Адрес редакции: Россия, 119571, г. Москва, пр-т Вернадского, д. 82, корп. 9, ауд. 2405

Тел.: +7 (499) 956-96-47

Журнал включен в следующие базы данных и электронные библиотечные системы: Scopus, Научная электронная библиотека (Elibrary.ru), РИНЦ, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, Cyberleninka, ЭБС «Лань».

Публикуемые материалы прошли процедуру рецензирования и экспертного отбора.

© Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте Российской Федерации

© Авторы

ISSN 2412-9410

Shagi/Steps. Vol. 6. No. 1. 2020

Editor-in-Chief

Sergei Yu. Nekliudov (Dr. Sci. (Philology), Responsible for Theoretical Folklore Studies Section; Russian State University for the Humanities, The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Moscow, Russia)

Editorial Team

Maria V. Akhmetova (Cand. Sci. (Philology), Deputy Editor-in-Chief), *Marina I. Baiduzh* (Editorial Staff Manager), *Irina V. Ershova* (Dr. Sci. (Philology), Responsible for Historical-Literary Section), *Nikolai P. Grintser* (Dr. Sci. (Philology), Responsible for Classical Studies Section), *Dmitry A. Khudiakov* (Cand. Sci. (Philology), Responsible for Oriental Studies and Comparative Linguistic Section), *Maria S. Neklyudova* (PhD, Responsible for Cultural Studies Section), *Dmitry S. Nikolaev* (Cand. Sci. (Philology), Editorial Coordinator), *Ilya A. Zhenin* (Cand. Sci. (History), Responsible for Historical Section)
(The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Moscow, Russia)

Editorial Board

Henryk Baran (PhD, University at Albany, State University of New York, USA), *Tatiana V. Chernigovskaya* (Dr. Sci. (Philology, Biology), Saint Petersburg State University, Russia), *Liudmila M. Ermakova* (Dr. Sci. (Philology), Kobe City University of Foreign Studies, Japan), *Sergei A. Ivanov* (Dr. Sci. (History), National Research University Higher School of Economy, Russia), *Catriona Kelly* (PhD, University of Oxford, Great Britain), *Andrei A. Kibrik* (Dr. Sci. (Philology), The Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia), *Maxim A. Krongauz* (Dr. Sci. (Philology), National Research University Higher School of Economy, Russia), *Stephen Lovell* (PhD, University of London, King's College, Great Britain), *Vladimir A. Mau* (Dr. Sci. (Economy), The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Russia), *Andreas Schönle* (PhD, University of Bristol, Great Britain), *Yuri Slezkine* (PhD, The University of California, Berkeley, USA), *Vladimir F. Spiridonov* (Dr. Sci. (Psychology), The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Russia), *Nikolai B. Vakhtin* (Dr. Sci. (Philology), European University at St. Petersburg, Russia), *Andrei L. Zorin* (Dr. Sci. (Philology), University of Oxford, Great Britain; The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Russia), *Sergei E. Zuev* (Cand. Sci. (Art History), The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Russia)

Guest Editor: *Ekaterina V. Ilyushechkina*

Academic Editor: *Maria V. Akhmetova*

English Language Editor: *Henryk Baran*

Website: <http://shagi.ranepa.ru/steps>

Postal address: Russia, 119571, Moscow, Prospekt Vernadskogo, 82, corpus 9, room 2405

Tel.: +7 (499) 956-96-47

Copy Editor: *Natalia V. Saikina*

Layout Editor, Designer: *Vadim F. Lurie*

E-mail: shagisteps-ion@ranepa.ru

The journal is indexed in Scopus, Russian Science Citation Index, Elibrary.ru, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, Cyberleninka, E.lanbook.com.

All articles published in the journal have been peer-reviewed.

© The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration

© Authors

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

Плиний Старший и его время: политика, идеология, знание

От редакции 7

СТАТЬИ

S. BIANCHETTI. Traces of scientific geography in Pliny's <i>Naturalis Historia</i>	10
V. BUCCIANTINI. Fragments of the historians of Alexander the Great in the <i>Naturalis Historia</i> : Between memory and oblivion	26
A. В. ПОДОСИНОВ. Плавания по океану в географических описаниях Плиния Старшего.....	40
E. N. ANDREEVA. Phrygian inventions by Pliny the Elder.....	57
A. V. BELOUSOV. Magic in Pliny the Elder revisited	73
A. MALOMUD. Eponymic plants in Nicander of Colophon and Pliny the Elder: Alcibi'us' Herb	91
E. V. ILYUSHECHKINA. Some remarks on the preface of Caius Iulius Solinus.....	101
A. KUZNETSOV. Transformations of the world space: From Pliny's <i>Natural History</i> to the <i>Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium</i> of C. Julius Solinus and the poem <i>De Mirabilibus</i> of Theodericus.....	113
S. G. MEREMINSKIY. Pliny and the classical tradition of the description of Britain	146
I. M. NIKOLSKY. Images of animals from <i>Historia Naturalis</i> in political rhetoric of Late Antiquity: Blossius Aemilius Dracontius' lion.....	158
I. VELÁZQUEZ SORIANO. The influence and use of Pliny's <i>Naturalis Historia</i> in Isidore of Seville's <i>Etymologiae</i>	168
O. В. АУРОВ. <i>Segund diz Plinio</i> ...: «Естественная история» Плиния Старшего как возможный источник «Истории Испании» Альфонсо X Мудрого	187
R. J. A. TALBERT. An English translation of Pliny's geographical books for the 21 st century	214

РЕЦЕНЗИИ

A. А. САБАШНИКОВА, Я. С. ЛИНКОВА. Литература о повседневности и повседневность в литературе (обзор книг В. А. Мильчиной)	229
---	-----

CONTENTS

PLINY THE ELDER AND HIS TIME: POLITICS, IDEOLOGY, AND KNOWLEDGE

Editorial note.....	7
---------------------	---

ARTICLES

S. BIANCHETTI. Traces of scientific geography in Pliny's <i>Naturalis Historia</i>	10
V. BUCCIANINI. Fragments of the historians of Alexander the Great in the <i>Naturalis Historia</i> : Between memory and oblivion	26
A. V. PODOSSINOV. Oceanic navigations in geographical descriptions by Pliny the Elder	40
E. N. ANDREEVA. Phrygian inventions by Pliny the Elder.....	57
A. V. BELOUSOV. Magic in Pliny the Elder revisited	73
A. MALOMUD. Eponymic plants in Nicander of Colophon and Pliny the Elder: Alcibiŭs' herb.....	91
E. I. ILYUSHECHKINA. Some remarks on the preface of Caius Iulius Solinus.....	101
A. KUZNETSOV. Transformations of the world space: From Pliny's <i>Natural History</i> to the <i>Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium</i> of C. Julius Solinus and the poem <i>De Mirabilibus</i> of Theodericus.....	113
S. G. MEREMINSKIY. Pliny and the classical tradition of the description of Britain	146
I. M. NIKOLSKY. Images of animals from <i>Historia Naturalis</i> in political rhetoric of Late Antiquity: Blossius Aemilius Dracontius' lion.....	158
I. VELÁZQUEZ SORIANO. The influence and use of Pliny's <i>Naturalis Historia</i> in Isidore of Seville's <i>Etymologiae</i>	168
O. V. AUROV. <i>Segund diz Plinio...</i> : Pliny the Elder's <i>Naturalis Historia</i> as a possible source of Alfonso the Wise's <i>Estoria de Espanna</i>	187
R. J. A. TALBERT. An English translation of Pliny's geographical books for the 21 st century	214

BOOK REVIEWS

A. A. SABASHNIKOVA, YA. S. LINKOVA. Literature about everyday life and everyday life in literature (A review of books by V. A. Milchina).....	229
--	-----

ОТ РЕДАКЦИИ

Предлагаемый вниманию читателей номер журнала «Шаги/Steps» посвящен материалам прошедшей 26–28 сентября 2018 г. в Москве международной научной конференции «Плиний Старший и его время: политика, идеология, знание». Этот научный форум, объединивший представителей разных гуманитарных дисциплин — историков, филологов, культурологов и лингвистов — из Москвы и Санкт-Петербурга, а также ведущих ученых-антиковедов из США, Франции, Италии и Испании, был организован сотрудниками Лаборатории античной культуры ШАГИ РАНХиГС и проведен в связи с подготовкой двуязычного издания книг «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего на латинском и русском языках с историко-филологическим комментарием (в серии «*Bibliotheca antiqua*»).

О жизни Плиния Старшего известно мало. Родился он в 23 или 24 г. в небольшом городке Комо на севере Италии. Считается, что образование Плиний получил в Риме. При Калигуле и Нероне Плинию довелось пережить время гонений и репрессий, а при Веспасиане и его соправителе Тите — достичь высших должностей. Погиб Плиний в 79 г. при извержении Везувия, занимая пост командующего римской военной эскадрой (подробности гибели Плиния Старшего изложены его племянником Плинием Младшим в письме историку Тациту — см. *Plin. ep. VI.20*).

Отношение исследователей к единственному из сохранившихся трудов¹ Плиния Старшего «Естественная история» долгое время было противоречивым: в сочинении Плиния видели прежде всего компиляцию, собрание античных сведений научного и технического характера; оригинальность замысла и литературные особенности труда умалялись или даже игнорировались. Тем не менее в последние годы вновь появился ряд работ (и число их неизменно возрастает), авторы которых рассматривают творчество и личность Плиния в контексте античной истории, культуры и литературы, стремятся выявить присущую его труду специфичность, определить его место в общелитературном процессе и т. д.

Энциклопедический труд Плиния Старшего, привлекающий все больший интерес исследователей самого широкого круга проблем, содержит данные, относящиеся к различным разделам междисциплинарного знания, — о космологии, антропологии, видах зверей, птиц, рыб и насекомых, о дикорастущих и садовых деревьях, кустарниках, лечебных растениях, ископаемых земных недр, металлах, драгоценных камнях, художественных ремеслах, скульптуре и живописи (всей этой разнообразной тематике сопутствуют пассажи об историческом прошлом Рима и выдающихся личностях), наконец, данные о религиозных представлениях, а также народных приметах, знамениях, охранительной и вредоносной магии, гаданиях и суевериях. Недаром энциклопедия Плиния Старшего, вобравшая в себя письменные свидетельства ученой и народной традиций предшествующих поколений греков и римлян, не только

¹ Плиний, напомним, был автором пособия по риторике «Учащийся», написал специальную работу по грамматике «Двойные формы в языке» и труд по современной ему истории «От окончания Ауфидия Басса» (все эти произведения не сохранились).

обозначила определенный рубеж в истории научного знания, но и стала заметной вехой в эволюции коллективной памяти античной цивилизации. «Естественная история» как сумма знания о природе и соответствующих ему смыслов эпохи ранней Римской империи снискала особенный интерес у читающей публики времен европейского Средневековья и Возрождения.

Представленные в этом номере журнала статьи посвящены рассмотрению круга проблем, непосредственно связанных со временем жизни Плиния Старшего и его «Естественной историей». Так, в статье **С. Бьянкетти** анализируются цитаты Евдокса, Пифея и Эратосфена в II–VII книгах «Естественной истории»; наряду с картиной мира Эратосфена Плиний одновременно отразил характерные для римлян представления об окружающем мире эпохи Флавиев. Подробному рассмотрению политических контекстов в связи с многочисленными источниками «Естественной истории» посвящена статья **В. Буччантини**, в которой предлагается новое толкование пассажей из VI книги, в частности, рассматривается эволюция исторического мифа об Александре Македонском и его передача в эпоху ранней Римской империи.

В следующих статьях затрагиваются географические аспекты отдельных регионов античной ойкумены. Темой статьи **А. В. Подосинова** стал анализ пассажей Плиния, посвященных плаваниям древних по океану, возможности обойти его вдоль побережья; автор приходит к выводу, что изложение представляет собой смесь реальных знаний и домыслов самого Плиния. **С. Г. Мереминский** на материале источников Плиния исследовал античные традиции описания Британии и влияние «Естественной истории» на средневековые (XII–XIII вв.) представления об этом острове (включая идеи знаменитого хрониста Матвея Парижского). Об изобретениях, приписанных Плинием фригийцам, рассказано в статье **Е. Н. Андреевой**, где прослеживаются возможные источники этих сообщений, а также анализируются причины, по которым именно эти открытия классическая традиция приписала фригийцам. **А. М. Маломуд** в своей статье подвергает сравнительному анализу сведения эллинистической поэмы Никандра Колофонского и энциклопедии Плиния Старшего, посвященные названным в честь мифологического героя Алкибия растениям, что позволяет сделать выводы о методах работы Плиния и о его способах отбора материала для медицинских книг «Естественной истории». **А. В. Белоусов** критически рассматривает сведения о сущности, истории и содержании античной магии, которые Плиний Старший излагает в XXVIII и XXX книгах «Естественной истории», а также анализирует ряд теоретических и источниковедческих подходов к этим сведениям, которые сложились к настоящему моменту в современной науке.

Различные формы влияния «Естественной истории» на произведения позднеантичных и христианских авторов стали предметом изучения следующих авторов. **И. М. Никольский** рассматривает бестиарий Плиния, в частности, образ льва в политическом и риторическом контексте поэм карфагенского автора V в. Блоссия Эмилия Драконция. Статья **О. В. Аурова** посвящена проблеме использования «Естественной истории» в качестве одного из источников средневековой хроники «История Испании» (*Estoria de Espanna*), составленной на средневековом кастильском языке при дворе Альфонсо X Мудрого после 1270 г.: прямых рукописных свидетельств использования Плиниева тек-

ста в королевском скриптории не сохранилось, однако не вызывает сомнений высокий авторитет трудов Плиния в Кастилии и Леоне указанного периода как следствие общего роста интереса к античной культуре в контексте «долгого XII века»; среди прочего, эта тенденция четко прослеживается и на примере рукописной традиции «испанского Плиния» XIV в. К проблемам использования текста «Естественной истории», в частности, как одного из основных источников для «Этимологий» Исидора Севильского, обращается в своем исследовании **И. Веласкес Сориано**.

Интерпретации политической риторики в предисловии к географической компиляции Солина, основанной на труде Плиния, посвящена статья **Е. В. Илюшечкиной**. О поэтическом творчестве Теодерика, избравшего в качестве основного источника труд Плиния Старшего, говорится в статье **А. Е. Кузнецова**. Наконец, проблемы перевода географических книг Плиния Старшего с латинского на современный английский язык и поиск адекватных соответствий анализирует **Р. Дж. А. Талберт**.

Таким образом, в номере представлены разнообразные подходы и взгляды на проблемы изучения наследия Плиния Старшего в контексте его времени — от вопросов исторической географии и картографии до рецепций труда Плиния в позднейшие эпохи вплоть до гуманистических изданий «Естественной истории» в XV–XVII вв. Соотношение политических представлений ранней Римской империи, риторически оформленного набора идей и наследия ученой традиции предполагает использование различных методов исследования и рассмотрения труда Плиния под разными углами зрения, что оказывается чрезвычайно плодотворным не только для антиковедения, но и для гуманитарной науки в целом. Далеко не все проблемы, связанные с изучением политических реалий ранней Римской империи, с набором идей и смыслов, наконец, с состоянием научного знания в период правления династии Флавиев нашли отражение в опубликованных статьях. Однако хочется надеяться, что введение в обиход впервые полностью переведенных с латинского на русский язык книг «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего будет способствовать расширению интереса к произведению знаменитого энциклопедиста и еще не раз привлечет к себе внимание специалистов в области гуманитарных и естественных наук.

Е. В. Илюшечкина

(Оргкомитет конференции «Плиний Старший и его время»)

S. Bianchetti

ORCID: 0000-0003-3232-1223

✉ serena.bianchetti@unifi.it

Флорентийский университет
(Италия, Флоренция)

TRACES OF SCIENTIFIC GEOGRAPHY IN PLINY'S *NATURALIS HISTORIA*

Аннотация. «Естественная история» Плиния Старшего содержит множество свидетельств таких авторов, как Евдокс, Пифей и Эратосфен, — в книгах II–VI, посвященных космологии и географии. В VII книге, наоборот, фактически отсутствуют ссылки на авторов научных географических трудов (за исключением цитаты из сочинения Евдокса в VII, 24 об индах). VII книга представляет своего рода собрание рассказов о диковинах и по существу выполняет психолого-литературную функцию.

На основе анализа приводимых в книгах II–VI цитат из сочинений античных авторов в статье показано, что наряду с приверженностью Эратосфеновой картине мира Плиний отражает и представления о мире римлян эпохи Флавиев. Следовательно, описание картины мира у Плиния основано, скорее всего, на астрономо-климатической концепции географии (восходящей к Эратосфену и дополненной Посидонием) и на астролого-климатической концепции (восходящей к Нигидию Фигулу). Влияние Посидония на содержание «Естественной истории» не затрагивает структуру карты мира Эратосфена, но заключается главным образом в разъяснении происхождения атмосферных явлений и геологических процессов, что позволяет говорить о существовании климатических поясов. Последнее обстоятельство можно рассматривать в качестве элемента эволюционирующей картины мира Евдокса и Эратосфена. Кроме того, латинские источники (прежде всего Варрон наряду с Нигидием Фигулом и Витрувием), по всей видимости, сыграли важную роль в передаче знаний греческих ученых, а также в использовании латинской астрономической лексики, о чем свидетельствует труд Плиния Старшего.

Ключевые слова: география, астрономия, Эратосфен, Евдокс, Пифей, Посидоний, карта мира, климатические пояса (параллели)

Для цитирования: Bianchetti S. Traces of scientific geography in Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* // Шаги / Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 10–25. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-10-25.

Статья поступила в редакцию 2 октября 2019 г.
Принято к печати 24 октября 2019 г.

S. Bianchetti

ORCID: 0000-0003-3232-1223

✉ serena.bianchetti@unifi.it

University of Florence
(Italy, Florence)

TRACES OF SCIENTIFIC GEOGRAPHY IN PLINY'S *NATURALIS HISTORIA*

Abstract. The text of *Natural History* contains many references to the scientist geographers such as Eudoxus, Pytheas and Eratosthenes in Books II–VI: these books include both cosmology and geography, while in Book VII, on the contrary, there is almost no reference to the scientist geographers (only Eudoxus is quoted in VII, 24 about the Indians). This book is a sort of container of wonders and seems to have a psycho-literary function: on one hand, it reassures the reader of the “opposition” and “distance” of those places compared to the one in which one lives, and, on the other, it emphasizes the importance of research which, in Pliny’s time, had preserved and updated Greek science.

My analysis herein shows that quotations from ancient authors in Books II–VI point to the strong continuity between Eratosthenes and his conception of the world with that of the Romans under the Flavians. Hence, Pliny’s description seems to come from a synthesis of both an astronomical-climatic conception (of Eratosthenes’ origin and Posidonius’ elaboration) and an astrological-climatic one (which derives from Nigidius Figulus). The influence of Posidonius on the *Naturalis Historia* does not affect the framework of Eratosthenes’ map, but mainly involves the interpretation of the atmospheric phenomena that characterize the earth, thereby allowing us to hypothesize climatic bands. The latter are understood to be an evolution on the thinking of both Eudoxus and Eratosthenes. Then, among Latin sources, Varro (with Nigidius Figulus and Vitruvius) seems to have played an important role in the transmission of Greek science and in the creation of a Latin astronomical lexicon, as witnessed by the work of Pliny.

Keywords: geography, astronomy, Eratosthenes, Eudoxus, Pytheas, Posidonius, map of the world, latitudes

To cite this article: Bianchetti, S. (2020). Traces of scientific geography in Pliny’s *Naturalis Historia*. Shagi/Steps, 6(1), 10–25. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-10-25.

Received October 2, 2019

Accepted October 24, 2019

In order to analyse the passages containing traces of scientific geography in the *Naturalis Historia*, it is necessary to deal with Pliny's method of working in order to understand the role of his study on the cosmos and the inhabited world. The *Naturalis Historia* is, in fact, a sort of updated "world inventory" that focuses on the Roman Empire in the Flavian age: "La cosmographie et la géographie sont l'introduction, le cadre mentale (à la fois géométrique et politique) qui permettra de saisir et de classer un inventaire de la nature entière" [Nicolet 1988: 96]¹.

Book II is dedicated to cosmography, while Books III–VI deal with geography. Book VII is dedicated to anthropology and clearly differs from any of his previous books.

This differentiation is already an example of Pliny's method, which catalogues the knowledge of his time in categories, with the aim to reflect the progress of the sciences and, at the same time, to show how some of them evolved.

The separation of geography and anthropology may seem strange in relation to the method used by ancient scholars to investigate: indeed, in Book VII, for example, we find all those wonderful aspects concentrated in Ethiopia and India. They are set out in such a way as to let us believe that these lands are "other places", characterized by exceptional flora and fauna, and described in such a way as to catch the reader's attention². Through the fusion of *periegesis* and *paradoxographia*, again in Book VII, both *prodigiosa aliqua et incredibilia* reappear and are described with accuracy³.

My initial observation regarding the theme of this discussion is that, in Book VII, there is almost no reference to the scientist geographers, such as Eudoxus of Cnidus, Pytheas of Massalia, Dicaearchus of Messene, Eratosthenes of Cyrene, or Hipparchus of Nicaea: only Eudoxus is quoted in Book VII, 24 about the Indians — about their feet being enormous in males and very small in females. We do not know if this information goes back to Ctesias, as Gisinger believed [Gisinger 1921: 20], or to a dossier on the wonders of India. But, if this was the only testimony we had about Eudoxus, we would certainly not consider him to be the pioneer of scientific geography.

Furthermore, regarding the authors mentioned on the wonders of India, the absence of Nearchus is notable among the explorers of Alexander⁴: indeed, he is mentioned five times in the Sixth Book (VI, 96, 97, 107, 109, 124), whereas Onesicritus

¹ For an evaluation of Plinian encyclopedism, see [Conte 1982: xvii; Murphy 2004: 4]. Cf. also [Naas 2002: 78–81; 2011: 60 ss.]. For a summary of the negative judgements, beginning with E. Norden, on Plinian encyclopedism cf. [Wallace-Hadrill 1990: 80–81] (with bibliography). For an innovative approach to Plinian encyclopedism cf. [French, Greenaway 1986; Serbat 1986: 2170 ("testament de la science antique"); Citroni Marchetti 1991; Beagon 1992; Doody 2010]. On the relationship between Plinian encyclopedism and Roman Imperialism cf. [Naas 2011: 57; Taylor 2015: 46–47]; for a critical position cf. [Laehn 2013].

² On the exceptional characteristics of "extreme" countries, particularly Ethiopia and India, cf. [Schneider 2004, passim.]. On the hypothesis that the zoological and botanical information may be related to the triumphant arrival in Rome of the exotic species mentioned cf. [Murphy 2004: 50–51]; Laehn noted how "the chronology of each section of the *Natural History* is structured around the dates when each of the products of Nature described therein first made their appearance in Rome" [Laehn 2013: 113].

³ *NH* VII, 6. See [Healey 1999: 63–70] for the use of the terms *mirabilia-miracula* in the *Naturalis Historia*.

⁴ On the expansion of geographic knowledge related to military expansionism according to Pliny and on the evaluation of the Alexander enterprise by the Naturalist, see [Cotta Ramosino 2001].

is mentioned only twice (81; 96): the description of Taprobane belongs in VI, 81–82 to the *prisci* with Onesicritus, Megasthenes and Eratosthenes, while at the time of Pliny *dilegentior notitia Claudii principatu contigit, legatis etiam ex ea insula advectis* (VI, 84).

As we know, Megasthenes enlightened Eratosthenes by providing him with a lot of information about India. His name appears three times in Book VII: men with backward feet and eight toes per foot (VII, 23); the Sirites, who had holes instead of a nose (VII, 25); and the Mandi, who lived in three hundred villages and whose females gave birth at the tender age of seven and who, at forty, were considered old (VII, 29).

In the quotations mentioned in Book VII, Pliny does not add any personal comments: his testimonies are listed in a sort of dossier of wonders with references to Ctesias, Crates, Agatarchides, Clitarchus, Artemidorus as well as to Aristotle. His description of the countries furthest away appears in the conclusion, with the aim to preserve and transmit, even in times of extended knowledge, an idea of Ethiopia and India fixed to the past.

This sort of container of wonders seems to have a psycho-literary function: on the one hand, it reassures the reader of the “opposition” and “distance” of those places compared to the one in which one lives and, on the other, it emphasizes the importance of research which, at the time of Pliny, had preserved and updated Greek science, as described in Books II–VI.

These books, which we will now consider, include — as already mentioned — both cosmology and geography, wherein the presence of the scientist geographers is conspicuous: we will examine here some important passages.

Eudoxus of Cnidus, who is mentioned seven times in the *Naturalis Historia* (II, 130; VI, 198; VII, 24; XVIII, 213; 312; XXX, 3; XXXI, 16), is quoted in II, 130 on the cyclicity of the winds, which, like other atmospheric phenomena, return to the same order within a four-year period (cf. II, 131).

Subsequently Pliny describes a type of wind known for its sudden gusts and which occurs in variable forms: among these, he mentions the wind coming from the clouds, called *ecnephas* by the Greeks. This explanation is reflected in the *Naturales Quaestiones* (II, 12, 5) of Seneca, who describes the effect of clouds colliding violently. Seneca ascribed to the clouds a specific role (*De nubibus*) [Vottero 1989: 107–111] drawn from ancient meteorological texts (especially those of Aristotle, *Met.* I, 9–12) as well as doxographic manuals (e. g. Aet., III, 4, in *DDG* 370a 12–13; b 23–25; Diog. Laert., VII, 153) and Posidonius, who transmitted to Strabo the subtle discussion of the winds, which may be read in I, 2.21 C29 (= F 137a EK) [Vottero 1989: 107–111].

Regarding the great problem of Seneca's sources in the *Naturales Quaestiones*, a prominent role seems to have been played by Posidonius⁵, who took care of the meteorological aspects with a fortune witnessed by our tradition.

The “hunt” for Posidonius in Seneca's work has certainly produced questionable results, but undoubtedly, studies of Posidonius' meteorological aspects seem to have influenced, directly or indirectly, the Latin tradition, which, in turn, appears to have been acquired and reworked in the results of the Greek investigation, especially for the first cen-

⁵ See [Vottero 1989: 38 with bibliography].

ture B.C. Posidonius seems to have had a leading role in the transmission of Greek science in Rome, where the Stoic approach to interpreting the cosmos received wide approval.

Therefore, I think that a survey on Posidonius' influence in the passages devoted to scientific geography in the *Naturalis Historia* could be a starting point for further reflection.

Let us first go back to the passages where Eudoxus of Cnidus is mentioned: Pliny quotes the scientist in VI, 198 (= F 369 Lasserre), where the location of Cerne and other oceanic islands is mentioned:

Insulas toto eo⁶ mari et Ephorus complures esse tradidit et Eudoxus et Timosthenes... Contra sinum Persicum Cerne nominatur insula adversa Aethiopiae, cuius neque magnitudo neque intervallum a continente constat; Aethiopus tantum populos habere proditur. Ephorus auctor est a Rubro mari navigant<e>s in eam non posse propter ardores ultra quasdam columnas — ita appellantur parvae insulae — provehi.

The mention of Eudoxus and Timosthenes on Cerne is very important and, as we have not found this description in any other source, we therefore have to recognize that Timosthenes' knowledge should be strictly limited to the islands of the Mediterranean and the Red Sea⁷. As for Eudoxus, we know nothing about a description of the oceanic islands: and hence, it is from this Pliny passage, wherein Strabo mentions Crete [Gisinger 1921: 111–112], that Gisinger derived his idea for a catalogue on the islands, contained in Book VII of the *Periodos tes ghes*. This catalogue by Eudoxus would form the basis for successive “books on islands”, and the best and most well-known of these is contained in Book V by Diodorus. We do not actually have any elements to support this hypothesis, but the fact that Pliny speaks of oceanic *complures insulae* gives us at least a glimpse of just one conception of the islands recorded around the various parts of the oikumene.

The island of Cerne, identified by Ephorus, according to Pliny, *contra sinum Persicum*⁸, can be inserted into a geographical framework that finds analogies to the one by Posidonius: in fact, he imagined not a triangular Africa, as Eratosthenes did, but rather a trapezoidal one, as we learn from Pliny (VI, 57 = F 212 EK on India; VI, 197 on Ethiopia)⁹.

In this conception of a trapezoidal Africa, with the Ethiopians located along the southern side of this quadrilateral, the Cerne of Ephorus represented the extreme south-eastern point of Ethiopia. Instead, in the representation by Eratosthenes — which probably derived from Annon — the island was located to the southwest. In conclusion, Cerne represents a sort of *trait-d'union* between two different traditions, linked to two attempts to circumnavigate Africa: from Annon in the West and Ephorus in the East [Bianchetti 1989].

If this interpretation of the Plinian text is correct, then we are led to believe that Pliny knew the geographies of both Ephorus and Posidonius. Pliny was able to

⁶ Eoo [Detlefsen 1908, with references to VI, 56; 82; X, 58], cf. [Wagner 1888: 66].

⁷ On Timosthenes, see [Wagner 1888; Gisinger 1937: 1310 ss.; Prontera 1992; Meyer 1998].

⁸ Lasserre [1966: 266] thought that Eudoxus could also have spoken about the island of Cerne and located it in the Red Sea, like Ephorus (*FGrHist* 70 F172). In reality, there are no arguments for thinking that Eudoxus was mentioned here for Cerne in the Red Sea, like Ephorus.

⁹ On Posidonius' Ethiopia cf. [Bianchetti 1990].

derive the mention of Eudoxus in the context of a description of the oceanic islands that included a specific idea on the form and extent of land and seas.

It is necessary, however, to add that on specific questions such as those regarding astrology in XVIII, 213, Pliny cites Eudoxus along with Hesiod, Thales, Anaximander, and Euctemon, and declares that he is following Caesar. Hence, since the passage probably comes from a specific dossier¹⁰, we are led to believe that the use of dossiers on particular subjects could be integrated with the privileged sources, which we could call “guide sources” (Posidonius, Varro et al.) — and which were the basis of *Naturalis Historia* and primarily concentrated in the first six books.

Among the scientist geographers examined herein, **Pytheas** of Massalia is mentioned nine times in the *Naturalis Historia*¹¹. Apart from the quotations in the 1st Book with the list of Plinian sources, we find four quotations in Books II and IV; in II, 187 Pytheas’ name is linked to Thule: “which is six days of navigation from Britain to the north”. The description of the island is part of a list of latitudes that includes Meroe, Alexandria and Britain, according to a system that probably belongs to Eratosthenes, which is cited in II, 186.

Pliny updates the information and states that “some attest that the phenomenon described by Pytheas on Thule, where the sun withdraws in the opposite direction in the winter solstice, occurs in Mona (Anglesey), about 200 miles from Camulodunum (Colchester)”.

Instead, in II, 217 Pytheas is cited on the tides, which rise 80 cubits north of Britain¹². The subject of the tides, already treated by Aristotle, was, as we know, at the centre of Posidonius’ *The Ocean*, a work that was an essential update of Pytheas’ theories. The long passage by Strabo (III, 5, 7–8 C173–174 = F 217 EK and comm.767–776)¹³, which describes Posidonius’ theory, even mentions the moon among the causes, and recalls, but does not cite, the explanation by Pytheas. The latter was clearly known to Posidonius, who was not only an expert observer, but also a deep connoisseur on the work of the Massaliote, echoed in the title (*The Ocean*).

The other passages that mention Pytheas are related to contexts that are dated up to the Roman expansion: IV, 94–95¹⁴, wherein we find the description of the northern coast of Europe, is a rich dossier on the history of the name of the North Sea and its islands. Pytheas is mentioned as using the toponym Basilia — probably transmitted from Timaeus, who is also mentioned in XXXVII, 35, in a description of the coast of Germany that goes back to Pytheas.

As already pointed out [Bianchetti 1996], Pliny’s passages regarding the Nordic context do not seem to show any contrast with Greek knowledge, but rather are a necessary integration of it. Indeed, the information obtained from the expedition sent

¹⁰ Cf. also XVIII, 312 where Eudoxus is mentioned with Philippos, Callippus, Dositheus, Parmeniscus, Conon, Criton, Democritus; XXX, 3 on the chronology of Zoroaster’s death, set 6,000 years before Plato’s death; XXXI, 16 on a spring in Cilicia for which the testimony of Eudoxus is invoked together with that of Theopompus.

¹¹ I, 2c: Eratosthenes; I, 4c: Xenophon of Lampsacus; I, 37c: Sotacus; II, 187: Thule; II, 217: the tides over Britain; IV, 96: island Basilia, Balcia of Xenophon of Lampsacus; IV, 102: Isidorus on Gesoriacus-Calidonia distance; XXXVII, 35: Sotacus on *aestuarium Metuonidis*.

¹² Pyth. F 7e [Bianchetti 1998 with comm., 148–149].

¹³ On Eratosthenes’ knowledge of the theory of tides elaborated by Pytheas and on Posidonius’ theory cf. Aujac 1966, 285–286; 287–288 on Plin. *NH* II, 97–100.

¹⁴ Pyth. F 16 [Bianchetti 1998 with comm., 200–204].

by Nero to the Baltic Sea — not before 55 A.D. (NH XXXVII, 45) — was added not only to the data obtained by Tiberius' fleet, who recognized twenty three Frisian islands, but also included the information obtained by Germanicus' army that stopped on the islands between the Zuiderzee and the Ems. In conclusion, according to Greek sources, Pliny follows Timaeus in his criticism of the poets as well as the Greek fantastic versions for the origin of amber. He also followed Timaeus for his positive viewpoint on the description of the North Sea by Pytheas. There are many additions resulting from updates, especially for the area of Britain (IV, 104) and the exploration of the island, which the Romans completed in the last thirty years up to the Calidonian Forest. For Ierne-Ibernia, which is situated to the north of Britain (*super eam*), Pliny gets his information from Caesar in order to "update" the description of Timaeus, who is explicitly mentioned. But Pytheas is not mentioned at all.

In conclusion, even Pliny's knowledge of Pytheas' work does not seem to be direct and does not always occur through the same source: indeed, the references to the tides (II, 217), and perhaps also those on the latitude of Thule — inserted in a framework of latitudes from the southern to the most northern points — go back to Posidonius (and via the philosopher on to Pytheas and Eratosthenes). However, the quotations on the northern ocean coast derive from Timaeus, who wrote of an original return trip for the Argonauts, using the work of Pytheas [Bianchetti 2004: 3–10]. We have to say, however, that contrary to the critical attitude shared by Pliny and Timaeus regarding the fantasy stories of the Greeks in Books II–VI, many of these stories can be found in Book VII. In my opinion, this is an important fact, and sheds light on Pliny's method, for we know that he selected materials of different origin and value according to the themes set down in the *Naturalis Historia*.

This sort of reflection may also help us to understand why **Eratosthenes** is mentioned many times in Pliny's work — precisely, 24 times in total, and mostly concentrated in Books II–VI¹⁵, where we find him mentioned 17 times, plus another five times in the 1st Book among the main sources¹⁶.

In II, 247 Eratosthenes is cited with particular admiration: indeed, the scientist is defined in *omnium quidem litterarum subtilitate, in hac utique praeter ceteros sollers*, especially for his measurement of the terrestrial meridian, calculated at 250,000 stades, equal to 31,500 Roman miles, and considered *improbum ausum, verum ita subtili argumentatione comprehensum ut pudeat non credere*.

Then, Pliny inserts an unusual reference to Hipparchus¹⁷, who would add a bit less than 26,000 stades to the one measured by Eratosthenes (see below), and concludes with an episode that sounds like an *exemplum vanitatis graecae maximum*. This is the story about Dionysodorus of Melos, *geometricae scientia nobilis*, who died of old age and was the protagonist of an extraordinary event. The women who had arranged his funeral are said to have found a letter signed by Dionysodorus in his tomb wherein it was written that the deceased had gone from his grave to the deepest point of the earth. The distance between the tomb and this point would have been 42,000 stades. Some unknown expert in geometry calculated that had the letter been sent from the centre of the earth, it was ascertained that earth's circumference would have been 252,000 stades.

¹⁵ II, 185, 247; III, 75; V, 39, 40, 41, 47, 127, 132; VI, 3, 36, 56, 81, 108, 163, 171, 183.

¹⁶ I, 2c; I, 4c; I, 5c; I, 6c; I, 22b.

¹⁷ Hipparchus is mentioned among the foreign sources (I, 2a; I, 5c; I, 18c); on the moon (II, 53; II, 57); on the comet stars (II, 95); on the duration of the day (II, 188); on the earth's circumference (II, 247).

Pliny's critical attitude here towards *vanitas graeca* seems to demonstrate, through the reference to "some expert in geometry", the validity of Eratosthenes' measurement: the value of the ray actually emerges ($C / 2\pi$) from a formula where π is equal to three. Therefore, Eratosthenes' measurement would be confirmed.

The passage on the measurement of the terrestrial meridian brings to mind just how Pliny managed to give his support to the calculation made by Eratosthenes: indeed, if the episode of Dionysodorus is proof of *vanitas graeca*, the addition of 26,000 stades by Hipparchus — which finds no confirmation in the astronomer's fragments — and the criticism of those who do not believe Eratosthenes, is proof of the uncertain destiny of Eratosthenes' measurement, and of Pliny's strong defence. In the episode written up by the latter, we note the allusion to an alternative measurement to the one put forward by Eratosthenes, and which, indeed, could have come from Posidonius: for we know the latter calculated 180,000 stades as the earth's circumference. This is a measurement that Pliny, or perhaps his source, does not seem to share; however, it allows us to catch a glimpse of the problem, which dragged on up to the time of Ptolemy, and ended not in favour of the number proposed by Eratosthenes.

It is possible to correlate this passage, albeit partly in a different content, with VI, 211–220 on the *circuli* reported to ancient Greek science (*unam Graecae inventionis scientiam vel exquisitissimae subtilitatis*), which were called *paralleli* (*nostrum... appellavere*) by the Greeks. The seven *circuli* cited by Pliny were related to the 7 *klimata* of the tradition, as witnessed by Ptolemy [Shcheglov 2004: 27–31]: they indicated the latitudes of certain sites on earth, calculated according to the duration of the longest and shortest days.

Much has been written on the concept of *klima* and its origin, and I would like to refer here to the excellent article by D. A. Shcheglov [2004] on "Geographia Antiqua": he retraced the history of the concept, the origin of which is attributed by modern scholars to Eudoxus of Cnidus¹⁸.

The scientist who would then apply the concept of the inhabited world to the map must have been Eratosthenes, according to Honigmann's reconstruction [Honigmann 1929: 13–14, 54]. This was further confirmed by Shcheglov, who underlined how Eratosthenes was not so much involved in defining the precise latitudes of places based on the duration of the longest day, but rather on measuring the maximum breadth of the inhabited world in relation to the terrestrial meridian. Therefore, the six points chosen by the scientist (Meroe, Syene, Alexandria, Rhodes, Hellespont and Borysthenes) are located on the main meridian and can be interpreted by following the strong cartographic interest of Eratosthenes. The distances between one point and another are calculated in stades, with a "hodological" perspective, based on the travels of the Greek, both by land and by sea.

As to the points that marked the extremes of the inhabited world — northward and southward — neither of these were, originally, included in the system of the 7 *klimata*: as we know from Meroe and the "Country of Cinnamon", Eratosthenes calculated 3,400 stades¹⁹ (symmetrically, the same parallel crossed both the "Country of Cinnamon" and Taprobane). Northward, from the mouth of the Borysthenes

¹⁸ Eudox. F 350 [Lasserre 1966 and comm.: 259–260]. Cf. also [Heidel 1937: 98–99; Aujac 1966: 168; Prontera 2003: 196].

¹⁹ Str. I, 4, 2 C63: cf. [Aujac 1966: 185–186]. Cf. also Plin. *NH* VI, 81 (= F III B, 18 Berger; Str. XV, 1, 13–14 C690 = F III B, 12 Berger) for Eratosthenes' measure of Taprobane — Sri Lanka.

to the parallel of Thule, the scientist calculated 11,500 stades. These calculations, on an astronomical-geometric basis, were criticized by Strabo²⁰, especially for the northern segment, which would never have been measured before Eratosthenes. In fact, Pytheas had provided astronomical information about Thule, while the correlation made by Eratosthenes on the distance from the Borysthenes to the parallel of Thule would result from the combined calculations, which integrated the travel data and the measurements taken from the geometry of the sphere. Essentially, the aim of this procedure was to design a map, and therefore, as already observed by Shcheglov, it suggests that Eratosthenes' idea of *klimata* was different from both the Hipparchus system and the zone theory of Posidonius: neither Hipparchus, nor Posidonius, drew a map of the world, but they did carry out work on systematic divisions of land spaces according to their purposes, both of which were different.

Let us now return to Pliny's passage, which is pertinent to our subject: the table described in VI, 211–219 has a composite character. Here, the 7 astrological *klimata* (14h, 14h 24m, 14h 32m, 14h 40m, 15h, 15h 12m, 15h 36m) are combined with geographic *klimata*²¹, which seem to find comparisons in the testimonies of not only Cleomedes and Martianus Capella (see table in [Shcheglov 2004]), but also that of Geminus.

In particular, the *klimata* of Cleomedes (Meroe 13h, Alexandria 14h, Rhodes 14h and ½, Hellespont 15h and Rome, with little more than 15h, Massalia 15h and ½, Celts 16h, Maeotis 17h, Britain 18h) show a Rome-Hellespont alignment, which we find in Pliny too, and which reveals an attempt to correlate the Eastern and Western areas of the oikoumene. It was an attempt that already had a precedent in the analogous latitude attributed — erroneously, according to Szabó [1992] — by Hipparchus to Massalia and Byzantium (43°) [Dicks 1960: 182–183].

The comparison with the table by Martianus Capella²² reveals the difficulty to align Rome and the Hellespont: Rome is, in fact, on the fifth *klima*, with Macedonia and the river Tagus, in the West, while the Hellespont is on the sixth *klima* with Thrace and Gallia bordering with Germany. In Rome and the Hellespont, the longest day lasts 15 hours, but the shortest day lasts 9 hours in Rome and 8 hours at the Hellespont. By observing a remarkable analogy between the *klimata* of Martianus

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Cf. II, 185 for the shadows in Troglodyte in the context of a list on the latitudes of Meroe, Alexandria, Italy, and Britain up to Thule.

²² Mart. Cap. Nupt. VIII, 876–877: *Nam climata VIII sunt, sed proximum solstitiali Diameroes, deinde alterum Diasyenes, tertium Diaalexandrias, quod ducitur per Cyrenas in Africam Carthagini ab austro adiacentem, quartum et medium ex omnibus Diarhodu, quod per mediam Peloponnesum Siciliamque ductum ad ostium Baetis peruenit, quintum est Diarhodes per Macedoniam et altera, parte per Gallias et Lusitaniam ad Tagum descendens, deinde sextum per Hellespontum Thraciamque et confinem Germaniae Galliam, septimum Diaborysthenus, Ponticum mare et ab altera parte Germaniam Britanniamque praecedens; ultimum est ultra Maeotis paludes et infra Rhiphaeos montes.*

Ergo secundum climata dies dicantur. Diameroes maximus dies habet aequinoctiales horas XIII, minimus dies XI; Diasyenes maximus dies horas habet XIII, minimus X; Diaalexandrias maximus horarum XIII, minimus X; Diarhodu maximus horas XIII, minimus VIII; Diarhodes maximus XV, minimus VIII; Diahellespontu maximus horas XV, minimus VIII; Diaborysthenus maximus horas XVI, minimus VIII; Diarhiphaeon maximus XVI, minimus VII. Deinde cum prope cardinem accesseris, longior dies semper breuiorque nox fiet; denique colligitur sub ipso sphaerae cardine semestrem diem esse.

Capella and those of Eratosthenes, as well as Martianus, who essentially focused his attention on the West, Honigmann [1929: 51] was able to hypothesize that the table of Martianus dated back to Varro, who is also considered a privileged source of Pliny. Hence, Pliny would have built his table on a nucleus of Eratosthenes, updated by Varro, while the astrological components would have been influenced by Nigidius Figulus and through him, by Serapion too.

It was Shcheglov who then came up with a derivation taken from Eratosthenes, also for the table of Ptolemy. We can see from the *Almagest*, and again from the *Geography*²³, that he drew from Eratosthenes via Marinus of Tyrus: however, Ptolemy moved away from Eratosthenes in *Geography* for the extension of the oikoumene under the equator, for the definition of the meridian of reference, which, for Eratosthenes, passed from Alexandria²⁴ to Rhodes and the Hellespont, as well as for the measurement of the earth's circumference, estimated by Ptolemy to be 180,000 stades, compared to 252,000 stades by Eratosthenes.

For our subject, the measurement of the earth's circumference seems to be very important. In fact, while Ptolemy is linked to Posidonius, it is known that Hipparchus welcomed Eratosthenes' measurement.

Furthermore, we note that Geminus, in his *Introduction to Astronomy*, placed only Rome in the *klima* with the longest day at 15h.

To compare what we have set forth here, it shows that Pliny's table has important features:

The Naturalist considers the length of the longest day to be slightly different in both the Hellespont (fifth parallel: 15h) and in Rome (sixth parallel: 15 and $\frac{1}{2}$ or 15 and $\frac{1}{3}$ according to Nigidius Figulus)²⁵. Rome is placed on the same *klima* as Massalia and other places that are very distant from each other.

For this sixth parallel, which also shows some analogies with the *klima* of Cleomedes, Pliny cites Nigidius Figulus who, in his work *De terris*, elaborated, within an astrological framework, astronomical data going back through Serapio to Hipparchus. This data would have been reworked, in the 1st century BC, by someone who wanted to place Rome within the seven *klimata*. It may have been Posidonius²⁶ who carried out the results of Greek and Roman research. Indeed, Rome played an important role in the work of Posidonius²⁷, who might have aligned Rome and Massalia, a city that had a central role in Pytheas' text, which undisputedly was a reference point for Posidonius, as previously noted.

Secondly, it is important to note that there is no mention of Alexandria in this passage by Pliny. Instead, Alexandria is mentioned in II, 186, and derived from Eratosthenes (integrated by the mention of the *klima* in Italy 15h).

Finally, there are some clues in Pliny's words about the northern latitudes:

²³ Meroe (13h), Siene (13h $\frac{1}{2}$); country south of Alexandria (14h), Rhodes (14h $\frac{1}{2}$), Hellespont (15h), the area of the Middle Pontus (15h $\frac{1}{2}$), the mouth of Borysthenes (16h).

²⁴ Cf. [Shcheglov 2004: 30 n. 85] for the *klima* of 14h through lower Egypt, probably on the influence of Hipparchus.

²⁵ For Honigmann [1929: 52] the information on Rome comes from Varro.

²⁶ Honigmann [1929: 52] for Varro with the citation to one day of 15h and $\frac{1}{2}$ — which differs from the 15h and $\frac{1}{3}$ by Nigidius Figulus.

²⁷ FF 49, 218, 253, 258 EK; cf. also the mention of Romans in FF 53, 67, 78, 257, 259, 260, 261, 263, 264, 265, 266, 272, 273, 274 EK.

Hactenus antiquorum exacta celebravimus. Sequentium diligentissimi quod superest terrarum supra tribus adsignavere segmentis, a Tanis per Maeotim lacum et Sarmatas usque Borysthenen atque ita per Dacos partemque Germaniae, Gallias oceani litora amplexi, quod esset horarum XVI, alterum per Hyperboreos et Britanniam horarum XVII, postremum Scythicum a Ripaeis iugis in Thylen, in quo dies continuarentur, ut diximus, noctesque per vices.

The three northern parallels include the Borysthenes, part of Germany and the Gallic coast (16h), Britain and the Hyperboreans (17h), Thule and the Far North with its six-month night. From the fragments of Posidonius' work, it is not possible to make any noteworthy comparisons; however, the philosopher did speak about the Borysthenes (F 263 EK) when he told the story of Mitridates Eupator (100 BC), and he did not deny the existence of the Hyperboreans (F 270 EK), who were also mentioned by Pliny and placed by Posidonius περὶ τὰς Ἀλπεὶς τῆς Ἰταλίας.

As for the southern parallels, Pliny cites Meroe and Syene²⁸; these places are also mentioned by Posidonius in the context of defining his "zones"²⁹. Therefore, given these facts, I think it is quite possible to find Posidonius, rather than Varro, in Pliny's *diligentissimi*, as Sallmann has already put forward.

This hypothesis is supported by analogies between the tables of Pliny and Cleomedes, who knew the work of Posidonius well, as we learn in his *De motu circulari*: particularly in I, 6, 31–33 (= F 210 EK). Posidonius is quoted regarding a division into zones wherein, as per Strabo's testimony (II, 5.43 C135–136 = Posid. F 208 EK), there are terms such as παράλλελος or κύκλος which Pliny says correspond to *circuli* in Latin.

An implicit reference to Posidonius can be found, as already mentioned, in the critical reference (II, 247) to those who did not share Eratosthenes' measurement of the terrestrial circumference.

Posidonius, who "corrected" Eratosthenes' measurement of the earth, developed an original theory on *klimata*: starting from the astronomical notion inherited from Eudoxus and Pytheas with a measurement of *klimata* on a north–south axis, Posidonius came up with a theory that formed the basis of the modern climatic one, and included territories with similar physical, ethnic and atmospheric characteristics.

Posidonius acknowledged his debt to Eratosthenes, a recognition that was pointed out by D. Marcotte [1998; 2018], who also stressed Posidonius' role — already highlighted by Lasserre [1975] — in defining the correlation between latitude, soil fertility and the physical traits of living beings.

Posidonius attached great importance to the human factor in geography, and duly distinguished five areas on the terrestrial sphere as "useful from the point of view of human phenomena". Strabo, who criticized Posidonius' theory, also suggests that for the philosopher, human behavior and even political systems could, in some way, be related to *klimata*. This slow evolution of climatology seems, in my opinion, help us understand the genesis of the astrological interpretation, the results

²⁸ Cf. *diligentissimi* in II, 246 (who know nothing beyond the Tanais); V, 40 (Polybius and Eratosthenes); VI, 141; VI, 170 (Juba); VI 219; X, 19 (Manilius); XI, 63; XIII, 31; XVIII, 20; XX, 262; XXV, 5 (Mitridas); XXX, 4 (Hermippus); XXIV, 65; XXXV, 131 (Nicia painter); XXXVI, 109.

²⁹ F 49 EK. Syene is also mentioned in FF 115; 210 EK.

of which may be read in Pliny. The fortune of this interpretation in Rome is mostly thanks to Nigidius Figulus³⁰.

Therefore, it could have been Posidonius, rather than Varro, who acted as the filter through which Pliny derived geographic climate data. Such are the bases of the description of the astrological *circuli* in the abovementioned passage.

In view of the information put forward today, we should acknowledge the significant influence of Posidonius (mentioned only nine times in the work of Pliny). The hypothesis of one single source, i. e. Varro, in the *Naturalis Historia*, is now fading [Sallmann 1971: 7–20], and therefore we have to recognize, in my opinion, a multiplicity of sources. Among these — for scientific geography — is Eratosthenes, who undoubtedly played a leading role³¹. But knowledge of Eratosthenes' work was probably not direct, and in all likelihood, it was Posidonius, even with his criticism on the extent of Eratosthenes' circumference of the Earth, who was the source that transmitted the nucleus of geographic science to Pliny. Of course, Eratosthenes' map was updated by Pliny with extensively documented references to various Roman enterprises, albeit in different contexts³². Pliny explicitly cites Varro, for example, for the shape of the Caspian Sea being similar to a sickle (VI, 38), and this correction of Eratosthenes' conception of the Caspian was seen by researchers as proof of Varro being the guiding source for Pliny. These updates, however, do not

³⁰ Citroni Marchetti [1982: 126] underlines, in the famous expression *deus est mortali iuvare mortalem* (NH II, 18), the trace of a Stoic humanitarianism that is joined with praise of Vespasian's imperial policy.

³¹ Posidonius in Pliny: I, 2c, 4c, 5c, 6c, 11c; II, 85; VI, 57; VII, 112. Cf. [Sallmann 1971: 70–74].

³² See the denominations of the different sections of the Mediterranean Sea (III, 75), the distances Cyrene–Alexandria (V, 39) and Gades–Carthage–Canopus (V, 40), the distance Rhodes–Alexandria (V, 41). The information from Eratosthenes is also updated six times in Book VI, where the scientist is mentioned: in particular, the area of the Caspian sea, where the description dates back to the historians of Alexander, and updated (VI, 36) with information obtained from Artemidorus, Agrippa and other unspecified authors.

In VI, 51 Pliny reports that Alexander the Great used to say that the water of the Caspian was sweet, and M. Varro claimed that this kind of water was taken to Pompey during his military operations in the Mithridatic War. Varro added that during an exploration under the direction of Pompey, the Roman people ascertained that it took seven days to travel from India to the river Battrò, a tributary of the Oxos in the Bactrian country and that, from this river, through the Caspian Sea and up to Cyprus, the merchandise coming from India could then be transported up to the Pontus in no more than five days, over land. This communication route is described by Eratosthenes (F IIIB, 67 = Str. XI, 7, 3 C 509) in the context of a story that derives from Patrocles, who was sent by Seleucus I to explore the Caspian Sea. The mission confirmed the ancient Ionian idea of an open sea, also accepted by Eratosthenes.

The Plinian text, where Varro is also mentioned in connection with the shape of the sea being similar to a sickle (VI, 38), constitutes one of the reasons why he is considered a leading source for Pliny. It must be said, however, that precisely the circumstantial nature of the information connected to the activity of Varro (*legatus* of Pompey in 65 and supporter of Pompey in the Mithridatic War) can explain the appeal of the Naturalist to Varro for precise geographical realities: [Healey 1999: 42–47]; cf. [Sallmann 1971: 245–246] on the importance of the roles played by Pliny, the *procurator* in various Roman provinces, a counselor of Vespasian and commander of the imperial fleet at Cap Misenus; see also [Cecconi 207: 313]).

Even the observations already made on India, where Agrippa, Posidonius and also Seneca are mentioned, can help us to understand Pliny's method: for he adds onto the image of the world derived from Eratosthenes and elaborated in the Claudian and Flavian ages, and updates it by demonstrating the importance of the Roman conquest.

affect Pliny's acknowledgement of either his sources or the writers who transmitted Greek science to the Naturalist: the idea of the world of *Naturalis Historia* belongs to Eratosthenes, and hence is an important basic element in understanding Pliny's attitude towards scientific geography.

To summarize my conclusions:

1. Pliny's adherence to Eratosthenes' conception of the world is probably linked to an idea of continuity, established by the Flavians and underlined by the Naturalist, between the empire of Augustus and the dynasty set up by Vespasian [Boyle 2002: 15–16]. We can read in *Naturalis Historia* — with great verisimilitude — a strong continuity between Greek science and the organization of space by the Romans³³: just as Agrippa's map was connected to the one drawn up by Eratosthenes, which in turn could be considered the basis of Strabo's *Geography*. Hence Pliny's idea of the world remained consistent with that model, i. e. the one evoked in III, 17.

2. Posidonius' influence on the *Naturalis Historia* appears conspicuous: for this influence does not discuss the framework of Eratosthenes' map, but mainly involves the interpretation of the atmospheric phenomena that characterize the earth, thereby allowing us to hypothesize climatic bands. The latter are understood to be an evolution on the thinking of both Eudoxus and Eratosthenes. The description by Pliny therefore seems to result from a synthesis of the astronomical-climatic conception of both Eratosthenes' and Posidonius' viewpoints, added to the astrological-climatic one (which refers to Nigidius Figulus).

3. As for the role of Varro, cited 140 times in *Naturalis Historia*, his importance appears to be linked not only to precise geographic contexts, but also to the important lexical work that he, too, carried out. It is also known that Cicero, Nigidius Figulus and Vitruvius worked together with Varro on a Latin astronomical vocabulary which, by virtue of a sort of "lexical chauvinism" [Le Boeuffe 1987: 19], avoided any direct borrowing, and preferred to use morphological or semantic calques to render original Greek concepts: for example, ἀστρολογία becomes *siderum ratio*.

The great uncertainty, which is typical of the Latin lexicon, did not favour the progress of science because "la terminologia scientifica ha per ideale la monosemia dei suoi termini" [Perrot 1968: 296]: *cardo*, *axis*, *polus*, *vertex* are words that sometimes have precise, but multiple meanings. The case of *circuli* (VI, 211) — in Greek, παράλλελοι — which indicate *segmenta mundi* is emblematic of a process in which the Greek word is understood to be very strange (Hyg. *Astr.* I, 4.1; Mart. Cap. VIII, 817) but is preferred to the one that oscillates between the meaning of a "circle in the celestial sphere" (Varr. LL, IX, 24; RR, I, 2,4; Manil. I, 566 etc.) and that of a "circular trajectory of a star", or others [Le Boeuffe 1987: 89].

We could add more about Pliny's choices and method if we analysed the art of Pliny's lexicon: Pliny underlines the continuity between Greek and Roman science, and his language shows adaptations which help us understand the role played by scientists such as Posidonius, who acted as an intermediary between the Greek and Roman cultures.

The role of the *Naturalis Historia* is also great, and we hope that research on Pliny's text will continue at the levels witnessed here at this important conference in Moscow.

³³ Cf. Isager [2006: 120] for Pliny's awareness of the supreme level achieved by science at this time and for the decision developed by the Naturalist to narrate, in his work, the stages of this evolution.

References

- Aujac, G. (1966). *Strabon et la science de son temps*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In French).
- Beagon, M. (1992). *Roman nature: The thought of Pliny the Elder*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Bianchetti, S. (1989). Isole africane nella tradizione romana. In A. Mastino (Ed.). *L'Africa romana: Atti del VI Convegno di Studio su L'Africa Romana Sassari, 16–18 dicembre 1988* (Vol. 2), 235–247. Sassari: Gallizzi. (In Italian).
- Bianchetti, S. (1990). L'idea di Africa da Annone a Plinio. In A. Mastino (Ed.). *L'Africa romana: Atti del VII Convegno di Studio, Sassari, 15–17 dicembre 1989* (Vol. 2), 871–878. Sassari: Gallizzi. (In Italian).
- Bianchetti, S. (1996). Plinio e la descrizione dell'Oceano settentrionale in Pitea di Marsiglia. *Orbis Terrarum*, 2, 73–84. (In Italian).
- Bianchetti, S. (1998). *Pitea di Massalia. L'oceano. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*. Pisa; Roma: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali. (In Italian).
- Bianchetti, S. (2004). Da Gades al Tanais: l'Europa di Pitea. *Sileno*, 30, 1–10. (In Italian).
- Boyle, A. J. (2002). Introduction: Reading Flavian Rome. In F. A. J. Boyle, W. J. Dominik (Eds.). *Flavian Rome: Culture, image, text*, 1–68. Leiden: Brill.
- Cecconi, G. A. (2007). “Res, historiae, observationes” a tema militare e la legittimazione dei principi: passato e presente in Plinio il Vecchio. In P. Desideri, S. Roda, A. M. Biraschi (Eds.). *Costruzione e uso del passato storico nella cultura antica: atti del convegno internazionale di studi: Firenze 18–20 settembre 2003*, 313–337. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso. (In Italian).
- Citroni Marchetti, S. (1982). *Iuvare mortalem*, l'ideale programmatico della *NH* di Plinio nei rapporti con il moralismo stoico-diatribico. *Atene e Roma*, 27, 124–148. (In Italian).
- Citroni Marchetti, S. (1991). *Plinio il Vecchio e la tradizione del moralismo romano*. Pisa: Giardini. (In Italian).
- Conte, G. B. (1982). L'inventario del mondo. Ordine e linguaggio della natura nell'opera di Plinio il Vecchio. In G. B. Conte (Ed.). *Gaio Plinio Secondo, Storia naturale, I Cosmologia e Geografia (Libri 1–6)*, xvii–xlvi. Torino: Einaudi. (In Italian).
- Cotta Ramosino, L. (2001). La guerra e lo sviluppo delle conoscenze geografiche in Plinio: tra condanna e valorizzazione. In M. Sordi (Ed.). *Il pensiero sulla guerra nel mondo antico*, 209–223. Milano: Vita e pensiero. (CISA; 27). (In Italian).
- Detlefsen, D. (1908). *Die Geographie Afrikas bei Plinius und Mela und ihre Quelle. Die “Formulae provinciarum”, eine Hauptquelle des Plinius*. Berlin: Weidmann. (Quellen und Forschungen z. alt. Gesch. und Geogr., 14). (Neudr. 2011). (In German).
- Dicks, D. R. (1960). *The geographical fragments of Hipparchus*. London: Athlone Press.
- Doody, A. (2010). *Pliny's Encyclopedia: The reception of the “Natural History”*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- French, R., Greenaway, F. (Eds.) (1986). *Science in the Early Roman Empire: Pliny the Elder, his sources and influence*. London; Sidney: Croom Helm.
- Gisinger, F. (1921). *Die Erdbeschreibung des Eudoxos von Knidos*. Leipzig; Berlin: Teubner (Neudr. Amsterdam 1967). (In German).
- Gisinger, F. (1937). Timosthenes. In Pauly, A., Wissowa, G., Kroll, W., et al. (Eds.) *Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 6 A,2), 1310–1322. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Healey, J. F. (1999). *Pliny the Elder on science and technology*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Heidel, W. A. (1937). *The frame of the ancient Greeks maps*. New York: Arno Press. (Repr. 1976).

- Honigsmann, E. (1929). *Die sieben klimata und die πόλεις ἐπίσημοι*. Heidelberg: Winter. (In German).
- Isager, J. (2006). Pliny's Natural History: A medium for preservation and a cause of loss of knowledge. *Classica*, 19(1), 115–125.
- Laehn, T. R. (2013). *Pliny's defense of empire*. London: Routledge.
- Lasserre, F. (1966). *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos*. Berlin: De Gruyter. (In German).
- Lasserre, F. (Ed., Trans.) (1975). *Strabon, Géographie* (Vol. 8, Book 11). Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In French).
- Le Boeuffe, A. (1987). *Astronomie. Astrologie: Lexique latin*. Paris: Picard. (In French).
- Marcotte, D. (1998). La climatologie d'Eratosthène à Poséidonios: genèse d'une science humaine. In G. Argoud, J. Y. Guillaumin (Eds.). *Sciences exactes et sciences appliquées à Alexandrie (III^e siècle av. J.C. — I^{er} siècle ap. J.C.): Actes du Colloque International de Sain-Étienne (6–8 juin 1996)*, 263–277. Sain-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Sain-Étienne. (In French).
- Marcotte, D. (2018). Entre Athènes et Alexandrie, la genèse de la notion de climat. In J. Jouanna, C. Robin, M. Zink (Eds.). *Colloque: Vie et climat d'Hésopde à Montesquieu: actes*, 89–118. Paris: Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres. (Cahiers de la Villa "Kérylos", 29). (In French).
- Meyer, D. (1998). Hellenistische Geographie zwischen Wissenschaft und Literatur: Timosthenes von Rhodos und der griechische Periplus. In W. Kullmann, J. Althoff, M. Asper (Eds.). *Gattungen wissenschaftlicher Literatur in der Antike*, 193–215. Tübingen: G. Narr. (In German).
- Murphy, T. (2004). *Pliny the Elder's Natural History: The empire in the encyclopedia*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Naas, V. (2002). *Le projet encyclopédique de Pline l'Ancien*. Rome: École française de Rome. (In French).
- Naas, V. (2011). Imperialism, "mirabilia", and knowledge: Some paradoxes in the "Naturalis Historia". In R. Gibson, R. Morello (Eds.). *Pliny the Elder: Themes and contexts*, 57–70. Leiden; Boston, Brill.
- Nicolet, C. (1988). *L'inventaire du monde*. Paris: Fayard. (In French).
- Perrot, L. (1968). *Le langage*. Paris: Gallimard. (In French).
- Prontera, F. (1992). Periplus: sulla tradizione della geografia nautica presso i Greci. In *L'uomo e il mare nella civiltà occidentale: da Ulisse a Cristoforo Colombo: atti del convegno, Genova, 1–4 giugno 1992*, 27–44. Genova: Soc. Ligure di Storia Patria. (In Italian).
- Prontera, F. (2003). Karte (Kartographie). In Klauser, Th. et al. (Eds.) *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (Vol. 20), 187–229. Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann. (In German).
- Sallmann, K. G. (1971). *Die Geographie des älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro*. Berlin: De Gruyter. (In German).
- Shcheglov, D. A. (2004). Ptolemy's system of Seven Climata and Eratosthenes' Geography. *Geographia Antiqua*, 13, 21–37.
- Schneider, P. (2004). *L'Éthiopie et l'Inde. Interférences et confusions aux extrémités du monde antique*. Rome: École française de Rome. (Coll. Éc. Fr. Rome, 335). (In French).
- Serbat, G. (1986). Pline l'Ancien. État présent des études sur sa vie, son œuvre et son influence. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 32(4), 2069–2200. (In French).
- Szabó, A. (1992). *Das geozentrische Weltbild. Astronomie, Geographie und Mathematik der Griechen*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag. (In German).
- Taylor, R. (2015). *Tensions in knowledge-construction in Pliny the Elder's books on astronomy and agriculture*. London: Univ. of London.

- Vottero, D. (1989). *Lucio Anneo Seneca: Questioni naturali*. Torino: UTET. (In Latin and Italian).
- Wagner, E.A. (1888). *Die Erdbeschreibung des Timosthenes von Rhodos* (Diss.). Leipzig. (In German).
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1990). Pliny the Elder and man's unnatural history. *Greece & Rome*, 37(1), 80–96.

* * *

Информация об авторе

Серена Бьянкетти

PhD

ординарный профессор (Prof. ordinario di Storia greca), факультет литературы и философии (Dipartimento di Lettere e Filosofia = DILEF), Флорентийский университет

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Via della Pergola 60, 50121 Firenze

Тел.: +392756627

✉ serena.bianchetti@unifi.it

Information about the author

Serena Bianchetti

PhD

Full Professor of Greek Ancient History, Department of Lettere e Filosofia (DILEF), University of Florence

Via della Pergola 60, 50121 Firenze

Tel.: +392756627

✉ serena.bianchetti@unifi.it

V. Bucciantini

ORCID: 0000-0001-6709-4222
✉ veronica.bucciantini@unifi.it

Флорентийский университет
(Италия, Флоренция)

FRAGMENTS OF THE HISTORIANS OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT IN THE *NATURALIS HISTORIA*: BETWEEN MEMORY AND OBLIVION

Аннотация. В статье анализируется VI книга «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего, содержащая сведения историков Александра Великого и других участников восточного похода. Плиний, обнаруживая знакомство со свидетельствами бематистов, не привлекает сочинение Аристобула по исторической географии, а Птолемея упоминает лишь в отдельных местах в связи с незначительными ссылками. Более того, часть приводимых им сведений заимствована из произведений Юбы II. Таким образом, при изложении рассматриваемых в статье фрагментов Плиний вдохновлялся содержанием текстов Непарха. Помимо всего, кратко оценивая свидетельства современников-очевидцев, историков Александра Великого, Плиний не отмечает важности их информации. Сведения историков Александра Великого, использованные в «Естественной истории», отнюдь не играют столь решающей роли, как в «Анабасисе» (или «Походе Александра») Арриана из вифинской Никомерии. Историк Арриан полагал, что достижения Александра Великого следует использовать в качестве «примера» для императора Траяна (ср. «Деяния божественного Августа»), в то время как Плиний не ставил целью, да и не мог «подать пример» императору Веспасиану или его соправителю Титу. В современной Плинию политической жизни занятие историографией не являлось своего рода «бегством от действительности» (иными словами, это вовсе не приветствовалось), особенно в последние годы правления Нерона. Энциклопедическая направленность труда Плиния была обусловлена его содержанием: «описание мира в эпоху Флавиев» более не вызывало интереса и отнюдь не вдохновлялось мифом об Александре Великом — его место занимает *Imitatio Alexandri* в августовской пропаганде.

Ключевые слова: фрагменты историков Александра Великого, VI книга «Естественной истории», Юба II, Аристобул, Птолемей, Непарх, «Анабасис» Арриана

Для цитирования: Bucciantini V. Fragments of the historians of Alexander the Great in the *Naturalis Historia*: Between memory and oblivion // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 26–39. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-26-39.

Статья поступила в редакцию 9 октября 2019 г.

Принято к печати 14 декабря 2019 г.

Shagi / Steps. Vol. 6. No. 1. 2020

Articles

V. Bucciantini

ORCID: 0000-0001-6709-4222

✉ veronica.bucciantini@unifi.it

University of Florence
(Italy, Florence)

FRAGMENTS OF THE HISTORIANS OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT IN THE *NATURALIS HISTORIA*: BETWEEN MEMORY AND OBLIVION

Abstract. The analysis starts from the 6th Book of the *Naturalis Historia*, where we can find information derived from the historians of Alexander and those others scientists who followed his expedition. Pliny thus proves to know the work of the bematists but doesn't consider at all the historiographical work of Aristobulus, and mentions Ptolemaeus only in specific dossiers regarding certain subjects. Moreover, the Naturalist declares that he drew his account from Juba II, but in terms of the passages analyzed here he consistently took inspiration from the work of Nearchus. However, Pliny made only sporadic notes about the contemporary historians of Alexander and he did not consider their importance. The passages concerning Alexander's historians in *NH* don't have the kind of significant role as they will have in Arrian's *Anabasis*: the historian from Nicomedia thinks that the achievements of Alexander the Great as *Res Gestae* should be used as *exemplum* for Trajan, while Pliny doesn't want and cannot "show as exemplum" anything to emperors Vespasian or Titus. In the contemporary political life of the Plinian age, historiography was not a very neutral refuge (in other words it wasn't something very advisable to do), especially during the last years of Nero's empire. The encyclopedic purpose of the work has strongly conditioned the content: the author of "the inventory of the World of the Flavian age" was no longer interested and fascinated by the myth of Alexander, which had been the reference point of the *Imitatio Alexandri* of Augustan propaganda.

Keywords: Fragmentary historians of Alexander, Book 6 of *NH*, Juba II, Aristobulus, Ptolemaeus, Nearchus, Arrian's *Anabasis*.

To cite this article: Bucciantini, V. (2020). Fragments of the historians of Alexander the Great in the *Naturalis Historia*: Between memory and oblivion. *Shagi / Steps*, 6(1), 26–39. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-26-39.

Received October 9, 2019

Accepted December 14, 2019

In the 1st Book of *Naturalis Historia*, Pliny offers not only a list of all the topics he intends to address in the following 36 books, but also the sources of these arguments, dividing them between Roman and external — *ex auctoribus romanis ed (ex auctoribus) externis*. The clarity and precision of the Plinian scheme did not prevent the birth of a debated *Quellenforschung*¹ with regard both to the content and sequence of the *Indices* and to the text of the *NH*.

I do not intend to go into any of the much debated Plinian problems, such as the importance of intermediate sources, neither the more or less relevant influence of the Catonian model on Plinian encyclopedias², nor the discussion of the anti-Hellenism of the *NH*.

I just want to suggest some observations on the traces that can be found, regarding the fragments of the historians of Alexander, first of all on the Book 6 and then also on the entire work, defined by Gian Biagio Conte as “the inventory of Plinian World” [Conte 1982: xvii].

The analysis starts from the Book 6 because it closes the section of the studies dedicated to geography, and treats the Asian regions, i. e. Central and Eastern Asia, India, Parthia, Mesopotamia and Arabia. The Indian section (6.56–91) contains information derived from the historians of Alexander and those others scientists who followed the expedition: there are numerous Greek sources as compared to Latin ones, even if it is not certain that Pliny directly gathered these from the quoted authors.

The Naturalist often intervenes with updates dated back to his time: e. g. Plin. *NH* 6.84³, which is related to the activity of Annius Plocamus⁴ attested by a bilingual inscription of 5–6 CE found not far from Berenice on the Red Sea⁵.

¹ Brunn [1856] believed that the *Indices* were a faithful list of the sequence of authors used by Pliny; Münzer [1897] focused on the historical and antiquarian sections but he did not reach convincing conclusions, hypothesizing also primary sources and intermediate sources such as Varro and Verrius Flaccus, whose importance was later supported by Rabenhorst [1907]. Klotz [1906; 1907], studying in particular Plinian geography, attributed the errors to the manuscript tradition, while Detlefsen [1909] considered that Pliny used a number of works inferior to those declared in the *Indices*. Della Corte [1954] then hypothesized a substantial Varronian influence on Pliny; this problematic relationship was also discussed by Sallmann [1971], which still remains a point of reference in the history of studies. The largest Plinian bibliography until 1946 is in [Le Bonniec 1946]. See also [Brieger 1857; Aly 1882; Dalstein 1885; Stadler 1891].

² See [Della Corte 1954; Cotta Ramusino 2004: 52–53].

³ 6.84: *Nobis diligentior notitia Claudi principatu contigit legatis etiam ex ea insula advectis. id accidit hoc modo. Anni Plocami, qui mar is Rubri vectigal a fisco redemerat, libertus circa Arabiam navigans aquilonibus raptus praeter Carmaniam, XV die Hippuros portum eius invectus, hospitali regis clementia sex mensum tempore inbutus adloquio percunctanti postea narravit Romanos et Caesarem*. I adopt in this paper the Latin text after Mayhoff.

⁴ See [Meredith 1953; De Romanis 1992; Janni 2004: 125–126].

⁵ We should note the importance of the impulse given by emperor Nero to the geographical explorations, with expeditions to Ethiopia looking for the sources of the Nile. and towards

It is essential to evaluate the quality of Plinian information and the role played by Juba II in relation to the testimonies of the historians of Alexander. I will begin the analysis with the fragments of the bematists reported by Pliny: these were participants in the expedition of Alexander the Great in Asia who were responsible for measuring the distances travelled, and their collected data was added to the Royal Archive in Babylon after the death of the Macedonian king⁶. The bematists, whose fragments we retain, are Baeton⁷, Diognetus⁸, Amyntas⁹, Philonides of Crete¹⁰ and Archelaus¹¹, but Pliny mentions only the first two. Diognetus is quoted three times in the *Indices* (6.12.13) and only once in the text, together with Baeton, in relation to the distance from the Caspian Gates to the city of Hekatompylon (6.45). Baeton is quoted also in the text at 6.69, where Pliny describes an Indian phenomenon occurring in the Monaedi and Suari region and, more precisely, on Mount Maleus: here the shadows project to the north for six months in winter, and to the south for six months in summer. Pliny alludes to this event also in 2.184 talking about the Oretes Indians, and he notes that it can occur only on a mountain located on the equator [Schiwek 1962: 42–43; Janni 1978: 95–96]. What is interesting here is not only that the bematists reported information in addition to the distances travelled, but also that these extreme various reports came to Pliny, or more likely to the intermediate source that the Naturalist used. The last Plinian fragment of Baeton derives from the 7th Book, the first one dedicated to animals: actually it represents a book on its own, for the enormous variety of anecdotes, which the Naturalist probably derived from collections of *exempla* and *mirabilia*¹². In this text Pliny treats the tribes of Scythians Anthropophagi, and Baeton adds that these wild men, with the soles of their feet pointing backwards, were wandering like nomads with beasts and that they could not live in a different climate¹³. Also in this case Baeton — defined as *itinerum mensor* — wrote a report that, in addition to data about distances, also contained a

the Caspian Gates, the Silk Road, the Baltic Sea and the Amber Way. The Roman expeditions are located from 62 to 67 CE: on one hand, they went up to the Nile towards equatorial Africa, on the other hand they tried to know and to control the caravan routes through the desert, because these linked the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean. See [Kirwan 1957; Cotta Ramosino 2001: 222–223].

⁶ We know their works from some passages of Strabo: at 15.1.11 C689 for the measure of the shortest side of India the Geographer refers 16.000 stadia, a measure that Eratosthenes had obtained from the records of the stages. In another passage (15.2.8–9 C723–724) Strabo mentions the width of the Ariana, that could be calculated either from the Caspian Gates to Alexandria Ariana or from the region of Ariana to the south towards the Drangiana and up to the Indus: he reports that these two ways of measuring are in Ἀσιατικοὶ Σταθμοὶ (*FGrHist* 119 F 3). For bematists see [Schwartz 1897; Matthews 1974; Tzifopoulos 2013].

⁷ See [Schwartz 1896: 2779]; *FGrHist* 119; *BNJ* 119.

⁸ See [Berger 1903: 785]; *FGrHist* 120; *FGrHist* 2016; *BNJ* 120.

⁹ *FGrHist* 121; *BNJ* 121.

¹⁰ *FGrHist* 122; *BNJ* 122; [Tzifopoulos 1998: 137–170].

¹¹ *FGrHist* 123; *BNJ* 123.

¹² 7.11: *super alios autem Anthropophagos Scythas in quadam convalle magna Imavi montis regio est quae vocatur Abarimon, in qua silvestres vivunt homines aversis post crura plantis, eximiae velocitatis, passim cum feris vagantes. hos in alio non spirare caelo ideoque ad finitimos reges non pertrahi neque ad Alexandrum Magnum pertractos Baeton itinerum eius mensor prodidit.*

¹³ See *FGrHist* 715 F 27b = Strab. 15.1.57 C711 ὁμοία δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τῶν Ἐνωτοκοιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγρίων ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἄων τερατῶδῶν. τοὺς μὲν οὖν ἀγρίους μὴ κοιμισθῆναι παρὰ Σανδρόκοττον· ἀποκαρτερεῖν γάρ. ἔχειν δὲ τὰς μὲν πτέρνας πρόσθεν, τοὺς δὲ ταρσοὺς ὀπισθεν καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους.

lot more information on the movements of the sun and stars and on the populations of “others” encountered during the expedition.

The problem of the transmission of the data collected by the bematists to Pliny, and probably of the non-direct access to these texts by the Naturalist, also seriously impacts the historians of Alexander. Ptolemaeus and Aristobulus are also the main sources of Arrian’s *Anabasis*¹⁴, as can be seen from the beginning of the first book¹⁵. The historian of Nicomedia did not always use first-hand sources but also relied on compilations of selected sources; what is interesting to me, in this case, is that he favored these above the just mentioned generals of Alexander¹⁶. Aristobulus of Cassandrea¹⁷ probably had only a technical role in the Asiatic expedition, and an interest in engineering works and in the strategic aspect linked to the use of natural elements. We don’t know the title or the internal subdivision of his work, probably published in his old age, but it likely privileged those elements that supported the strategic choices of the sovereign and that had determined military success.

The Aristobulean fragments contain a great variety of themes and interests, such as geography, ethnography, location names, botany and hydrography: it should be noted, however, that the work is cited only by Greek authors, such as Strabo¹⁸, Plutarch¹⁹ and Atheneus²⁰. Some studies [Moretti 2012; 2013] have highlighted points of contact and correspondence between the Aristobulean fragments and some passages of the *Historiae Alexandri Magni* of Curtius Rufus, thus allowing us to hypothesize that the information derived from the Aristobulean work was circulated, perhaps summarized, or was present in other intermediate sources.

However, the fact remains that neither in the *Indices*, nor in Pliny’s work, nor in any other Latin work is there mention of the historian of Cassandrea.

Instead, there are several testimonies in the *Naturalis Historia* about Ptolemaeus²¹: he descended from a lateral branch of the Macedonian royal family, and was among the *Hetairoi* exiled by Philip II in 337 BCE.

Ptolemaeus later became one of the king’s bodyguards and, after the death of Alexander, *Basileus* of Egypt in 305 BCE, and he wrote — probably at an advanced age — an *Alexandergeschichte*. Unlike Aristobulus, Ptolemaeus, according to the fragments we have, described in detail various military operations of Alexander’s

¹⁴ See [Bosworth 1980: 16–34; Tonnet 1988 (1): 105–219; Sisti 2001: 301–302].

¹⁵ Arr. *Anab.* 1, 1–2: Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Λάγου καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος ὁ Ἀριστοβούλου ὅσα μὲν ταῦτά ἄμφοι περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Φιλίππου συνέγραψαν, ταῦτα ἐγὼ ὡς πάντῃ ἀληθῆ ἀναγράφω, ὅσα δὲ οὐ ταῦτά, τούτων τὰ πιστότερα ἐμοὶ φαινόμενα καὶ ἅμα ἀξιαφηγητότερα ἐπιλεξάμενος (<...> ἄλλ’ ἐμοὶ Πτολεμαῖός τε καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος πιστότεροι ἐδοξάν ἐς τὴν ἀφήγησιν, ὁ μὲν ὅτι συνεστράτευσε βασιλεῖ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, Ἀριστόβουλος, Πτολεμαῖος δὲ πρὸς τῷ ξυστρατεῦσαι ὅτι καὶ αὐτῷ βασιλεῖ ὄντιαισχροτέρων ἢ τῷ ἄλλῳ ψεύσασθαι ἦν· ἄμφοι δέ, ὅτι τετελευτηκότος ἤδη Ἀλεξάνδρου συγγράφουσιν ὅτε αὐτοῖς ἢ τε ἀνάγκη καὶ ὁ μισθὸς τοῦ ἄλλως τι ἢ ὡς συνηνέχθη συγγράψαι ἀπῆν.

¹⁶ Arrian adds (*Anab.* 1.3) that he used even information of other writers who were not “entirely incredible”. About this “secondary” tradition see [Bosworth 1988: 61–93].

¹⁷ *FGrHist* 139; [Berve 1926: 64–66, n. 121; Pearson 1952; 1960: 150–187; Brunt 1974: 65–69; Pédech 1984: 331–405; Sisti 2001: xxix (with huge bibliography); Heckel 2006: 46].

¹⁸ For 15 times: FF 9b, 19, 20, 28a, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 48, 49b, 51b, 56, 57.

¹⁹ For 11 times: TT 2; FF 2, 3, 4, 5, 7b, 11, 21a, 46, 59, 63.

²⁰ For 5 times: FF 6, 9a, 18, 32, 47. Moreover Aristobulus is also mentioned twice in Luciano, see TT 3, 4 and once in Menander, see T 5.

²¹ *FGrHist* 138; *BNJ* 138; [Berve 1926: 329–335; Wirth 1959; Pearson 1960: 188–211; Worthington 2016; Howe 2018].

expedition (attacks, sieges, fights and conquests of new territories) but he rarely adds geographical data, as Arrian (e. g. *Anab.* 5.20.8) points out. In the Plinian work the references to Ptolemaeus appear in the *Indices* of Book 12²², dedicated to botany (*de arborum natura*), and of Book 13, dedicated to the most particular tree species (*de perigrinis arboribus*). It is also noteworthy that these two *Indices* are identical and are the only two *Testimonia* cited by Felix Jacoby [1926–1930; 1930] in the collection of Fragments (*FGrHist* 138).

But there are also other references to Ptolemaeus: two passages come from the Book 7, which reports on the *Exempla Mirabilia*. At 7.207–208²³ Pliny describes the dawn of navigation with the evolution of ships and reports that, according to Mnesigiton, it was Alexander the Great who introduced ships up to 10 orders of oars, while Ptolemaeus Soter introduced the twelve orders of oars, according to Philostephanus. Then follows an unlikely and impossible size of ships of thirty and forty orders of oars at the time of Ptolemaeus Philadelphus and Ptolemaeus Philopator. I am not going to talk about the analysis of the text, which represents an important source for the history of the ancient navigation, as Janni [1996: 245–250] clearly analyzed, but I am interested in underlining two points:

1) Ptolemaeus Soter is called the Savior of Egypt, and this title fits in a context of royal succession in chronological order, from Alexander the Great until Ptolemaeus Philopator;

2) Philostephanus, who, according to Pliny, could have reported the news was a pupil of Callimachus of Cyrene in Alexandria. During the reign of Ptolemaeus Philopator he wrote a history of Cyprus, now lost. This probably suggests an Egyptian context for the origin of information and perhaps also for the intermediate source, which I think may be Juba II. Again, in the Book 7 of the *NH* 7.123–124²⁴ there is a list of scholars who distinguished themselves in different sciences: Berossus²⁵ in astrology, Apollodorus in grammar and Hippocrates and others in medical science.

Pliny later adds that during the sacred Megalesia festival Cleombrotus of Kea was rewarded with 100 talents by King Ptolemaeus for saving the life of King Antio-

²² *Index EXTERNIS Liber 12 Theophrasto. Herodoto. Callisthene. Isigono. Clitarcho. Anaximene. Duride. Nearcho. Onesicrito. Polyclito. Olympiodoro. Diogneto. Nicobule. Anticlide. Charete Mytilenaeo. Menaechmo. Dorotheo Athenaeo. Lyco. Antaeo. Ehippo. Dinone. Adimanto. Ptolemaeo Lagi.*

²³ 7.207–208: *nave Iasonem primum navigasse Philostephanus auctor est, Hegesias Parhalum, Ctesias Samiramin, Archemachus Aegaeonem, biremem Damastes Erythraeos fecisse, triremem Thucydides Aminoclen Corinthium, quadriremem Aristoteles Carthaginienses, quinquere mem <M>nesi<gi>ton Salaminios, sex ordinum <X>enagoras Syracusios, ab ea ad decemremem <M>nesigiton Alexandrum Magnum, ad duodecim ordines Philostephanus Ptolemaeum Soterem, ad quindecim Demetrium Antigoni, ad XXX Ptolemaeum Philadelphum, ad XL Ptolemaeum Philopatorem, qui Tryphon cognominatus est.*

²⁴ 7.123–124: *Hippocrates medicina, qui venientem ab Illyriis pestilentiam praedixit discipulosque ad auxiliandum circa urbes dimisit, quod ob meritum honores illi quos Herculi decrevit Graecia. eandem scientiam in Cleombroto Ceo Ptolemaeus rex Megalensis sacris donavit centum talentis servato Antiocho rege. magna et Critob<u>lo fama est extracta Philippi regis oculo sagitta et citra deformitatem oris curata orbitate luminis, summa autem Asclepiadi Prusiensi condita nova secta, spretis legatis et pollicitationibus Mithridatis regis, reperta ratione qua vinum aegris medetur, relato e funere homine et conservato, sed maxime sponsione facta.*

²⁵ See [Primo 2009: 65–72] with bibliography.

chus. Cleombrotus, father of Erasistratus and Cleophanus, was the private physician of Seleucus Nicator and, since he had to move away from Antigonus Monophthalmus after 316 BCE, he escaped to Egypt. It may be thought that the *Rex Ptolemaeus* of the Plinian passage that rewarded the physician of Kea for saving the life of Antiochus, son of Seleucus I, is in fact Ptolemaeus Soter. This reference, if considered correct, would refer to information concerning the kingdom of Ptolemaeus the First and not his participation in the expedition of Alexander. Such an interpretation is supported by a passage concerning painting²⁶ in Book 35, where Pliny, describing the extraordinary ability of Apelles to make portraits that were so close to the original, remembers that this artist didn't have good relations with Ptolemaeus the First, whose official painter at court was Antiphrilos. The Naturalist adds that Apelles once arrived in Alexandria due to a violent storm, and was invited to court by a jester who had been bribed by the rivals of the famous painter. King Ptolemaeus came to know about the deception and asked Apelles to draw the servants who organized this; the painter did it so well that the malefactor was recognized. In the Plinian account Ptolemaeus is defined as being part of the *entourage* of the Macedonian King — *in comitatu Alexandri* — and reigning in Alexandria — *regnante Alexandriam*. These observations help to place the *terminus post quem* in 305 for this episode. Even the story of Apelles, therefore, refers to information involving the reign of Ptolemaeus, as do the other two previously mentioned Plinian testimonies.

What has been analyzed until now demonstrates that in Pliny's work there is no trace of the historiographical fragmentary work of Aristobulus and Ptolemaeus, which has come down to us, although their work is the point of reference for Arrian's *Anabasis*.

In fact, the first of these authors is never mentioned in the *NH*, and the second one is found in some passages regarding events that occurred after 305 BCE, once he had become King of Egypt.

In the mentioned texts, there are probably specific dossiers on navigation, on scholars, on painting, produced perhaps in an Alexandrian environment and consulted by Pliny: it is also possible to exclude the direct use by the Naturalist of the literary work of Ptolemaeus.

I shall now focus on the fragments of Nearchus of Crete and Onesicritus of As-typalea. Some scholars ([Sprengler 1891]; see [Sallmann 1971: 86, n. 100]) agree that Pliny knew Onesicritus' works through the filter of Juba II of Mauretania²⁷ as reported by the Naturalist at 6.96: *sed priusquam generatim haec persequamur indicari convenit quae prodidit Onesicritus class Alexandri circumvectus in mediterranea Persidis ex India, enarrata proxime a Iuba, deinde eam navigationem quae his annis comperta servatur*.

On the other hand, the analysis of the Nearchean fragments in Pliny's work is based on three quotations in the *Indices* (6.12.13), and three of the five references

²⁶ 35.89: *non fuerat ei gratia in comitatu Alexandri cum Ptolemaeo, quo regnante Alexandriam vi tempestatis expulsus, subornato fraude aemulorum plano regio invitatus, ad cenam venit indignantique Ptolemaeo et vocatores suos ostendenti, ut diceret, a quo eorum invitatus esset, arrepto carbone extincto e foculo imaginem in pariete delineavit, adgnoscente voltum plani rege inchoatum protinus*.

²⁷ *FGrHist* 275; [Roller 2003]. See for a complete *Quellenanalyse* [Sallmann 1971: 35–119].

in Book Six simultaneously cite the two admirals. I would like to start with the passages where the Cretan is quoted alone: at 6.97²⁸ it is the *oppidum* of Arbis²⁹ founded by Nearchus on the homonymous river, as we also read in Arr. *Ind.* 22.8. Pliny probably confused the natural port at the mouth of the Arabis, which is located after the mouth of the Indus, with a city of the same name, but what is interesting to us is that the city was founded by Nearchus and probably the information comes from the Cretan.

The admiral is also cited at 6.107³⁰ — *Nearchus scripsit* — in connection with the length of the coast of Carmania which is calculated as 1.250 Roman miles, probably corresponding to 10.000 Greek stadia. According to Strabo (15.2.1 C720), it is clear that Carmania is 3.700 stadia, a number that, added to the length of the coast of the Ichthyophagi (7.400), amount to 10.000 stadia.

Apart from these considerations on the measurements [Brunt 1983: 523–525; Bucciantini 2013], it appears that the information was not gathered directly from Nearchus' report, but more probably from its synthesis: was not Onesicritus interested in naming the city founded by the rival to the expedition's command? In the other three passages the Admiral is quoted together with Onesicritus. The first (6.96)³¹ presents a textual problem related to *nec nomina habet mansionum nec spatia*, which was integrated by Geier [1844] with *omnia*, possibly mistakenly left out by the copyist — *propter similitudinem antecedentis vocis*. The reports of navigation had to have many names and measurements of places and the corrupted text is very difficult to understand: Pliny had to know *nomina mansionum et spatia*, even though he had not drawn directly from his sources [Brown 1949: 105–109].

The two marshals of the expedition sent by Alexander are also cited in two other passages of the Book 6 (109³² and 124³³): in the first we learn that Onesicritus and Nearchus calculated 1,700 miles from the mouth of the Indus to the Persian Gulf, and from there to the swampland formed at the Euphrates; this measurement is much lower than the 23,000 stadia handed down in Arrian [Bucciantini 2015: 72–77].

In the second passage, on the other hand, a much shorter partial measurement, which is the length of the navigable tract of the Euphrates from Babylon to the Persian Gulf, is indicated as 412 miles, a number which is very close to 3.330 stadia of Arr. *Ind.* 41.8: this fact might suggest that this information derives from the Nearchean account.

²⁸ 6.97: *oppidum a Nearchō conditum in navigatione et flumen Arbiū navium capax, contra insula distans LXX stadiis*.

²⁹ Stein [1943: 214, n. 1] obtained, from Arrian's text, a different location of the mouth of the Arabis, identified with the actual Hab, which flows few miles to N-E of Ras Mūāri. For Stein the error depended both on the idea that the shoreline, at the time of Alexander, was more to the north, and on the absence of archaeological evidence.

³⁰ 6.107: *Carmaniae oram patere duodeciens quinquaginta milia passuum Nearchus scripsit*.

³¹ 6.96: *Onesicriti et Nearchi navigatio nec nomina omnia habet mansionum nec spatia, primumque Xylinepolis ab Alexandro condita, unde ceperunt exordium, iuxta quod flumen aut ubi fuerit non satis explanatur: haec tamen digna memoratu produntur ab iis*.

³² 6.109: *Onesicritus et Nearchus ab Indo amne in sinum Persicum atque illinc Babylonem Euphratis paludibus scripserunt | XVII | esse. in Carmaniae angulo Chelonophagi, testudinum superficie casas tegentes, carne vescentes. a flumine Arabi promunturium ipsum inhabitant praeter capita toto corpore hirti coriisque piscium vestiti*.

³³ 6.124: *Euphrate navigari Babylonem e Persico mari CCCXL p. tradunt Nearchus et Onesicritus*.

I am going to omit the question of measurement and transformation of stadia into Roman miles, but I would like to focus on the following point. The quotations analyzed so far, where Onesicritus and Nearchus appear at the same time, not only represent reports about the context of the naval expedition along the coast and the subsequent report to Alexander, but sometimes they also seem to have quite precise information. In contrast to it, in *NH*, the fragments concerning only Onesicritus seem to have a very different and precisely identifiable theme.

The passage 2.183–185³⁴ deals with the shadows on Mons Maleus. We learn that in the summer the shadows there lean to the south, while in winter they lean to the north; in addition, the Great Bear is visible only for 15 nights. During Alexander's stay — says Pliny in 2.185 — it was recorded that the Bear could only be seen in the early part of the night, while Onesicritus wrote that there are places in India where it can't be seen and that these places are called Askia. Another Plinian passage — 7.28³⁵ — must be linked to this last information. It's where Onesicritus is quoted regarding the characteristics of the Indians inhabiting the areas of the country without shadow: they would be tall more than five cubits, they would live for at least 130 years and they would die without knowing a real aging process. The phenomenon we are speaking about is not possible in India at the latitudes reached by the expedition, but it actually occurs in nature and it is seen starting from the Tropic of Cancer (*24° latitude and 46°1' longitude in the time of Alexander*). In Onesicritus' account concerning an inland region of northern India, Pliny must have recognized a phenomenon similar to that which took place in Siene, a city of Upper Egypt, during the summer solstice. He exploited his astronomical knowledge to shape a "land of the Absurd", a utopian reality, where the same laws of nature are subverted or suspended. At 6.81³⁶ the text talks about Taprobane and how Onesicritus tells that elephants found there are bigger and more belligerent than elephants in India.

There is little doubt that the reality described by Onesicritus, from the quotations of Strabo and Pliny, has to be identified with the island of Ceylon / Sri Lanka, and more likely it must be regarded as the first mention of this place in Western literature. What is important to us here is that the Onesicritean Taprobane was a remote reality difficult to access, a sort of "boundary of humanity", where all the characteristics of India known by the Greek-Macedonians are concentrated in amplified form. Some *mirabilia* also refer to the other two fragments of Onesicritus in Pliny concerning extraordinary tree species. At 12.34³⁷ he speaks about exotic trees and thorny shrubs that grow in Gedrosia: their juice, if splashed in the eyes, blinds a person. Here also grows a grass with a strong odor: its fluid, if consumed, kills

³⁴ 2.183–184: *simili modo tradunt in Syene oppido, quod est supra Alexandriam quinque milibus stadium, solstitii die medio nullam umbram iaci puteumque eius experimenti gratia factum totum inluminari. ex quo apparere tum solem illi loco supra verticem esse, quod et in India supra flumen Hypasim fieri tempore eodem Onesicritus scribit.*

³⁵ 7.28: *Onesicritus, quibus locis Indiae umbrae non sint, corpora hominum cubitorum quinum et binorum palmorum existere, et vivere annos CXXX nec senescere, sed ut medio aevo mori.*

³⁶ 6.81: *Taprobanen alterum orbem terrarum esse diu existimatum est Antichthonum appellatione. ut insulam liqueret esse Alexandri Magni aetas resque praestitere. Onesicritus classis eius praefectus elephantos ibi maiores bellicosioresque quam in India gigni scripsit.*

³⁷ 12.34: *Onesicritus tradit in Hyrcaniae convallibus fico similes esse arbores quae vocentur occhi, ex quibus defluat mel horis matutinis duabus.*

instantly. Onesicritus says that in Hyrcania — south Caspian valley — there are fig-like trees called “Eyes”, from which honey runs for two hours in the morning. Hyrcanian trees, whose figs that are much sweeter and more productive than ours, are mentioned at 15.68³⁸ as well as at 12.34. It seems clear therefore that Pliny, in his selection of the Onesicritean fragments, was more interested in extraordinary phenomena than in information that was more related to the voyage from India to Babylon and most likely drawn from Nearchus. In conclusion, for the geography of Africa, Arabia and India Pliny seems to draw from Isidorus of Charax³⁹ but, above all, from Juba, who lived in the Augustan Age and died in 23 CE, at about the same time as Strabo. Above all we owe him the information about the way to India, about the course of the Euphrates between Babylon and Charax (6.124) and about the south coast of Arabia (6.149) as well as the fauna of the southern areas, the subtropical trees and the treasures of Arabia, pearls and other gemstones.

For a complete overview see the summary table.

	VI Book <i>NH</i>	<i>Naturalis Historia</i>
Diognetus	<u>61</u>	1 (<i>Indices</i> 6.12.13)
Baeton	<u>61</u> , 69	1 (<i>Indices</i> 5.6.7), 7.12
Ptolemaeus I	—	1 (<i>Indices</i> 12.13) 7.123, 7.208, 35.89
Aristobulus	—	—
Nearchus	<u>96</u> , 97, 107, <u>109</u> , <u>124</u>	1 (<i>Indices</i> 6.12.13)
Onesicritus	81, <u>96</u> , <u>109</u> , <u>124</u>	1 (<i>Indices</i> 2.6.7.10.12.13.14.15), 2.183, 2.185, 7.28, 12.34, 15.68
Juba	96, 124, 139, 141, 149, 156, 170, 175, 176, 179, 201, 203, 205	1 (<i>Indices</i> 5.6.8.9.19.12.13.15.25.31.32. 33.35.36.37), 5.16 5.20, 5.51, 5.59, 8.7, 8.14, 8.35, 8.48, 8.107, 8.156, 9.115, 10.126, 12.39, 12.56, 12.61, 12.67, 12.80, 13.34, 13.92, 13.142, 15.99, 25.14, 25.77–78, 31.18, 32.10, 33.118, 35.39, 36.163, 37.24, 37.69, 37.73.

Everything I have addressed so far is likely derived from Juba’s *De expeditione arabica* (6.141, 12.56 and 32.10) and from other works of geography about Africa⁴⁰ and India, such as the lost work of Seneca *De situ Indiae*.

Roman military news and military reports in general seem less important, as we do not know how much they may have influenced the improvement of the information available.

³⁸ 15.6.8: *Onesicritus tradit in Hyrcania multum nostris esse dulciores fertilioresque (sc. ficos), ut quae modios CCLXX singulae ferant.*

³⁹ Isidorus of Carax wrote two minor literary works: the first one on pearls in the Persian Gulf, and the second one on the way from Zeugma to Alexandria: he was sent to the East by Augustus before his adopted son Caius Caesar died in 4 CE. *FGrHist* 781; *BNJ* 781; [Schoff 1914; Walser 1985; Chaumont 1984; Khlopin 1977].

⁴⁰ See [Hönigsmann 1926, very important 178].

Juba is the only Greek author, probably used directly and for large sections by Pliny, while others — Ephorus, Timaeus, Polybius, Eratosthenes — had rarely been used directly and much more likely he did it through paradoxographic collections. However, Sallmann [1971: 85–88] affirms that, even if Pliny could not have consulted Juba's work about Arabia, he would certainly have been able to use directly other works of the king of Mauretania, because Pliny had knowledge of Juba's entire work, which he praised at 5.16.

Pliny thus proves to know the work of the bematists but completely ignores the historiographical work of Aristobulus and mentions Ptolemaeus only in specific dossiers regarding certain subjects. Considering Onesicritus, the Naturalist declares that he draws his account from Juba — 6.96 — but in relation to the passages analyzed here it seems that Pliny consistently took inspiration from the work of Nearchus, especially regarding the data about navigation.

Onesicritus remains the main source for data related mostly to *mirabilia*, but not for information related to the knowledge about the coast from India to Babylon. The Naturalist used therefore specific dossiers on different subjects, but the common trait is that it did not prove him to have ever had a true historical interest either in the expedition of Alexander or what it meant.

Pliny makes sporadic notes about the contemporary historians of Alexander and let us suppose their lesser importance for his work. Moreover, in the contemporary political life of the Plinian age historiography was not a very neutral refuge (in other words it wasn't something very advisable to do), especially during the last years of Nero's reign.

The passages concerning the historians of Alexander don't have as significant role, as they will in Arrian's *Anabasis*: the Nicomedian historian thinks that the achievements of Alexander the Great as *Res Gestae* should be used as *exemplum* for Trajan⁴¹, while Pliny doesn't want and cannot "show as exemplum" anything to emperors Vespasian or Titus.

The encyclopedic purpose of the work has strongly conditioned the content: "the inventory of the World of the Flavian age" was no longer interested and fascinated by the myth of Alexander, which instead had been the reference point of the *Imitatio Alexandri* of Augustean propaganda [Cresci Marrone 1993: 15–30].

References

- Aly, F. (1882). *Die Quellen des Plinius in achten Buch der Naturgeschichte*. Marburg: N. G. Elwert. (In German).
- Berger, E. H. (1903). Diognetos (16). In A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 5.1), 785. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag (In German).
- Berve, H. (1926). *Das Alexanderreich Auf Prosopographischer Grundlage* (Vol. 2). München: Beck. (In German).
- Bosworth, A. B. (1980). *A historical commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, (Vol. 1) *Commentary on Books I–III*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

⁴¹ See [Sisti 2001: xx, n. 1] with a good selection of bibliography about the influence of Alexander in the Hellenistic age and in the Roman world.

- Bosworth, A. B. (1988). *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in historical interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brieger, A. (1857). *De fontibus librorum XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, Naturalis historiae Plinianae, quatenus ad artem plasticam pertinent* (Diss.). Greifswald. (In Latin).
- Brown, T. S. (1949). *Onesicritus: A study in Hellenistic historiography*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Brunn, H. (1856). *De auctorum indicibus Plinianis disputatio isagogica*. Bonnae: Litteris Caroli Georgi. (In Latin).
- Brunt, P. A. (1974). Notes on Aristobulus of Cassandria. *The Classical Quarterly*, 24(1), 65–69.
- Brunt, P. A. (Ed.) (1983). *Arrian, History of Alexander and Indica*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Bucciantini, V., (2013). Misurazioni e distanze marittime nel Periplo di Nearco. In K. Geus, M. Rathmann (Eds.). *Vermessung der Oikoumene: Mapping the Oikoumene*, 65–76. Berlin: De Gruyter. (In Italian).
- Bucciantini, V., (2015). *Studio su Nearco di Creta. Dalla geografia descrittiva alla narrazione storica* (Studi di Storia Greca e Romana, n. 11). Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso. (In Italian).
- Chaumont, M.-L. (1984). Études d'histoire parthe. V: La route royale des Parthes de Zeugma à Séleucie du Tigre d'après l'itinéraire d'Isidore de Charax. *Syria*, 61(1), 63–107. (In French).
- Conte, G. B. (1982). Introduzione. In *Gaio Plinio Secondo, Storia Naturale. Vol. 1. Cosmologia e geografia*. Torino: Einaudi. (In Italian).
- Cotta Ramosino, L. (2001). La guerra e lo sviluppo delle conoscenze geografiche in Plinio: tra condanna e valorizzazione. In M. Sordi (Ed.). *Il pensiero sulla guerra nel mondo antico*, 209–223. Milano: Vita e Pensiero. (In Italian).
- Cresci Marrone, G. (1993). *Ecumene Augustea. Una politica per il consenso*. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider. (In Italian).
- Dalstein, J. (1885). *Quibus fontibus Plinius in artificum historia usus sit* (Diss.). Metz. (In Latin).
- De Romanis, F. (1992). Viaggi ed esplorazioni oltre i confini dell'Impero fra l'età di Plinio e quella di Tolomeo. In G. Aujac, O. Baldacci, P. Barozzi (Eds.). *Optima Hereditas. Sapienza giuridica romana e conoscenza dell'ecumene*, 267–274. Milano: Libri Scheiwiller. (In Italian).
- Della Corte, F. (1954). App. II. La nuova *lex Brunn* sugli indici di Plinio. In F. Della Corte. *Varrone, il terzo gran lume romano*, 283–319. Genova: Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Universitario di Magistero. (In Italian).
- Detlefsen, D. (1909). *Die Anordnung der geographischen Bücher des Plinius und ihre Quellen*. Berlin: Weidmann. (In German).
- Geier, R. (1844). *Alexandri Magni historiarum scriptores aetate suppres*. Leipzig: Gebauer. (In Latin).
- Heckel, W. (2006). *Who's who in the age of Alexander the Great*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hönigsmann, E. (1926). Libye. In A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, (Vol. 13), 149–202. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag (In German).
- Howe, T. (2018) *Ptolemy I Soter: A self-made man*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Jacoby, F. (Ed.) (1926–1930). *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, (Vol. 2) *B: Spezialgeschichten, Autobiographien und Memoiren, Zeittafeln [nn. 106–261]*. Berlin: Weidmann. (In German).
- Jacoby, F. (Ed.) (1930). *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, (Vol. 2) *D: Kommentar zu Nr. 106–261*. Berlin: Weidemann. (In German).
- Janni, P. (1978). “Il Sole a Destra”: Estrapolazione nella Letteratura Geografica Antica e nei Resoconti di Viaggio. *Studi Classici e Orientali*, 28, 87–115. (In Italian).

- Janni, P. (1996). *Il mare degli antichi*. Bari: Dedalo. (In Italian).
- Janni, P. (2004). *Miti e falsi miti. Luoghi comuni, leggende, errori sui Greci e sui Romani*. Bari: Dedalo. (In Italian).
- Khlopin, I. (1977). Die Reiseroute Isidors von Charax und die oberen Satrapien Parthiens. *Iranica Antiqua*, 12, 117–165. (In German).
- Kirwan, L. P. (1957). Rome beyond the southern Egyptian frontier. *The Geographical Journal*, 123(1), 13–19.
- Klotz, A. (1906). *Quaestiones Plinianae geographicae* (Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie, 11). Berlin: Weidmann. (In German).
- Klotz, A. (1907). Die Arbeitsweise des Älteren Plinius und die Indices Auctorum. *Hermes*, 42, 323–329. (In German).
- Le Bonniec, H. (1946). *Bibliographie de l'Histoire naturelle de Pline l'Ancien*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In French).
- Matthews, V. J. (1974). The “Hemerodromoi”: Ultra long-distance running in Antiquity. *Classical World*, 68(3), 161–169.
- Meredith, D. (1953). Annius Plocamus: Two inscriptions from the Berenice road. *Journal of Roman Studies*, 43, 38–40.
- Moretti, A. (2012). *Introduzione ad Aristobulo*. In V. Costa (Ed.). *Tradizione e trasmissione degli storici greci frammentari II. Atti del III Workshop Internazionale, Roma, 24–26 febbraio 2011*, 211–235. Tivoli: Edizioni Tored. (In Italian).
- Moretti, A. (2013). Aristobulo e Curzio Rufo: alcuni confronti. In F. Gazzano, G. Ottone (Eds.). *Le età della trasmissione. Alessandria, Roma, Bisanzio. Atti delle giornate di studio sulla storiografia greca frammentaria (Genova, 29–30 maggio 2012)*, 251–270. Tivoli: Edizioni Tored. (In Italian).
- Münzer, F. (1897). *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius*. Berlin: Weidmann. (In German).
- Pearson, L. (1952). Aristobulus the Phocian. *American Journal of Philology*, 73, 71–75.
- Pearson, L. (1960). *The lost histories of Alexander the Great* (Philological Monographs; 20). New York: The American Philological Association.
- Pédech, P. (1984). *Historiens, Compagnons d'Alexandre*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In French).
- Primo, A. (2009). *La storiografia sui Seleucidi: da Megastene a Eusebio di Cesarea*. Pisa: Fabrizio del Serra Editore. (In Italian).
- Rabenhorst, M. (1907). *Der Ältere Plinius als Epitomator des Verrius Flaccus. Ein Quellenanalyse des Siebenten Buches der Naturgeschichte*. Berlin: Georg Reimer. (In German).
- Roller, D. W. (2003). *The world of Juba II and Kleopatra Selene: Royal scholarship on Rome's African frontier*. London: Routledge.
- Sallmann, K. G. (1971). *Die Geographie des älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro*. Berlin: De Gruyter. (In German).
- Schiwek, H. (1962). Der Persische Golf als Schifffahrts und Seehandelsroute in Achämenidischer Zeit und in der Zeit Alexander des Großen. *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 162, 4–96. (In German).
- Schoff, W. H. (Ed.) (1914) *Parthian Stations. By Isidore of Charax: An account of the overland trade route between the Levant and India in the first century B.C.: The Greek text, with a translation and commentary*. Philadelphia: The Commercial Museum.
- Schwartz, E. (1896). Baiton. In A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 2.2), 2779. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- Schwartz, E. (1897). Bemastistai. In A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 3), 266–267. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).

- Sisti, F. (Ed.) (2001). *Arriano. Anabasi di Alessandro I (Libri I–III)*. Milano: Mondadori. (In Italian).
- Sprengler, J. G. (1891). Die Quellen des älteren Plinius in 12. und 13. Buch der Naturgeschichte. *Rheinische Museum für Philologie*, 46, 54–70. (In German).
- Stadler, H. (1891). *Die Quelle des Plinius im 19. Buche der Naturalis Historia*. Neuburg a D.: Griessmayersche Buchdruckerei. (In German).
- Stein, A. (1943). On Alexander's route into Gedrosia: An archaeological tour in Las Bela. *The Geographical Journal*, 102, 193–227.
- Tonnet, H. (1988). *Recherches sur Arrien, sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes* (2 Vols.). Amsterdam: Hakkert. (In French).
- Tzifopoulos, Y. Z. (1998). 'Hemerodromoi' and Cretan 'dromeis': Athletes or military personnel? The case of the Cretan Philonides. *Nikephoros*, 11, 137–170.
- Tzifopoulos, Y. Z. (2013). *Bematists*. In R. S. Bagnall et al. (Eds.) *The encyclopedia of ancient history* (Vol. 2), 1079–1080. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah09247>.
- Walser, G. (1985). Die Route des Isidorus von Charax durch Iran. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*. 18, 145–156. (In German).
- Wirth, G. (1959). Ptolemaios als Schriftsteller und Historiker. In A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 23), 2467–2484. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- Worthington, I. (2016). *Ptolemy I: King and Pharaoh of Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

* * *

Информация об авторе

Вероника Буччантини

PhD

профессор,

факультет литературы и философии
(Dipartimento di Lettere e Filosofia, DILEF),

Флорентийский университет

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Via della Pergola 60 50121 Firenze

Тел.: +39 (055) 2757891

✉ veronica.bucciandini@unifi.it

Information about the author

Veronica Bucciandini

PhD

Professor,

Department of Letters and Philosophy,

University of Florence

Via della Pergola 60 50121 Firenze

Tel.: +39 (055) 2757891

✉ veronica.bucciandini@unifi.it

А. В. Подосинов^{ab}

ORCID: 0000-0003-2295-9290

✉ podossinov@mail.ru

^a Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова (Россия, Москва)

^b Институт всеобщей истории РАН (Россия, Москва)

ПЛАВАНИЯ ПО ОКЕАНУ В ГЕОГРАФИЧЕСКИХ ОПИСАНИЯХ ПЛИНИЯ СТАРШЕГО

Аннотация. В статье анализируется (на фоне других античных авторов), как римский ученый Плиний Старший в своих географических описаниях представлял себе океан, окружающий ойкумену, и возможность плавать вдоль океанского побережья. Построенное по принципу перипла описание ойкумены Плиния предполагало последовательный рассказ не только о берегах «Нашего моря» (в которое включались, кроме Средиземного, также и Черное, и Азовское моря), но и об океанических побережьях Атлантики, Северного, Восточного, Индийского и Африканского океанов (если иметь в виду античное понимание расположения ойкумены и окружающих ее океанов). В то время как наиболее исследованные и доступные плаванию Атлантический (от Северной Африки до Скандинавии) и Индийский (от Индии и Шри-Ланки до Сомали и Египта) океаны описаны наиболее подробно, Плинию приходилось домысливать остальные части ойкумены, омываемые океаном, но никогда не пройденные античными мореплавателями. Таким образом, получающаяся картина представляет собой смесь реальных знаний и фантастических домыслов.

Ключевые слова: Плиний Старший, «Естественная история», античная география, океанические плавание, географический вымысел, навигационная практика

Для цитирования: Подосинов А. В. Плавание по океану в географических описаниях Плиния Старшего // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 40–56. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-40-56.

Благодарности. Работа выполнена в рамках исследовательского проекта РФФИ № 18-09-00486 «Пространства и ландшафты в мемориально-историческом, религиозном и политическом дискурсах Античности и Средневековья» (рук. А. В. Махлаюк).

Статья поступила в редакцию 1 октября 2019 г.

Принято к печати 18 октября 2019 г.

A. V. Podossinov^{ab}

ORCID: 0000-0003-2295-9290

✉ podossinov@mail.ru

^a Moscow Lomonosov State University (Russia, Moscow)

^b Institute of World History, Russian Academy of Sciences
(Russia, Moscow)

OCEANIC NAVIGATIONS IN GEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTIONS BY PLINY THE ELDER

Abstract. The article analyzes, against the background of other ancient authors, how the Roman scholar Pliny the Elder (second half of the 1st century AD) imagines in geographical descriptions in his *Historia Naturalis* the ocean surrounding the ecumene and the possibility to sail along the ocean coast. The description of Pliny's ecumene, based on the principle of the periplus, implied a continuous narration not only about the shores of 'Our sea' (which included, besides the Mediterranean, also the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov), but also about the oceanic coasts of the Atlantic, Northern, Eastern, Indian and African Oceans (in terms of the ancient geographers). While the Atlantic coast (from North Africa to Scandinavia) and the Indian coast (from India and Sri Lanka to Somalia and Egypt), the most explored and accessible for navigation, are described in great detail, Pliny also had to conjecture about the rest of the ecumene — washed by the ocean, but never traversed by ancient seafarers. Thus, the resulting picture is a mixture of real knowledge and fantastic speculation. In the article we also analyze data about oceanic voyages found in the works of other ancient authors, who worked as scholars or even as belletrists.

Keywords: Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, ancient geography, oceanic voyages, geographical fiction, navigation practice

To cite this article: Podossinov, A. V. (2020). Oceanic navigations in geographical descriptions by Pliny the Elder. *Shagi / Steps*, 6(1), 40–56. (In Russian). DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-40-56.

Acknowledgements. The article was carried out as part of the research project No. 18-09-00486 "Spaces and landscapes in the memorial-historical, religious and political discourses of Antiquity and the Middle Ages" of the Russian Foundation of Fundamental Researches (A. V. Machlayuk, project head).

Received October 1, 2019

Accepted October 18, 2019

Представление о земле как диске, окруженном со всех сторон единым Океаном, восходит к очень древним временам и отразилось в космологических, картографических и географических сочинениях и артефактах многих культур от Китая до Ирландии. Укажу только на древневавилонскую карту мира VIII–VII вв. до н. э., показывающую реку-океан, окружающую землю¹.

В Древней Греции это представление² было известно уже Гомеру. Знаменитый щит Ахилла, описанный в книге XVIII «Илиады» и изображающий весь мир, рисует круглую землю, окруженную со всех сторон рекой-океаном³. Гесиод также говорит о кругообразном течении Океана⁴. Об Океане как «реке, текущей вокруг земли», упоминает Аристотель (*Meteor.* 347a 5–7). Практически вся античная литература разделяла мнение о таком соотношении суши и океана — Эратосфен, Пифей, Кратет Маллосский (Малльский), Посидоний, Страбон, Мела, Плиний, Птолемей, если называть только самых известных географов и других ученых (см.: [Olshausen 1999: 171]).

Плавание по океану, даже если оно предполагалось вдоль побережий, могло реально осуществляться лишь в нескольких местах вокруг ойкумены, более точно — в двух, а именно, во-первых, при выходе из Средиземного моря через Гибралтар в Атлантический океан на юг вдоль побережья Африки и на север вдоль побережья Европы в сторону Британии или позже — Ютландии, а во-вторых — на юго-востоке, с выходом через Красное море в Индийский океан и плаванием на юг вдоль восточного побережья Африки и на восток до Индии, Цейлона (в античности — Тапробана) и, возможно, до юго-восточной оконечности Азии. Океанское побережье, теоретически предполагаемое в других местах — на юге Африки, на севере Евразии и на востоке Азии, — не было освоено и пройдено на кораблях средиземноморскими мореплавателями.

Тем не менее воображаемые плаванья вокруг всей ойкумены всегда имели место в мифологической или романической литературе. Океанические плаванья совершали Одиссей, аргонавты и Геракл (см. подробнее: [Подосинов 2015]).

¹ О вавилонском влиянии на гомеровскую картину мира и о древневавилонской карте, восходящей к середине III тыс. до н. э. и изображающей сушу окруженной Океаном, см.: [Hyde 1947: 73–74]. См. также: [Ballabriga 1986: 63; Nesselrath 2005: 153–154; Gehrke 2007: 22–25].

² См. о нем: [Lesky 1947: 58–87; Ramin 1979: 17–26]. Ср.: «Знания о гомеровской географии позволяют представить себе, что в эпоху сложения древнейшего эпоса о походе аргонавтов водные пространства за пределами Эгейского моря казались еще достаточно неопределенными и представление о его границах сливалось с представлением об Океане как об омывающем землю потоке, берега и острова которого населены обитателями потустороннего мира» [Ельницкий 1961: 9].

³ II. XVIII, 606–607: «Там и ужасную силу представил (Гефест. — А. П.) реки Океана (ποταμοῦ μέγα σθένος Ὠκεανοῖο), / Коим под верхним он ободом щит окружил велелепный» (пер. Н. И. Гнедича).

⁴ См.: *Theog.* 776; ср. о приписываемом Гесиоду «Щите Геракла», 314–315: Ἀμφὶ δ' ἵτον ῥέεν Ὠκεανὸς πλῆθοντι ἑοικώς, / πᾶν δὲ συνείχε σάκος πολυδαίδαλον — «Обод вокруг обтекал Океан, как поток наводненный, / Целостно он охватывал щит премногоискусный» (пер. О. П. Дыбенко). Так же описывается Океан в *Orphic. Hymn.* 84, у Эсхила в «Прометее Прикованном» (v. 138–140) и др.

От эпических сюжетов берут свое начало океанические плавания героев греческих утопических романов, поскольку в них повествовалось о фантастических путешествиях в неведомые земли; ведь Одиссей и аргонавты также путешествовали по большей части в неизведанных фантастических просторах океанического пространства⁵.

В самом начале «утопической» традиции стоит, несомненно, Платон со своей Атлантидой⁶, которая находилась на острове (или островах) где-то в Атлантическом океане. Одним из первых после Платона был Феопомп, который рассказал о мифической Меропиде, лежащей где-то в Северной Атлантике; в этом жанре работали также Евгемер из Мессены, который в своем сочинении *Τερὰ ἀναγραφὴ* описал несуществующую страну Панхею, Геродор, который обработал в рациональном ключе историю Геракла, а также Ямбул, описавший свое путешествие к Островам Блаженных⁷. Все авторы утопических романов помещают острова с фантастическими народами в Океане: у Платона Атлантида находится в Атлантическом океане, у Феопомпа страна Меропида лежит в Западном или Северном океане, у Евгемера остров Панхея — в Восточном океане, у Ямбула Острова Блаженных — в Южном океане, у Лукиана фантастические острова в пародийной «Правдивой истории» — в Западном океане.

Существуют еще два романа, находящиеся в русле такого рода литературы, в которых герои в поисках загадочных и легендарных островов (гипербореев и Туле) проплывают, как Гомер, Геракл и аргонавты, по Северному океану. Я имею в виду роман Гекатея Абдерского «О гипербореях» (*Περὶ Ὑπερβορέων*) и роман Антония Диогена «Невероятные приключения по ту сторону Фулы» (*Τὰ ὑπὲρ Φούλην ἀπίστα*). И в том и в другом романе предполагается, как у Гомера и в «Аргонавтике», океаническое плавание⁸ — оба героя проходят по Северному океану, только герой Антония Диогена Диний плывет из Восточной Европы на восток вокруг Азии, Африки и приплывает снова в Северный океан, а Гекатей плывет от Каспийского моря на запад.

Итак, от Гомера до Антония Диогена (а это уже, вероятно, I в. н. э.) плавание по окружающему ойкумену Океану (*ἐξὸς οὐρανίου*) представлялось вполне возможным.

* * *

Наконец, веру в возможность навигации по Океану, в том числе по Северному морскому пути, как бы укрепляли и аргументировали научно-географические труды античных авторов, и это понятно, поскольку до конца античности и в Средние века продолжали считать, что земля (ойкумена) со всех сторон окружена Океаном. Речь идет о «научных» трудах Пифея из Массалии, Посидония, Страбона, Помпония Мелы, Плиния Старшего и др., многие из

⁵ О связи сказочного и эпического в раннегреческой литературе см.: [Hölscher 1988]. Ср. также: «The other-world explorations that predominated in the earliest days of Greek fiction, in the proto-novelistic traveller's tales of Iambulus and Euhemerus — or, for that matter, of Homer's *Odysseus*» [Romm 2008: 125].

⁶ См.: [Rohde 1876: 197–199; Рабинович 1983: 67–84].

⁷ См. об этих утопиях: [Clay, Purvis 1999; Holzberg 1996: 621–653].

⁸ См. подробнее: [Romm 1992: 204–211].

которых были дилетантами в географии и лишь пересказывали труды своих предшественников⁹. Здесь я хотел бы указать на очень полезный для этой проблематики труд Серены Бьянкетти [Bianchetti 2012].

В конце IV в. до н. э. Пифей, выйдя в Атлантику через Гибралтар, совершил плавание вдоль берегов Западной Европы на север, описал легендарный остров Туле и прилегающие к нему местности и сообщил, что он проплыл вдоль северных берегов Европы до границы Европы с Азией, до реки Танаис (Strabo II, 4, 1)¹⁰. Написанный им труд «Об океане» стал практически первым в античной географии, специально посвященным плаванию в океане. Некоторые последующие писатели (например, Дикеарх, Полибий, Артемидор, Страбон) решительно отказывали сообщениям Пифея в достоверности. Лишь к рубежу эр и позже, когда римский флот вышел по Нижнему Рейну к Северному морю и затем к берегам Ютландии, существование на севере Европы моря-океана перестало подвергаться сомнению. Представление о Северном (Скифском, Кронийском, Ледовом) океане, омывающем с севера Евразию, делало возможным — конечно, лишь умозрительно — морское сообщение по Северному морскому пути.

Эта виртуальная возможность проплыть по Северному морскому пути хорошо иллюстрируется словами Плиния Старшего, к которому мы и переходим, при описании Восточной Европы (IV, 94): «Затем следует выйти [из Понта], чтобы описать внешние [границы] Европы, и, перейдя Рипейские горы, плыть, [имея] слева берег Северного океана, до тех пор, пока не встретится Гадес (*litus oceani septentrionalis in laeva, donec perveniatur Gadis, legendum*)»¹¹. Я думаю, такого путешествия в древности никто не совершал. Оно было возможно лишь в представлении античных географов, полагавших, что вся суша омывается Океаном, и в жанре перипла, предполагающего последовательное описание морского побережья [Ziegler et al. 1951: 303]. Сам Плиний не сомневался в существовании окружающего Землю океана (см. II, 166: «Весь земной шар окружен морями, а по своей середине еще и препоясан ими. Это известно из непосредственного опыта и не нуждается в доказательствах»).

С этого места и до конца IV книги Плиний последовательно описывает северное побережье Европы, омываемое Балтийским и Северным морями (под которыми он, как и другие античные географы, понимал Северный океан), а также западное побережье Европы, омываемое Атлантическим океаном. В описании Северной Европы (до устья Рейна) мы встречаем большое количество конкретной информации; это и перечисление островов Северного океана (с востока на запад): множество безымянных островов, остров Бавнония, куда море выбрасывает янтарь, огромный остров Балкия, или Басилия, острова Ойоны, остров Скатиавия, остров Энингия, остров Латрис; остров Буркана (или Фабария, или Глэзария, или Аустеравия, или Актания); реки, впадающие в Северный океан: Паропанис, Вистула (Висла), Скальдис, Гутал, Альбис (Эльба), Висур-

⁹ Подробнее о греческом восприятии океана и об океанических плаваниях см.: [Bianchetti 2011].

¹⁰ См. издания фрагментов его труда «Об океане»: [Mette 1952; Roseman 1994; Bianchetti 1998]; о Пифее и его открытиях см.: [Gisinger 1963; Bianchetti 1998; Magnani 2002; Cunliffe 2003]. См. также: [Bianchetti 2004].

¹¹ Здесь и далее, кроме оговоренных случаев, перевод автора статьи.

гис (Везер), Амисис, Ренус (Рейн), Моса; мысы: Рубеи, Кимврский; полуостров Тастрис; прибрежная огромная гора Сево; заливы: Коданский, Килипенский, Лагн; народы: мифические гиппоподы и панотии, более историчные сарматы, венеды, скиры, гирры, ингвеоны, хорошо засвидетельствованные кимвры, ван-дилы, к которым относятся племена бургодионов, вариннов, харинов, гутонов, тевтоны и хауки.

Знания о северном побережье Европы связаны, по-видимому, с информацией, получаемой в ходе поставок и торговли янтарем, происходящим в основном с Балтийского побережья Европы. В качестве своих источников Плиний упоминает Ксенофона Лампсакского и того же Пифея.

Западное атлантическое побережье Европы с Германией, Галлией и Испанией, а также островами Британией, Гибернией (Ирландией) и др., уже более известное римлянам и более освоенное мореплавателями, описывается вполне реалистично. Моря, омывающие это побережье, называются Британским (между Рейном и Секваной/Сеной), Галльским морем (современный Бискайский залив), а Испания, по словам Плиния, омывается с севера Галльским и с запада Атлантическим океанами.

Интересно, что в книге IX, которая посвящена рыбам и прочим обитателям моря, несколько раз упоминается вместо Атлантического Гадитанский океан (см. IX, 4, 8: здесь перечисляются Индийское море, Галльский океан, Гадитанский океан; 5, 9; 6, 12; 32, 68). Последнее название не встречается в географических книгах «Естественной истории», использовавших, очевидно, другие источники, нежели в книгах по ихтиологии.

Выше я цитировал Плиния, рассказывавшего, как его воображаемый корабль плывет с востока на запад вдоль океанического побережья Европы. Но на этом освоение Северного морского пути для Плиния не заканчивается: в *Nat. Hist.* VI, 33 он предлагает проделать такое же плавание вдоль Северной Азии на восток от Европы: «Теперь, описав все внутренние части Азии, перенесемся мысленно через Рипейские горы и пойдем вправо по берегу океана» (*transcendat animus dextraque litore oceani incedat*).

Плиний — единственный автор, который прямо пишет о судоходности Северного океана. Так, в книге II «Естественной истории» мы читаем:

167. От Гадеса и Геркулесовых Столпов теперь плавают по всему Западу вокруг Испании и Галлий. Северный же Океан в большей своей части пройден на кораблях (*septentrionalis vero oceanus maiore ex parte navigatus est*) благодаря заботам божественного Августа¹²:

¹² Речь идет о походе римского флота в 5 г. н. э. под руководством Тиберия во время правления Августа. Перечисляя в автобиографии наиболее значительные события в годы своего правления, Август упомянул и об этом: «Мой флот проплыл от устья Рейна по Океану до восточной области и пределов кимвров, в каковое море и землю никогда прежде не доходил никто из римлян» (*RGDA*, 26). Д. Ван Сон [van Son 1962: 146–152] считает, что Тиберий в 5 г. через мыс Скаген добрался до норвежского побережья, а Плиний использовал в этом своем сообщении какие-то архивы императорского флота. По мнению Л. Вейбуля, римский флот дошел только до устья Эльбы, где жили кимвры [Weibull 1934], другие исследователи (см., например: [Melin 1960: 3–4]) считают, что римляне доплыли до мыса Скаген на Ютландии, откуда им и открылся вид на Балтийское море. По мнению Е. Штехова, в результате экспедиции 12 г. римляне проникли к устьям Одера [Stechow 1948: 240–241]. О географических данных, добытых во время похода Тиберия, см.: [Bernecker 1989].

флот обогнул Германию до Кимврского мыса, и оттуда вплоть до Скифской страны и обледенелых от чрезмерной влажности [областей] было осмотрено, а также стало известно по рассказам огромное море¹³ <...> Подобным же образом с востока под одной и той же звездой от Индийского моря всю часть [Океана], обращенную к Каспийскому морю, проплыли военные силы македонян (*pars tota vergens in Caspium mare pernavigata est Macedonum armis*) в царствование Селевка и Антиоха¹⁴. 168. И вокруг Каспия исследованы многие океанские берега, и почти весь север с той и с другой стороны¹⁵ пройден на кораблях (*Et circa Caspium multa oceani litora explorata parvoque brevius quam totus hinc aut illinc septentrio eremigatus*)¹⁶.

Одной из причин такого представления о севере Евразии и Северном океане является тот факт, что Индия, Скифия и Кельтика выглядели на ментальной карте античных авторов соседями¹⁷, поэтому сообщение между ними по морю представлялось вполне возможным.

Как доказательство возможности такого плавания римский автор середины I в. н. э. Помпоний Мела рассказывает следующую историю (III, 44–45):

Какое-то время не знали точно, что лежит за Каспийским заливом — то ли тот же Океан, то ли земля, угнетаемая морозом и простирающаяся без конца и края. 45. Но кроме физиков¹⁸ и Гомера¹⁹, которые говорили, что весь мир окружен морем, можно положиться также на Корнелия Непота²⁰, [мнение которого]

¹³ Судя по сообщению Плиния (здесь и ниже в IV, 97), римляне достигли крайнего северного мыса Скаген на Ютландском полуострове (Кимврский мыс) и оттуда увидели и узнали по рассказам Балтийское море [Хенниг 1961: 364].

¹⁴ Речь у Плиния идет, по-видимому, о знаменитом плавании Патрокла по Каспийскому морю, которое тот совершил между 285 и 282 гг. до н. э. с исследовательскими целями по поручению Селевка I и Антиоха I (ср.: *Plin. Nat. Hist.* VI, 58; *Strabo* II, 1, 6; XI, 7, 1; см.: [Bunbury 1883: 568, 572–574; Ельницкий 1962: 72–75; Яйленко 2007: 99–103]). Об этом исследовании Плиний пишет в VI, 31.

¹⁵ Плиний придерживался широко распространенного в античности взгляда, что Каспийское море представляет собой залив Северного океана, а не внутреннее озеро. Поэтому выражение «с той и другой стороны» подразумевает разные прибрежные стороны «устья» Каспийского моря — восточную и западную.

¹⁶ В отличие от «оптимистического» взгляда Плиния на возможность навигации в Северном море, Тацит скептически замечает, что германское побережье Северного океана «редко посещается кораблями из нашего мира (*ab orbe nostro*)» (*Germ.* 2, 1).

¹⁷ См. *Diodor.* II, 43: «Теперь перейдем к скифам, населяющим соседнюю [с индийцами] страну»; ср.: *Plutarch. Marius*, XI.

¹⁸ Под «физиками» (*physici*) Мела понимает, по всей видимости, древнеионийских ученых, о которых еще Геродот (IV, 36) писал: «Смешно видеть, как многие люди уже начертили карты земли, хотя никто из них даже не может правильно объяснить очертания земли. Они изображают Океан обтекающим землю, которая кругла, словно вычерчена циркулем». См. также у Аристотеля (*Meteor.* II, 5, 362 b, 11), который высмеивает карты, изображающие землю круглой, в то время как это не соответствует «ни логике, ни наблюдаемым фактам».

¹⁹ Ср.: *Hom. Il.* XXI, 195–197.

²⁰ Имеется в виду какое-то не дошедшее до нас произведение Корнелия Непота (ум. ок. 27 г. до н. э.). Судя по многочисленным упоминаниям мнения Непота в географических книгах Плиния, ему принадлежал и некий географический труд, на который могли опираться как Плиний, так и Мела: это могли быть «*Exempla*» или «*Chorographia*» [Detlefsen 1909: 153–154; Luisi 1988: 41–51].

тем более авторитетно, что оно более современно. Он приводит свидетельство об этом Квинта Метелла Целера и припоминает такой его рассказ: когда тот управлял Галлией в качестве проконсула²¹, царь бойев²² подарил ему каких-то индов. Расспросив их, откуда они прибыли в эти земли, он узнал, что они были бурей унесены из индийских морей и, проплыв весь путь [от Индии], пристали наконец к берегам Германии. Следовательно, остается [полагать, что за Каспием находится] море, но остальная часть его побережья скована вечной мерзлотой и поэтому пустынна...

Четверть века спустя Плиний Старший повторил этот рассказ с небольшими изменениями (*Nat. Hist.* II, 170):

...Непот относительно северного побережья рассказывает, что Квинту Метеллу Целеру, коллеге Афрания по консульству и в то время проконсулу Галлии, царь свебов подарил индийцев, которые, отправившись для торговли из Индии на кораблях, были бурями отброшены в Германию...

Итак, перед нами совершенно фантастическая история о том, как на северное побережье Европы в 62 г. до н. э. (а именно в этом году Метелл был проконсулом Галлии Цизальпийской в Северной Италии) бурей были выброшены индийцы, которые якобы приплыли сюда из Индии Северным морским путем²³.

По Восточному (Эойскому в греческом варианте), или Серскому океану едва ли в античности плавали греки или римляне, тем не менее мы видели, что в мифологической и романической географии это было возможно. В VI, 33 Плиний пишет об Океане:

Он, омывая Азию с трех сторон света, на севере называется Скифским²⁴, на востоке — Эойским²⁵, на юге — Индийским²⁶, кроме того, различается многими разными названиями по заливам и прибрежным народам.

²¹ Квинт Цецилий Метелл Целер был проконсулом Галлии Цизальпийской в Северной Италии в 62 г. до н. э.

²² *Boii* — конъектура Рейнольда 1711 г. Боты (*Boti*), названные Мелой, не упоминаются другими античными авторами; их идентифицируют с бойями, которые жили в среднем течении Дуная.

²³ Подробнее об этом сюжете см.: [Podossinov 2014: 133–145].

²⁴ Точно так же три части океана названы Мелой (см. I, 9). В другом месте (IV, 94–95) Плиний называет Скифский океан (совр. Северный Ледовитый океан) Северным (*Septentrionalis*) и приводит еще несколько его названий (Амальхийский, Моримаруса, Кроныйский). Птолемей этот океан называет Сарматским (III, 5, 1).

²⁵ Эойский (Восточный) — это наименование как противоположность Западному (Гесперийскому) океану известно со времени Эратосфена (*Marcian. Periplus maris externi*, I, 3). Ниже (VI, 37) Плиний называет Эойский океан Серским.

²⁶ Индийский океан географически еще во времена Эратосфена представлялся лишь частью Восточного океана (*Strabo* XV, I, 11); см.: [Ельницкий 1949: 864].

Слова Плиния о трех океанах, омывающих Азию, общие у него с Мелой (I, 9), восходят, возможно, к Варрону [Detlefsen 1909: 20, 121].

Итак, «за Каспийским морем и Скифским океаном маршрут сворачивает к Восточному морю²⁷, идя вдоль побережья, обращенного к востоку» (*Nat. Hist.* VI, 53). На этом побережье Плиний помещает серов, производящих шелк, и называет несколько географических примет: реки Пситарас (Хуанхэ?), Камбари (Янцзы?), Лан (Меконг?), затем полуостров Хрисе (Малакка?), залив Кирнаба (Мартабан?), реку Атиан (Иравади?), залив аттакоров (возле устья Ганга?) и народ аттакоров, далее упоминаются туны, тохары и «уже из индийцев, кассиры».

Таковы многочисленные данные Плиния о Восточном (Тихом) океане. Информация о его побережье могла поступать от индийцев, которые торговали с китайцами и которые были активными торговыми партнерами римлян. В VI, 88 Плиний передает слова Рахии, руководителя посольства индийцев с острова Тапробаны, посланных царем Тапробаны к императору Клавдию: «Они говорили еще, что за горами Хемода собственными глазами видели серов, известных им также и по торговле, — отец Рахии путешествовал туда, и серы выходили навстречу тем, кто к ним прибыл».

После описания Восточного океана речь у Плиния идет об Индии, о народе которой сказано, что (VI, 56)

...он примыкает не только к восточному морю, но и к южному, которое мы называем Индийским. Та часть Индии, что обращена к востоку, по прямой линии тянется до поворота и начала²⁸ Индийского моря на 1875 миль, после чего поворачивает и по южной стороне простирается, по словам Эратосфена, на 2475 миль, вплоть до реки Инд, которая служит границей Индии на западе.

Интересно отметить, что Индийский океан (море) географически еще во времена Эратосфена представлялся лишь частью Восточного океана (Strabo XV, I, 11) [Ельницкий 1949: 864].

Плиний отмечает, что «в то время, когда у нас самая стужа, здесь (т. е. на южном побережье Индии. — *А. П.*) лишь легкое дыхание ветров и море свободно для плаваний...» (VI, 58). Описывая остров Тапробану (современный Цейлон), Плиний много пишет про условия океанического плавания в этом районе (VI, 82–83):

Начало его — от Восточного моря, и он вытянут с востока на запад напротив Индии; когда-то считалось, что он отстоит от народа прасиев на 20 дней плавания; сейчас же, поскольку туда плавают на тростниковых лодках и со снастями, как на Ниле, это расстояние оценивают промежутком времени в 7 дней хода наших кораблей. Море между островом и Индией мелководное — не больше 30 футов, но в некоторых протоках такое глубокое, что никакие якоря

²⁷ Тихий океан.

²⁸ Таким образом, Бенгальский залив Плиний не считает частью Индийского океана — последний начинается лишь к западу от мыса Коморин (Каньякумари).

не достают дна: из-за этого на кораблях носовая часть находится с обеих сторон, чтобы не было нужды разворачиваться в тесном русле; размер их — до трех тысяч амфор. 83. Навигация по звездам невозможна — Большая Медведица не видна; но моряки берут с собою птиц и, время от времени выпуская их, следуют в том же направлении, что и они, ибо те летят к суше. Плавают они не более чем в течение четырех месяцев в году; но особенно опасаются ста дней после летнего солнцестояния, пока море штормит.

В своих описаниях плавание по Индийскому океану Плиний опирается на сообщения историков Александра, рассказавших о плавании его флотоводцев от устья Инда до устья Евфрата (VI, 96–97):

...Надлежит сообщить о том, что говорит Онесикрит, который с флотом Александра совершил плавание из Индии в центральные области Персиды (об этом недавно подробно написал Юба²⁹). Затем надо очертить морской маршрут, открытый в эти годы, которым пользуются ныне. Описание плавания Онесикрита и Нearchа не содержит ни названий стоянок, ни расстояний; и с самого начала нет ясного определения, где и у какой реки находился город Ксилинеполь, основанный Александром, откуда они отплыли. 97. Однако они перечисляют места, достойные упоминания...

Более поздние мореплаватели пользовались уже более удобными маршрутами (VI, 100–101):

...Так плыл флот Александра. Но впоследствии оказалось, что самый надежный маршрут для путешествий — от мыса Сиагра в Аравии до Паталы (расстояние оценивается в 1332 мили) с помощью западного ветра, который здесь называют гиппалом³⁰. 101. А следующий период показал, что более подходящий и безопасный путь, если от того же мыса направляться в индийскую гавань Зигер; и долго именно так и плавали — до тех пор, пока торговец не нашел кратчайший путь и жажда наживы не приблизила Индию к нам. Плавания совершают ежегодно с когортами лучников на борту — ведь нападения пиратов участились. Не лишним будет описать весь маршрут из Египта, поскольку теперь впервые об этом появились точные сведения. Это — важная тема, ибо каждый год Индия вычерпывает из нашей империи не менее 50 миллионов сестерциев, в обмен доставляя товары, которые у нас продаются в сто раз дороже.

Далее Плиний описывает детально маршрут морского плавания в Индию из Египта из порта Береника на Красном море, основываясь на, возможно, со-временных ему источниках (VI, 104–106):

²⁹ Юба — сын нумидийского царя, совершившего самоубийство в 46 г. до н. э. Жил при дворе Августа, занимался литературно-научной деятельностью.

³⁰ Гиппал — название юго-западного муссонного ветра в Индийском океане.

104. Навигацию открывают в середине лета, перед восходом созвездия Пса³¹ или в самом начале его восхода, а примерно на тридцатый день достигают Окелиса³² в Аравии или Кане³³ в стране благовоний. Есть и третья гавань, которая называется Муза, куда не заходят корабли во время плавания в Индию — только те, что торгуют аравийскими благовониями и ароматными маслами. Внутри страны — столичный город, который называется Сафар³⁴, и еще один — Саве³⁵. Но для тех, кто путешествует к индийцам, лучше всего отправляться из Окелиса; плыть отсюда, когда дует гиппал, — 40 дней до первого портового города Индии, Музириса³⁶. Однако он не является желанной целью, поскольку рядом — пираты, которые занимают район, называемый Нитрии³⁷, а потому здесь нет изобилия товаров; к тому же стоянка для кораблей находится далеко от берега, и грузы привозят и увозят на лодках. Правил здесь в то время, о котором я говорю, Келоботр³⁸. 105. Более удобная гавань у другого народа — неакиндов³⁹, она называется Бекаре. Здесь правил Пандион⁴⁰, город его, Модура⁴¹, находится далеко от порта, в глубине страны; область же, из которой перец доставляют в Бекаре на выдолбленных из дерева лодках, именуется Коттонара⁴². Но все эти названия народов и гаваней или городов не встречаются ни у кого из прежних авторов, откуда явствует, что местная ситуация меняется. 106. В обратное плавание из Индии отправляются в месяце тибі по египетскому календарю, а по-нашему — в декабре или по меньшей мере до шестого дня египетского месяца мехир, то есть до наших январских ид⁴³; так поступают для того, чтобы вернуться в том же самом году. Из Индии плывут при юго-восточном ветре — Волтурне, а когда входят в Красное море, то дует юго-западный, Африканец, или же южный.

Так подробно описывает Плиний плавание в Индийском океане! В некоторых своих частях это описание напоминает «Перипл Эритрейского моря», составленный в конце I в. н. э., т. е. практически одновременно с «Естественной

³¹ Созвездие Большого Пса (начало его восхода приходится на 18 июля).

³² Окелис — гавань на юго-западе Аравийского полуострова, в районе современной лагуны Шейх-Саид напротив острова Перим.

³³ Кане (Кана) — эмпорий в южной Аравии (на месте городища Бир-Али).

³⁴ Сафар — столица химьяритов (Зафар в северной части Йемена).

³⁵ Саве (Саба) — город в Счастливой Аравии; столица Маафира.

³⁶ *Muziris* — тамильское Мучири.

³⁷ *Nitriae*, ср. *Nitriai* у Птолемея (VII, 1, 7).

³⁸ *Caelobotras* — *Keralaputra*, династия, упоминаемая впервые в надписях Ашоки (III в. до н. э.), правила на территории современного штата Керала в юго-западной части Индии.

³⁹ *Neacyndon* — вероятно, ошибочное прочтение вместо *Νελκυνδών*. Ср. *Νελκύνδα* в «Перипле Эритрейского моря», 53–55.

⁴⁰ Пандион — *Pāṇḍya*, южноиндийская династия, которая упоминается впервые в надписях Ашоки (III в. до н. э.). Столицей Пандьев был город Мадурай (Модоура — Ptolem. VII, 1, 89), который сохранил название до настоящего времени.

⁴¹ Мадурай в южной части современного штата Тамилнаду.

⁴² Ср. *Kottonarik* («Перипл Эритрейского моря», 56), *Κοττίαρα* (Ptolem. VII, 1, 9) — тамильское *Kuṭṭanaḍi*.

⁴³ 13 января.

историей» Плиния и по подробности изложения не имеющий себе равных в периплической литературе.

Поскольку Плиний дает описание всего океанического побережья ойкумены, юг Африки также не остался вне его внимания (см. VI, 197–199). В другом месте Плиний упомянул о нескольких легендах или реальных сведениях об осуществленных попытках обогнуть с юга Африку. Так, в II, 169 он пишет:

Когда могущество Карфагена было в зените, Ганнон⁴⁴ плавал от Кадикса (т. е. Гибралтара. — *А. II.*) до крайних пределов Аравии и обнародовал описание этого плавания... Кроме того, Корнелий Непот⁴⁵ сообщает, что некий его современник, Эвдокс⁴⁶ бежал от царя по имени Латир⁴⁷ и, выйдя из Персидского залива, достиг Кадикса. Задолго до Непота Целий Антипатр утверждал, что видел некоего человека, который для торговли плавал из Испании в Эфиопию⁴⁸.

Заметим, что эти легенды о плаваньях вокруг Африки у Плиния соседствуют с вышеприведенными его рассказами о плавании индийских купцов и римских и селевкидских флотов по Северному океану (*Nat. Hist.* II, 167–170), что должно было свидетельствовать о том, что вся суша окружена Океаном.

Всю территорию юга Африки от юго-востока до юго-запада, по Плинию (VI, 197), занимают эфиопы — представление очень древнее, восходящее еще к Гомеру (см. *Od.* I. 23–24). Весь юг Африки занят эбеновыми лесами, в середине южного побережья континента «пылает вечным огнем высокая гора, нависшая прямо над морем, которая названа греками “Теон охема” (гора Камерун? — *А. II.*). От нее на удалении четырехдневного плавания — мыс, названный Гесперу Керас (букв. “мыс запада”. — *А. II.*) <...> где край материка впервые об-

⁴⁴ Ганнон из Карфагена, как считается, совершил попытку обогнуть Африку с запада через южное побережье в VII–VI или, по другим версиям, в IV в. до н. э. Свидетельствами этого путешествия являются сохранившийся греческий перевод «Перипла» Ганнона, а также сообщения Мелы, Плиния (*Nat. Hist.* II, 169; V, 8; VI, 200) и Арриана (*Ind.* 43, 11–12). Остается неизвестным, до какого места смог проплыть Ганнон вдоль западного побережья Африки. Ср. *Arrian. Ind.* 43, 11–12: «Ливиец Ганнон, выйдя из Карфагена, направился за Геракловы столбы, выйдя в открытое море, имея слева ливийскую землю, и плыл к восходящему солнцу всего 35 дней; когда же он повернул на юг, то столкнулся со многими трудностями: недостатком воды, палящей жарой и потоками огня, выпадающими в море» (пер. М. Д. Бухарина).

⁴⁵ Корнелий Непот был, вероятно, общим источником сведений о Ганноне и Эвдоксе для Мелы и Плиния. На его мнение оба автора ссылаются и при описании «индийцев», прибывших в Германию через Северный океан из Индии (см. выше).

⁴⁶ О греческом путешественнике Эвдоксе и его плаваньях вокруг Африки в конце II в. до н. э. см. подробнее: *Strabo* II, 3, 4–5; *Mela* III, 90.

⁴⁷ Имеется в виду египетский царь Птолемей IX Сотер II (116–107 и 88–80 гг. до н. э.).

⁴⁸ Ср. близкий по содержанию рассказ Помпония Мелы (III, 89–90): «...Раньше сомневались, есть ли за [Африкой] море и ограничена ли она береговой линией, или же море здесь истощается, и Африка простирается [к югу] бесконечно. 90. Ведь и карфагенянин Ганнон, будучи послан своими соотечественниками для исследования [Африки], после того как вышел через устье океана (Гибралтар) и объехал большую часть ее, рассказал, что он потерпел неудачу не из-за [отсутствия] моря, а из-за [нехватки] провианта. Также некий Эвдокс во времена наших дедов, когда бежал от Латира, царя Александрии, выйдя из Арабского залива, проплыл по этому морю, как утверждает Непот, вплоть до Гадеса; поэтому побережья [Африки] до некоторой степени известны».

ращается к западу и Атлантическому морю». Плиний называет даже несколько островов, будто бы находящихся в Южном океане, ссылаясь при этом на Эфора, Евдокса, Тимосфена, Клитарха, Ксенофона Лампсакского, Полибия, Корнелия Непота: это острова Керна, Атлантида (вероятно, Платонова), Горгады (острова мифических горгон), два острова Гесперид (тоже мифических).

Сведения об Атлантическом океане, омывающем Африку с запада, вплоть до Гибралтара ограничиваются у Плиния перечислением островов: это острова Блаженных Инваллис и Планазия (Канары?), Юнония (Мадейра?), Плювиалий и Капрарий, Омбриос, Канария.

* * *

Конечно, структура географического описания ойкумены, принятая Плинием, а именно периплический принцип, согласно которому он сначала описывал побережья Средиземного моря, а затем ее внешние, океанические берега, требовала описания всего океанического побережья, даже если север, восток и юг ойкумены не были еще достаточно известны. Отсюда и воображаемые плаванья в Северном, Восточном и Южном океанах, которые предсказуемо отличаются эскизностью, краткостью и в большой степени мифологичностью. Источником Плиния здесь могли служить периплы океанических побережий ойкумены, которые также составляли отдельный, пусть не очень распространенный жанр географической литературы, см. например, «Перипл внешнего моря» (*Periplus maris externi*) Маркиана Гераклеяского (IV или V в.)⁴⁹. Ксенофон Лампсакский — автор II в. до н. э. — был упомянут Плинием как источник в описаниях и Северного, и Южного океанов. Он тоже, вероятно, был автором труда с таким же названием — «Перипл внешнего моря». К сожалению, мы знаем о нем только из нескольких цитат Плиния.

Наиболее подробно океанические плаванья описаны Плинием относительно Атлантики вдоль западного побережья Европы и Африки, а также Индийского океана между Египтом и Индией. И это естественно, так как в обеих частях ойкумены поддерживался оживленный трафик морских сообщений.

Литература

- Ельницкий 1949 — *Ельницкий Л. А.* [Комментарий к «Естественной истории»] // Вестник древней истории. 1949. № 2. Приложение: *Латышев В. В.* Известия древних писателей о Скифии и Кавказе (продолжение). С. 839–885.
- Ельницкий 1961 — *Ельницкий Л. А.* Знания древних о северных странах. М.: Географгиз, 1961.
- Ельницкий 1962 — *Ельницкий Л. А.* Древнейшие океанские плаванья. М.: Географгиз, 1962.
- Подосинов 2015 — *Подосинов А. В.* Куда плавал Одиссей? О географических представлениях греков архаической эпохи. М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2015.
- Рабинович 1983 — *Рабинович Е. Г.* Атлантида (контексты платоновского мифа) // Текст: семантика и структура / Отв. ред. Т. В. Цивьян. М.: Наука, 1983. С. 67–84.

⁴⁹ См. о Маркиане и его месте в истории античной географии: [Belfiore 2011].

- Хенниг 1961 — *Хенниг Р.* Неведомые земли / Пер. с нем. Т. 1. М.: Изд-во иностр. лит., 1961.
- Яйленко 2007 — *Яйленко В. П.* Очерки этнической и политической истории Скифии в V–III вв. до н. э. // *Античный мир и варвары на юге России и Украины: Ольвия. Скифия. Боспор* / [Гл. ред. А. А. Масленников, Н. А. Гаврилюк]. М.; Киев; Запорожье: Дикое Поле, 2007. С. 61–118.
- Ballabriga 1986 — *Ballabriga A.* Le Soleil et le Tartare: L'image mythique du monde en Grèce archaïque. Paris: Éditions de l'École des hautes études en sciences sociales, 1986.
- Belfiore 2011 — *Belfiore S.* Il geografo e l'editore: Marciano di Eraclea e i peripli antichi. Roma: Aracne, 2011.
- Bernecker 1989 — *Bernecker A.* Die Feldzüge des Tiberius und die Darstellung der unterworfenen Gebiete in der "Geographie des Ptolemaeus". Bonn: Habelt, 1989.
- Bianchetti 1998 — *Pitea di Massalia. L'Oceano* / Introd., testo, trad. e comment. a cura di S. Bianchetti. Pisa; Roma: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, 1998.
- Bianchetti 2004 — *Bianchetti S.* Da Gades al Tanais: l'Europa di Pitea // *Sileno*. Vol. 30. 2004. P. 1–10.
- Bianchetti 2012 — *Bianchetti S.* I Greci e il "mare esterno": dalle esplorazioni delle aree estreme alla rappresentazione "scientifica" dell'ecumene // *Los griegos y el mar* / Ed. J. S. Yanguas, B. D. Ariño. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco, Servicio Editorial = Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, Argitaipen Zerbitzua, 2012. P. 155–171. (Revisión de Historia Antigua; 6).
- Bunbury 1883 — *Bunbury E. H.* A history of ancient geography among the Greeks and Roman from the earliest ages till the fall of the Roman Empire. 2nd ed. Vol. 1. London: J. Murray, 1883. (Repr. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1979).
- Clay, Purvis 1999 — *Four island utopias: Being Plato's Atlantis; Euhemerus of Messene's Panchaia; Iamboulos' Island of the sun; Sir Francis Bacon's New Atlantis; With a supplement on utopian prototypes, developments, and variations* / Ed. by D. Clay, A. Purvis. Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing, 1999.
- Cunliffe 2003 — *Cunliffe B.* The extraordinary voyage of Pytheas the Greek. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Detlefsen 1909 — *Detlefsen D.* Die Anordnung der geographischen Bücher des Plinius und ihre Quellen. Berlin: Weidmann, 1909. (Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie; 18).
- Gehrke 2007 — *Gehrke H.-J.* Die Raumwahrnehmung im archaischen Griechenland // *Wahrnehmung und Erfassung geographischer Räume in der Antike* / Hrsg. M. Rathmann. Mainz am Rhein: P. von Zabern, 2007. S. 17–30.
- Gisinger 1963 — *Gisinger F.* Pytheas von Massalia // *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* / Hrsg. von G. Wissowa, W. Kroll. Bd. 24(1). Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag, 1963. Col. 314–365.
- Hölscher 1988 — *Hölscher U.* Die Odyssee: Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman. München: C. H. Beck, 1988.
- Holzberg 1996 — *Holzberg N.* Novel-like works of extended prose fiction // *The novel in the ancient world* / Ed. by G. Schmeling. Leiden: Brill, 1996. P. 621–653.
- Hyde 1947 — *Hyde W. W.* Ancient Greek mariners. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1947.
- Lesky 1947 — *Lesky A.* Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer. Wien: R. M. Rohrer, 1947.
- Luisi 1988 — *Luisi A.* Cornelio Nepote geografo // *Geografia e storiografia nel mondo classico* / Ed. para M. Sordi. Milano: Vita a Pensiero, 1988. P. 41–51.
- Magnani 2002 — *Magnani S.* Il viaggio di Pitea sull'Oceano. Bologna: Pàtron, 2002.
- Melin 1960 — *Melin B.* Die Heimat der Kimbern. Uppsala: Lundequistka Bokhandeln, 1960. (Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift; 5).

- Mette 1952 — Pytheas von Massalia. *Fragmenta* / Collegit H. J. Mette. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1952. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen; 173).
- Nesselrath 2005 — *Nesselrath H.-G.* “Where the Lord of the Sea grants passage to sailors through the deep-blue mere no more”: The Greeks and the Western Seas // *Greece and Rome*. Vol. 52. No. 2. 2005. P. 153–171.
- Olshausen 1999 — *Olshausen E.* *Geographie // Mensch und Landschaft in der Antike: Lexikon der Historischen Geographie* / Hrsg. H. Sonnabend. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1999. S. 169–173.
- Podossinov 2014 — *Podossinov A. V.* The Indians in Northern Europe? On the Ancient Roman notion of the configuration of Eurasia // *The periphery of the Classical world in ancient geography and cartography* / Ed. by A. V. Podossinov. Leuven; Paris; Walpole, MA: Peeters Leuven, 2014. P. 133–145 (*Colloquia antiqua*; 12).
- Ramin 1979 — *Ramin J.* *Mythologie et géographie*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1979.
- Rohde 1876 — *Rohde E.* *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1876.
- Romm 1992 — *Romm J. S.* *The edges of the Earth in ancient thought: Geography, exploration, and fiction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1992.
- Romm 2008 — *Romm J. S.* *Travel // The Cambridge companion to the Greek and Roman novel* / Ed. by T. Whitmarsh. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008. P. 109–126.
- Roseman 1994 — Pytheas of Massalia: On the Ocean / Text, trans., and comment. by Ch. Roseman. Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1994.
- Stechow 1948 — *Stechow E.* Zur Entdeckung der Ostsee durch die Römer // *Forschungen und Fortschritte*. Bd. 24. 1948. S. 240–241.
- van Son 1962 — *van Son D. W. L.* Zur Deutung von Plinius N.H. II 167 // *Mnemosyne*. Ser. 4. Bd. 15. No. 1. S. 146–152.
- Weibull 1934 — *Weibull L.* Uptäckten av den skandinaviska Norden // *Scandia*. Vol. 7. Nr. 1. 1934. P. 80–143.
- Ziegler et al. 1951 — *Ziegler K., Kroll W., Gundel W., Aly W., Hanslik R.* Plinius der Ältere // *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* / Hrsg. von G. Wissowa, W. Kroll. Bd. 21(1). Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag, 1951. Col. 271–439.

References

- Ballabriga, A. (1986). *Le Soleil et le Tartare: L'image mythique du monde en Grèce archaïque*. Paris: Éditions de l'École des hautes études en sciences sociales. (In French).
- Belfiore, S. (2011). *Il geografo e l'editore: Marciano di Eraclea e i peripli antichi*. Roma: Aracne. (In Italian).
- Bernecker, A. (1989). *Die Feldzüge des Tiberius und die Darstellung der unterworfenen Gebiete in der "Geographie des Ptolemaeus"*. Bonn: Habelt. (In German).
- Bianchetti, S. (Ed.) (1998). *Pitea di Massalia. L'Oceano*. Pisa; Roma: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali. (In Italian).
- Bianchetti, S. (2004). Da Gades al Tanais: l'Europa di Pitea. *Sileno*, 30, 1–10. (In Italian).
- Bianchetti, S. (2012). I Greci e il “mare esterno”: dalle esplorazioni delle aree estreme alla rappresentazione “scientifica” dell’ecumene. In J. S. Yanguas, B. D. Ariño (Eds.). *Los griegos y el mar*, 155–171. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco, Servicio Editorial = Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, Argitaipen Zerbitzua. (Revisiones de Historia Antigua; 6). (In Italian).
- Bunbury, E. H. (1883). *A history of ancient geography among the Greeks and Romans, from the earliest ages till the fall of the Roman Empire* (2nd ed.) (Vol. 1). London: J. Murray (Repr. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1979).

- Clay, D., Purvis, A. (Eds.) (1999). *Four island utopias: Being Plato's Atlantis; Euhemerus of Messene's Panchaia; Iamboulos' Island of the sun; Sir Francis Bacon's New Atlantis; With a supplement on utopian prototypes, developments, and variations*. Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing.
- Cunliffe, B. (2003). *The extraordinary voyage of Pytheas the Greek*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Detlefsen, D. (1909). *Die Anordnung der geographischen Bücher des Plinius und ihre Quellen*. Berlin: Weidmann. (Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie; 18). (In German).
- El'nitskii, L. A. (1949). [Comments to Pliny's *Natural History*]. *Vestnik drevnei istorii* [Journal of Ancient History], 1949(2), Supplement. Latyshev, V. V. *Izvestiia drevnikh pisatelei o Skifii i Kavkaze* [Records of the ancient authors about Scythia and Caucasus], 839–885. (In Russian).
- El'nitskii, L. A. (1961). *Znaniia drevnikh o severnykh stranakh* [The knowledge of the ancients about northern lands]. Moscow: Geografiz. (In Russian).
- El'nitskii, L. A. (1962). *Drevneishie okeanskii plavaniia* [The most ancient oceanic navigations]. Moscow: Geografiz. (In Russian).
- Gehrke, H.-J. (2007). Die Raumwahrnehmung im archaischen Griechenland. In M. Rathmann (Ed.), *Wahrnehmung und Erfassung geographischer Räume in der Antike*, 17–30. Mainz am Rhein: P. von Zabern. (In German).
- Gisinger, F. (1963). Pytheas von Massalia. In G. Wissowa, W. Kroll (Eds.), *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 24(1)), 314–365. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- Hölscher, U. (1988). *Die Odyssee: Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman*. München: C. H. Beck. (In German).
- Holzberg, N. (1996). Novel-like works of extended prose fiction. In G. Schmeling (Ed.), *The novel in the ancient world*, 621–653. Leiden: Brill.
- Hyde, W. W. (1947). *Ancient Greek mariners*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Iailenko, V. P. (2007). Ocherki etnicheskoi i politicheskoi istorii Skifii v V–III vv. do n. e. [Essays on the ethnic and political history of Scythia in the 5th–3rd centuries BC]. In A. A. Maslennikov, N. A. Gavriluk (Eds.), *Antichnyi mir i varvary na iuge Rossii i Ukrainy: Ol'vii. Skifii. Bospor* [The ancient world and the barbarians in the South of Russia and Ukraine: Olbia. Scythia. Bosporus], 61–118. Moscow: Dikoe Pole. (In Russian).
- Khennig, R. (1961). *Nevedomye zemli* [Trans. from Hennig, R. (1944). *Terrae incognitae*. Leiden: n. p.] (Vol. 1). Moscow: Izdatel'stvo inostrannoi literatury. (In Russian).
- Lesky, A. (1947). *Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer*. Wien: R. M. Rohrer. (In German).
- Luisi, A. (1988). Cornelio Nepote geografo. In M. Sordi (Ed.), *Geografia e storiografia nel mondo classico*, 41–51. Milano: Vita e Pensiero. (In Italian).
- Magnani, S. (2002). *Il viaggio di Pitea sull'Oceano*. Bologna: Pàtron. (In Italian).
- Melin, B. (1960). *Die Heimat der Kimbern*. Uppsala: Lundequistka Bokhandeln. (Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift; 5). (In German).
- Mette, H. J. (Ed.) (1952). *Pytheas von Massalia. Fragmenta*. Berlin: De Gruyter. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen; 173). (In German).
- Nesselrath, H.-G. (2005). "Where the Lord of the Sea grants passage to sailors through the deep-blue mere no more": The Greeks and the Western Seas. *Greece and Rome*, 52(2), 153–171.
- Olshausen, E. (1999). Geographie. In H. Sonnabend (Ed.), *Mensch und Landschaft in der Antike. Lexikon der Historischen Geographie*, 169–173. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler. (In German).
- Podossinov, A. V. (2014). The Indians in Northern Europe? On the ancient Roman notion of the configuration of Eurasia. In A. V. Podossinov (Ed.), *The periphery of the classical world in ancient geography and cartography*, 133–145. Leuven: Peeters Leuven. (Colloquia antiqua; 12).

- Podossinov, A. V. (2015). *Kuda plaval Odissei? O geograficheskikh predstavleniiakh grekov arkhaiskoi epokhi* [Where did Odysseus sail? On the geographical concepts of archaic Greeks]. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury. (In Russian).
- Rabinovich, E. G. Atlantida (konteksty platonovskogo mifa) [Atlantis (contexts of Plato's myth)]. In T. V. Tsiv'ian (Ed.). *Tekst: semantika i struktura* [Text: Semantics and structure], 67–84. Moscow: Nauka. (In Russian).
- Ramin, J. (1979). *Mythologie et géographie*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In French).
- Rohde, E. (1876). *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel. (In German).
- Romm, J. S. (1992). *The edges of the earth in ancient thought: Geography, exploration, and fiction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Romm, J. S. (2008). Travel. In T. Whitmarsh (Ed.). *The Cambridge companion to the Greek and Roman novel*, 109–126. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Roseman, Ch. H. (Ed.) (1994). *Pytheas of Massalia: On the Ocean*. Chicago: Ares Publishers.
- Stechow, E. (1948). Zur Entdeckung der Ostsee durch die Römer. *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, 24, 240–241. (In German).
- van Son, D. W. L. (1962). Zur Deutung von Plinius N.H. II 167. *Mnemosyne. Ser 4*, 15(1), 146–152. (In German).
- Weibull, L. (1934). Uppäckten av den skandinaviska Norden. *Scandia*, 7(1), 80–143. (In Swedish).
- Ziegler, K., Kroll, W., Gundel, W., Aly, W., Hanslik, R. (1951). Plinius der Ältere. In G. Wissowa, W. Kroll (Eds.). *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 21(1)), 271–439. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).

* * *

Информация об авторе

Александр Васильевич Подосинов
 доктор исторических наук
 профессор, зав. кафедрой древних языков,
 исторический факультет,
 Московский государственный
 университет им. М. В. Ломоносова
 Россия, 119192, Москва, Ломоносовский
 пр-т, д. 27, корп. 4
 Тел.: +7 (495-939-56-88)
 главный научный сотрудник,
 Центр «Восточная Европа в античном и
 средневековом мире»,
 Институт всеобщей истории РАН
 Россия, 119991, Москва, Ленинский пр-т,
 д. 32а
 Тел.: +7 (495-954-44-82)
 ✉ podossinov@mail.ru

Information about the author

Alexandr V. Podossinov
 Dr. Sci. (History)
 Professor, Head of the Department of
 Classical Languages, Historical Faculty,
 Moscow Lomonosov State University
 Russia, 119192, Moscow, Lomonosovsky
 Prospekt, 27, Corp. 4
 Tel.: +7 (495-939-56-88)
 Head Researcher,
 Centre "Eastrern Europe in ancient and
 medieval world",
 Institute of World History,
 Russian Academy of Sciences
 Russia, 119991, Moscow, Leninsky Prospekt,
 32a
 Tel.: +7 (495-954-44-82)
 ✉ podossinov@mail.ru

E. N. Andreeva

ORCID: 0000-0003-0728-4109

✉ aenik@ya.ru

Институт всеобщей истории РАН
(Россия, Москва)

PHRYGIAN INVENTIONS BY PLINY THE ELDER

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются все изобретения, приписываемые Плинием Старшим фригийцам (обработка меди, повозка с четырьмя колесами, запряжка колесницы парой лошадей, поперечная и двойная флейты, фригийский музыкальный лад и вышивание иглой), и прослеживаются возможные источники соответствующих сообщений, а также анализируются причины, по которым именно эти открытия классическая традиция приписала фригийцам. Сюжеты, связанные с фригийцами в античной литературе, автор статьи условно делит на три большие группы: «мифологическую», «сакральную» и «реалистическую», демонстрируя, что скудные и разрозненные свидетельства об изобретателях-фригийцах в каталоге достижений человеческой культуры у Плиния Старшего лишь кажутся случайными, но на самом деле представляют собой закономерный синтез разнородной литературной традиции об этом народе, так или иначе отражающий все ее аспекты.

Ключевые слова: Плиний Старший, «Естественная история», фригийцы, Фригия, изобретения, *prōtoi eūretai*, классическая литературная традиция, Идейские Дактили, литературный топос

Благодарности. Эта статья представляет собой доработанную версию доклада, представленного на международной конференции «Плиний старший и его время» в сентябре 2018 г. (РАНХиГС, Москва). Автор хотела бы поблагодарить организаторов конференции, а также всех участников дискуссии за их важные замечания.

Для цитирования: Andreeva E. N. Phrygian inventions by Pliny the Elder // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 57–72. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-57-72.

Статья поступила в редакцию 20 сентября 2019 г.

Принято к печати 18 октября 2019 г.

E. N. Andreeva

ORCID: 0000-0003-0728-4109

✉ aenik@ya.ru

*Institute of World History, Russian Academy of Sciences
(Russia, Moscow)*

PHRYGIAN INVENTIONS BY PLINY THE ELDER

Abstract. The paper reviews all the inventions Pliny the Elder attributes to the Phrygians (copper working, four-wheeled vehicle, harnessing pairs of horses, transverse flute, double oboe, Phrygian musical mode, and embroidering with a needle) and tries to identify possible sources of these reports and the reasons why these particular discoveries were deemed “Phrygian” in the classical tradition. The analysis is focused on the literary tradition out of which Pliny made a compilation, and not on what we would now call the “real” historical origins of the abovementioned inventions. Each discovery is placed within the context of this tradition, but without isolating it from the immediate context of Pliny’s catalogue. The topics related to the Phrygian people within the frames of the ancient tradition can conventionally be divided into three groups: “mythological”, “sacred” and “realistic”, and the inventions or inventors Pliny mentions can, in fact, be subsumed under these three categories. Even though at first glance there seems to be no logical pattern to the “Phrygian discoveries” as listed by Pliny, this approach helps demonstrate that the scarce information on Phrygian inventors offered by Pliny the Elder only seems random, but in fact the Roman author gives a synthesis of all the aspects of the rich literary tradition about this people.

Keywords: Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia*, Phrygians, Phrygia, inventions, *protoi heuretai*, heurematology, Idaean Dactyls, classical literary tradition, *topoi*

Acknowledgements. The paper was presented at the International Conference “Pliny the Elder and His Time” in September 2018. I would like to thank the organizers of the event for the kind invitation as well as all participants of the discussion for valuable remarks.

To cite this article: Andreeva, E. N. (2020). Phrygian inventions by Pliny the Elder. *Shagi / Steps*, 6(1), 57–72. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-57-72.

Received September 20, 2019

Accepted October 18, 2019

The 7th Book of the *Natural History*, dedicated to the treatment of man “for whose benefit great nature seems to have created everything else”¹ (7.1), is completed by a small post scriptum, added “before we leave the subject of man’s nature” (NH 7.191), — a list of inventors and inventions. In this paper I shall list all the inventions Pliny attributes to the Phrygian people in general or to some characters traditionally identified as Phrygian, and shall try to find the reasons why these particular objects or skills were thought to originate in Phrygia. Within the context of this research it is important to remember that Pliny’s text is based on literary tradition, which he analysed and made a compilation of, and not on research into what we would now call the “real” historical origins of things (cf. [Thraede 1962: 1192]).

The main sources of Pliny’s catalogue of cultural achievements are: Euphorus’s *On Discoveries* (4th c. BC) and Strabo’s polemic answer to this work; and also a treatise of the same name by Philostephanus of Cyrena (3rd c. BC). None of these works is known to us directly. Pliny also refers to Aristotle and Theophrastus, while of Roman authors he cites Cn. Gellius (2nd c. BC) and Varro. Obviously, this list does not exhaust all the works on discoveries and inventions written by the ancients: interest in the genesis of cultural achievements was strong among the sophists, the peripatetics, the stoics, and other Hellenistic scholars. Among Roman works we may point to Ennius and Lucretius, and, later, Seneca and the *Fabulae* attributed to Hyginus. Interest in this topic was not uncommon among Christian authors as well².

Pliny’s catalogue is dominated by Greek inventors; many discoveries are attributed to other peoples, all of which, however, are commonly referenced by Greek literary tradition. In this context the total absence of Roman inventors is quite noticeable — Pliny mentions only those Romans who used some of the listed inventions on Roman soil for the first time, which further confirms the predominance of Greek sources for the text. The list of inventions is also euhemeristic in nature, i. e., Pliny tries to avoid ascribing inventions and cultural achievements to deities as the tradition often does, and instead depicts the inventors as people who were later deified for their deeds. For instance, when Pliny says that Ceres was the first to teach people how to grow crops, he is quick to specify that it is actually because of this deed that she is regarded as a goddess (NH 7.191).

At first glance the list seems to be rather random: there is no obvious logic in the order in which the inventions are mentioned³: for example, first Pliny talks about trade, then about agriculture and laws, then about writing, etc. Moreover, issues of trade and writing are revisited later. The authorship of an invention can be ascribed to entire peoples as well as to specific individuals. In many cases, Pliny cites several contradictory sources that attribute one invention to different persons. It is not always easy to understand why a specific discovery is attributed to a specific inventor, but sometimes the attribution is quite obvious: it has either aetiological (e. g., Arachne invented thread and nets; NH 7.196) or mythological (e. g. Bellerophon was first to ride a horse; 7.202) reasons; etymology and aptronymy can also play a role (e. g. a man named *Pyrodes* invented striking fire from flint; 7.198), and so do

¹ All translations of Book 7 of *NH* are taken from Mary Beagon’s edition [Beagon 2005].

² For more on this subject — namely, the Greeks’ and Romans’ interest towards genealogies and inventions — in connection to Pliny’s work see [Beagon 2005: 417–420]; on the connected topic of *mirabilia* and paradoxography see [Ibid.: 17–20]. More generally see [Thraede 1962].

³ On possible pattern here see [Mistretta 2017].

well known real-life facts (e. g. mining of silver is associated with Athens; 7.197) [Beagon 2005: 419].

However, if one looks more closely at the structure of smaller parts of this list, i. e., passages devoted to similar discoveries, one is sure to note that they all are constructed on the same principle: from simple (i. e., from the first discovery of something) to complex (i. e., to the various modifications of the invention); for instance, from creating writing *per se* to the invention of the Greek alphabet and gradual adding to it of non-Punic letters (*NH* 7.192); or from the first boat to bireme, trireme, and so on (7.206). In order then to understand why Pliny ascribes an invention to an inventor one should not only mind the previous tradition but also the *NH*'s context, as it reflects the author's intention.

To begin with, let us review all the discoveries attributed to the Phrygians (or to specifically Phrygian characters) by Pliny. They are: copper working, the four-wheeled vehicle, harnessing pairs of horses, some musical instruments, and, of course, the Phrygian musical mode. Pliny's work contains one more reference to Phrygian inventions: in Book 8 he mentions that they invented embroidering with a needle.

The first subject on the list — the discovery of copper — is part of a passage telling the story of how humans learned to use metals. Metal-working has always been associated with magic⁴, so it is not surprising to see a whole list of mythical creatures here — although Pliny definitely rationalizes the tradition:

Aes conflare et temperare Aristoteles Lydum Scythen monstrasse, Theophrastus Delam Phrygem putant, aerariam fabricam alii Chalybas, alii Cyclopas, ferrum Hesiodus in Creta eos qui vocati sunt Dactyli Idaei. Argentum invenit Erichthonius Atheniensis, ut alii, Aeacus; auri metalla et flaturam Cadmus Phoenix ad Pangaeum montem, ut alii, Thoas aut Aeacus in Panchaia aut Sol Oceani filius, cui Gellius medicinae quoque inventionem ex metallis assignat. Plumbum ex Cassiteride insula primus adportavit Midacritus. Fabricam ferrariam invenerunt Cyclopes, figlinas Coroebus Atheniensis... (Aristotle thinks that the melting and working of copper was first demonstrated by Scythes the Lydian, while Theophrastus attributes it to the Phrygian Delas. Some authorities attribute the working of bronze to the Chalybes, others to the Cyclopes. According to Hesiod, iron was discovered by the people called the Idaean Dactyli in Crete. Erichthonius of Athens or, according to others, Aeacus discovered silver. Mining and melting gold was discovered by Cadmus the Phoenician or Aeacus in Panchaia, or, again, by Sol son of Oceanus to whom Gellius also attributes the discovery of the medicinal use of metals. Tin was first imported from the island of Cassiteris by Midacritus. Iron-working was invented by the Cyclopes, pottery by Coroebus of Athens... — *NH* 7.197–198).

So, a Phrygian named Delas is one of the candidates for the title of inventor of copper-working, while his competitor is a representative of a very close (both

⁴ See e. g. [Delcourt 1959; Beagon 2005: 431].

geographically and culturally) people — a Lydian named Scythes⁵. The author of the translation and commentary to Pliny's Book 7, Mary Beagon (*ad loc.*), claims that both these characters are otherwise unknown, but, as we shall see, this is not entirely true.

The Idaean Dactyls, mentioned in the passage, are of particular interest in the context of this research. They are credited for discovering iron on the island of Crete. As M. Beagon states in her commentary, the iron deposits on Crete are quite poor, but they are indeed plentiful in Anatolia, so here we could have the usual confusion between two mountains Ida — the one on Crete and the one in Western Asia Minor [Beagon 2005: 431]⁶. The mountain is located in Troad or Mysia, but the borders between regions in this part of Asia Minor were notoriously vague, and the Anatolian Ida was predominantly associated with Phrygia due to the cult of the *Magna Mater Idaea*, widespread in the Graeco-Roman world in Hellenistic and Roman times and believed to have come from (or be connected with) Phrygia (cf. Strab. 10.3.22)⁷.

The Idaean Dactyls are a distinct group of mythical creatures, akin to the Cabiri, the Corybantes, the Telchines and the Curetes (see, e. g. Strab. 10.3.7, 22), described by the sources as sorcerers and smiths. There are usually three or five of them and they are servants of Adrasteia, Rhea or the Great Mother of the Gods⁸. Like the mountain Ida, the Idaean Dactyls are connected to both Crete and Phrygia⁹, but the earliest literary source points to Phrygia as their homeland¹⁰. Although all the early sources are known to us indirectly, owing to the quotations by later authors, we do possess at least one direct ancient testimony of the connection between the Dactyls and Phrygia: a marble stele dating back to the 4th c. BC (*IG* XII.9 259) found in the temple of Apollo in Eretria. On the stele there is a poetic hymn honouring the Dactyls, the servants of Mother Oreia — the text is very fragmentary, but it does mention Phrygia in connection with the Dactyls. The famous "Parian Marble" (*IG* XII.5 444), a Hellenistic historical chronicle compiled at around 263 BC, also mentions the Idaean Dactyls and names them the discoverers of iron (l. 11.21b–22). The location here, however, is Crete.

⁵ Another possibility here is that Lydus is the name while Scythes is the ethnonym (so [Lamer 1939]), as in all other corresponding cases in this context the personal name goes first and the *nomen gentis* follows. M. Beagon [2005: 430], however, calls this interpretation 'unlikely' due to the fact that it was Asia Minor, and not Scythia, that became an important center of metallurgy in early antiquity. On the other hand, as I have said before, Pliny was clearly dealing with literary tradition and not historical evidence as modern historians would conceive of it. Still, Clemens of Alexandria (*Strom.* I.16.75.5), as we will see below, seems to interpret Scythes as the proper name.

⁶ On this confusion see also [Bürchner 1914; Delcourt 1959: 167; Roller 1999: 171–172].

⁷ See [Jessen 1914; Roller 1999: 144 n. 5].

⁸ Brothers Kelmis, Damnameneus and Akmon (*Phoronis*: F 2 Barnabé); Pausanias (5.7.6) names five Cretan Idaean Dactyls: Herakles, Paeonaeos, Epimedes, Iasios, and Idas (cf. 5.14.7; 8.31.3). The source material on the origins, names, number, and familial connections of the Dactyls is extremely diverse, which did not escape Strabo's attention, however, as he states, all agree on one thing: they were sorcerers and invented iron-working on the Mount Ida (10.3.22). All literary sources on the Dactyls are collected and analyzed by B. Hemberg [1952].

⁹ On the Cretan vs Phrygian Dactyls see [Roller 1999: 172; Beagon 2005: 431] and commentary to *BNJ* 107 F 12a by S. Dmitriev. Diodorus Siculus (5.64.4–5) tries to bring the two origin stories together by stating that the Dactyls were born on the Phrygian Ida and then moved to Crete.

¹⁰ I. e. 7th or 6th c. BC poem *Phoronis* [Barnabé 1996: 118–121]. Stesimbrotos (*BNJ* 107 F 12a; 5th c. BC), however, takes the side of Crete.

The early Christian author Clemens of Alexandria mentions the Idaean Dactyls several times in the first book of his *Stromata*, on one occasion (I.16.75.4–5) saying that two of them discovered iron — this time on Cyprus, that another “Idaeon”, Delas, invented the art of making bronze and that Hesiodos names him Scythes (Κέλμης τε αὖ καὶ Δαμναμενεὺς οἱ τῶν Ἰδαίων δάκτυλοι πρῶτοι σίδηρον εὑρον ἐν Κύπρῳ, Δέλας δὲ ἄλλος Ἰδαῖος εὑρε χαλκοῦ κρᾶσιν, ὥς δὲ Ἡσίοδος, Σκύθης). It is obvious that this is an excerpt from the same source as Pliny’s passage — it most probably goes back to the lost poem about the Dactyls (Περὶ τῶν Ἰδαίων Δακτύλων) by Hesiodos mentioned in *Suda* (s. v. Ἡσίοδος)¹¹. For the purposes of our research, the most important aspect of this text is that it establishes a direct connection between Delas — a Phrygian, according to Pliny, and the Idaean Dactyls, even though no other source includes this name among the names of the Dactyls. So, the association between Mount Ida, the Idaean Dactyls and Phrygia or Crete was unavoidable in the context of the ancient tradition, and here we see Pliny combining the two strains of this tradition while trying to avoid the Phrygia vs Crete controversy by separating two discoveries (that of copper and that of iron) and ‘as-signing’ them to different locations (one to Phrygia and the other — to Crete).

The second Phrygian invention in Pliny’s catalogue is the four-wheeled vehicle:

Vehiculum cum quattuor rotis Phryges, mercaturas Poeni, culturas vitium et arborum Eumolpus Atheniensis, vinum aquae misceri Staphylus Sileni filius, oleum et trapetas Aristaeus Atheniensis, idem mella; bovem et aratrum Buzyges Atheniensis, ut alii, Triptolemus (The Phrygians invented the four-wheeled vehicle, the Carthaginians invented commerce, Eumolpus of Athens viticulture and arboriculture, Staphylus son of Silenus the mixing of wine with water, Aristaeus of Athens oil and oil-presses. He also discovered honey. The ox and the plough were introduced by Buzyges the Athenian or, according to others, Triptolemus — *NH* 7.199).

Almost all other correlations between the inventors and inventions in this passage are quite obvious in one way or another. Who else, if not the Phoenicians, could have invented trade? The inventor of ‘mixing wine with water’ technique is named Staphylus, which in itself gives a direct connection to viniculture (σταφυλή — ‘bunch of grapes’, see *LSJ* s.v.). The fact that Silenus, a companion of Dionysus, is said to be his father makes the link to this ‘civilized’ way of drinking wine even stronger. Moreover, here we can remember the story of Silenus being captured by king Midas, who added wine into the water of a stream the satyr drank from. The name of *Buzyges* is just as telling — ‘he who yokes the oxen’. The tradition on Eumolpus and Triptolemus as Athenian culture heroes is very rich (see [Beagon 2005: 436–437]). Less obvious connections also find their explanation: Aristaeus is credited with the invention of making olive oil and procuring honey from the bees by other authors, e. g. Apollonius of Rhodes (4.1131) and Vergil (*Georg.* 4).

So it would seem that the link between the Phrygians and the four-wheeled cart in this context should be just as obvious, at least for well-educated readers of Pliny. However, we find no evidence on this point in ancient authors. Beagon comments

¹¹ It is worth mentioning that the cited phrases from Pliny and Clemens are the only fragments that can be attributed to this poem with certainty.

on the invention of four-wheeled vehicles in general and their appearance in Asia Minor and Greece in particular [Beagon 2005: 436], but this seems irrelevant in the context of Pliny's methods (compilation of previous tradition, not research into the 'actual' history — and of course Pliny couldn't have had any information on the earliest four-wheeled vehicles). However, besides data from specific authors Pliny used commonplace knowledge — as, for example, in the case of the connection between Phoenicians and trade (in reality they obviously did not invent the concept, but were prodigiously successful in this field). It therefore seems quite plausible that the association between Phrygians and carts be similar in nature.

There are numerous testimonies by ancient authors on the subject that cattle breeding was a thriving (or at least important) branch of Phrygian economy. One of Pliny's sources, M. Varro, claims in his *Res rusticate* (2.1.5; 2.6.3) that there are abundant herds (*greges complures; greges multi*) of half-domesticated sheep and asses in Phrygia, and also reports (2.11.12) on the production of fabrics made of goat wool in the region. Pliny repeats (8.174) the information about wild asses (*onagri*); another passage from the same book, which will be reviewed later, implies successful production of wool fabrics in Phrygia. Pliny has yet another note on Phrygian cattle, this one of paradoxographical nature: he claims that Phrygian bulls can move their horns just like their ears (10.125; this piece of information comes most likely from Aristotle *HA* 517a 29).

As for the special role of cattle breeding in the economy of the region, 1st c. BC author Nicolaus of Damascus says (*BNJ* 90 F 103i) that anyone who kills a worker ox in Phrygia is put to death. The same is reported by Claudius Aelianus (*NA* 12.34). The late Roman poet Claudianus (4th c. AD) describes the plains of Phrygia as "rich in horses, happy in cattle" (*Eutrop.* 2.273: *dives equis, felix pecori*). This view, it seems, reflected the reality: the culture of stock-breeding, which remains to this day an important part of the region's economy, finds its reflection on the stelae and altars dedicated to the sanctuaries of Phrygia in the first three centuries AD. The dedicatory inscriptions often contain pleas for the wellbeing not only of the dedicator and their family, but of their possessions as well, including the cattle. Moreover, dedicatory formulae "for the sake of bulls/cows" are known almost exclusively from Phrygia or closely neighbouring regions¹². Horses, bulls, cows with calves and

¹² A list of such epigraphic texts (and the ones with similar formulae, i. e. ὑπὲρ/περὶ κτηνέων, τετραπόδων, θρεμμάτων, ζώων, προβάτων, etc.) was compiled by Ch. Schuler [2012: 93–94]. Here I would like to cite his examples of ὑπὲρ/περὶ βοῶν dedications as well as add new ones to the list in order to demonstrate the scale of the phenomenon. Monuments from Phrygia: ὑπὲρ βοῶν *CIG* 3817; *MAMA* V 120; 152; 153; 212; VII 303; *BCH* 45: 558 No. 3; *SEG* 32: 1273; 56: 1514; 56: 1517–1518; 56: 1520; 56: 1524; 56: 1627; περὶ βοῶν *MAMA* V 170; 182; 213; R8; [Haspels 1971: 335 No. 99]; *SEG* 28: 1186; 44: 1044; 56: 1564; 56: 1577; 56: 1613; 56: 1622; 56: 1658; 62: 1152; 62: 1264–1265; from Galatia: *RECAM* II 61; from Lydia: *TAM* V.1 509; from Bythnia: *SEG* 29: 1288 (εἰς βοῶν); from Paphlagonia: *SEG* 44: 1000. The only inscription with a similar formula from another region is *IGBulg* III.2 1805 from Hadrianopolis (Edirne), which still belongs to a relatively close geographical area. The bulk of Phrygian examples originates from the regions of Dorylaion and Nakoleia (see *MAMA* V p. 29; [Schuler 2012: 93]). Cf. [Robert 1939: 204; 1955: 36–37; 108], for general analysis of such dedications see [Schuler 2012: 76–79] (with further references): the author suggests that the originality of this group of dedications did not lie in some unique underlying religious practice, but merely in the habit of inscribing it on stone. Of course, it is hard to deny that the welfare of cattle was indeed an everyday concern for farmers in all regions of the Greek world; however, the very fact that the inhabitants of Roman Phrygia were the only ones to write down such prayers en masse seems to be of some significance.

so on are very common objects of depiction on the reliefs on Phrygian dedicatory stelae (see [Schuler 2012: 76 n. 56, 77])¹³. So could this notion of a successful draft animal-rearing culture be the reason behind this connection between Phrygia and wheeled transportation?

It has already been mentioned that it is hard to define the general principle behind the catalogue's structure, however, one pattern catches the eye: Pliny tries to alternate peaceful and military inventions (see [Mistretta 2017]). After describing the most important peaceful achievements of human culture (agriculture, writing, house-building, metal-working, fire and types of government) he proceeds to the affairs of war: the invention of clubs, shields, armour, swords, the bow and arrow and so on. It is in this list of military achievements that we find the next Phrygian invention — the chariot harnessed with a pair of horses:

Equum (qui nunc aries appellatur) in muralibus machinis Epium ad Troiam, equo vehi Bellerophontem, frenos et strata equorum Pelethronium, pugnare ex equo Thessalos, qui centauri appellati sunt, habitantes secundum Pelium montem. Bigas prima iunxit Phrygum natio, quadrigas Erichthonius. Ordinem exercitus, signi dationem, tesseras, vigiliis Palamedes invenit Troiano bello, specularum significationem eodem Sinon, inducias Lycaon, foedera Theseus (The horse, a siege-machine now called the ram [was invented] by Epium at Troy. Horse-riding was invented by Bellerophon, reins and saddles by Pelethronius, fighting on horseback by the Thessalians called Centaurs who lived on Mount Pelion. The Phrygian people first harnessed pairs of horses, Erichthonius a team of four. Army formation, the giving of signals, watchwords, and sentries were inventions of Palamedes during the Trojan war, the campaign in which Sinon instituted signalling from watch-towers. Lycaon introduced truces, Theseus treaties — NH 7.202).

Strictly speaking, the word '*bigae*' can designate any type of tandem, not necessary a chariot. However, given the predominantly military nature of the passage, it is impossible to link this invention directly to the previous one. Crediting the Phrygians with any kind of military achievement seems rather odd in the general context of Greek and Roman literature: most authors describe this people as cowardly and effeminate, totally incapable of any achievement in war [Levick 2013: 43–44; Andreeva 2017: 603–605]. M. Beagon also tells a brief story of chariots' appearance in the Near East and Asia Minor, and points to the success in chariot warfare achieved by the Hittites, the predecessors of the Phrygians in Central Anatolia [Beagon 2005: 443]. However, there can be no direct connection here: neither Greeks nor Romans knew of the existence of the Hittites, much less of their success in horse-breeding and chariot-riding. Just as in previous cases, the context of the *NH* itself is most important for understanding the logic behind this attribution.

¹³ Bovines are also sometimes depicted on funerary monuments, but are more characteristic of dedicatory ones (see comm. ad *MAMA* V 50; [Robert 1939: 204]).

One association between the Phrygians and chariots in the classical tradition seems to come in the form of the Pelops story¹⁴: he won a chariot race in Pisa¹⁵. The connection between Pelops and chariots is strongly reflected in Greek art [Triantis 1994: 284–285]. However, the origins of this hero are not so clear — Pindar calls him Lydian (*Ol.* 1.24), while Herodotus — Phrygian (7.8); in any case he was the son of Tantalus, a Lydian king. And even though strict borders between these two Anatolian regions in literary narratives are hard to draw (this will be discussed later), the rest of Pelops's story is connected to continental Greece, not Asia Minor. According to Pindar (*Ol.* 1.71–88) Pelops got his horses and the chariot from Poseidon, so, following the euhemeristic principle, Pliny could have removed the divine intervention from the story, much like he does when he credits Marsyas with the invention of the flute, which was traditionally thought to have been made by Athena (see below). However, unlike the satyr and the flute story, Pelops was never depicted as the *first* mortal to use some device invented by a god.

On the other hand, it is not Pelops himself, but the *Phrygum natio* (Phrygian people) who is said to have invented the *bigae*. Moreover, the context seems to suggest military and not agonal use of chariots. As we can see, of the thirteen inventions that are in direct connection to the one in which we are interested, more than a half are linked to the Trojan war, and it is therefore possible that this invention should also be regarded in the Trojan context. The *Iliad* mentions the Phrygian people only twice (2.862 and 10.431), and they do not generally stand out among other allies of Troy, however, they are said to be *ἰπτόμαχοι* ('fighting from horses') — an epithet used in the poem only once, that could, according to J. N. O'Sullivan, in this context actually mean 'using horse drawn chariots in battle'¹⁶. A similar epithet — *ἰππόδαμος* ('horse-taming') — is used constantly and refers to various heroes on both sides, but most often it describes the Trojans as a people, and can also refer to the use of horses for drawing chariots¹⁷.

Later literary tradition, starting with Aeschylus and especially Euripides, has the word "Phrygian" for a synonym of "Trojan", an *usus* most characteristic of Greek drama (see [Hall 1988]). Strabo complains about this mix-up between the names of Anatolian peoples, caused mostly not by the constant migrations and merging of peoples, but by the efforts of tragic writers: "An obscurity arose not from these changes only, but from the disagreement between authors in their narration of the same events, and in their description of the same persons; for they called Trojans Phrygians, like the Tragic poets; and Lycians Carians, and similarly in other instances" (12.8.7) and "the poets, however, particularly the tragic poets, confound nations together; for instance, Trojans, Mysians, and Lydians, whom they call Phrygians, and give the name of Lycians to Carians"¹⁸ (14.3.3; trans. H. C. Hamilton). This equating of Phrygians and Trojans continued to exist in Greek literature of the Hellenistic and Roman epochs and was adopted by Roman poets, the most prominent example being Virgil's *Aeneid*.

¹⁴ I would like to thank Dr A. Dan and Dr D. V. Panchenko for pointing this out to me in course of the conference discussion.

¹⁵ For details of Pelops myth see [Scherling 1940; Stenger 2006].

¹⁶ *Lfgre* II, 1208.

¹⁷ Τρῳες: *Il.* 2.230; 3.127, 251, 343; 4.80, 333, 352, 355, 509; 6. 461; 7.361; 8.71, 110, 516, 525; 10.424; 11.568; 12.440 etc. See *Lfgre* II, 1206.

¹⁸ Cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant.* 1.47; Claud. *Eutrop.* 2.242–246.

So is this notion of the Phrygians inventing the chariots connected to the tradition, unknown to us, but probably starting with Homer's description of them as *ἵπτομαχοί*, or is it grounded in their later identification with the Trojans, who were also depicted as skilled horse tamers by the *Iliad*? In any case, this discovery could be connected to the Trojan cycle just as well as to the Pelops myth, and probably even more so, as in the case of the former the tradition speaks of entire peoples, not individual heroes, as does Pliny.

After reporting the invention of peace treaties by Theseus, Pliny goes back to peaceful inventions — divination and music. The music-related inventions are the last ones ascribed to the Phrygians in *NH* Book 7:

Musicam Amphion, fistulam et monaulum Pan Mercurii, obliquam tibiam Midas in Phrygia, geminas tibias Marsyas in eadem gente, Lydios modullos Amphion, Dorios Thamyras Thrax, Phrygios Marsyas Phryx, citharam Amphion, ut alii, Orpheus, ut alii, Linus (Amphion invented music, Pan son of Mercury the pan-pipe and the single oboe. Midas in Phrygia invented the transverse flute, while in the same country Marsyas invented the double oboe. Amphion invented the Lydian mode, the Thracian Thamyras the Dorian mode, the Phrygian Marsyas the Phrygian mode. The lyre was invented by Amphion, though others say Orpheus and others say Linus — *NH* 7.204).

In this case the mythological tradition is quite well-known. According to some authors (e. g. Apollod. 1.4.2; Hyg. *Fab.* 165; Ovid. *Fast.* 695–710; cf. Paus. 1.24.1) the satyr Marsyas picks up the flute-*aulos* (αὔλος) made and thrown away by Athena and learns to play it. It is with this flute that he loses the musical contest to Apollo (Diod. 3.59. Paus. 2.22.9; Ovid. *Met.* 6.382–403; Pliny himself briefly mentions this story in *NH* 16.89). We do not find, however, any other evidence of him inventing the Phrygian mode, one of the basic harmonies of ancient Greek music, but the later author Pausanias (10.30.9) reports that he is deemed to be the inventor of a specific kind of music for the flute, τὸ Μητροῦρον αὐλημα. It is true that in some cases Marsyas is depicted as a companion of Cybele. For instance, Diodorus Siculus (3.58) narrating the childhood of the goddess, says that “the man who associated with her and loved her more than anyone else, they say, was Marsyas” (trans. C. H. Oldfather). In the same passage he reports that Cybele invented the pipe (πολυκάλαμος σύριγξ), while Marsyas adapted melodies for the *aulos* flute. The Phrygian mode itself was more associated with flute music among the Greeks [West 1992: 180].

The Phrygian city of Celaenae-Apamea more than others was connected to the story of Marsyas, and the satyr playing the flute was depicted on the city's coins in Roman times (1st c. BC — 2nd c. AD). On many coins of this type Marsyas is depicted playing a double flute, i. e. exactly the type of flute he is credited for inventing by Pliny¹⁹. Considering Pliny's tendency to rationalize, it is no wonder that goddess Athena was removed from the picture.

Of course, Marsyas was not the only mythological figure credited with the invention of the *aulos* by the ancient tradition. Another candidate is Olympos — an

¹⁹ Some examples of the type: *BMC Phrygia* 47, 74, 130, 158; *SNG Cop.* 189, 191–193, 200; *SNG Tüb.* 3975; *SNG Aulock* 3474. On Apamean coins with Marsyas see [Nollé 2006: 79–84].

apprentice of Marsyas [Wegner 1939]. The abovementioned “Parian Chronicle” (l. 10.19–20) ascribes the invention of both the *aulos* and the Phrygian mode to a Phrygian named Hyagnis (who was probably regarded as Marsyas’s father) [Abert 1913: 2624], but the event still takes place in Phrygian Celaenae. The ancients thought that the Phrygian mode could have different effects on the listeners, but one of these effects was causing religious frenzy and ecstasy and making people commit insane deeds. The inscription in question states that Hyagnis not only invented the *aulos* and the Phrygian harmony, but also put in place “other laws of the Mother, Dionysius and Pan”, so the connection between the flute, the Phrygian mode and ecstatic religious rites is inescapable (see [Wegner 1939: 322–323; West 1992: 31, n. 89, 180–181, n. 79])²⁰.

The association between king Midas and musical instruments is more vague, but it was he (according to some authors) who judged that ill-fated competition between Marsyas and Apollo and preferred the sounds of flute to the sounds of cithar — a mistake that resulted in him obtaining the famous donkey ears. There is a tradition that makes Midas an apprentice of Orpheus himself (Conon *BNJ* 26 F1; Ovid. *Met.* 11. 92; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.13.1)²¹: the sources focus more on mysteries than on the art of music, but it would seem that one is inseparable from the other. The author of *Suda*, for instance, states (s. v. ἑλεγχος) that it was Midas who instituted flute-playing during sacrifices. Also, Athenaeus (14.617b) mentions some Phrygian king of sacred flutes (Φρύγα καλλιπνόνων αὐλῶν ἱερῶν βασιλῆα), who was the first one to invent the light Lydian song in defiance of the Dorian Muse — and Midas is one of very few “candidates” for the role of this king.

The last Phrygian invention is mentioned in passing in Book 8, in the narration about sheep and fabrics made from their wool:

Acu facere id Phryges invenerunt, ideoque Phrygioniae appellatae sunt. aurum intexere in eadem Asia invenit Attalus rex, unde nomen Attalicis. colores diversos picturae intexere Babylon maxime celebravit et nomen inposuit. plurimis vero liceis texere, quae polymita appellant, Alexandria instituit, scutulis dividere Gallia (Embroidering with the needle was discovered by the Phrygians, and consequently embroidered robes are called Phrygian. Gold embroidery was also invented in Asia, by King Attalus, for whom Attalic robes got their name. Weaving different colours into a pattern was chiefly brought into vogue by Babylon, which gave its name to this process. But the fabric called damask woven with a number of threads was introduced by Alexandria, and check patterns by Gaul — *NH* 8.196, trans. by H. Rackham).

As the invention of different ways to adorn a cloth is definitely not one of the most important achievements of the human race, it is no wonder that such inventions did not make it to the catalogue of man’s discoveries in Book 7. In this particular case we, unfortunately, face a *circulus vitiosus* that cannot be broken by the information

²⁰ It is interesting to note that Clemens of Alexandria (1.15.73.1) names the Phrygian Idaean Dactyls the first wise-men and, among other things, the inventors of musical rhythm (cf. Strab. 10.3.7). On connection between the Idaean Daktyls and ecstatic music see [Wegner 1939: 322].

²¹ This tradition, however, sees him as the king of Thracian *briges* [Eitrem 1932: 1526].

from existing sources: were the embroidered clothes called “Phrygian” because the Phrygians invented embroidering as Pliny suggests, or did the name give rise to the speculation that this particular type of ornament was devised by the Phrygians? The Latin language has two words for embroiderers, *plumarii* and *phrygiones*, which were often used without any difference in meaning [Scherling 1951]. We do not have any data on wide-scale production of embroidered fabrics for export in Central Anatolia; there is no doubt, however, that the people there produced some wool fabrics. Spindles and other weaving appliances were often depicted on Phrygian (usually women’s) gravestones, however, this trend is not unique for the region [Masségliа 2013: 99].

At the first glance, there is no logical pattern to the “Phrygian inventions” listed above. So why then these particular achievements, and not others, were identified as Phrygian by Pliny? As I have already said, Pliny based his catalogue on the data of Greek and Roman literary tradition, so in order to answer the question one should review what the tradition states regarding the Phrygians in general. The topics linked to this people can be conventionally divided into three groups:

1) “Mythological” — a group of widely known stories whose heroes were thought to be Phrygians or at least were associated with this land. The legends of king Midas, the satyr Marsyas, the myths of Attis and Cybele, and so forth could be cited as examples. These narratives were very well known to the public and did not, in fact, stand out from the bulk of what today we call “Ancient Greek myths”. We can also associate the literary *topos* of Phrygians = Trojans with this group.

2) “Sacred” — this group is closely connected to the previous one, but it can still be regarded separately. It involves the reports of rites of veneration for the Great Mother of the Gods. Of course, Cybele is the heroine of many myths, but here we are more interested not in the events of her and her companion’s lives, but rather in the tales of sacred, arcane knowledge she was believed to bestow on her followers. Additionally, we will regard any data on “Phrygian wisdom”, not necessarily directly connected to the goddess.

3) “Realistic” — unlike the ancient kings and the gods, contemporary Phrygians were regarded by the Greeks and Romans as a “lower race”. The notions of Phrygian effeminacy and cowardice most likely originate in the stereotype of an ‘eastern barbarian’, maybe even in the equating of Trojans with Phrygians; however, the fact that they were regarded as a typical slave-race may be due not only to the traditional dramatic part of an Anatolian slave, but to the realities of the contemporary slave market as well²². Another common motive in the description of Phrygia and its people is the previously discussed aptitude for cattle-breeding.

This sort of classification seems (and actually is) artificial, as no ancient author catalogues Phrygian stories in this manner, and the narratives of all groups are in fact intertwined. However, the semantic differences are too noticeable to ignore them altogether, and this scheme can help us understand which branch of tradition

²² Phil. *VA*. 8.7.12: “For though one can buy here on the spot slaves from Pontus or Lydia or Phrygia — for indeed you can meet whole droves of them being conducted hither, since these like other barbarous races have always been subject to foreign masters, and as yet see nothing disgraceful in servitude; anyhow with the Phrygians it is a fashion even to sell their children, and once they are enslaved, they never think any more about them...” (trans. by F. C. Conybeare). On slaves from Anatolia see [Bradley, Cartledge 2011, 93, 184, 304].

engendered Pliny's invention stories. For instance, the invention of *bigae* falls into the "mythological" category, regardless of its connection to the Trojan cycle or the Pelops story. The whole music-related group of discoveries could also be described as "mythological", at last in the way that Pliny and, probably, his immediate sources present it, even though its deeper roots are definitely connected to the cult of the Great Goddess, with its ecstatic music and dances.

If we turn to the "sacred" branch of the tradition, we find the Phrygians possessing the secret knowledge of metallurgy. The mystic character of this art is reinforced by the connection to the Idaean Dactyls (cf. [Delcourt 1959: 166]). However, the idea that the Phrygians possess — or at least possessed in ancient times — some kind of specific wisdom is not necessarily connected to the mysteries of the Great Goddess. For instance, the famous story of pharaoh Psammetichos' 'linguistic experiment', told by Herodotus (2.2), goes as follows: the king decided to raise two babies without them hearing any kind of human speech in order to determine which language is innate in humans and, thus, which race is the most ancient. The babies' first word was *bekos*, i. e., 'bread' in Phrygian, so the Egyptians had to admit that the Phrygians, and not themselves, were the most ancient race on Earth. As one of the most ancient peoples along with the Egyptians and the Babylonians, the Phrygians were thought to possess some kind of sacred knowledge told in the so-called "Phrygian tales" (Φρύγιοι λόγοι), mentioned by Hellenistic and later scholars. Such pseudo-oriental 'tales' (Egyptian, Chaldean, Persian and Lybian) usually contained allegoric and euhemeristic interpretations of myths, presented as ancient Oriental wisdom²³. In this context it is worth noting that the wise Aesop is said to be of Phrygian descent by some authors (Phaedrus, Dion of Prusa, Gellius, Lucian and others)²⁴.

The "realistic" aspect of the tradition is less prominent in Pliny's catalogue, but this is not surprising: Pliny based his narrative more on historical and paradoxographical traditions, while the dramatic tropes on cowardly and servile nature of the Phrygians were re-interpreted in a realistic fashion in rhetoric literature (especially by Cicero ad Dion of Prusa)²⁵. However, it is possible that the invention of the four-wheeled cart should be put in this bracket as some sort of common knowledge, especially as in the text it is a neighbor of "the Carthaginians invented commerce" statement.

As for the embroidery, this association could be due the stereotype of a luxury-loving oriental barbarian. As we can see, in the relevant passage of the *NH* almost all exquisitely adorned fabrics come from the East. Ovid (*Met.* 6.166) also talks about a Phrygian gown embroidered with gold (cf. Plaut. *Truc.* 536). The story of King Midas's 'golden touch' also comes to mind here. However, we should not forget that the fabrication of wool textile could in fact have been important for the region, which is known for a specific kind of wool — the angora — even today.

Through this research I have attempted to demonstrate that the scarce information on Phrygian inventors offered by Pliny the Elder only seems random, but in fact the Roman author gives a synthesis of all the aspects of the rich literary tradition about this people.

²³ On Φρύγιοι λόγοι see [Rives 2005].

²⁴ This version of his origin is predominant since the 2nd c. AD (see [Rives 2005: 235, n. 35]).

²⁵ For more details on the subject see [Andreeva 2017: 607–611].

Abbreviations

- BCH — *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*. Paris: École française d'Athènes. (In French).
- BMC Phrygia — Head, B. V. (1906). *Catalogue of the Greek coins of Phrygia*. (*British Museum Catalog of Greek Coins*; Vol. 25). London: Gilbert and Rivington Limited.
- BNJ — *Brill's New Jacoby*. Retrieved from <https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby>.
- CIG — *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum* (1828–1877) (4 Vols.). Berolini: Ex officina academica. (In Latin).
- IG XII.5 — Hiller von Gaertringen, F. (Ed.) (1903–1909). *Inscriptiones Graecae*, (Vol. 12.5) *Inscriptiones Cycladum*. Berolini: Apud Georgium Reimerum. (In Latin).
- IG XII.9 — Ziebarth, E. (Ed.) (1915). *Inscriptiones Graecae*, (Vol. 12.9) *Inscriptiones Euboeae insulae*. Berolini: Apud Georgium Reimerum. (In Latin).
- IGBulg III.2 — Mihailov, G. (Ed.) (1964). *Inscriptiones graecae in Bulgaria repertae*, (Vol. 3.2) *Inscriptiones inter Haemum et Rhodopem repertae. Fasciculus posterior: A territorio Philippopolitano usque ad oram Ponticam*. Sofia: In aedibus typographicis Academiae Litterarum Bulgaricae. (In Latin).
- LfgRE — *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (1979–2010) (4 Vols.). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. (In German, English etc.).
- LSJ — Liddell, H. G., Scott, R. A., Jones, H. S. (1996). *Greek-English lexicon with a revised supplement*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- MAMA V — Cox, C. W. M., Cameron, A. (Eds.) (1937). *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, (Vol. 5) *Monuments from Dorylaeum and Nacolea*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press.
- MAMA VII — Calder, W. M. (Ed.) (1956). *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, (Vol. 7) *Eastern Phrygia*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press.
- RECAM II — Mitchell, S. (Ed.) (1982). *Regional epigraphic catalogues of Asia Minor II: The Ankara District. The inscriptions of North Galatia*. Oxford. (BAR International Series, 135).
- SEG — *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (1923–). Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- SNG Aulock — *Sylloge nummorum graecorum Deutschland. Sammlung von Aulock* (1957–1968). Berlin: Mann. (In German).
- SNG Cop. — *Sylloge nummorum graecorum. The Royal Collection of Coins and Medals. Danish National Museum* (1942–1979). Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard.
- SNG Tüb. — *Sylloge nummorum graecorum Deutschland. Münzsammlung der Universität Tübingen* (1981–1999). München: Hirmer. (In German).
- TAM V.1 — Herrmann, P. (Ed.) (1981). *Tituli Asiae Minoris*, (Vol. 5.1) *Tituli Lydiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti. Regio septentrionalis, ad orientem vergens*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (In Latin).

References

- Abert, H. (1913). Hyagnis. In A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 8.2), 2624. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- Andreeva, E. N. (2017). Sero sapiunt Phryges: obraz frigiitsa v antichnoi literature [*Sero sapiunt Phryges: The image of the Phrygians in classical literature*]. *Vestnik drevnei istorii* [Journal of Ancient History], 77(3), 599–614. (In Russian).
- Barnabé, A. (Ed.) (1996). *Poetarum epicorum Graecorum: testimonia et fragmenta. Pars I*. Leipzig: Teubner. (In Latin).

- Beagon, M. (2005). *The Elder Pliny on the human animal. Natural History, Book 7*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bradley, K., Cartledge, P. (Eds.) (2011). *The Cambridge world history of slavery* (Vol. 1), *The ancient Mediterranean world*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Bürchner, L. (1914). Ida. In A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 9.1), 858–864. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- Delcourt, M. (1959). *Héphaistos, ou, La Légende de magicien*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In French).
- Eitrem, S. (1932). Midas 1. In A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 15.2), 1526–1536. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- Jessen, O. (1914). Idaia 1–2. In A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 9.1), 864–865. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- Hall, E. (1988). When did the Trojans turn into Phrygians? Alcaeus 42.15. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 73, 15–18.
- Haspels, C. H. E. (1971). *The highlands of Phrygia: Sites and monuments*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Hemberg, B. (1952). Die Idaiischen Daktylen. *Eranos. Acta Philologica Suecana*, 50, 41–59. (In German).
- Lamer, H. (1927). Lydos 5. In A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 13.2), 2209. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- Levick, B. (2013). In the Phrygian mode: A region seen from without. In P. Thonemann (Ed.). *Roman Phrygia. Culture and society*, 41–54. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Masségli, J. (2013). Phrygians in relief: Trends in self-representation. In P. Thonemann (Ed.). *Roman Phrygia. Culture and society*, 95–123. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Mistretta, M. R. (2017). Empire and invention: The Elder Pliny's Heurematography (NH 7.191–215). *Society for Classical Studies*. Retrieved from <https://classicalstudies.org/annual-meeting/148/abstract/empire-and-invention-elder-pliny-s-heurematography-nh-7191-215>.
- Nollé, J. (2006). Beiträge zur kleinasiatischen Münzkunde und Geschichte 4–5. *Gephyra. Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Antike auf dem Gebiet der heutigen Türkei*, 3, 49–131. (In German).
- Rives, J. B. (2005). Phrygian tales. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 45, 223–244.
- Robert, L. (1939). Hellenica. *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*, 13 (ser. 3), 97–217. (In French).
- Robert, L. (1955). *Hellenica: recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques* (Vol. 10). Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient. (In French).
- Roller, L. E. (1999). *In search of God the Mother: The cult of Anatolian Cybele*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Scherling, K. (1940). Pelops 1. In Pauly, A., Wissowa, G., Kroll, W., et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Suppl. Vol. 7), 849–865. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- Scherling, K. (1951). Plumarii. In Pauly, A., Wissowa, G., Kroll, W., et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 21.1), 1268–1269. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- Schuler, Ch. (2012). Inscriptions and identities in Asia Minor. In Davies, J. Wilkes, J. (Eds.). *Epigraphy and the historical sciences*, 63–100. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

- Stenger, J. (2006). Pelops 1. In Canik, H., Schneider, H., Salazar, Ch. F. (Eds.). *Brill's New Pauly*. Retrieved from <https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/der-neue-pauly>.
- Thraede, K. (1962). Erfinder II (geistesgeschichtlich). In Klauser, Th., Dassmann, E., Schöllgen, G. et al. (Eds.). *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (Vol. 5), 1191–1278. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann. (In German).
- Triantis, I. (1994). Pelops. In *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (Vol. 7), 282–287. Zürich; München; Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winkler Verlag. (In French).
- Wegner, M. (1939). Olympos 26. In Pauly, A., Wissowa, G., Kroll, W., et al. (Eds.). *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. 18.1), 321–324. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag. (In German).
- West, M. L. (1992). *Ancient Greek music*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

* * *

Информация об авторе

Евгения Николаевна Андреева
научный сотрудник,
Отдел сравнительного изучения
древних цивилизаций,
Институт всеобщей истории РАН
Россия, 119334, Москва,
Ленинский проспект, д. 32а
Тел.: +7 (495) 954-48-52
✉ aenik@ya.ru

Information about the author

Eugenia N. Andreeva
Researcher,
Department for Comparative Studies
of Ancient Civilizations,
Institute of World History,
Russian Academy of Sciences
Russia, 119334, Moscow, Leninsky Prospekt,
32a
Tel.: +7 (495) 954-48-52
✉ aenik@ya.ru

A. V. Belousov^{abc}

ORCID: 0000-0001-6231-2446

✉ abelv@yandex.ru

^a Российский государственный гуманитарный университет
(Россия, Москва)

^b Институт всеобщей истории РАН (Россия, Москва)

^c Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова
(Россия, Москва)

MAGIC IN PLINY THE ELDER REVISITED

Аннотация. Статья посвящена критической ревизии сведений о сущности, истории и содержании античной магии, которые Плиний Старший излагает в 28-й и 30-й книгах своей «Естественной истории», а также анализу ряда теоретических и источниковедческих подходов к этим сведениям, каковы сложились к настоящему моменту в современной науке. Общий пересмотр концепции магии у Плиния Старшего обусловлен, во-первых, тем, что наши знания о магии и ее теоретическом понимании у древних невероятно расширились за эти полвека, а с другой стороны, тем, что за последние десятилетия сильно изменился научный подход к «Естественной истории»: не переставая (как и для средневекового читателя) быть чудесным бабушкиным сундуком, из которого достают самые разные вещи для самых разных исследовательских целей, «Naturalis Historia» стала интересна и сама по себе, как *opus sui generis*. Магия у Плиния Старшего рассматривается в статье, исходя в первую очередь из философских и идеологических предпосылок самой книги. Автор кратко излагает содержание сведений Плиния о магии и приходит к следующему выводу: все, что говорит Плиний о магии (к которой относится с нескрываемым презрением, см. его риторические выпады против магии в 28-й книге и в очерке истории магии в 30-й книге), упирается по сути в две прочные и взаимосвязанные идеи. Во-первых, это очевидное первенство и главенство Рима над всем «земным кругом», а во-вторых, идея *humanitas*, которая, подобно платоническому благу, эманурует из Рима на весь подвластный ему мир, вплоть до мест, где истинно человеческое фактически отсутствует.

Ключевые слова: Плиний Старший, римская религия, греческая религия, античная магия, иатромагия, история магии, *humanitas*

Для цитирования: Belousov A. V. Magic in Pliny the Elder revisited // Шаги / Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 73–90. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-73-90.

Статья поступила в редакцию 7 октября 2019 г.
Принято к печати 12 декабря 2019 г.

A. V. Belousov^{abc}

ORCID: 0000-0001-6231-2446

✉ abelv@yandex.ru

^a Russian State University for Humanities (Russia, Moscow)

^b Institute of World History, Russian Academy of Sciences
(Russia, Moscow)

^c Lomonosov Moscow State University (Russia, Moscow)

MAGIC IN PLINY THE ELDER REVISITED

Abstract. The article is devoted to a critical revision of information about the essence, history and content of ancient magic, which Pliny the Elder presents in Books 28 and 30 of his *Natural History*, as well as to analyzing a number of theoretical and source-study approaches to this information, which have developed to date in modern scholarship. The general reconsideration of Pliny the Elder's concept of magic is caused, firstly, by the fact that our knowledge of magic and its theoretical underpinnings among the ancients has greatly expanded over the past half century, and, on the other hand, by the fact that in the past few decades the scientific approach to *Natural History* has greatly changed. Without ceasing to be, as it was for the medieval reader, a wonderful grandmother's chest from which a variety of things can be obtained for various research purposes, *Naturalis Historia* became interesting in and of itself, as an *opus sui generis*. In the article, discussion of magic in Pliny the Elder derives primarily from the philosophical and ideological premises of *Natural History* itself. The author briefly summarizes Pliny's information about magic and comes to the conclusion that all that Pliny says about magic (which he treats with undisguised contempt, see his rhetorical attacks on magic in Book 28 and in the essay on the history of magic in Book 30) in essence rests on two firm and interrelated ideas. The first — the obvious primacy and supremacy of Rome over the whole *orbis terrarum*, and the second — the idea of *humanitas*, which, like the Platonic Good, emanates from Rome to the whole world subject to it, even to those places where the truly human is practically absent.

Keywords: Pliny the Elder, Roman religion, Greek religion, ancient magic, iatromagia, history of magic, *humanitas*

To cite this article: Belousov, A. V. (2020). Magic in Pliny the Elder revisited. *Shagi/Steps*, 6(1), 73–90. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-73-90.

Received October 7, 2019

Accepted December 11, 2019

It goes without saying that Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* is one of our most important sources of ancient magic. One way or another, Pliny must be taken into account by a historian of ancient magic proper, by a western medievalist, and, not least, even by an expert in Slavic magical practices. Furthermore, it is true that in the *Natural History* we find a great variety of magical recipes, to which one might find parallels in the history of almost any culture. Nevertheless, despite the fact that Pliny's text is indisputably the magical reference text *par excellence* of the ancient and early modern world, it turns out that, in the end, it is only used uncritically for some information, as if we have forgotten that *Naturalis Historia* is yet not an "encyclopedia" in our sense of the word, but a unique author's work written by a man named Caius Plinius Secundus at a certain time, in accordance with a certain technique and certain strategy of writing and narration chosen by this person, determined by the communicative goals specific to the author, and presented to specific readers.

I did not title my paper "Magic in Pliny the Elder Revisited" merely on account of its terse academical sonority. On the one hand, I should like to pay tribute to the memory of the great French philologist and publisher of Pliny's "magical" books, Alfred Ernout, whose article "La magie chez Pline L'Ancien" was published fifty-four years ago, in 1964, in the *Festschrift* dedicated to Jean Bayet, and which is still the only work attempting to summarize and conceptualize the contents of Pliny the Elder's ideas about magic [Ernout 1964]. On the other hand, I dare to use this title in order to clarify and, to an extent, overcome A. Ernout's views on Pliny's magic. The general revision of our concepts of the idea of magic in Pliny the Elder is due, firstly, to the fact that our knowledge of ancient magic, its theoretical understanding, has incredibly expanded over this half a century; and, secondly, to the fact that in the last few decades the scholarly approach to *Natural History* has greatly changed: without ceasing to be a 'grandmother's chest' full of wonders, as for a medieval reader (cf. [Bodson 1997: 327: *on lit peu Pline l'Ancien pour lui-même*]), from which the most diverse things are obtained for a variety of research purposes, *Naturalis Historia* became interesting in itself, as an *opus sui generis* (ex. gr., [König, Winkler 1979; Serbat 1973; 1986; Beagon 1992; Murphy 2004; Naas 2002; Doody 2010; Laenh 2013]). Proceeding from these premises, I undertook my own consideration of magic in Pliny the Elder, which I should like to present to you, trying to keep in this phrase a worthy balance between "magic" and "Pliny".

Let me begin by recalling what Pliny the Elder says about magic in *Natural History*. It should be noted that information about magic and magicians is scattered throughout the *Natural History*, but the central books in which Pliny offers, on the one hand, the theory of magic, and on the other — its history, are Books 28 and 30. The information relating to the history of magic contained in Book 30 (*NH* 30.1–7) has always been viewed as the most important. The author immediately calls magic *magicas uanitates* (fraudulent lies of the Magi), thereby immediately setting the tone for his story. In Book 37 (*NH* 37.14.1) he talks about magic in similar terms: *magorum infandam uanitatem*. A person who resorts to magical means of treatment is considered to be *obscenus et nefandus* (immoral and wicked) by Pliny (*NH* 28.2.9). It is worth noting that history of magic is firmly connected by Pliny with theory of magic and is set out as follows¹:

¹ All translations are cited after H. Rackham (*NH*, Book 1) and W. H. S. Jones (*NH*, Books 28–30) from Loeb Classical Library, except for specified instances.

I — *De origine magices* (Origin of magic);

II — *Quando et a quo coeperit. A quibus colebrata sit* (Date and place of its commencement, by whom practiced);

III — *An exercuerit eam Italia. Quando primum senatus uetuerit hominem immolari* (Whether carried on in Italy. Human sacrifice, when first prohibited by the Senate);

IV — *De Galliarum druidis* (The Druids of the Gauls);

V — *De generibus magices* (Kinds of magic);

VI — *Magorum perfugia* (Evasions of Mages);

VII — *Opinio Magorum de talpis* (Magicians' view as to Moles).

As you can see from this content of the beginning of Book 30, most probably written by Pliny himself, we have before us a historical exposition, at the center of which is Italy, as is almost always the case in Pliny, but this exposition (as is already clear from the content itself!) is presented in a certain (tendentious) way due to the negative evaluation of magic by Pliny. As always in Pliny, the very exposition is much richer than the dry, but tendentious index. Pliny says that magic — the most deceptive of all the arts (*fraudentissima artium*), flourished and flourishes throughout the oecumene at all times (*plurimum in toto terrarum orbe plurimisque saeculis ualuit*). The reason for such flowering, as Pliny maintains (*auctoritas maxima!*), is that magic absorbed into itself the most powerful *artes* in men's eyes (*imperiocissimas humanae mentis complexa in unam se redegit*), namely: medicine, *uires religionis* (whose exact significance has long puzzled philologists) and astrology (*artes mathematicas*). Holding men's emotions by such a three-fold bond (*triplici uinculo*), magic continues to exist in the time of Pliny, and in the East even commands the kings of kings (*ut hodieque etiam in magna parte gentium praeualeat et et Oriente regum regibus imperet*).

The history of magic follows here the theory according to which magic is the sum of three things: astrology, *religio* and medicine, the last of which will occupy Pliny further and about which he says that this "magical" medicine is pretending (*inrepsisse!*) to be "the highest and the holiest" (*altior sanctiorque medicina*). This last point will constitute one of the axes of my further presentation. According to Pliny, referring to the *auctores*, the history of magic originates in Persia from Zoroaster (*in Perside a Zoroastre*), he does not neglect to note however, that it is unclear whether Zoroaster refers to only one person. Here Pliny refers to Eudoxus of Cnidus, who asserts that, if, again, we are to believe Pliny's text, this same Zoroaster lived some six thousand years before Plato's death, and this information is supposedly confirmed by Aristotle. On the other hand, Hermippus of Smyrna, who *de tota ea arte diligentissime scripsit*, claims that Zoroaster himself learned magic from a certain Azonacus who lived five millennia before the Trojan War. This information surprises Pliny, first of all, because from those times (of Azonacus) no magical works have survived. This last statement makes it clear that for Pliny the magic of his time is already clearly and inextricably linked with books and book culture. Further, he names the names of famous magicians whose works were not preserved until his time: Apusorus, Zaratus, the Babylonians Marmarus and the Arabantiphocus, and also the Assyrian Tarmoenda. Pliny's surprise is also caused by the fact that there is no mention of magic in Homer, unless, according to him, we count Homer's story of Proteus, the singing of the Sirens, the Circe, and the

calling of the dead (*inferum euocatione*). Pliny also does not find in his sources any information whatever about how magic appeared in the Carian Telmessos, which he calls *religiosissima urbs* (the most superstitious city); when the magic appeared among the *Thessalae matres*, who, according to Pliny (and a number of other ancient authors), were mostly associated with magic, although, again according to Pliny, the Thessalians, a people originally completely alien to magical pursuits, “were content, at any rate in the Trojan period, with the medicines of Chiron, and with Ares as the only wielder of the thunderbolt” (*Troianis utique temporibus Chironis medicinis contenta et solo Marte fulminante*). Pliny is surprised that the people of Achilles acquired such a strong magical reputation, so that even Menander, a poet of incomparable literary taste (*litterarum subtilitati sine aemulo genitus*), wrote the comedy “Thessala”, which described magical rituals of drawing the Moon to the Earth (*fabulam complexam ambages feminarum detrahentium lunam*). Furthermore, Pliny notes that he would readily admit that Orpheus brought magic to Thrace, if the whole of Thrace had not been considered home of magic before ‘this Orpheus’ (*expers sedes eius tota Thrace magices fuisset*). Here Pliny ends the pre-written history of magic and proceeds to the authors and books.

The first who wrote about magic was, according to Pliny (*ut equidem inuenio*), Osthanes, who accompanied the Persian king Xerxes in his campaign against the Greeks, and along the way sowed the seeds of this “monstrous craft” (*semina artis portentosae*). In passing, Pliny notes that some *diligentiores* authors put before Osthanes some second Zoroaster from Proconnesus, but, in our writer’s opinion, it is quite certain that it was that Osthanes who instilled in the Greeks not just a greedy taste, but with a frantic passion for magic (*quod certum est, hic maxime Osthanes ad rabiem, non auiditatem modo scientiae eius, Graecorum populos egit*). Pliny further enumerates the names of Greek philosophers who, according to him, are famous for magical interests and magical writings: Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, and even Plato, who according to Pliny undertook whole journeys, which to him rather seem to be “exiles”, to learn magic, in order to teach it then to their fellow countrymen in the guise of a real mystery (*ad hanc discendam nauigauere exiliis uerius quam peregrinationibus susceptis, hanc reuersi praedicauere, hanc in arcanis habuere*). According to Pliny, Democritus was distinguished by a special passion for magic: he allegedly climbed into the grave of Dardanus the Phoenician in search of his works.

It should be noted here that one of Pliny’s main sources on magic was the work Χειρόμηκτα by Bolos of Mendes, which presented a theory, ascribed to Democritus, of universal sympathy and antipathy, as well as numerous magical recipes (ex. gr. [Wellman 1928; Boulin 1996; Dickie 1999; Gaillard-Seux 2003; 2004; 2009; 2014]). Pliny is absolutely sure, probably under the influence of Nigidius Figulus and Anaxilaus of Larissa, that this book really was written by Democritus, so he even claims that some deny Democritus the authorship of magical books, “but it is all to no purpose, for it is certain, that it was he who especially instilled into men’s minds the sweets of magic” (*sed frustra: hunc enim maxime adfixisse animis eam dulcedinem constat*).

Pliny notes a fact that, from his point of view, is amazing. Both *artes* (magic and medicine), the first under the leadership of Democritus, and the second — under Hippocrates, blossomed at the same time: during the Peloponnesian War. Here Pliny

makes a pause to report that there is another, Jewish branch of magic (*alia magices factio*), whose ancestors are Moses, Jannes and Lotapes, and which appeared many thousands of years after Zoroaster. And here he adds that a considerable part of the popularity of magic is due to the campaigns of Alexander the Great, accompanied by a second Osthanes, who traveled with the Macedonian king around the whole earth (*planeque, quod nemo dubitet, orbem terrarum peragrauit*).

Having described the history of magic outside Rome, Pliny finally turns to the Romans, and says that traces of magic are also visible among Italians. So, for example, he refers to the laws of the XII Tables, the magical content of which he already pointed out earlier in Book 28. Without going into other details of the history of magic in Italy, he immediately notes that in the 657th year of the City, (94 BC), in the consulship of Cnaeus Cornelius Lentulus and Publius Licinius Crassus, human sacrifice was banned here; this, according to our author, is proof of the existence of magic in Rome. Despite the fact that this chapter is very short and takes only seven lines in A. Ernout's edition, it is one of the most important ones for understanding both Pliny's notions of magic and Pliny's work as a whole. Therefore, this connection between magic and human sacrifice should be kept in mind.

Pliny then goes on to the Gauls, in whose territories magic, according to Pliny, was practiced by the Druids, whom the emperor Tiberius exterminated "within our memory" (*ad nostram memoriam*), and to Britain, which is so passionately engulfed in magic that one might think, says Pliny, as if Britannia had taught Persia magic, and not the other way around (*Britannia hodieque eam attonita celebrat tantis caerimoniis ut dedisse Persis uideri possit*). The whole world, Pliny argues further, despite internal disagreements among the peoples, admits that it was to Rome that it owed the destruction of the monstrous rites in which to sacrifice a person was considered the supreme piety and to eat him also extremely beneficial to health (*adeo ista toto mundo consensere, quamquam discordi et sibi ignoto, nec satisem aestimari potest quantum Romanis debeatur qui susutulere monstra in quibus hominem occidere religiosissimum erat, mandi uero etiam saluberrimum*). (Please pay attention to the human sacrifice and eating of human flesh and the role of Rome in eradicating them!)

Here the general history of magic ends and Pliny moves on to its kinds (*species*), of which, with reference to Osthanes, are very many. But the discussion here focuses, rather, on the variety of substances and objects used by the mages. So, magicians use "spheres, air, stars, lamps, basins, axes and many others for divination"; in addition, magic employs "conversations with the shadows of the dead" (*umbrarum inferorumque colloquia*). Here, if we recall the constant anti-Neronian tendency in the *Natural History*, Pliny refers to the example of Nero, who utilized all the listed magical means (*Nero uana falsaue comperit*), and Pliny says that "no other of the arts ever had a more enthusiastic patron" (*nemo umquam ulli artium ualidius fauit*). For Pliny, Nero is an excellent example of this false science (*inmensum, indubitatum exemplum falsae artis*), if only because he, in the end, abandoned magic. It would have been 'better if he had continued to consult the dead and the gods about his suspicions, rather than entrusting his investigations to brothels and prostitutes' — notes Pliny, because there is not a single sacrament, or a barbarous and wild ritual, which would not be tamer than his thoughts! Indeed, says our author, Nero, through his unbridled cruelty, filled Rome with the shadows of dead people. Mages, justifying themselves and explaining the fact that Nero

failed, despite all his efforts to succeed in this craft, say, according to Pliny, that their “gods do not listen and do not even notice people with freckles” (*lentiginem habentibus non obsequi numina aut cerni*). However, Pliny continues, Nero did not have physical deficiencies, the absence of which was supplemented by his freedom to choose any day and any livestock for magical rituals, and performing human sacrifices was for him in general the most enjoyable occupation (*homines immolare etiam gratissimum*). Nero was initiated into magical mysteries by the Armenian king Tiridates, who came to Rome in order for Nero to celebrate his Armenian triumph, and brought with him magicians².

Finally, turning to personal experience, Pliny concludes that magic is detestable (*intestabilis*), ineffective (*inrita*) and useless (*inanis*), and in it there are only “certain shadows of truth” (*quasdam umbras ueritatis*), and even then only in the area dealing with poisons, and not sorcery (*in his ueneficas artes pollere, non magicas*). “One might well ask,” says Pliny, “what were the ancient lies of the old Magi, when as a youth I saw Apion the grammarian, who told me that the herb *cynocephalia*, called in Egypt *osiritis*, was an instrument of divination and a protection from all kinds of sorcery, but if it were uprooted altogether the digger would die at once, and that he had called up ghosts to inquire from Homer his native country and the name of his parents, but did not dare to repeat the answers which he said were given” (*NH* 30.6.18). Turning to the actual magical use of animals, Pliny notes that the outstanding evidence of fraud (*peculiare uanitatis argumentum*) is found in magicians’ views on moles, which, in their opinion, are animals most suitable for their activities (in this case, he refers to divination and iatromagia) (*nullum religionum capacius animal*).

This is, in short, the beginning of the 30th Book of *Natural History*, which describes the history of magic, Pliny’s theory of its three components, the connection between magic and human sacrifice, and which brings up the Emperor Nero as an example of uselessness of magical hopes: he achieved nothing in magic, and only serves as an example of a brutal murderer with occult interests, contrary to all truly Roman views and laws. Further in Book 30 there follows a list of iatromagical recipes according to the principle of *a capite ad calcem*³. But this information is closely related to the information on magic that Pliny gives a little earlier in Book 28, in connection with questions about the medical properties of the human body and the effectiveness of the human word in religious (and medical) practice.

Note that Pliny attacks magic and magicians as soon as he approaches the section *Ex homine remedia* (Medicines from the human body). Justifying the description of the not very appetizing details of such “preparations”, Pliny paraphrases what he tells the future Emperor Titus in the *epistula* that serves as a preface to the *Natural History*, in which he writes:

I personally believe that among scientific works the most significant are those that, disregarding difficulties, have set a desire to bring an effective benefit ahead of the pleasure of being liked (*Equidem ita sentio, peculiarem in studiis causam eorum esse qui difficultatibus victis utilitatem iuvandi praetulerunt gratiae placendi*)⁴.

² On this topic see also [Méthy 2000].

³ On iatromagical recipes by Pliny see [Önnerfors 1985; 1993; Stannard 1987; Gaillard-Seux 2004; Méthy 2015].

⁴ Trans. by A. V. Belousov.

Here Pliny also says:

So what? We will talk about herbs and types of flowers, about the numerous and hard-to-reach rarities, and at the same time we will bypass the things that in the person can be useful to a person, and about the other types of medicines found among us, especially when only life for a person exempt from pain and illness does not become a punishment? Assuredly not; we will we apply our diligence to the contrary, even if our exposition will be in danger of arousing disgust; after all. from the very beginning we decided to cater to what beneficial to life, rather than to pleasantness (*Quid ergo? Dixerimus herbas et florum imagines ac pleraque inuentu rara ac difficilia, idem tacebimus quid in ipso homine prosit homini ceteraque genere remedium inter nos uiuentia, cum praesertim nisi carenti doloribus morbisque uita ipsa poena fiat? Minime uero, omnemque insumemus operam, licet fastidii periculum urgeat, quando ita decretum est minorem gratiae quam utilitatum uitae respectum habere*)⁵.

That is why Pliny does not exclude from his work a story about “external and barbaric rites” (*externa quoque et barbari ritus*), among which, first of all, he includes the drinking of human blood, citing the example of epileptics who rush to drink the gushing blood of a gladiator struck dead in the arena. To this he adds that some authors recommend the bone marrow of a man and the brains of newborn babies as a medicine, noting that many Greeks discuss in their books the taste of human intestines and body parts. Here his story takes on a pathetic rhetorical tone when he says that these authors detail the medicinal properties of each part of the human body right up to the nails, so that “just as though it could be thought health for a man to become a beast, and to deserve disease as punishment in the very process of healing” (*quasi uero sanitas uideri possit feram ex homine fieri morboque dignum in ipsa medicina*).

To look at human entrails is considered sin; what must it be to eat them? Who was the first, Osthane, to think up such devices? For it is you who must bear the blame, you destroyer of human rights and worker of horrors; you were their first founder, in order, I suppose, to perpetuate your memory. Who first thought of chewing one by one human limbs? What soothsaying guided him? What origin could your medical practices have had? Who made magic potions more innocent than their remedies? Granted that foreigners and barbarians had discovered the rites, did the Greeks also make these arts their own? (*aspici humana exta nefas habetur: quid mandi? Quis ista inuenit, Ostane? Tecum enim res erit, euersor iuris humani monstrorumque artifex, qui primus ea condidisti, credo, ne <tui> uita obliuisceretur: Quis inuenit singula membra humana mandere? qua coniectura inductus? quam potest medicina ista originem habuisse? quis ueneficia innocentiora fecit quam remedia? Esto, barbari externique ritus inuenerant: etiamne Graeci suas fecere has artes*).

⁵ Trans. by A. V. Belousov.

Furthermore, just like in Book 30, Pliny again turns to Democritus as if he were the main Greek sorcerer, for it is he, according to Pliny, who affirmed, that in certain cases the bones of the criminals' skulls are supposedly helpful, and in other cases the bones of a friend or a guest. A certain Apollonius (probably Apollonius of Pitana) writes that a very effective remedy for pain in the gums is the scarification of them with the help of the tooth of a murdered person. A certain Meletus talks about the use of human bile; Artemon writes about the skull of an innocent murdered and burnt person; while drinks served in the skull of a hanged man help, according to Anteus, with the bite of a rabid dog. Finally, the human body is used even in veterinary medicine. Here Pliny again breaks into a pathos filled rhetoric and exclaims: "Far from me and my writings be such horrors!" (*procul a nobis nostrisque litteris absint ista!*), and at the end of the presentation of these medicines, adds:

I do not indeed hold that life ought to be so prized that by any and every means it should be prolonged. You holding this view, whoever you are, will none the less die, even though you may have lived longer through foulness or sin. Wherefore let every man consider that first among the remedies for his soul is this: that of all the blessings given to man by Nature none is greater than a timely death, and herein the brightest feature is that each man can have the power to bestow it on himself (*uitam quidem non adeo expetendam censemus, ut quoquo modo trahenda sit. quisquis es, talis aequae moriere, etiam quom obscenus uixeris aut nefandus. quapropter hoc primum quisque in remediis animi habeat, ex omnibus bonis quae homini tribuit natura nullum melius esse tempestiuam morte, idque in ea optimum, quod illam sibi quisque praestare possit*).

Having pronounced his verdict regarding magic, Pliny poses what is in fact a philosophical question, but which, nevertheless, is closely related to our theme. The first medicine with which he starts the enumeration of medicines that have a source in the person himself, is the word. Pliny's question is whether words and magical spells have any force to them (*ex homine remediorum primum maximae quaestionis et semper incertae est, polleantne aliquid uerba et incantamenta carminum*). Here he notes that although philosophers do not believe in such a power, faith in the magical (and religious) power of words is widespread everywhere, even if unconsciously (*sed uirritim sapientissimi cuiusque respuit fides, in uniuersum uero omnibus horis credit uita nec sentit*). In developing this topic, Pliny says that without uttering words one cannot perform a sacrifice and correctly ask advice from the gods (*quippe uictimae caedi sine precatione non uidetur referre aut deos rite consuli*). This is followed by the Pliny's classification of prayers: prayers for favorable auspices (*precationes inpetritae*), prayers for averting evil (*depulsoriae*), and prayers for commendation (*commendatoria*) (see: [Köves-Zulauf 1972; 1978; Thérassé 1980; Dumont 1987; Guittard 1987]). Pliny clearly believes that these *precationes* exist both in the religion approved by the Roman State and in magic, in which, following his terminology, they become *incantamenta*, *carmina* or *incantamenta carminum*. Our author brings up examples from Roman practice, which are interesting and important for my further exposition.

So, he speaks about prayer formulas, which must be spoken in clear order, and without any elision, in official religious rites by the higher magistrates. He cites the prayer of Decius as an example of *precatio inpetrita* the (cf. *Liv.* 8.9.6–8), and as

an example of *precatio depulsoria* — the prayer of the Vestal Tuccia (cf. *Val. Max.* 8.1.5). Probably, as an example of *precatio commendatoria*, he gives, oddly enough given the context described above, the ritual sacrifice of a Greek man and a Greek woman in the Forum Boarium (cf. *Liv.* 22.57.7)⁶. It is interesting to note here that this human sacrifice, carried out within the framework of the official Roman religion, is not criticized by Pliny, and is not even declared to be “magic.” Here, in his opinion, everything is fine. He does not condemn and declared as “magic” when the Vestals keep escaped slaves within the city with the help of a special *precatio* (*non-dum egressa urbe mancipia*). Faith in the power of the prayer’s word is confirmed for Pliny by the ancients (*prisci quidem nostri perpetuo talia credidere*).

I shall omit Pliny’s remarks on oracles and the fact that they can be interpreted differently, in accordance with human will (*haec satis sint exemplis ut appareat ostentorum vires et in nostra potestate esse ac, prout quaeque accepta sint, ita ualere*), and shall turn to magic. Pliny here refers to two well-known laws from the XII Tables: *Qui fruges excantassit, et alibi: Qui malum carmen incantassit*. As we can see, this is about the *mala carmina*, which Pliny considered “magic” when it sprang from a private initiative, and not when it involved the official Roman cult. For instance, a spell-prayer to the enemy gods, calling on them to change sides and support the Romans, abandoning their former worshippers, is not regarded as something bad by Pliny. However, almost immediately thereafter he observes: “Everyone is terribly afraid of being immobilized by spells” (*defigi quidem diris precationibus nemo non metuit*). Further, Pliny also speaks of love incantations (*incantamenta amatoria*), of spells of serpents and the tribe of Marsi, of the spells against fire on the walls of houses, and finally of prayers with incomprehensible words (*externa uerba atque ineffabilia*) to which he refers, rather, with a laugh. Finally, he gives examples of magical incantations from Cato and Varro, then proceeds to magical gestures, and after that he gives healing prescriptions based on the human body (for example, saliva, earwax, etc.).

Thus, from the abundance of information with which Pliny provides us in this section, we can draw a number of important conclusions regarding his understanding of magic. First, that magic, because it sees in a person a means and, therefore, calmly refers to killing them and using in its practice the parts of a human dead body, is a nasty occupation. Secondly, magic actively uses the same speech practices as the official Roman cult, but since it is a private and occult thing, it is an antisocial activity. Thirdly, magical spells, divorced from the official and civil cult, are used in a variety of ways: *dirae deprecationes, incantamenta amatoria, incantamenta agraria, incantamenta contra incendia* etc.

Attempts to reconcile theoretical reflections on magic in the 30th and 28th Books with what follows, i. e. the composition of magical recipes themselves, which Pliny diligently and systematically describes, and also in the content of the magic formulas scattered throughout his work, the number of which reaches to twenty-seven, and most of which Pliny quotes from his Greek sources [Gaillard-Seux 2014], lead us to a feeling of perplexity and confusion. On the one hand, we have vivid rhetorical statements with addresses to Osthane himself, an historical essay on magic, and, on the other hand, an interesting but nevertheless much less incendiary lists of medical prescriptions, the material of which is man and the animal world.

⁶ To this kind of *precationes commendatariae*, it is obviously possible to refer also *defixionum tabellae* (see, for example: [Guittard 1987: 480]).

Previously, researchers into Pliny's magic chose one of the two paths in interpreting his information about magic: some focused on a separate description and contextualization of Pliny's information against the background of data from the literary tradition and within the historical realm of 1st century BC. — 1st c. AD, while forgetting about the author of this information [Garosi 1976; Le Glay 1976; Graf 1994: 61–68 (= Graf 1997: 49–56)], while others [Ernout 1964] tried to find a suitable philosophical “shortcut” for Pliny. So, for example, Alfred Ernout, emphasizing the fact that Pliny talks about the theory of universal sympathy and antipathy (*concordia* and *discordia*)⁷, hastens to explain this idea by the influence of Stoic philosophy, which, in fact, explains little, since we know that here Pliny, who does not fully believe in astrology (ex. gr.: *NH* 7.162: *primum ergo ipsius artis inconstantia declarat quam incerta res est*; cf. [Ector 1985, Le Boeuffe 1987]) and refers with skepticism to superstition (*superstitio, religio*), just picks up one of the basic ideas of his source, Bolos of Mendes (III century BC), whose work was probably called *Περὶ φυσικῶν συμπαθειῶν καὶ ἀντιπαθειῶν* (*Geoponica* 15.1.25, see [Gailard-Seux 2004; 2014]). In addition, this idea of sympathy in magic of Pliny's time became an absolute common place and, it can be even said, had no direct relation to the Stoics. Thus, to call Pliny the Elder a Stoic here absolutely does not make sense, since this does not render the discourse map of his narrative more understandable. On the other hand, a detailed analysis of what Pliny tells us here certainly enhances our understanding of ancient magic in general, but in this analysis, *Natural History* remains what it was most of the time for the European Middle Ages and New Times, namely, just a “dump” of various kinds of information. In both cases, Pliny and his *Natural History* remain on the sidelines of the information extracted from them, which becomes the object of study. Is it, however, possible to adequately assess Pliny's information, in this case about magic, if one neglects the question: Why does Pliny talk about magic just this way?

If we want to understand why Pliny writes about magic exactly what he writes, it is necessary to keep at the forefront of our interest all the time, *firstly*, how his work is arranged, *secondly*, for whom it is written, and, *thirdly*, what, so to speak, ‘ideological’ tendencies pass through the fabric of Pliny's entire work like a gold thread.

Let me remind you that the Pliny's project is concentrated on the description of *rerum natura, hoc est uita* (*praef.* 13). This “life” is described by a high official of the Roman state — Caius Plinius Secundus, born in the year 23 or 24, who began his career with the troops on the Rhine, where he rose to the rank of commander of a cavalry *ala*. In the year 59 his career was interrupted for a long time, and he does not seem to serve until the end of Nero's reign, indulging in composing literary works. With the ascension of Vespasian, Pliny returns to the service and serves in Germany with the son of Vespasian, Titus, with whom he is then linked by a bond of friendship. He serves four times as procurator between 70 and 76 in Gallia Narbonensis, in Africa, in Hispania and in Belgicum, where he commands two Rhine armies. Finally, death caused by the eruption of Vesuvius overtakes him as acting commander of the Fleet at Misenum on the 24th of August in the year 79. *Natural History*, on which he apparently worked for quite a long time, beginning its compila-

⁷ *NH* 20.1; 20.28; 24.1; 28.84; 28.147; 31.1; 37.59. See [Boulin 1996; Conte 1991; Capitani 1972].

tion in the fifties, is published in 77 with a dedication to Vespasian's son, the future emperor Titus. In the prefatory *epistula* for Titus, Pliny, after lavish compliments to the future emperor, talks about the main motivations that prompted him to write this work and the principles according to which *Natural History* is composed.

I do not intend to retell the well-known message of Pliny to Titus. I should only like to draw attention, first, to the fact that in spite of saying: "When I took up this work, your name was not yet on this list. I knew that your situation is too elevated for me to hope that you would condescend to my work" (*praef.* 6)⁸, throughout his work in thirty-seven books Pliny has in mind a reader just like Titus and indeed Titus himself. And secondly, to the fact that this preface already contains anti-Neronian rhetoric, which researchers have already discussed (ex. gr. [Naas 2002: 88–89]), and which permeates the whole of *Natural History*. Pliny was not simply an unsystematic amateur collector of "twenty thousand facts", he was already an experienced and accurate writer who managed to give these "facts" a clear structure, making the whole work sound as he needed by introducing transitions from one topic to another with the help of introductions and conclusions to the corresponding books, thereby turning the *Natural History* into a well-harmonized composition with clearly distinguishable themes of a moral nature.

One of the most important elements of the poetics of the *Natural History* are the Introductions and Conclusions to specific books, which in addition to helping the author maintain the balance of the whole work and create a sense of smoothness and logical character of the transitions from one topic to another, following the general direction of Pliny's description of life — cosmology-geography-anthropology-zoology-botany-medicine-mineralogy — contain constant references to the ensemble of moral strategies contained in the epistle to Titus. An important feature in these transitional elements of Pliny's text was discovered by Valérie Naas, who, following a detailed study of their content came to the conclusion that rhetorical digressions in the Introductions and Conclusions are particularly densely concentrated in the last part of his work, namely from Book 27 to Book 37 [Naas 2002: 224]. She notes that "their concentration in this place may indicate the increasing desire of Pliny to repeat his beliefs and protect his enterprise" (*leurs concentrations à cette place pourrait témoigner de la volonté croissante de Plinie de répéter ses convictions et de défendre son entreprise*). A similar phenomenon, by the way, is also found in Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (ex. gr. [Janson 1964: 57]).

What are the main moral and ideological "staples" that Pliny uses persistently in his narrative to give to his composition, and not least to the discourse on magic, exactly the form that it adopted? *Natural History* is a description of nature (*natura*), which is life (*uita*), and which is inextricably linked with man and is oriented toward man. It, being a *parens melior* (NH 2.154-157, 7.1, 22.1, 24.1), and sometimes even a *tristior nouerca* (NH 2.236; 7.1), entirely exists only for the sake of man, who should use its gifts with gratitude (cf. [Sallmann 1987; Naas 2002: 225]). This description of nature is given by Pliny, as if from a bird's eye view, making ever smaller circles over the orbis terrarum, and finally landing in Rome (NH 37.201), which was always in its field of vision. Pliny seeks to describe "nature" with the height of Roman power and using traditional Roman *grauitas* (cf. NH 23.32: *nos*

⁸ Trans. by A. V. Belousov.

ista Romana grauitate artiumque liberalium adpetentia non ut medici, sed ut indices salutis humanae diligenter distinguamus). And finally, it is Rome and Italy in general, according to Pliny, that is *rectrix parensque mundi altera* (NH 37.201), which, moreover, is the “country-breadwinner of all (other) countries, and she is the mother chosen by the will of the gods” (NH 3.39: *terra omnium terrarum alumna eadem et parens, numine deum electa*). Pliny observes that the gods made Rome “as a second light for the human race” (NH 27.3: *adeo Romanus uelut alteram lucem dedisse rebus humanis uidentur*). Hence arises the constant need for Pliny to commensurate almost everything he talks about, with Rome, its customs and its history⁹.

In accordance with this initial and final point of Pliny’s discourse, the author also establishes the hierarchy of sources which he presents in the index to the *Natural History*, where these sources are strictly ranked as “authoritative” (*auctores*) and, mainly, Roman, and “external” (*externi*), mainly Greek, cf. [Naas 2002: 183–184]. Thus, even here Pliny emphasizes Roman superiority in everything. For example, Pliny never forgets to say that the Greeks are gullible and deceitful (ex gr. NH 2.248: *exemplum uanitatis Graecae maximum*; NH 8.82: *mirum est quo procedat Graeca credulitas*). Nevertheless, Pliny extensively uses these “external” sources, but always from his “Roman” distance (cf. [Serbat 1973]).

Turning back to the story of Pliny and magic, we can note that magic for him is something doubly alien. On the one hand, Pliny immediately speaks of the “barbaric” source of magic: about Zoroaster and Osthanes, on the other — he does not miss any opportunity to note that the fascination with magic by the Greeks is not just a hobby, but “rage” (*rabies* — NH 2.8). Magic for Pliny is, in fact, *externa quoque et barbari ritus*, which he still considers necessary to describe, since, firstly, his “encyclopedic” project is based on not disdaining even the *sordidissima pars* (*praef.* 13) of “nature,” and secondly, since the *Natural History* for us today (and not only if we recall the impression of Aulus Gellius [Naas 2002: 271–274], rather, is a completely “unnatural” story, which initially requires preliminary ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία and is concentrated almost exclusively on miracles [Naas 2002; Doody 2010]. And magic, from his point of view, in spite of all its *uanitates*, is one of the most amazing and strange of miracles (cf. NH 24.156: *in promisso herbarum mirabilium occurrit aliqua dicere et de magicis. Quae enim mirabiliores?*). It is no accident, therefore, that Pliny unhesitatingly starts to report on magic recipes and magic formulae [Gaillard-Seux 2014] long before the 30th and even 28th Books. Only starting with Book 28 does he feel the need to explain himself, and angrily pontificates about magic’s Iranian founders, Greek admirers, and goes on to disdainfully discuss magical recipes, the substance of which is the human body and animals.

Why is it that only here, in Books 28 and 30, does Pliny speak so angrily about magicians and magic? After all, before, in botanical and other books, he almost calmly talks about magical recipes, only indicating that their source is *magi*. This is probably the case because medicine based on herbs is, in his opinion, the *maximum opus naturae* (NH 20.1–2) and *rerum naturae ipsius munificentia*, and the therapeutic effects resulting from such healing for him are *nullo uitae miraculo maiore* (NH 27.1–2). And despite the fact that Pliny admits that medicine based on the flesh of animals is *summa naturae exemplorumque per rerum ordinem* (NH 27.146), he

⁹ Cf. [Naas 2002: 251]: “Il ne s’agit pas seulement pour lui de rapporter l’inconnu au connu, mais de le situer par rapport à Rome”.

clearly feels distrust for such medicine, starting the 28th book, which begins right after this statement, with the section *Contra magos*. I believe that the issue here is that Pliny refers to animals as natural beings of the second order after man, and which have many properties that bring them closer to man. In order not to take the time for a detailed retelling of what Pliny writes about animals in Books 8-9, I would like to give the sum up of his views on this subject by Liliane Bodson, based on a careful study of the two books:

ANIMAL être doté du principe vital (*anima*), qui s'incarne dans une multitude d'organismes complexes et remarquable (*mira*) (1) par leurs caractères physiques et comportementaux, lesquelles présentent des analogies avec ceux de l'homme, et (2) par les produits et services qu'ils procurent à celui-ci. En conséquence de la relation (*societas*) qu'instaurent et les affinités biologiques et les fonctions tant psychologiques que matérielles remplis par les animaux (sauvages, apprivoisés ou domestiques) auprès de l'homme, ils doivent être traités par lui d'une manière digne de la raison (*ratio*) qui fait la spécificité humaine [Bodson 1997: 30].

Thus, a decent person, according to Pliny, is associated with people who are his equals through *humanitas*, and with the animal world — through *societas*. If indeed, we accept the previously proposed interpretation of *humanitas* as recognition and nurturing, based on the *ratio* and provided by *sermo*, the eternal linkage of all people worthy of such a name (ex. gr. [Schadewaldt 1973; Novara 1982; Kaster 1986; Ferrary 1988: 493–516; Naas 2002: 27–34]), examples of which are given by Pliny himself in the descriptions of remarkable people in Book 7, the *societas* of man with the animal suggests, taking into account the relationship of the person and animal noted by Pliny, a relationship to the animal that derives its essence from the relation of men to men. I would note that the main thing with which Pliny associates magic is murder not consecrated by a rite of the official cult, a human sacrifice. Therefore, killing an animal that goes beyond the bounds of recognized norms (for use as food and as sacrifice) Pliny regards as wicked, even if it may restore a patient to health. But this kind of medicine becomes more poisonous than poison, and if there is nothing “normal” medicine that may help you, it's better to die than to live unworthily, through the use of such means.

Thus, all that Pliny says about magic in his rhetorical attacks against magic in Book 28 and in his outline of the history of magic in Book 30 essentially rests on two strong and interconnected tendencies. Firstly, the obvious primacy of Rome over the whole *orbis terrarum*, and secondly, with the idea of *humanitas*, which, like the platonic Good, emanates from Rome to the whole world under its control, even to the point where the truly human is practically absent (*NH* 30.4: *naturae inane*). In one place Pliny directly says that Italy is destined by the gods “to unite scattered empires, to make manners gentle, to draw together in converse by community of language the jarring and uncouth tongues of so many nations, to give mankind civilization, and in a word to become throughout the world the single fatherland of all the races.” (*NH* 3.39: *tot populorum discordes ferasque linguas sermonis commercio contraheret ad conloquia et humanitatem homini daret breuiterque una cunctarum gentium in toto orbe patria fieret*). This, in fact, is the

basis for his story about magic, and, among others, examples from Roman history, especially the example of the emperor-murderer Nero, who even without the aid of magic filled Rome with the shades of the dead.

I would like to finish my paper with a question rather than conclusions, which are obvious in any case: If both Pliny's stories about magic are so rhetorical in nature, sharpening and making more negative the attitude towards magic in general, how then ought one to treat what on the surface appears to be the most detached and theoretical moment of his narrative, namely, the assertion that magic absorbed into itself the most powerful *artes* in the eyes of man (*imperiōsissimas humanae mentis complexa in unam se redegit*), specifically: medicine, *uires religionis* and astrology (*artes mathematicas*). Is it possible to take at face value the "theory" proposed here, which certainly finds its confirmation when compared with other sources, but which itself was originally probably created by Pliny in the heat of rhetorical and antimagical inspiration? Pliny – if I dare to speak in his name – would likely have wished us to smirk contemptuously at this point. After all, despite the fact that he devoted several books to medicine, he says that "there is no science more contradictory" (*NH* 29.1: *nullam artium inconstantiore fuisse*). Despite the fact that he speaks a great deal about astrology, he accuses this science of the same vice (*NH* 7.162: *primum ergo ipsius artis inconstantia declarat quam incerta res sit*) as medicine, and most likely does not believe in the influence of stars on human beings and on events in the human world (cf. *NH* 2.97; 2.23; 2.28, see also: [Le Boeuffe 1987]). Finally, the expression *uires religionis*, most likely, speaks of the "forces of superstition", rather than, in fact, about religion, which can exist in Rome only openly and be carried out by state magistrates. In the same sense, Pliny discusses in the same book the Carian city of Telmessus, calling it *religiosissima urbs* (*NH* 30.2.6). So, is it not more appropriate to interpret these words of Pliny with greater caution, drawing parallels from other literary and epigraphic sources and carefully filling out the cards for each of these three titles. Will we get then the magic of Pliny the Elder's time by mixing these three elements in one magic flask? I do not think so, although I can not dispute the positive data obtained from this Plinian rhetoric. Undoubtedly, these data can help us reconstruct what Pliny himself had in his head on the subject of magic, but only if we consider this information primarily from the viewpoint of the *Natural History* itself.

References

- Beagon, M. (1992). *Roman nature: The thought of Pliny the Elder*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Bodson, L. (1997). Le témoignage de Plin l'Ancien sur la conception romaine de l'animal. In B. Cassin, J.-L. Labarrière (Eds.). *L'animal dans l'antiquité*, 325–354. Paris: J. Vrin. (In French).
- Boulin, R. (1996). Sympathie et antipathie dans l'HN de Plin l'Ancien, (Mémoire de DEA. Université de Lille 3). (In French).
- Capitani, U. (1972). Celso, Scribonio Largo, Plinio il Vecchio e il loro atteggiamento nei confronti della medicina popolare. *Maia*, 24, 120–140. (In Italian).
- Citroni Marchetti, S. (1992). Filosofia e ideologia nella 'Naturalis historia' di Plinio. In W. Haase (Ed.). *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (II.36.5), 3275–3296. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

- Conte, G. B. (1991). L'inventario del mondo, Forma della natura e progetto enciclopedico nell'opera di Plinio il Vecchio. In G. B. Conte. *Generi e lettori, Lucrezio, l'elegia d'amore, l'enciclopedia di Plinio*, 95–144. Milano: Mondadori. (In Italian).
- Dickie, M. W. (1999). The learned magician and the collection and transmission of magical lore. In D. R. Jordan, H. Montgomery, E. Thomassen (Eds.). *The world of Ancient magic: Papers from the first International Samson Eitrem Seminar at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 4–8 May 1997*, 163–193. Bergen: Norwegian Institute at Athens.
- Doody, A. (2010). *Pliny's Encyclopedia: The reception of the Natural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Dumont, J.-P. (1987). L'idée de Dieu chez Pline (NH, II, 1–5; 1–27). In J. Pigeaud, J. Oroz Reta (Eds.). *Pline l'Ancien: témoin de son temps*, 219–237. Salamanca-Nantes: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca. (In French).
- Ector, J. (1985). L'influence des astres sur les êtres humains selon Pline l'Ancien. *Les Études Classiques*, 3–4, 407–414. (In French).
- Ernout, A. (1964). La magie chez Pline l'Ancien. In M. Renard, R. Schilling (Eds.). *Hommages à Jean Bayet*, 190–195. Bruxelles; Latomus. (In French).
- Ferrary, J.-L. (1988). *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*. Rome: École française de Rome. (In Italian).
- Gaillard-Seux, P. (2003). Sympathie et antipathie dans l'Histoire Naturelle de Pline l'Ancien. In N. Palmieri (Ed.). *Rationnel et irrationnel dans la médecine ancienne et médiévale. Aspects historiques, scientifiques et culturels (Actes du colloque international sur les textes médicaux antiques et médiévaux, Saint-Étienne, 14–15 novembre 2002)*, 113–128. Saint-Étienne: PU Saint-Étienne. (In French).
- Gaillard-Seux, P. (2004). La place des incantations dans les recettes médicales de Pline l'Ancien. In S. Sconocchia, F. Cavalli (Eds.). *Lingue tecniche del greco e del latino, 4. Testi medici latine antichi. Le parole della medicina; lessico e storia (Atti del settimo convegno internazionale, Trieste, 11–13 ottobre 2001)*, 83–98. Bologna: Pàtron Editore. (In French).
- Gaillard-Seux, P. (2009). Un pseudo-Démocrite énigmatique. Bolos de Mendès. In F. Le Blay (Ed.). *Transmettre les savoirs dans les mondes hellénistique et romain (Actes du colloque "Doctrinarum disciplina". La transmission des savoirs dans les mondes hellénistique et romain, Nantes, mars 2007)*, 223–243. Rennes: Presses universitaires. (In French).
- Gaillard-Seux, P. (2014). Magical formulas in Pliny's Natural History: origins, sources, parallels. In B. Maire (Ed.). *'Greek' and 'Roman' in Latin medical texts: Studies in cultural change and exchange in ancient medicine*, 201–223. Leiden: Brill.
- Garosi, R. (1976). *Magia. Studi di storia delle religioni in memoria di Raffaella Garosi* (P. Xella, Ed.). Roma: Bulzoni. (In Italian).
- Graf, Fr. (1994). *La magie dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine : idéologie et pratique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Graf, Fr. (1997). *Magic in the ancient world*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Guittard, Ch. (1987). Pline et la classification des prières dans la religion romaine (NH 28, 10–21). In J. Pigeaud, J. O. Reta (Eds.). *Pline l'Ancien témoin de son temps*, 473–486. Salamanca-Nantes: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca. (In French).
- Janson, N. T. (1964). *Latin prose prefaces: Studies in literary conventions*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Kaster, R. A. (1986). "Humanitas" and Roman education. *Storia della storiografia*, 9, 5–15.
- König, R., Winkler, G. (1979). *Plinius der Ältere. Leben und Werk eines antiken Naturforschers*. München: Heimeran. (In German).
- Köves-Zulauf, Th. (1972). *Reden und Schweigen. Römische Religion bei Plinius Maior*. München: Fink. (In German).

- Köves-Zulauf, Th. (1978). Plinius der Ältere und die römische Religion. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (II.16.1), 187–288. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter (In German).
- Laehn, Th. R. (2013). *Pliny's defense of Empire*. New York: Routledge.
- Le Boeuffe, A. (1987). Pline et l'Astrologie. In J. Pigeaud, J. O. Reta (Eds.). *Pline l'Ancien témoin de son temps*, 173–184. Salamanca-Nantes: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca. (In French).
- Le Glay, M. (1976). Magie et sorcellerie à Rome au dernier siècle de la République. In *Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon. L'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine* (Vol. 1), 525–550. Rome: École française de Rome. (In French).
- Méthy, N. (2000). Neron: mage ou monstre? Sur un passage de Pline l'Ancien (NH 30, 14–17). *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 143, 381–399. (In French).
- Méthy, N. (2015). Magie, religion et botanique. À propos de la formule herbae felicitas. In O. Devillers (Ed.). *Autour de Pline le Jeune. En hommage à Nicole Méthy*, 89–101. Paris: de Boccard. (In French).
- Murphy, T. (2004). *Pliny the Elder's Natural History: The Empire in the Encyclopedia*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Naas, V. (2002). *Le projet encyclopédique de Pline l'Ancien*. Rome: École française de Rome. (In French).
- Novara, A. (1982). *Les idées romaines sur le progrès d'après les écrivains de la République. Essai sur le sens latin de progrès*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In French).
- Önnerfors, A. (1985). Iatromagische Beschwörungen in der "Physica Plinii Sangallensis". *Eranos*, 83(1), 235–252. (In German).
- Önnerfors, A. (1993). Magische Formeln im Dienste römischer Medizin. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (II.37.1), 157–224. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter (In German).
- Otto, B.-Chr. (2011). *Magie. Rezeptions- und diskursgeschichtliche Analysen von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten; 57). (In German).
- Römer, F. (1983). Die plinianische 'Anthropologie' und der Aufbau der Naturalis Historia. *Wiener Studien NS*, 17, 104–108. (In German).
- Sallmann, K. (1987). La responsabilité de l'homme face à la nature. In J. Pigeaud, J. O. Reta (Eds.). *Pline l'Ancien témoin de son temps*, 251–266. Salamanca-Nantes: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca. (In French).
- Schadewaldt, W. (1973). Humanitas Romana. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (I.4), 43–62. (In German).
- Serbat, G. (1973). La référence comme indice de distance dans l'énoncé de Pline. *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes*, 47, 38–49. (In French).
- Serbat, G. (1986). Pline l'Ancien. État présent des études sur sa vie, son œuvre et son influence. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (II.32.4), 2069–2200. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter (In French).
- Stannard, J. (1987). Herbal medicine and herbal magic in Pliny's time. In J. Pigeaud, J. O. Reta (Eds.). *Pline l'Ancien témoin de son temps*, 95–106. Salamanca-Nantes: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca.
- Thérasse, J. (1980). Croyances et crédulité des romains, d'après Pline l'Ancien et les écrivains latins. In J. B. Caron et al. (Eds.). *Mélanges d'études anciennes offerts à Maurice Lebel*, 283–319. Québec: Éditions du Sphinx. (In French).
- Wellmann, M. (1928). Die Φυσικά des Bolos Demokritos und der Magier Anaxilaos von Larissa. *Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 7, 3–80. (In German).

* * *

Информация об авторе

Алексей Владиславович Белоусов

кандидат филологических наук
доцент, кафедра классической
филологии, Институт восточных
культур и античности, Российский
государственный гуманитарный
университет
Россия, 125993, Москва, ГСП-3, Миусская
площадь, д. 6, корп. 1
Тел.: + 7 (495) 250-69-38
научный сотрудник, Отдел
сравнительного изучения древних
цивилизаций, Институт всеобщей
истории РАН
Россия, 119334, Москва, Ленинский пр-т,
д. 32а
Тел.: +7 (495) 954-48-52
доцент, кафедра древних языков,
исторический факультет, Московский
государственный университет
им. М. В. Ломоносова
Россия, 119991, ГСП-1, Москва,
Ленинские Горы, д. 1
Тел.: +7 (495) 939-56-88
✉ abelv@yandex.ru

Information about the author

Alexey V. Belousov

Cand. Sci. (Philology)
Associate Professor, Institute for Oriental
and Classical Studies,
Department of Classical Philology,
Russian State University for Humanities
Russia, 125993, Moscow, GSP-3, Miusskaya
Sq., 6, Corp. 1.
Tel.: + 7 (495) 250-69-38
Researcher, Department for Comparative
Studies of Ancient Civilizations, Institute of
World History, Russian Academy of Sciences
Russia, 119334, Moscow, Leninsky Prospekt,
32a
Tel.: +7 (495) 954-48-52
Associate Professor,
Department of Ancient Languages,
History Faculty, Lomonosov Moscow State
University
Russia, 11999, Moscow, GSP-1, Leninskiye
Gory, 1
Tel.: +7 (495) 939-56-88
✉ abelv@yandex.ru

A. Malomud

ORCID: 0000-0003-1212-8186

✉ annmood@gmail.com

Берлинский университет им. Гумбольдтов
(Германия, Берлин)

EPONYMIC PLANTS IN NICANDER OF COLOPHON AND PLINY THE ELDER: ALCIBIUS' HERB

Аннотация. В статье анализируются сведения о растении (либо растениях), названном (названных) по имени мифологического персонажа Алкибия, которые содержатся в «Theriaka» Никандра Колофонского и в «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего. Рассматриваются два фрагмента, содержащие подробные этиологические экскурсы (Αλκίβιου ἔχης — *Ther.* 541–549; Αλκίβιου ποῖν — 666–675). Идет ли здесь речь об одном растении или о разных, является предметом дискуссии. Плиний, не упоминая об Алкибии как об эпониме, говорит о двух растениях, названия которых, вероятно, связаны с этим персонажем: *archebion* (*NH* 22.51), описание которого во многом совпадает с таковым у Никандра, и *alcibium* (22.39), для которого Плиний лишь приводит рецепт — как и Никандр во втором отрывке. Этот пример, по мнению автора, подкрепляет гипотезу о том, что Плиний был непосредственно знаком с поэмами Никандра, а также иллюстрирует методы организации материала в медицинских книгах «Естественной истории». В статье также приводится список эпонимных растений, упоминаемых в корпусе сочинений Никандра, с указанием соответствий в энциклопедическом труде Плиния.

Ключевые слова: Никандр Колофонский, Плиний Старший, Алкибий, эпонимы, *primus inventor*, названия растений

Для цитирования: Malomud A. Eponymic plants in Nicander of Colophon and Pliny the Elder: Alcibius' herb // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 91–100. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-91-100.

Статья поступила в редакцию 3 октября 2019 г.
Принято к печати 16 декабря 2019 г.

A. Malomud

ORCID: 0000-0003-1212-8186
✉ annmood@gmail.com

Humboldt University of Berlin
(Germany, Berlin)

EPONYMIC PLANTS IN NICANDER OF COLOPHON AND PLINY THE ELDER: ALCIBIUS' HERB

Abstract. The article analyzes information about the plant(s), named after an otherwise unknown mythological character Alcibi-us, which are found in *Theriaka* of Nicander of Colophon and in the *Natural History* of Pliny the Elder. The bulk of the two passages in Nicander (regarding Ἀλκιβίου ἔχης Ther. 541–549 and Ἀλκιβίου ποίη 666–675 respectively) consists of detailed etiological excurses, each telling about how the plant was found by Alcibi-us. Whether the plant is the same one in both cases, remains a subject of controversy. As for Pliny, he makes no mention of Alcibi-us as an eponym, but he nevertheless mentions two plants, names of which very likely refer to this mythological figure: *archebion* (NH 22.51), whose external description overlaps in large part with the first account in Nicander, and *alcibium* (22.39), for which Pliny gives no description, but only a recipe — just like Nicander does in the second passage. Thus, the way Pliny arranges his information reflects the structure of both Nicandrian places. The example of Alcibi-us' plants, in the author's opinion, supports the hypothesis that Pliny was directly familiar with the poems of Nicander and also illustrates the methods of organizing the material in the medical books of *Naturalis Historia*. The article also contains a list of eponymic plants referred to in the corpus of Nicander's works, with corresponding places in Pliny's encyclopedia.

Keywords: Nicander of Colophon, Pliny the Elder, Alcibi-us, eponyms, primus inventor, names of plants

To cite this article: Malomud, A. (2020). Eponymic plants in Nicander of Colophon and Pliny the Elder: Alcibi-us' herb. *Shagi / Steps*, 6(1), 91–100. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-91-100.

Received October 3, 2019

Accepted December 16, 2019

1

Pliny's acquaintance with the works of Nicander of Colophon is a matter that has no final clarity and that, to my knowledge, has not yet been considered separately. Pliny mentions Nicander in the lists of sources for sixteen of the thirty-seven books of *Naturalis Historia* (Books 8, 10–11, 20–21, 23–27, 29–32, 36–37) and twelve times Nicander is referred to in the text. Most of these quotations show intersections with Nicander's poem *Theriaka* (about the bites of poisonous animals and antidotes against them), but there are also references to other works, including lost ones: thus, on the basis of two testimonies of Pliny (37.102, 127 = Nic. fr. 102, 101), Nicander is supposed to have written a work about stones. Pliny's quotations contain a lot of inaccuracies, in particular with regard to the identification of plants and the attribution of certain recipes to Nicander. For example, according to Pliny 20.25, Nicander recommends *raphanus* (radish) for poisoning with mushrooms, henbane and blood of bull, yet ῥάφανος in one of the corresponding places in Nicander (*Alex.* 527) denotes not a radish, but cabbage, and in the recipe for an antidote against bovine blood (*Alex.* 319–334) it is not mentioned at all. However, in some cases Pliny's text conveys even the verbal nuances of the original source¹. There are also a number passages in Pliny where Nicander is not referred to, but for which he is very likely the source — this includes, inter alia, a report on the place of growth of Illyrian irises (Plin. 21.40 = Nic. *Ther.* 607) and the list of spiders (29.84–87 ≈ Nic. *Ther.* 716–751). Jean-Marie Jacques in his edition of *Theriaka* repeatedly expresses the opinion that Pliny was quite likely acquainted with Nicander's writings and could set out the information obtained from there without always giving a reference to his source directly in the text [Jacques 2002: lxiii, 198, 202, 207]. Therefore, according to Jacques, there is no need to explain the overlaps between Pliny and Nicander by the fact that the former used their common source [Ibid.: 198]. In this paper, I will confine myself to only one area — the so-called eponymic plants, which are mentioned in Nicander, as well as information about these plants in the *Naturalis Historia* of Pliny. One case concerning the plant named after Alcibiuss will be discussed in detail. Even such a selective analysis provides some observations as to what extent Pliny was familiar with the writings of Nicander.

2

First, a few words about the selected material. Eponymic plants — that is, plants named after a mythological or historical character — are a special case of the literary topos πρῶτος εὑρετής (*primus inventor* in Latin), extremely popular in antiquity. It is based on a certain object, custom or technique being assigned to the figure of its 'discoverer' or 'inventor' [Baumbach 2001]. In the works of Nicander, who had, like other Hellenistic poets, a predilection for etiological stories [Fantuzzi, Hunter 2004: 49–50, Zimmermann, Rengakos 2014: 51, 57, 97, 169, 171], this technique plays a significant role [Overduin 2014: 109–112], and at the same time the majority of his *primi inventores* are characters that gave the names to medicinal plants. In addition, the eponymic plants in Nicander perform a compositional function: for example, in *Theriaka* the stories about two panacea plants (Cheiron's and Asclepius') as well as two digressions about plants found by a certain Alcibiuss are located symmetrically within the section on antidotes against snake bites, and thus structure long lists of ingredients and give a certain unity to the whole

¹ E. g. the interpretation of the word μύωψ, "closing the eyes", regarding the plant in Nic. *Ther.* 662 as "antequam floreat" in Plin. 21.183.

section [Overduin 2014: 57–59]. Pliny also does not ignore eponymous plants: e. g., a significant part of Book 25 is filled with reports about who first discovered one or another of the medicinal herbs that have a corresponding name (for example, the varieties of panacea *panaces Asclepion*, *Heracleon*, *Chironium* 25.30–32). It also should be noted that names represent one of the central concerns for Pliny [Doody 2010: 27–30], in particular, their ability to indicate the origin of the object to which they were assigned [Doody 2011: 123–124], and eponymic plants appear to be demonstrative in this regard.

3

The following table lists eponymic plants which occur in Nicander, alongside corresponding passages in Pliny. Plant identifications are given insofar as possible.

Nicander	Pliny	Identifications of plants
<i>Ther.</i> 500–508 Cheriron's root Χείρωνος ῥίζα = <i>Ther.</i> 565 πάνακες	25.32 panaces Chironium 25.66 Centaurion = Chironion	Nicander: ? <i>Chlora perfoliata</i> = <i>Blackstonia perfoliata</i> , a plant from the family Gentianaceae. Pliny: ? common rock-rose <i>Helianthemum vulgare</i> . For further identifications see [Jacques 2002: 149]
<i>Ther.</i> 541–549 Alcibiuss' bugloss Ἀλκιβίου ἔχινς = ? <i>Ther.</i> 666–675 Alcibiuss' herb Ἀλκιβίου ποίη	22.50 Echis (among other names) 22.51 Archebion (among other names) 27.39 Alcibium	Different species of bugloss <i>Echium</i> . See [Jaques 2002: 151; André 1985 s. v. alcibium, archebion, echion]
<i>Ther.</i> 627 Heracles' organy Ἡράκλειον ὄριγανον = πανάκτειος κονίλη	25.32 panaces Heracleon = origanum Heracleoticum	A species of organy: <i>Origanum viride</i> , <i>Origanum</i> <i>Heracleoticum</i>
<i>Ther.</i> 685 Phlegyan* (= <i>Asclepius</i> *) all-heal πάνακες Φλεγυήιον	25.30 panaces Asclepion	A plant from the family <i>Umbelliferae</i> , probably <i>Echinophora tenuifolia</i>
<i>Ther.</i> 764 Περσεύς = Alex. 99– 105 περσεΐη Perseus' tree	13.60, 15.45 Persea	<i>Mimusops Schimperi</i> , a plant from the family <i>Sapotaceae</i>
<i>Ther.</i> 873 Telephus' plant φύλλα Τηλεφίοιο	? 25.42 Achilleos	A plant from the genus <i>Sedum</i>
<i>Ther.</i> 902 Hyacinth ὑάκινθος	21.66 Hyacinthus	? <i>Delphinium Ajacis</i>
<i>Alex.</i> 234–35 Kydon's plant Κύδωνος ... φυτόν	—	<i>Pirus cydonia</i> quince
<i>Georgica</i> fr. 74.59 flower of Zeus Διὸς ἄνθος	21.59 Iovis flos	? <i>Dianthus inodorus</i> carnation

* In some traditions Phlegyas was the grandfather of Asclepius (*Hymn. Hom. Asclep.* 16.2–3, *Pind. Pyth.* 3.8, *Apollod.* 3.10.3).

Eponyms of three other plants occur only in the scholia on Nicander; I group them separately:

Aristolochia ἀριστολόχεια a) Sch. <i>Ther.</i> 509a a woman named Aristolochē Ἀριστολόχη b) Sch. <i>Ther.</i> 937 an inhabitant of Ephesus named Aristolochus	25.95 Aristolochia — explained as ἀρίστη λεχούσαις — “excellent for women in childbirth”	A plant from the genus <i>Aristolochia</i>
Organy κονίλη Sch. <i>Ther.</i> 626b a certain Conilos φησὶ Πέτριχος ἐν τῷ Ὀφιακῷ ὅτι Κόνιλος εὗρε τὴν βοτάνην	—	A species of organy
Promenus' pomegranate Προμένειος σῖδη Sch. <i>Alex.</i> 490d a certain Promenus, an inhabitant of Crete	—	A species of pomegranate <i>Punica</i>

As we can see, the majority of eponymous plants mentioned by Nicander have parallels in the *Naturalis Historia*. From this list, I consider in more detail one case which I find most interesting: a plant named after Alcibius.

4

Alcibius. A character bearing this name is known only from *Theriaka*. It is difficult to judge whether Nicander used a rare myth that is not preserved in any other sources, or whether Alcibius is a pseudo-mythological figure invented by the poet specifically to explain the name of the plant. Alcibius appears in two plant names: Ἀλκιβίου ἔχης Alcibius's bugloss (*Ther.* 541–549) and Ἀλκιβίοιο ποίη Alcibius's herb (*Ther.* 666–675).

Ther. 541–549²

Ἐσθλὴν δ' Ἀλκιβίου ἔχιος περιφράζω ρίζαν.
 Τῆς καὶ ἀκανθοβόλος μὲν αἰεὶ περιτέτροφε χαίτη,
 λείρια δ' ὥς ἴα τοῖα περιτρέφει· ἡ δὲ βαθεῖα
 καὶ ραδινὴ ὑπένερθεν ἀέξεται οὐδεὶ ρίζα.
 Τὸν μὲν ἔχης βουβῶνος ὑπὲρ νεάτοιο χαράξας
 ἄντλῳ ἐνυπνῶντα χυτῆς παρὰ τέλοςον ἄλωος
 εἶθαρ ἀνέπνευσεν καμάτου βίη· αὐτὰρ ὁ γαίης
 ρίζαν ἐρυσάμενος τὸ μὲν ἔρκεϊ θρύψεν ὀδόντων
 θηλάζων, τὸ δὲ πέσκος ἐῶ περὶ κάββαλεν ἔλκει.

Consider now the excellent root of Alcibius's bugloss: its prickly leaves grow ever thick upon it, and it puts out a coronal of flowers like violets, but beneath them in the soil the root grows deep and slender. Alcibius a Male Viper wounded above the lowest part of his groin as he lay asleep upon a mound of uncleansed grain by the margin of a piled threshing-floor, straightway rousing him by the violence of die pain. Whereat he pulled the root from the ground and first broke it small with his close-set teeth as he sucked it, and then spread the skin upon his wound³.

² Text according to [Jacques 2002].

³ Here and subsequently translation of [Gow, Scholfield 1953].

Ther. 666–675

Ἄλλην δ' Ἀλκιβίοιο φερώνυμον ἄγρεο ποίην,
 δράχμα χερὸς πλήσας, παύρῳ δ' ἐν νέκταρι πίνειν.
 τὴν μὲν ὑπὸ σκοπέλοισι Φαλακράοισιν ἐπακτήρ
 Κρύμνης ἄμ πεδίον καὶ ἀνά Γράσον ἦδ' ἵνα θ' ἵππου
 λειμῶνες, σκυλάκεσσιν Ἀμυκλαίησι κελεύων,
 κνυζηθμῶ κνυὸς οὐλῶ ἐπήισε θυμολέοντος,
 ὅς τε μεταλλεύων αἰγὸς ρόθον ἐν στίβῳ ὕλης
 κανθῶ ἐνὶ ῥαντήρι τυπὴν ἀνεδέξατ' ἐχίδνης·
 καὶ τὴν μὲν κλάγξας ἀφ' ἐκὰς βάλε, ῥεῖα δὲ ποίης
 φύλλα κατέβρυξεν, καὶ ἀλεύατο φοινὸν ὀλεθρον.

Take herbage of another kind that also bears the name of Alcibi-
 us, fill your hand full, and drink in a little Wine. This it was
 that when hunting beneath Phalacra's cliffs, on Crymna's plain and about
 Grasu, and where lie the meadows of the Horse, as he hallooned to his
 Amyclacan whelps, he discovered through the anguished whimpering of
 his lion-hearted hound; for as it followed up a goat's trail along some
 woodland path it had received the Female Viper's stab in the watering
 corner of its eye. And with a howl it flung her off and readily ate the leaves
 of this herb and escaped deadly destruction.

The beginning of the second passage looks like the description of a different
 plant than the first one: Ἄλλην δ' Ἀλκιβίοιο φερώνυμον ἄγρεο ποίην “take a her-
 bage of another kind that also bears the name of Alcibi-
 us”. The etiological stories
 accompanying the descriptions also differ from each other: in the first, the plant is
 said to be found by Alcibi-
 us himself, and in the second by one of his hunting dogs.
 Nevertheless, on the basis of the practical information given by Nicander one can-
 not clearly judge whether it is a question of the same plant or two different ones
 (see [Jacques 2002: 186–187]): in the first context Nicander describes a plant (*Ther.*
 542–544) but says nothing about its use as an antidote, while in the second there is
 only a recipe (*Ther.* 667) without a description.

As for Pliny, he mentions three plants whose names are similar to those in Nica-
 ander. The first two — *echis* and *archebion* — follow directly after each other in
 Book 22 and are included in a series of alternative names for the plants *pseudoan-*
chusa and *onochilon* (= *anchusa*):

22.50 Echis⁴

*Est et alia similis pseudoanchusa ob id appellata, a quibusdam vero
 echis aut doris et multis aliis nominibus, lanuginosior et minus pinguis,
 tenuioribus foliis, languidioribus. radix in oleo non fundit rubentem
 sucum, et hoc ab anchusa discernitur. contra serpentes efficacissima
 potu foliorum vel seminis. folia ictibus inponuntur. virus serpentes fugat*
 (There is also another plant, which being like alkanet is called bastard
 alkanet, though some call it echis or doris or by many other names; it
 is more downy than the other and less fleshy, the leaves are thinner and
 more flabby. The root in oil does not give out a red juice, by which test it

⁴ Text according to [Mayhoff 1892].

is distinguished from true alkanet. The leaves or seed taken in drink are a very sure antidote to snake bite. The leaves are applied to stings and bites, and their strong smell keeps snakes away⁵).

22.51 Archebion

Est et alia herba proprio nomine onochilon, quam aliqui anchusam vocant, alii archebion, alii onochelim, aliqui rhexiam, multi enchrysam, parvo frutice, flore purpureo, asperis foliis et ramis, radice messibus sanguinea, cetero nigra, in sabulosis nascens, efficax contra serpentes maximeque viperas et radice et foliis, aequae cibo ac potu (There is another plant also, the proper name of which is onochilon, called by some people anchusa, or archebion, or onochelis, or rhexia, and by many enchrysa. It has a short base, a purple flower, rough leaves and branches, a root blood-red at harvest time, though dark at other times, growing on sandy soils, an antidote to the bites of serpents, especially of vipers, both root and leaves being equally efficacious in food and in drink).

Αλκιβίου ἔχις in Nicander is usually identified with *archebion* in Pliny, since both authors refer to purple flowers (*Ther.* 543 λείρια δ' ὥς ἴα, Plin. 22.51 flore purpureo), which are mentioned also by Dioscorides in the description of a plant called ἄγχουσα ἐτέρα, Ἀλκιβιάδειον and ὀνοχειλές (4.24 <ἄγχουσα ἐτέρα>, ἣν ἔνιοι Ἀλκιβιάδειον ἡνοχειλές ἐκάλεσαν ... ἄνθος πορφυροειδές, ὑποφαινικοῦν)⁶. In this connection, the possibility arises that *archebion* contains, in a distorted form, the name of the Nicandrian character Alcibius. However, according to Jacques, there are insufficient grounds for such identification — among other reasons, because Ἀλκιβιάδειον in Dioscorides is used as a synonymous name for several plants [Jacques 2002: 186].

Of particular interest is a passage from the 27th Book of *Naturalis Historia*:

27.39⁷

Alcibium qualis esset herba, non repperi apud auctores, sed radicem eius et folia trita ad serpentis morsum inponi et bibi, folia quantum manus capiat trita cum vini meri cyathis III aut radicem drachmarum III pondere cum vini eadem mensura (In my authorities I have found no description of alcibium, but only that its pounded root and leaves are applied locally, and taken in drink, for snake bite; a handful of the pounded leaves with three cyathi of neat wine, or three drachmae by weight of the root with the same measure of wine⁸).

Two points may seem surprising here. First, *alcibium* looks like a very accurate rendering of the plant name in Nicander, but Pliny says that he “has not found in his authorities” any information about its properties. Second, immediately after this phrase Pliny speaks about the use of *alcibium* as an antidote against snakebites, and he also gives a prescription using this herb. This implies that Pliny still knew something about the properties of the plant, and he is most likely to have obtained this information from some *auctores* — what he had just denied in the previous sentence.

⁵ Here and subsequently translation from [Jones 1951].

⁶ See more [Jacques 2002: 151–152].

⁷ Text according to [Mayhoff 1897].

⁸ Here and subsequently translation from [Jones, Andrews 1956].

The latter difficulty can be resolved by observing that the phrase *qualis esset* points not to any properties in general, but only to the external appearance of the plant (such as leaves, roots, flowers, etc.). This becomes clear when we consider descriptions of other plants in Book 27. In his botanical descriptions, Pliny usually places this kind of information immediately after the plant name, and for *alcibium* there is no such external description. However, as we recall, Nicander (*Ther.* 542–544) does describe in some detail the appearance of a plant named after Alcibius. This brings us back to Pliny's statement *non repperi apud auctores*.

In my opinion, everything can fall into place if we assume that Pliny considered Ἀλκιβίου ἔχης and Ἀλκιβίοιο ποίη as two different plants — just as Nicander's text suggests, where these two names are placed far apart and are accompanied by different etiological stories. In this case, *alcibium* will correspond to Ἀλκιβίοιο ποίη (*Ther.* 666), for which Nicander gives no description, but only therapeutic instructions. Nicander's prescription, unlike Pliny's, is formulated very briefly and superficially (for example, the proportions for wine are not given), but in Pliny we find the indication *quantum manus capiat*, which looks like a verbatim rendering of δράγμα χερὸς πλήσας in *Ther.* 667.

Thus, Pliny's phrase should not be understood in the sense that the authors (by which Nicander could be implied) do not report anything about *alcibium*, but in the sense that for some reason they do not consider it necessary to describe what this plant looks like. It is telling that two more contexts from Book 27 are built according to the same scheme as the section on *alcibium*:

27.103

Leucographis qualis esset, scriptum non repperi, quod eo magis miror: quoniam utilis proditur sanguinem excreantibus III obolis cum croco, item coeliacis, trita ex aqua et adposita profluvio feminarum, oculorum quoque medicamentis et explendis ulceribus, quae fiant in teneris partibus (A description of leucographis I have nowhere found in writing. I am the more surprised at this because in three-oboli doses with saffron it is considered useful for haemoptysis, and also for the coeliac disease; beaten up in water and applied as a pessary for excessive menstruation; useful too as an ingredient of eye salves, and for fining up ulcers that form on tender parts of the body).

27.141

Trachinia herba qualis sit, non traditur. credo falsum et promissum Democriti portentosum esse, adalligatam triduo absumere lienes (We are not told the nature of the plant trachinia. I think it untrue, and the assurance of Democritus fantastic, that used as an amulet it consumes the spleen in three days).

Thus, in all three cases Pliny points to the absence of a plant description by using quite similar expressions. It is noteworthy that in 27.103 Pliny openly expresses his perplexity (*quod eo magis miror*) about the inconsistency demonstrated in the sources: indeed, if a plant is recommended as an extremely useful one, then the reader should be able to identify it, which is very difficult to do without a description. This remark becomes even more interesting if we compare it with another passage in the *Naturalis Historia* where descriptions of plants are discussed:

25.9

Quare ceteri sermone eas tradidere, aliqui ne effigie quidem indicata et nudis plerumque nominibus defuncti, quoniam satis videbatur potestates vimque demonstrare quaerere volentibus. nec est difficilis cognitio: nobis certe, exceptis admodum paucis, contigit reliquas contemplari scientia Antoni Castoris, cui summa auctoritas erat in ea arte nostro aevo, visendo hortulo eius, in quo plurimas alebat (For this reason the other writers have given verbal accounts only; some have not even given the shape of the plants, and for the most part have been content with bare names, since they thought it sufficient to point out the properties and nature of a plant to those willing to look for it. To gain this knowledge is no difficult matter; I at least have enjoyed the good fortune to examine all but a very few plants through the devotion to science of Antonius Castor, the highest botanical authority of our time; I used to visit his special garden, in which he would rear a great number of specimens).

Immediately before this passage (25.8) it is said that the illustrations by which some Greek authors supply their works are unreliable and rather complicate the correct identification of plants than contribute to it — in particular, for the reason that the same plant can look differently depending on the season. It seems likely that Pliny considers verbal descriptions more appropriate than pictures. Nonetheless, even verbal descriptions are optional and the narrative can be reduced to the name of a plant (*nudis plerumque nominibus defuncti*). Most importantly, Pliny explicitly states that such a reduction does not impede correct identification of plants (*nec est difficilis cognitio*). Now we see that Pliny contradicts himself when in the section on *leucographis* (27.103) he rejects the practice that he has found acceptable in 25.9.

Let us return to Alcibius and the plants named after him. If we suppose that Pliny knew both passages from *Theriaka* where Alcibius appears, then it would be logical to expect that the plants related to the same eponymous person would be mentioned together or at least their similarity would somehow be pointed out. However, *alcibium* and *archebion* appear in different parts of the *Naturalis Historia*, though *archebion* could be derived from Nicander's Ἀλκίβιον and *alcibium* almost certainly has this origin. How could this happen? Regarding this question, one preliminary conclusion can be drawn. Book 27 of the *Naturalis Historia*, in which *alcibium* is mentioned, is arranged as an alphabetical list of plants. This list must have required considerable preparatory work, including selection of plants according to their names. In the course of such a selection, *alcibium* could have lost the connection with other names related to Alcibius in some way. Besides, it seems possible that at some stage of work with these preliminary materials the name of Alcibius could have been distorted or completely lost in Plin. 22.51, where Pliny alluded to Nicander *Ther.* 241–244.

Conclusions

Summing up, we can say the following. Pliny's descriptions — in both Book 22 and Book 27 — demonstrate quite obvious intersections with Nicander, who is included in the list of sources for both books. I have tried to demonstrate that both passages from *Theriaka* where Alcibius is mentioned (*Ther.* 541–544, 666–667) are visible in the *Naturalis Historia*. Pliny may have lost the connection between them due to a specific way of selecting material for the alphabetical list of plants in Book 27, and this fault can shed important light on his methods of work.

References

- André, J. (1985). *Les noms des plantes dans la Rome antique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In French).
- Baumbach, M. (2001). Protos heurètes. In *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*, (Vol. 10) 466–467. Stuttgart: Metzler. (In German).
- Crugnola, A. (Ed.) (1971). *Scholia in Nicandri Theriaca cum glossis*. Milano: Cisalpino. (In Greek, Latin and Italian).
- Doody, A. (2010). *Pliny's Encyclopaedia: The reception of the Natural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Doody, A. (2011). The science and aesthetics of names in the *Natural History*. In R. K. Gibson, R. Morello (Eds.). *Pliny the Elder: Themes and contexts*, 113–129. Leiden: Brill. (Mnemosyne Supplements; 329).
- Gow, A. S. F., Scholfield, A. F. (Eds.) (1953). *Nicander: The poems and poetical fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Fantuzzi, M., Hunter, R. (2004). *Tradition and innovation in Hellenistic poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Jacques, J.-M. (Ed.) (2002). *Nicandre: Oeuvres, Tome ii: Les thériaques. Fragments iologiques antérieurs à Nicandre*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In French).
- Jacques, J.-M. (Ed.) (2007). *Nicandre: Oeuvres, Tome iii: Les alexipharmaque. Lieux parallèles du livre XIII des Iatrica d'Aétius*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In French).
- Jones, W. H. S. (Ed.) (1951). *Pliny. Natural History*, (Vol. 6) Books 20–23. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Jones, W. H. S., Andrews, A. C. (Eds.) (1956). *Pliny. Natural History*, (Vol. 7) Books 24–27. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Mayhoff, K. (Ed.) (1892). *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis historiae libri XXXVII*, (Vol. 3) Libri XVI–XXII. Lipsiae: In aedibus B. G. Teubneri. (In Latin).
- Mayhoff, K. (Ed.) (1897). *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis historiae libri XXXVII*, (Vol. 4) Libri XXIII–XXX. Lipsiae: In aedibus B. G. Teubneri. (In Latin).
- Overduin, F. (2014). *Nicander of Colophon's Theriaca: A literary commentary*. Leiden: Brill. (Mnemosyne Supplements; 374).
- Zimmermann, B., Rengakos, A. (2014). *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike*, (Vol. 2) *Die Literatur der klassischen und hellenistischen Zeit*. München: C. H. Beck. (In German).

* * *

Информация об авторе

Анна Михайловна Маломуд*аспирантка,**Институт классической филологии,**Берлинский университет имени Гумбольдтов**D-10099 Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, Germany**Тел.: +49 (30) 2093-70416**✉ annmood@gmail.com*

Information about the author

Anna Malomud*Post-Graduate Student,**Department of Classics**Humboldt University of Berlin**Unter den Linden 6, D-10099 Berlin, Germany**Tel.: +49 (30) 2093-70416**✉ annmood@gmail.com*

E. V. Ilyushechkina ^{ab}

ORCID: 0000-0001-9220-9351

✉ ilyushechkiniae@gmail.com

^a Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте РФ (Россия, Москва)

^b Российский государственный гуманитарный университет (Россия, Москва)

SOME REMARKS ON THE PREFACE OF CAIUS IULIUS SOLINUS

Аннотация. В статье основное внимание уделяется так называемому первому предисловию к компиляции Гая Юлия Солина «Collectanea rerum memorabilium» и, в частности, тому, как его особенности (стилистические, структурные, риторические и жанрообразующие) раскрываются на фоне риторической системы конца III в. Анализ семантических связей, сравнений, метафор и других риторических элементов в предисловии помогает лучше понять авторское «я», цели и замысел произведения в целом, методы, намерения и вкусы автора. Используя темы и общие места, традиционные для латинских предисловий, Солин излагает методы отбора источников для своей компиляции, особенности материала, говорит даже о привлечении парадоксографических сюжетов и о собственном видении построения географического сочинения, что в результате создает уникальный текст. Что касается риторических приемов Солина, то он использует синонимы, антонимы, метафоры, проявляет особое внимание к звукописи, употребляя уменьшительные суффиксы, ассонансы и пр. Отличительной чертой произведения Солина является то, что он начинает географический рассказ (описание ойкумены) с отрывка об основании Рима и краткой истории Вечного города, о чем автор говорит уже в предисловии.

Ключевые слова: Гай Юлий Солин, Плиний Старший, Клавдий Салмазий, латинские предисловия, античная этногеография, риторическая топики

Для цитирования: Ilyushechkina E. V. Some remarks on the Preface of Caius Iulius Solinus // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 101–112. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-101-112.

Статья поступила в редакцию 1 декабря 2019 г.

Принято к печати 20 декабря 2019 г.

E. V. Ilyushechkina^{ab}

ORCID: 0000-0001-9220-9351

✉ ilyushechkinae@gmail.com

^a The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy
and Public Administration (Russia, Moscow)

^b Russian State University for Humanities (Russia, Moscow)

SOME REMARKS ON THE PREFACE OF CAIUS IULIUS SOLINUS

Abstract. The article focuses on the so-called “first” preface to Solinus’ *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, and especially on the way its functions (stylistic, structural, rhetorical and genre-defining) are revealed against the background of the third-century rhetorical system. The genre status and semantic connections of the preface, the similes, metaphors and various rhetorical elements created on their basis are discussed. By analyzing them we should be able to better understand the figure of the author himself, his methods, intentions and even personal tastes, as well as the aim and focus of this work as a whole. While utilizing themes and common places that are traditional for Latin prefaces, Solinus reveals the methods of selecting material for his compilation, the features of the material, he even comments on the attraction of paradoxography and on his own vision of composing a geographical work; all this, as a result, creates a unique text. As for Solinus’ rhetorical devices, these include, but are not limited to, the use of synonyms and polysemy; special attention is paid to the sound of words and phrases (he uses diminutives, assonances, etc.); and to the use of metaphors and juxtapositions of contrasting words. A distinctive feature of Solinus’ work is that he starts a geographical account (a description of the *oikoumene*) with a passage about Rome’s founding and a brief history of the Roman Empire as the author tells already in the Preface.

Keywords: Gaius Iulius Solinus, Pliny the Elder, Claudius Salmasius, Claude de Saumaise, Latin prefaces, ancient ethnogeography, rhetorical topics

To cite this article: Ilyushechkina, E. V. (2020). Some remarks on the Preface of Caius Iulius Solinus. *Shagi / Steps*, 6(1), 101–112. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-101-112.

Received December 1, 2019

Accepted December 20, 2019

In 1629 Claude de Saumaise (better known by his Latinized name, Claudius Salmasius) published his famous *magnum opus* “Plinianae exercitationes in C. Iulium Solinum”, which apart from Solinus’ compilation included Salmasius’ own indispensable text-critical and philological commentary [Salmasius 1629 (2nd ed. 1689)]. It is not by chance that Salmasius, lauded by both Scaliger and Casaubon as one of the great scholars of the 17th century¹, became interested in Solinus, who for many centuries remained a relatively popular figure among scholars and readers alike. At least 250 manuscripts and 85 editions are silent witnesses to the prestige of his work², known as *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* (“Collection of Curiosities”) or *Polyhistor* (“Multi-descriptive”), which is in fact a description of the ancient world, with remarks on historical, social, religious and natural history questions.

It was only later that Solinus’ reputation was tarnished by Mommsen’s harsh judgement expressed in his 1864 critical edition of the *Collectanea* [Mommsen 1864 (2nd ed. 1895)]. Since then, it has become conventional wisdom that Solinus’ compilation is a deeply unoriginal work, hardly worth any scholarly attention. I, however, am convinced that such a condemnation is unjust and unwarranted. In fact, recently there has been a new and welcome surge of interest among classicists in the *Collectanea*, and not just because the work so far has been largely overlooked but because it represents an important and not very well understood aspect of Graeco-Roman culture.

In 2001, Francisco J. Fernández-Nieto published a Spanish translation of Solinus’ book, complete with an introductory chapter about Solinus’ style and content, his date and manuscript tradition [Fernández Nieto 2001: 7–114]. In 2014, thanks largely to the efforts of Kai Brodersen, a conference dedicated to his oeuvre was held in Erfurt that resulted in a published volume; almost simultaneously a new bilingual edition of the *Collectanea*³ appeared. Thus, it soon became apparent that it is due to grave scholarly oversight that Solinus lay forgotten for such a long time, and that the *Collectanea* deserves our full attention both as a historical and geographical source and as a literary work.

It should be noted that the compilation-genre which flourished during the Imperial period and to which Solinus’ book obviously belongs was not as homogenous as one would imagine: it included both systematizing works, such as Pliny’s *Natural History*, and compilations in commentary-form, such as Probus’, Servius’, and Donatus’ commentaries on Virgil. Instead of expressing their own ideas and thoughts the creators of such compilations assumed a more modest task of excerpting and recombining other authors’ material in order to please and engage their audience and to meet as best they could the demands of the current cultural moment (see more in [Formisano 2007]). As for Solinus, in his compendium of ancient ethnographic knowledge he approached his sources and source-selection quite creatively and thus managed to expand his readers’ knowledge about the world they lived in.

¹ See, e. g. [Bots 2018: 99–101] (on Salmasius at Leiden University); [van Miert 2011] (on the correspondence between Scaliger and Salmasius).

² Cf. “The chief Latin geographer to a millenium” [Milham 1986: 74]. On the manuscripts tradition of Solinus see [Ibid.: esp. 73–75; Brodersen 2014b: 201–209].

³ [Brodersen 2014b] (conference proceedings), [Brodersen 2014a] (an edition of Solinus’ text with parallel Latin and German versions; the Latin part is based on the edition by Mommsen [1864]). See also [Brodersen 2018: 87–94].

In this article I shall focus on Solinus' preface to the *Collectanea*. I am especially interested in the way its stylistic, structural, rhetorical and genre-defining functions are revealed against the background of the 3rd century (the date favored by most scholars)⁴ rhetorical system. Solinus' preface takes the form of a dedicatory epistle addressed to his benefactor, a man by the name of Adventus, otherwise unknown to us. I will attempt to demonstrate how this preamble may help us better understand the author's methods, intentions and even personal tastes, as well as the aim and focus of his entire work.

Solinus begins his introductory epistle by — as the common rules of literary etiquette demand — first thanking his patron for his unwavering interest in his oeuvre and Latin literature in general:

Solinus Advento salutem

(1.1) *Cum et aurium clementia et optimarum atrium studiis praestare te ceteris sentiam idque oppido expertus de benivolentia tua nihil temere praeceperim, e re putavi examen opusculi istius tibi potissimum dare, cuius vel industria promptius suffragium vel benignitas veniam spondebat faciliorem*⁵.

Such formal addresses and/or dedications were commonplace but still very flattering for the addressee, whose name became forever associated with the work; it worked also vice versa in case of favor to the author of some high-ranking official (cf. [Herkommer 1968: 31]). Solinus here reproduces a fairly standard Latin mode of address, *captatio benevolentiae*, which may be directed alternatively at the addressee, the reader or the listener⁶. He then asks his benefactor to be the judge and critic of his work (also a common demand in dedicatory letters of this sort), which he calls *opusculum* ("this little work [of mine]"). Such deliberate minimizing of one's achievement and false modesty was likewise a well-established rhetorical device⁷.

⁴ Th. Mommsen preferred to date Solinus' compilation with the period between 200 and 400 AD, i. e. 3rd century [Mommsen 1895: vi–vii], Fernández Nieto places Solinus' in the period between 290 and 350 AD [Fernández Nieto 2001: 11–27], while K. Brodersen speaks about late 3rd century AD [Brodersen 2014a: 8]. R. Talbert relates the time of Solinus' work to 300 AD and connects it with the origin date of the Peutinger map [Talbert 2010: 136]; cf. [von Martels 2014: 22] for the 3rd AD century as well; cf. [Walter 1969].

⁵ "(1.1) Solinus greets Adventus. As I feel that you surpassed others by the clemency of your ears and your diligence in the finest arts — and I do not say this thoughtlessly, since I very much experienced your benevolence —, I thought I ought to give to you the initial critique of this little work of mine, because your diligence promised a quicker assent, or your kindness easier forgiveness" (here and below English trans. by Zweder von Martels [Brodersen 2014b: 9]).

⁶ On rhetorical formulas in the prefaces of Latin historians see [Janson 1964: 65–67; Herkommer 1968: 199–224; Nicolaidis 1988; Lausberg 1990: 156–160 (esp. § 273–279 on four varieties of the rhetorical formula *benevolum parare*)]. Cf. [Curtius 1948: 233–250; Moles 1993] (on Liv. *Proem.* 2–3, 4–5).

⁷ Starting from the time of Augustan Principate, the topic of the author's "self-derogation" was established in Roman literature: cf. *mea parvitas* (Val. Max. *prolog*); *mediocritas mea* (Vell. Pat. II.3.3, cf. Gell. XIV.2.25); *mea petulantia* (Plin. *Nat. Hist. praef.* 2). The use of self-derogatory formulas in Latin prefaces in the 2nd — 3rd centuries is connected, notes Janson, with the conditional topic of "modesty" either in relation to personal merits of the author, or in relation to their works [Janson 1964: 145–146].

The goal of all these rhetorical formulae seems clear enough: by addressing the reader or his patron directly and asking them, for example, to be charitable towards his work, the author wants to engage his readership, to produce in them a sense of trust and ultimately to dispose them favorably towards what is to come⁸.

Touching further on the nature of his content and purpose of the work, Solinus clarifies:

(1.2) *Liber est ad compendium praeparatus, quantumque ratio passa est ita mode-rate repressus, ut nec prodiga sit in eo copia nec damnosa concinnitas. Cui si animum propius intenderis, velut fermentum cognitionis magis ei inesse quam bratteas eloquentiae deprehendes*⁹.

As for his work's intent and theme, Solinus says that it is a brief overview of — or a short introduction to — ethnogeography composed mainly for didactic purposes and thus belonging to the ancient didactic tradition. He thus considers brevity to be one of the book's chief merits, but not the sole one. Solinus adds that he does not want his narrative to be either too dry or too verbose and long-winded¹⁰. He uses the adverb *moderate*, which probably refers both to the style and the substance of the *Collectanea*.

The noun *concinnitas* (“a neat, elegant, skilful joining of several things”, “beauty of style, produced by a skilful connection of words and clauses”), derived from the adjective *concinnus*, is used several times by Cicero¹¹ and was relatively common during the Early Imperial period¹². In this case, the term *concinnitas*, which means a skillful combination of words or phrases and is usually used to characterize a literary style, as does the adjective close to it, *concinnus*, indicates the expressiveness of the style and its features¹³.

⁸ According to the anonymous treatise attributed to Cicero (*Rhet. ad Heren.* I.6–8) and in the opinion of Cicero himself, the form of the preface to historical works of Latin authors was completely regulated by rhetorical conventions: in the preface, the author should, first of all, achieve the inclination of the reader/listener (*concliemus eos nobis, qui audiunt*, Cic. *De or.* II.115) and “gain his favor” (*conciliari quam maxime ad benevolentiam*, Cic. *De or.* II.182), while using *lenitas orationis* (*De or.* II.129), which equally applies to the “manner of statement” (*elocutio*) and to the “content of speech itself” (*actio*); cf. Quint. III.8.10; IV.1.5; IV.1.7–15; IV.1.72; X.1.48. See more in [Gasparov 1972: 7–74].

⁹ “(1.2) The book is prepared as an abridgement, restrained with moderation so that the multitude of subjects discussed is not extravagant, and the beauty of its style is not unfortunate. Reading it closely one will discover that the book, instead of the gold leaves of eloquence, contains as it were the ferment of knowledge”.

¹⁰ Cf. [Santini 1998]: according to him, the word-combination *copia prodiga* (“multitude of subjects [is not] extravagant”, cf. Plin. *Ep.* V.20.4) logically opposes the expression *damnosa concinnitas* (“beauty of its style [is not] unfortunate”) of the subordinate clause, as a result of which we can assume that *concinnitas* is used in the meaning of *dicendi brevitatis*. It should only be clarified that this is not about “brevity” of the content or of the work, but about the characterization of the author's style, which is devoid of rhetorical “embellishments” (cf. Cic. *De or.* III.100).

¹¹ E. g. Cic. *Or.* 81; 149; 164–167; 201; *Brut.* 325.

¹² Cicero noted that Latin authors began to take care of “speech ornaments” relatively “recently”; cf. Sen. *Ep.* 115.2; Suet. *Aug.* 86 etc.; Gell. II.26.4. See more in [Gasparov 1972: 17–18].

¹³ The adjective *concinnus* is synonymous with *venustus* and *elegans* cf. e. g. Plin. *Nat. Hist.* XXXV.36.111: *elegans ac concinnus ita, ut venustate ei pauci conparentur*.

Oddly enough, in Solinus' text the word *concininitas*, which normally has a positive meaning and refers to an elegant literary style, is followed by a pejorative adjective, *damnosa*: taken together this must mean something like "unexpressive, uncultivated style". Such an interpretation of *damnosa concininitas* seems to be confirmed by a passage in the introduction where Solinus juxtaposes knowledge and rhetoric. The former, i. e. knowledge of the facts collected in the *Collectanea*, he urges the reader to pursue, while the latter is nothing more than skillful yet superficial embellishment. Like other writers of the didactic tradition, Solinus' clearly wanted to raise the prestige of his chosen field — ethnogeography — in the eyes of the reading public.

However, Solinus does not want to abandon rhetoric altogether in order to focus solely on useful knowledge. In fact, his fairly clichéd remarks on the superiority of useful substance over empty style are themselves variations of similar tropes found in Cicero and Quintillian¹⁴.

Latin authors liked to brag about their industriousness and the labor it took to compose their works, and Solinus is no exception¹⁵. He mentions how carefully he selected all the volumes from which he made his excerpts:

(1.3) *Exquisitis enim aliquot voluminibus studuisse me impendio fateor, ut et a notioribus referrem pedem et remotis largius inmorarer. Locorum commemoratio plurimum tenet, in quam partem ferme inclinatio est universa materies. Quorum commeminisse ita visum est, ut inclitos terrarum situs et insignes tractus maris, servata orbis distinctione, suo quaeque ordine redderemus*¹⁶.

Actually, he is talking here about the "library", or his book's sources, on which Solinus depends. The goal of this 'library-work' was to filter out well-known ethnogeographic facts in favor of the more obscure and rare ones. As Solinus himself points out, the larger part of his compilation is dedicated to the description of "places of the earth and tracts of the sea" (*terrarum situs et tractus maris*) of the *orbis terrarum*. He chose the well-trodden path of describing them systematically (*ordine*) according to a previously outlined plan. Doing so was considered important by Latin authors: it had long become a *topos* among them that a good literary work needs an underlying structure or plan¹⁷.

¹⁴ Cf. *etenim ex rerum cognitione efflorescat et redundet oportet oratio. Quae, nisi res est ab oratore percepta et cognita, inanem quondam habet elocutionem et paene puerilem* (Cic. *De or.* I. 20); *Sunt qui, neglecto rerum pondere et viribus sententiarum, si vel inania verba in hos modos depravarunt summos se iudicent artifices* (Quint. IX.3.100).

¹⁵ See, e. g., Plin. *Nat. Hist. praef.* 12; Gell. *praef.* 12 etc. More in [Janson 1964: 97; Ilyushechkina 2001: 78–89, esp. 86–87].

¹⁶ "(1.3) For this book, I studied several carefully selected books with the intention of keeping my feet away from the more common ones, and staying with the more remote ones. The larger part of the book is concerned with the record of geographical places; most of its subject-matter is more fit for that part. It seemed proper to mention them so that we should produce the famous places of the earth and tracts of the sea, each in their order, observing the division of the world".

¹⁷ Cf. *prius ordine dicam* (Verg. *Georg.* IV.537); *ut breviter cognosci possint, ab inlustribus electa auctoribus digerere* (sic Kempf, codd. *deligere*) *constitui* (Val. Max. *praef.*); *στοιχῆδόν* (Dion. *Per.* 63); *easque nunc excerptiones nostras variis diversisque in locis factas cursim digessimus* (Gell. XVII.21.1); *in ordinem... convenirent* (Macr. *Sat.* I *praef.* 3).

In the next paragraphs Solinus, reproducing another didactic *topos*, discusses the topics that are both useful (he uses the word *utilitas*) and entertaining (i. e. they have *venustas* and bring *delectatio*):

(1.4) *Inseruimus et pleraque differenter congruentia, ut si nihil aliud, saltem varietas ipsa legentium fastidio mederetur. Inter haec hominum et aliorum animalium naturas expressimus. Addita pauca de arboribus exoticis, de extimarum gentium formis, de ritu dissono abditarum nationum, nonnulla etiam digna memoratu*¹⁸.

He knows that his book must be interesting and enjoyable and argues that thanks to the variety (*varietas*) of his chosen themes and topics the reader will never be bored by it (cf. Phaedr. 2, *prol.* 10: *ut delectet varietas*)¹⁹. Among such topics worth mentioning (*digna memoratu*), intended to provide both pleasure and benefit, Solinus mentions the various paradoxographic excursions that help ‘rhetorize’ his work.

Such paradoxographic digressions were clearly directed at readers who were typically newly middle-class, with enough money and leisure time to peruse the various kinds of educational and didactic literature that developed during the “Second sophistic” (periegesis, periploi, chorographiae, breviaria and didactic poems of various kinds)²⁰.

Next Solinus announces that he intends to “follow the traces of the ancient stamp” (*vestigia monetarum veteris*), that is, imitate the old Latin writers²¹:

(1.5) *quae praetermittere incuriosum videbatur quorumque auctoritas, quod cum primis industriae tuae insinuat velim, de scriptoribus manat receptissimis. Quid enim proprium nostrum esse possit, cum nihil omiserit antiquitatis diligentia, quod intactum ad hoc usque aevi permaneret? Quapropter quaeso, ne de praesenti tempore editionis huius fidem libes, quoniam quidem vestigia monetarum veteris persecuti opiniones universas eligere maluimus potius quam innovare*²².

¹⁸ “(1.4) We have inserted also a great many things that are different, though compatible so that, if nothing else, variety, at least, remedies the reader’s sense of distaste. Among these things we have portrayed the natures of men and other living creatures. Added are a few things on exotic trees, on the form of peoples living in the most remote places, on the different customs of hidden races, and also on several other things worthy to be mentioned”.

¹⁹ Judging by the context, the term *varietas* is used here in relation to the substantial part of the *Collectanea* (cf., e. g., Nep. XIII.4; XXV.10). At the same time, there are frequent cases when *varietas* (often together with *copia* “abundance, wealth, integrity”, which is synonymous with *eloquentia*) appears in Latin texts as a rhetorical figure serving to indicate expressiveness of style (cf. Cic. *De or.* I.59: *varie copioseque*; III.98–100: *varietas*; see more in [Fitzgerald 2016: 47–50]); cf. also Gell. XII.14.1–7: a passage about the origin and meaning of the particle *saltem* used in Solinus’ phrase next to *varietas*.

²⁰ Cf. Gell. IX.4.3.

²¹ Cf. a similar metaphor with the designation “minted in high standard coin” (*moneta*), associated with first-class poetry like poems by Virgil or Horace: Iuven. VII.54–55. See also [Pavlock 2014: 27–28].

²² “(1.5) It seemed to be careless to pass over these things, the authority of which — and this I should especially like to recommend to your assiduity — flows from the best received authors. For what could be ours, since the diligence of the ancients has left nothing to stay untouched until our age? Therefore, I ask you, do not judge the trustworthiness of this edition on the basis of the present time, for, following the traces of the ancient stamp, we have preferred to select universal opinions, rather than to alter them”.

Apart from rhetorical reasons, he uses the metaphor “ancient stamp” (*moneta veteris*) to emphasize the authority of the ancient tradition and ancient writers. He does so, in part, to place the responsibility for the veracity of the reported facts not on himself but on “the best received authors” (*scriptoribus receptissimis*) from whom he made his excerpts²³. It is also worth noting that the term *auctoritas*, here employed in reference to the *receptissimi scriptores*, was used in republican Rome in connection with figures of great political authority, whose opinions and pronouncements carried special weight.

Among his sources for the *Collectanea* Solinus mentions a host of different authors, such as the antiquarian Varro (he names several of his works, including a treatise *quod de litoralibus est* — XI.7); Juba the Numidian king; the annalists Lucius Cincius Alimentus, Quintus Fabius Pictor, Gneius Gellius, and the famous Marcus Portius Cato, Titus Pomponius Atticus, Cornelius Nepos, Marcus Tullius Cicero, Marcus Antonius Gniſo, “the most famous scholar” Lucius Tarruntius. He also quotes from Lutacius, the likely author of a book on the towns of Istria. Solinus’ list also includes various foreign, i. e. non-Latin, texts and authors, among them Hanno, the anonymous Punic books and Zoroaster; and a number of Greek authors: Aristotle, Callimachus, Democritus, Xenophon of Lemnos, Apollonides, Sotacus, a certain Demodamas (a general in Seleucus’ and Antiochus’ armies) and many more. Despite Solinus’ own admission that he only takes from ancient authors, there are several references in the *Collectanea* to his immediate predecessors and, maybe, even to some contemporaries — the 2nd century historian Granius Licinianus, Bocchus and Tiberius Fabianus.

What strikes one as odd, however, is that Solinus never names his two primary sources — Pomponius Mela and Pliny the Elder (in Theodor Mommsen’s view, Pliny’s *Natural History* was Solinus’ chief source), from whom he quite possibly got his information about earlier authors. In fact, we do not know if Solinus had any first-hand knowledge of them or if he relied entirely on Pomponius and Pliny for his information about the ‘ancients’. Be that as it may, in the introduction Solinus asks his benefactor Adventus to judge his work by how it compares to the texts of the ‘old masters’ and not modern writers.

In the next paragraph he again stresses the reliability of his ancient sources and by extension his own book.

(1.6) *Ita si qua ex istis secus quam opto in animum tuum venerint, des velim infantiae meae veniam: constantia veritatis penes eos est quos secuti sumus*²⁴.

Again, adopting the rhetorical pretense of modesty, he blames passages his patron may find objectionable on his supposed ineloquence. At the same time, he once more affirms the reliability of ancient sources, which as a whole made up “the steadfastness of truth”.

²³ Cf. similar passages in Pliny and Aulus Gellius: Plin. *Nat. Hist.* XIX.72; XXVIII.112; Gell. IX.4.11; X.12.5.

²⁴ “(1.6) So, if somehow you understand things otherwise than I wish, please forgive my want of eloquence: the steadfastness of truth is found in the authors followed”.

At the end comes the most authentic passage:

(1.7–8) *Sicut ergo qui corporum formas aemulantur, postpositis quae reliqua sunt, ante omnia effigiant modum capitis, nec prius lineas destinant in membra alia, quam ab ipsa ut ita dixerim figurarum arce auspiciū faciant inchoandi, nos quoque a capite orbis, id est ab urbe Roma principium capessemus, quamvis nihil super ea doctissimi auctores reliquerint, quod in novum praeconium possit suscitari, ac supervacuum paene sit relegere tramitem decursum tot annalibus. (8) Ne tamen prorsus dissimulata sit, originem eius quanta valemus persequemur fide*²⁵.

Solinus compares the writer to a painter who works on a piece of canvas²⁶; he argues that the most important part of a painted picture is the head, while other body parts are of less consequence. This type of metaphor, when the organic unity of a text is compared to the organic unity of a body, is not uncommon in Greek and Roman literature and likely goes back to Plato²⁷. Solinus here plays with different meanings of the word *caput*, which can be both ‘head of a body’ and ‘chapter of a book’, but can also have strong political connotations: the city of Rome is often referred to as *caput mundi*²⁸, a cliché that has been used over and over for propaganda-purposes. Solinus thus reproduces an old rhetorical propaganda tool, and yet his own worldview is markedly similar here to Pliny’s. He starts his narrative with the founding of Rome and its establishment as a world-power (I.1–54). He points out that the vast territory occupied by the Roman Empire is itself a sign of Rome’s special place and special role in the world-order²⁹.

It had been usual practice since the so-called annalists — 3rd/2nd century BC Roman historians distinguished by their characteristic dry and matter-of-fact narrative style — to start a history of Rome *ab Urbe condita*. Yet, Solinus says that it is no use going down a road so well-trodden by the annalists, and that he does not intend to blindly imitate their concise prose-style but use ‘rhetorical embellishments.’ Apart from style, the ethnogeographic substance of Solinus’ compilation is also markedly different from that of the annalists (despite the fact that he does indeed start his work “from the founding of the City”)³⁰, since it was not his intention to chronicle the history of Rome year by year as they did.

To sum up, in his introductory epistle Solinus states that 1. (a) His work is a short compilation, (b) its theme is ethnogeography, (c) it touches on a wide variety of

²⁵ “(1.7) In the same way as those, who endeavor to emulate the parts before they have made a beginning with the head: allow us also to take our start from the head of the world, that is from the city of Rome, although the best authors have left nothing that may be added to the praise thereof, and it is almost superfluous to go by a path which has so often been traversed. (1.8) Yet in order not to remain silent about it, I shall put all my effort into following its origin”.

²⁶ Cf. the commentary of Salmasius to this passage: *Linea in pictura, nihil aliud est quam penicilli ductus* [Salmasius 1689: fol. 4, col. 2 D].

²⁷ See, e. g., Plato. *Phaedr.* 264 c; *Gorg.* 503e–504 (cf. also Horat. *De arte poet.* 6–9).

²⁸ Cf. Liv. I.16.7 *caput orbis terrarum*; Luc. II.653–654: *caput mundi*; Verg. *Aen.* VI.851–853; CIL VI.29849a: *Roma caput mundi* etc.

²⁹ Cf. [Romer 2014: 78].

³⁰ For more information on the fundamental difference between Solinus’ picture of the world and the organization of space in comparison with the works of Pomponius Mela and Pliny the Elder, see [Brodersen 2013: 185–201].

topics. 2. (a) His sources are written works by ancient authors on whose authority he relies and does not intend to question, (b) his aim is to expand his readers' erudition and knowledge of ethnogeography, and not to criticize his sources. 3. (a) Solinus justifies his use of paradoxography by invoking the rhetorical aims of his works, (b) but he places the responsibility for the truthfulness of such stories firmly on his ancient sources. 4. What is different about Solinus' work is that he starts a geographical account (a description of the *oikoumene*) with a passage about Rome's founding and a short history of the Roman Empire.

As for Solinus' rhetorical devices, these include, but are not limited to, the use of synonyms and polysemy; special attention to the sound of words and phrases (he uses diminutives, assonance, rhymes etc.); the use of metaphors and juxtapositions of contrasting words. The latter may be due to an attempt on Solinus' part at a 'competition' (*aemulatio*) with ancient authors and their use of similar metaphorical expressions. Cf., e. g., *aurium clementia* "the clemency of your ears", *damnosa concinnitas* "unfortunate beauty of the style", *bratteas eloquentiae* "gold leaves of eloquence", *vestigia monetarum veteris* "the footsteps of ancient authors", lit. "of an ancient stamp", *antiquitatis diligentia* "the diligence of the ancients", *constantia veritatis* "the steadfastness of truth" (cf. [Lakoff, Dzihonsen 1990]).

The idea of a 'world-empire' first emerged and took hold during the Augustan age and soon became a useful ideological instrument and propaganda-tool for legitimizing the Principate and its rule (cf. [Galinski 2017]). In Solinus' time the territory inside the Empire's borders finally became an ordered geographical space with Rome at its center. His compilation covertly seeks to reinforce and consolidate in his readers' mind the already crumbling "Roman myth", which, in turn, served to strengthen the conservative ideology of the Empire.

References

- Bots, H. (2018). *De Republiek der Letteren. De Europese intellectuele wereld, 1500–1760*. Nijmegen: Vantilt. (In Dutch).
- Brodersen, K. (2013). Vom Periplus zur Karte. Die Leistung des Gaius Julius Solinus. In K. Geus, M. Rathmann (Eds.). *Die Vermessung der Oikumene*, 185–201. Berlin: De Gruyter. (Topoi: Berliner Studien der Alten Welt; 14). (In German).
- Brodersen, K. (Ed.) (2014a). *Gaius Iulius Solinus. Wunder der Welt*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. (In Latin and German).
- Brodersen, K. (Ed.) (2014b). *Solinus: New studies*. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike. (In English and Spanish).
- Brodersen, K. (2018). Barbaren bei Plinius der Älteren und seinem 'Aff'en' Solinus: vom Kulturbefragten zum geographischen Barbarenbegriff. In J. C. Bermejo Barrera, M. García Sánchez (Eds.). *Desmoi philías. Bonds of Friendship: Studies in Ancient history in honour of F. J. Fernández Nieto*, 87–94. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona. (In German).
- Curtius, E. R. (1948). *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern: A. Francke. (In German).
- Fernández Nieto, F. J. (Ed.) (2001). *Solino. Colección de hechos memorables o El erudito*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, B. C. G. (In Latin and Spanish).
- Fitzgerald, W. (2016). *Variety: The life of a Roman concept*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

- Formisano, M. (2007). Towards an aesthetic paradigm of Late Antiquity. *Antiquité Tardive*, 15, 277–284.
- Galinsky, K. (2017). Avgustovskaia literatura i avgustovskaia “ideologiya”: peresmotr otsenok [Augustan literature and Augustan “ideology”: An ongoing reassessment]. M. V. Shumilin (Trans.). *Shagi/Steps*, 3(4), 151–167. (In Russian).
- Gasparov, M. L. (1972). Tsitseron i antichnaia ritorika [Cicero and the ancient rhetoric]. In M. L. Gasparov (Ed.). *Mark Tullii Tsitseron. Tri traktata ob oratorskom iskusstve* [Marcus Tullius Cicero. Three essays on the eloquence]. F. A. Petrovskii, I. P. Strel'nikova, M. L. Gasparov (Trans.), 7–74. Moscow: Nauka. (In Russian).
- Herkommer, E. (1968). *Die Topoi in der Proömien der römischen Geschichtswerke*. Tübingen: Verlag Universität Tübingen. (In German).
- Ilyushechkina, E. V. (2001). Vstuplenie k “Atticheskim nocham” Avla Gelliia [Preface to *Noctes Atticae* by Aulus Gellius]. In *Problemy istorii, filologii, kul'tury* [Problems of history, philology, culture], 10, 78–89. (In Russian).
- Janson, T. (1964). *Latin prose prefaces: Studies in literary conventions*. Stockholm; Göteborg: Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell. (Studia Latina Stockholmensia; 13).
- Lakoff, G., Dzonsen, M. (1990). Metafori, kotorymi my zhivem [Trans. from Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press]. In N. D. Arutyunova, M. A. Zhurinskaya (Eds.). *Teoriia metafori* [Theory of metaphor], 387–415. Moscow: Nauka. (In Russian).
- Lausberg, H. (1990). *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. (In German).
- Milham, M. E. (1986). C. Julius Solinus. In F. E. Cranz et al. (Eds.). *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum. Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries* (Vol. 6), 73–85. Washington: Brepols Publishers.
- Moles, J. (1993). Livy's Preface. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 39, 141–168.
- Mommsen, Th. (Ed.) (1864, 2nd ed. 1895). *C. Iulii Solini Collectanea rerum memorabilium*. Berlin: In aedibus Friderici Nicolai (G. Parthey). (In Latin).
- Nicolaïdis, A. (1988). Comparative remarks on the prologues of Roman historians. *Ariadne*, 4, 31–60.
- Pavlock, B. (2014). Paradox and the journey in the dedicatory preface of Solinus' *Collectanea*. In K. Brodersen (Ed.) (2014). *Solinus: New studies*, 24–31. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike.
- Romer, F. E. (2014). Reading the myth(s) of Empire: Paradoxography and geographic writing in the *Collectanea*. In K. Brodersen (Ed.) (2014). *Solinus: New studies*, 75–89. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike.
- Salmasius, Cl. (1629). *Claudii Salmasii Plinianae exercitationes in Caji Iulii Solini Polyhistora: Item Caji Iulii Solini Polyhistor ex veteribus libris emendatus. Accesserunt huic editioni De homonymis hyles Iatricae exercitationes antehac ineditae, nec non De manna et saccharo*. Lutetiae Parisiorum: Apud Morellum Typographum Regium. 2nd ed.: Trajecti ad Rhenum: Apud Johannem van de Water, 1689. (In Latin).
- Santini, C. (1998). La lettera praefatoria di Giulio Solino. In C. Santini, N. Scivoletto (Eds.). *Prefazioni, prologhi, proemi di opera tecnico-scientifiche latine* (Vol. 3), 33–49. Roma. (In Italian).
- Talbert, R. J. A. (2010). *Rome's world: The Peutinger map reconsidered*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- van Miert, D. K. W. (2011). Joseph Scaliger, Claude Saumaise, Isaac Casaubon, and the discovery of the *Palatine Anthology*. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 74, 241–261.

von Martels, Z. (2014). Turning the tables on Solinus' critics: The unity of contents and form of the *Polyhistor*. In K. Brodersen (Ed.). *Solinus: New studies*, 10–23. Wiesbaden: Verlag Antike.

Walter, H. (1969). *Die "Collectanea rerum memorabilium" des C. Julius Solinus. Ihre Entstehung und die Echtheit ihrer Zweitfassung*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag. (Hermes Einzelschriften; 22). (In German).

* * *

Информация об авторе

Екатерина Викторовна Илюшечкина

канд. ист. наук, PhD

доцент, старший научный сотрудник,

Лаборатория античной культуры,

Школа актуальных гуманитарных

исследований, Российская академия

народного хозяйства и государственной

службы при Президенте РФ

Россия, 119571, Москва, пр-т

Вернадского, 82

Тел.: +7 (499) 956-96-47

доцент, кафедра классической

филологии, Институт восточных

культур и античности, Российский

государственный гуманитарный

университет

Россия, 125993, Москва, ГСП-3, Миусская

площадь, д. 6, корп. 1

Тел.: +7 (495) 250-69-38

✉ ilyushechkinae@gmail.com

Information about the author

Ekaterina V. Ilyushechkina

Cand. Sci. (History), PhD

Associate Professor, Senior Researcher,

Laboratory of Classical Culture

School of Advanced Studies in the

Humanities,

The Russian Presidential Academy

of National Economy and Public

Administration

Russia, 119571, Moscow, Prospekt

Vernadskogo, 82

Tel.: +7 (499) 956-96-47

Associate Professor, Institute for Oriental

and Classical Studies Department

of Classical Philology,

Russian State University for Humanities

Russia, 125993, Moscow, GSP-3, Miusskaya

Sq., 6, Corp. 1

Tel.: +7 (495) 250-69-38

✉ ilyushechkinae@gmail.com

A. E. Kuznetsov^{ab}

ORCID: 0000-0003-4541-1498

✉ recubanssub@googlemail.com

^a Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова
(Россия, Москва)

^b Свободный университет Берлина (Германия, Берлин)

TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE WORLD SPACE: FROM PLINY'S *NATURAL HISTORY* TO THE *COLLECTANEA RERUM MEMORABILUM* OF C. JULIUS SOLINUS AND THE POEM *DE MIRABILIBUS* OF THEODERICUS

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются два последовательно сделанных сокращения «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего: «Собрание достопамятных вещей» Гая Юлия Солина и средневековое сокращение Солина, сделанное в стихах неким Теодериком. Основное внимание уделяется той части «Collectanea», в которой дается географический упорядоченный обзор Экумены, соответствующий книгам 3–6 Плиния. Географическая часть представляет особый интерес для понимания поэмы Теодерика. Анализ структуры текста позволяет выявить глубинные различия между исследуемыми авторами. Эти различия могут быть интерпретированы как изменения глобальных представлений о мировом географическом пространстве. Для Солина большой мировой континуум был основой для упорядочения почерпнутого у Плиния энциклопедического материала, который у Солина структурирован наподобие современной базы данных. Эта структура названа в статье ветвящимся каталогом. В отличие от Солина, Теодерик полностью утратил идею Мирового континуума. Он не упоминает большую часть географических названий, и названия больших областей за редкими исключениями опущены. При этом он демонстрирует непоследовательную тенденцию сводить сведения, взятые у Солина, к тематическим блокам. В целом Теодерик имел смутное представление о том, как устроен мир в географическом пространстве, поэтому он не мог распознать явные ошибки в в своем экземпляре сочинения Солина, которые могли затронуть связность географического континуума. Пренебрежение географическим пространством можно объяснить тем, что поэма, вероятно, создавалась как многоуровневая аллегория, в которой географическая локализация не имела существенного значения.

Ключевые слова: античная география, средневековая география, диахрония пространств, пространство в литературе, критика текста, бестиарии, монстры в литературе, средневековая поэзия, Плиний Старший, Гай Юлий Солин

Для цитирования: Kuznetsov A. E. Transformations of the world space: From Pliny's *Natural History* to the *Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium* of C. Julius Solinus and the poem *De Mirabilibus* of Theodericus // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 113–145. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-113-145.

Статья поступила в редакцию 8 октября 2019 г.

Принято к печати 3 декабря 2019 г.

Shagi / Steps. Vol. 6. No. 1. 2020

Articles

A. E. Kuznetsov ^{ab}

ORCID: 0000-0003-4541-1498

✉ recubanssub@googlemail.com

^a Lomonosov Moscow State University (Russia, Moscow)

^b Free University of Berlin (Germany, Berlin)

TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE WORLD SPACE: FROM PLINY'S *NATURAL HISTORY* TO THE *COLLECTANEA RERUM MEMORABILIMUM* OF C. JULIUS SOLINUS AND THE POEM *DE MIRABILIBUS* OF THEODERICUS

Abstract. Two successive abridgements of Pliny's *Natural History* are discussed in the paper: the *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* by C. Julius Solinus and a medieval abridgement of Solinus, made in verse by a certain Theodericus. The main attention is paid to the biggest part of the *Collectanea* which gives a geographical account of the Universe corresponding to Pliny's Books 3–6. The geographical part of the *Collectanea* is of particular interest for understanding the poem of Theodericus. An analysis of the text structures reveals deep differences between the studied authors. These differences can be interpreted as changes in global concepts of the World geographic space. For Solinus, the large World space was a basis for arranging the encyclopedic material drawn from Pliny, and he created a universal continuum of information that looks somewhat similar to the modern data-base structure: I call it the ramifying catalogue. In contrast to Solinus, Theodericus completely lost the idea of a World continuum. Theodericus does not mention the greater part of the geographical names, and names of large regions are all omitted, save for a few exceptions. Theodericus, however, shows a tendency to reduce the matter of the *Collectanea* to thematic units. Since Theodericus had but a very vague idea of how the World was arranged in geographical space, he could not recognize evident scribal errors of his copy of Solinus' work which affected the coherence of the geographical continuum. A neglect of the geographical space can be explained by the fact that the poem was probably intended to be read as a multilevel allegory where geographical localization would be of little importance.

Keywords: ancient geography, medieval geography, diachrony of space, space in literature, textual criticism, bestiary, monsters in literature, medieval poetry, Pliny the Elder, C. Julius Solinus

To cite this article: Kuznetsov, A. E. (2020). Transformations of the world space: From Pliny's *Natural History* to the *Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium* of C. Julius Solinus and the poem *De Mirabilibus* of Theodericus. *Shagi / Steps*, 6(1), 113–145. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-113-145.

Received October 8, 2019

Accepted December 3, 2019

1. Theodericus and his poem

A poet who called himself *Theodericus* composed a versified paraphrase of the *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* of C. Julius Solinus¹. The poem has no title, and I shall call it *De mirabilibus*². It is composed in 1186 leonine hexameters which are irreproachable from the point of view of quantitative prosody.

The best, and eventually the only reliable manuscript of *De mirabilibus* is the Codex Bruxellensis Regius BR 10615–729³, which was written in Trier in the third quarter of the 12th century, but it is impossible to determine the distance in space and time that lay between this earliest copy and the original autograph. The manuscripts of *De mirabilibus* contain two other leonine poems that may have been composed

¹ Solinus' work exists in two versions. The earlier one is preserved in manuscripts defined by Mommsen [1895] as the first class. The earlier version is accompanied by a dedicatory letter where no title of the work is mentioned. The later version is found in manuscripts of the third class which contain a new dedicatory letter with the statement that the old title *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* should be suppressed, and the corrected work is to be called *Polyhistor* (p. 217, 17–21 Mommsen). The later version contains a few additions. Manuscripts of the second class have the same dedicatory letter as the first class, but they contain additions, often in common with the third class. Mommsen was convinced that the later version had been a work of an unknown grammarian [Ibid.: lxxxviii]. Against Mommsen's authority Peter L. Schmidt has argued that the second version can be considered a genuine work by Solinus [Schmidt 1995]. The problem of two versions is too large and complex to discuss here; suffice it to say that Theodericus used a manuscript of the second class (§ 10 below). It is important, however, to keep in mind that the text published by Mommsen was arranged as an edition of the 'non-interpolated' first version, and a critical text of the second version to date has never been edited. For Mommsen did not distinguish between genuine additions of the corrected version and interpolations that appear in different mss. Selected additions of the third and second classes were printed by Mommsen separately, without the apparatus, under the title *Codicum classium secundae et tertiae additamenta potiora* [Mommsen 1895: 217–221]. The *Collectanea* were first printed in 1474 (GW M42824) with the preface of the first version. See [Schmidt 1995; Brodersen 2011; 2014] for a reliable bibliography on Solinus, and [Dover 2013] for the Renaissance reception.

² The poem has never been fully edited, and this paper is based on — still unpublished — critical edition prepared by Prof. Dr. Rainer Jakobi (Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg) and the author of this paper.

³ Manuscripts of the poem were listed by Mommsen in his edition of Solinus [Mommsen 1895: liii]. For the Codex Bruxellensis see [Kaffarnik 2011; Verweij 2015]. Besides *De mirabilibus*, the manuscript contains other large poetic compositions datable to the 11th — early 12th cent.: a poem on the First Crusade by Gelo Parisiensis and the most full copy of the *Carmen de Hastingae Proelio*. The entire manuscript was first described by Frédéric baron de Reiffenberg [1841]; he, and later Manitius, published some excerpts from the poem [Ibid.: 258–262; Manitius 1913: 160–162].

by Theodericus: a description of the Tower of the Winds in Athens (from Vitruvius 1.6), and an Elegy on the death of Theodericus' dog (incipit *flete canes*⁴). We cannot be sure about the authorship of these two works, but the author of the Elegy, if he was not Theodericus himself, must have known him personally. In the Elegy, a line from the *Liber decem capitulorum* of Marbode of Rennes (written after 1096) is quoted almost literally:

<i>Flete canes</i> , 57	<i>Morte sua vitam seruaverat ille poetę</i> (his death saved the life of the poet)
Marbodus, <i>Decem capitula</i> , 4,114:	<i>Morte sua vitam regis servasse mariti</i> (her death saved the life of her spouse king)

This suggests that the floruit of Theodericus is likely to be dated back to the late 11th — early 12th century.

A part of *De mirabilibus* (vv. 974–1093) is copied without the name of the author in a Vienna manuscript that contains a collection of geographical works (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 507, 13th cent.). The Vienna excerpt is entitled *De monstris Indię*. Christian Hünemörder, who first published the Vienna fragment, failed to identify it with the selections from *De mirabilibus*, by then published [Hünemörder 1976: 271]. Hünemörder, however, has argued from textual evidence that the poet of *De monstris Indię* had drawn on the treatise *Imago Mundi* by Honorius Augustodunensis. The Vienna extract has been identified as Theodericus' work by Rainer Jakobi [2002]. Since the first version of *Imago Mundi* was finished in 1110 [Flint 1982: 40], and, in turn, *De mirabilibus* was abridged by an unknown poet called *Ovidius* some time before 1140⁵, Jakobi has concluded that the *De mirabilibus* was composed ca. 1120 [2002: 250]. It is a plausible assumption that a poetic work like the *De mirabilibus* is secondary to a prose composition on the same subject, if both are textually related to one another. But the true relation between the texts in question is difficult to establish, and inverse borrowing from Theodericus to Honorius cannot be excluded, in which case the date of Theodericus would be moved back the late 11th century. Further consideration of this problem would require a detailed comparison of the two works that exceeds the scope of the present paper.

The poem itself contains almost nothing about Theodericus. We learn that he had a friend named *Stephanus* who encouraged him to finish *De mirabilibus*, and the Elegy states that the above mentioned dog was called *Pitulus*. These facts do not allow to draw any conclusions. The name *Theodericus* was very popular, and suggested identifications with known historical persons can only be regarded as highly uncertain⁶.

It is not easy to establish the genre of *De mirabilibus* more precisely than *Lehrgedicht*. In this paper I shall argue that Theodericus did not arrange his poem according to any principle of composition, as it was done in *Imago Mundi*, or in a Carolingian treatise, *Liber monstrorum de diversis generibus* [Haupt 1876], so it is not likely that Theodericus intended to compose an encyclopedic work.

⁴ Text: [Manitius 1914: 161–163; Ziolkowski, Putnam 2008: 481–485].

⁵ 'Ovidius' was described and edited by [James 1913]. Jakoby has convincingly demonstrated that 'Ovidius' depends on Theodericus [Jakobi 2002: 249].

⁶ The most widely accepted attribution is Thierry, the Abbot of St. Trond [Manitius 1913: 160], but Thierry died in 1107. The relation between *De mirabilibus* and *Imago mundi* is thus of crucial importance for identification of revealing the personality of Theodericus.

2. Solinus: The structure of the universe, and the place of Rome in the World

Before we consider the abridgement, we need to consider its source, Solinus, whose work was itself an abridgement of *Natural History*, and we should always have Pliny in mind when studying his descendants, Solinus and Theodericus.

The *Collectanea* are divided into three parts. In the first one, Solinus narrates different stories referring to the foundation of Rome, and recounts at length the history of the Roman calendar until the calendar reform carried out by Augustus (Sol. 1.34–47 p. 9, 9–11, 22 Mommsen). Here Solinus drew largely on non-Plinian sources. The first part ends with a short discussion on Augustus (*calamitiosior an beator fuerit*, Sol. 1.48–49 11, 23–12, 13 M → Plin. 7.145–150). The second part, in which the human being is dealt with, is based largely on the Book 7 of *Natural History*. This section contains, among other themes, a vast list of examples of Roman military fortitude, and catalogues of persons who became famous due to their moral virtues or eloquence (Sol. 1.102–127 26, 6–31, 5 M). Those people are in large part Roman too.

The third part is the biggest one. It gives a geographical account of the Universe corresponding to Pliny's Books 3–6. In this paper, I shall deal mainly with the geographical part of the *Collectanea*, because it is of particular interest for understanding Theodericus.

A relatively short treatise by Solinus and an even shorter poem by Theodericus still inherited from Pliny a feature of fundamental importance: the abridgments sought to offer a picture of the Universe. Pliny's Universe was essentially the Roman Universe, and this leads us to the question of how Rome is represented in the *Historia Naturalis*. Pliny gives a short description of Rome in the section on Italy (Plin. 3.66–67), but Rome of the *Historia Naturalis* was more than an item of a geographical catalogue, she was even more than the political center of a great empire. Rome was the unifying power of the World which gained dominance over an immense mass of individual phenomena, and created from that mass an actual, visible and palpable, universal nature⁷. Rare and marvelous things had a particular importance for this cosmological system, because the Roman state absorbed natural and artificial *mirabilia* from every part of the World, and the City of Rome became a large depository of those signs of power⁸. Pliny usually finds it necessary to tell when an exotic creature became first known and seen in Rome, adding the names of magistrates in charge of the show, and this makes the *Historia Naturalis* similar to an inventory of an everlasting triumphal procession, *triumphus ex mundo*, as one may call it. Eventually, historical triumphs are frequently mentioned by Pliny throughout his Encyclopedia⁹, and they often give an occasion to introduce various notable facts and items, e. g., L. Caecilius Metellus 'led many elephants' in his

⁷ Before Pliny, Ovid declared that Rome became equated with the World, *Fasti* 1, 85: *Iuppiter arce sua totum cum spectet in orbem, | nil nisi Romanum quod tueatur habet* (When from his citadel Jupiter looks abroad on the whole globe, naught but the Roman empire meets his eye) (trans. by Frazer); see [Woodart 2006: 254–249] for the deep religious background of this idea.

⁸ The *mirabilia* are recognized as an important part of the 'imperialistic' ideology of the *Natural history* [Naas 2011]. This aspect of the Roman attitude towards *mirabilia* recently has been studied, largely on the basis of the *Natural History*, in [Rutledge 2012].

⁹ See [Murphy 2004: 154–160] on the importance of triumphs for Pliny.

triumph in 250 BCE (Plin. 7.139), or the inhabitants of the land of *Garamantes* are numerated in an inventory of people and cities whose ‘names and pictures’ (*nomina ac simulacra*) were shown in a triumph of L. Cornelius Balbus in 19 BCE (Plin. 5.37). Solinus preserves some of those statements¹⁰.

The Roman element is not only present in the *Collectanea*, but is even expanded in some points. Nonetheless, it is impossible to state that Solinus inherited from Pliny the idea of Rome as the center of power which dominated over the Universe. The first part of the *Collectanea* does include a vast discourse on the Roman past compiled largely from non-Plinian sources, but non-Plinian interpolations do not necessarily attest a particular interest in Rome, since they are found in other parts of the *Collectanea*, where Solinus speaks about the origins and history of other lands and nations. It will be enough to mention the excurses about Thracia (Sol. 8.3–7 61,19–62,11 M), Macedonia (Sol. 9.4–21 63,12–66,20 M), Carthage (Sol. 27.9–12 117,7–17 M), and the fabulous empire of Cilicia (Sol. 38.1–6 161,3–162,9 M), which are likely to reflect the idea of succession of world-empires¹¹. None of these interpolations are written from the point of view of Roman dominance, and Solinus might be similar in this regard to Pompeius Trogus¹².

Solinus begins the geographical part with a long antiquarian discourse on the origins of Italian cities (2.2–18 31,9–36,8 M). He mentions *Saturnia* and *Ianiculum* (p. 32,1–2 M), but he does not mention Rome. It is reasonable to suggest that Solinus did not want to repeat what he had said about Rome in the initial chapters. The paradox is that Rome totally falls out from the geographical account of Italy, and, throughout the whole geographical part of the *Collectanea*, she is merely mentioned occasionally. It is worth observing that Carthage is treated in a similar way: Solinus says in the historical excursus, referred to above, that restored Carthage became ‘the next after Rome splendour of the World’ (*alterum post urbem Romam terrarum decus*, 117,7 M), nonetheless, the great city is omitted from the description of Africa, and, in the whole geographical part, no more than two accidental mentions are found: one emerges in a narration about the tomb of Hannibal in Libyssa (172,7 M), another in a story concerning the monstrous creatures (probably gorillas) captured by Hanno (211,5 M) [McDermott 1938: 51–55]. The mentions of Rome are more frequent¹³, but they are equally accidental.

The presence of Rome in the world described by Solinus is significantly reduced compared to *Natural History*. On the other hand, stories about Rome are densely concentrated in the initial chapters of the *Collectanea*, wholly or mainly devoted to

¹⁰ Sol. 27.22 120,15 M: *Scaevola* and *leones*; 30.20 133,17 M: *Caesar* and *camelopardis*; 30.21 134,3 M: *Pompeius* and *rhinoceros*; 32.31 145,6–7 M: *Scaurus* and *hippopotami* and *crocodili*; 34.1 153,13 M: *Scaurus* and bones of a sea-monster (§ 7 below); 52.52 193,3 M: *Pompeius* and the *hebenus* wood; 53.30 201,7 M: large pearls were introduced in the time of Sulla. Pliny, however, does not state explicitly that *Numidici ursi* were first shown in a great spectacle arranged by L. Domitius Ahenobarbus on 17 Sept. 61 BCE: Sol. 26.10 115,13 M → Plin. 8.131.

¹¹ Sol. 8.3–7 61,19–62,11 M; Sol. 9.4–21 63,12–66,20 M; Sol. 27.9–12 117,7–17 M. From the large literature on the succession of world-empires [Ramosino 2005] is of particular importance in the Plinian context.

¹² Solinus gives only one direct reference to Pompeius Trogus, and it is borrowed from Pliny: Sol. 1.51 12,19 M → Plin. 7.33. [Seel 1982] remains the most lucid discussion of the universalism of Pompeius Trogus.

¹³ According to the index of Mommsen’s edition, there are about 20 occurrences of *Roma*, *Romanus* and *Romani* in the geographical part of the *Collectanea*.

Roman history. This may suggest that the idea of Rome as the Universe was still shared by Solinus, but it was being moved toward a purely historical level, and Rome was associated with the past, rather than with the actually dominating cosmic power.

This approach to Rome is announced in the first version of the Preface: Solinus calls Rome 'the head of the World' (*caput orbis*, *Praef.*, 5 2,18 M), and claims that with Rome he will begin his *compendium*. Yet, states Solinus, 'the most learned writers' left nothing untouched that could be spoken about as a new matter. Solinus does not want to repeat what was said in many old books, but he equally refuses to drop Rome altogether. The solution will be to write about the origins of Rome as reliably as possible (*Praef.*, 7). Solinus carried out this program in good faith, and the chapters devoted to the early history of Rome appear to be the most original and non-Plinian part of the *Collectanea*.

A similar *recusatio* is used to introduce the description of Italy in the geographical part, and this section is filled mainly with antiquarian excurses mentioned above, but, as far as real information is concerned (2.19–50), Italy appears to be one of the most strictly compressed chapters of the *Collectanea*.

3. Solinus: A disposition of the World

The geographical part of the *Collectanea* is relatively large, but it covers only four books of *Natural History*. Solinus¹⁴, however, did not ignore the immense treasures of learning collected by Pliny in other books. He transformed Pliny's great encyclopedia into a short world-wide itinerary, and arranged geographically all the diversity of natural and human phenomena gathered from Pliny.

Solinus divided the world into large regions which are further described in the form of catalogues of smaller areas and geographical or chorographical objects, such as rivers and mountains. Each region is represented as an imaginary route through local areas, and, except for few breaks, all content of geographical chapters forms a continuous movement from Italy to the ultimate Eastern shores of Oecumene, and back through India to the Atlantic shore, where *Canaria* islands are the last point of Solinus' geographical discourse (see *Appendix II* to this paper)¹⁵.

Though the greater part of the World described in the *Collectanea* could never be visited by the Romans or the Greeks, Solinus steadily used expressions of route and travel to describe transgressions from one region or area to another, e. g. 46.4 177,16 M: *hos terrarum ductus excepit Media* 'these movement of countries is picked up by Media'. In these points, Solinus sometimes speaks metaphorically about the travel of his 'pen'¹⁶, e. g.: 3.1 44,13 M; *flectendus hinc stilus est: terrarum vocant aliae...* (here the pen must change the way, for other lands call us); 33.44

¹⁴ I presume that Solinus relied directly on the *Natural History*, and that he was entirely responsible for the composition and content of the *Collectanea*; see [Brodersen 2011: 71] on Mommsen's theory of intermediate sources.

¹⁵ Klauss Geus has recently demonstrated that a geographical arrangement is employed in the *Paradoxographus Vaticanus* as a 'secondary principle' subordinated to the thematic disposition [Geus 2016].

¹⁶ Solinus could borrow the metaphor of journey from Pliny [Pavlock 2014], but for the Romans the linear route-pattern (called 'hodological' by Pietri Janni [1984]) probably was the most common way of representing geographical space. See the survey of this problem in [Talbert 2008].

147,13 M: *nunc ab Aegypto provehamus stilum* (now we are to carry the pen forward from Egypt); 56.4 206,3 M: *tempus ad Oceani oras reverti, represso in Aethiopiam stilo* (now it is time to return [from Babylonia] to the shores of the Ocean, after I shall hold my pen back to Ethiopia).

Solinus followed *Natural History* in distributing lands and regions throughout his catalogue with the exception of a few important shifts¹⁷. Still, the content of the geographical sections of the *Collectanea* differs significantly from *Natural History*.

Solinus used names of places as cells in which non-geographical items, such as animals, plants, stones, and exotic tribes, were located. Subordinated items can serve as host-entries at a lower level.

It is important to notice that connections established by Solinus between low level non-geographical units and their geographical host-entries are often arbitrary: hosts are not necessarily associated with subordinated items either in the natural order, or in *Natural History*. When Solinus seeks to create a general account of a creature which is not tied to a narrow geographical area (such as dolphins or bears, discussed below), he still gives a geographical localization.

Here I shall consider some examples that will further be helpful in understanding Theodericus.

Solinus says that the Propontis is particularly rich in dolphins, and this statement hosts a large collection of facts and stories about dolphins borrowed from Pliny (Sol. 12.3–12 78,3–80,6 M → Plin. 9.20–9.32). None of those items are located in the Propontis by Pliny, who in his section on dolphins does not mention the Propontis or Hellespont at all.

Similarly, Solinus anchored a survey of elephants (Sol. 25.2–15 111,3–113,15 M) to the description of Tingitana in Mauretania. Pliny does state (5.18) that the province of Tingitana produces elephants, but the section on elephants belongs to another book of *Natural History* (Plin. 8.1–44).

In the chapter on bears, Pliny remembered the famous show of Numidian bears produced by Domitius Ahenobarbus (n. 9 above). This geographical reference allowed Solinus to put an entire Plinian chapter on bears under the host-entry Numidia (Sol. 26.3–10 114,11–115,16 M → Plin. 8.126–131), though the information about bears provided by Pliny had nothing to do with that land (Pliny mentioned the bear when discussing hibernating animals). Moreover, Pliny doubted whether the Numidian bear existed altogether, ‘because it is well known that there are no bears in Africa’. This phrase is, of course, omitted by Solinus, who went even further in manipulating his source text, so that he began the section on bears with a bold statement: *Numidici ursi ceteris praestant rabie dumtaxat et villis profundioribus* (Numidian bears surpass the others in ferocity, and, at least, in thicker fur)¹⁸.

While Pliny often puts information related to some item into different thematic parts of *Natural History*, Solinus accumulates it under one and the same host-entry. He thus interpolates into the section on bears an observation about how those beasts treated themselves for mandragora poisoning (Sol. 26.8 115,8–10M → Plin. 8.101).

¹⁷ Brodersen has argued that the arrangement of geographical matter in the *Collectanea* changed from the linear, largely litoral, pattern typical for Pliny and Pomponius Mella to a description of areas [Brodersen 2011: 72–86].

¹⁸ The phrase is wrongly marked as borrowed from Plin. 8.131 in Mommsen's edition.

A more complicated instance of contamination involves precious stones. In the book on mineralogy, Pliny created a large alphabetical list of stones which begins with the *achates*. He further mentioned different names and local varieties of the *achates* (37.139–142).

Solinus inserted this section into a description of Sicily, because the river *Achates* is situated there. The whole list of varieties of *achates* stones was transferred to that head-entry, though it contained the names of Crete, India and Cyprus, all of which were preserved by Solinus (Sol. 5.25–27). Solinus also added the description of a famous ring made of *achates*: he took this from another part of Book 37 of *Natural History* (Plin. 37.5).

Solinus returns to the theme of precious stones in the section on Mesopotamia (Sol. 37.7 sqq.), where a catalogue of gems is divided between four geographical entries which follow the movement from the upper reaches of Euphrates to the Persian Gulf: *Euphrates*, *Chaldaei*, *Parthi*, *Persis*. Stones mentioned here are in large part hosted by the entry *Persis*. This disorderly collection of minerals is gathered from different catalogues which Pliny included in Book 37, but the four hosting geographical entries are gathered directly from the alphabetical list of stones mentioned above. In the alphabetical list, Solinus found stones whose places of origin were occasionally referred to by Pliny:

mitrax (*mithridax*, Solinus) — *Persis* (Plin. 37.173) *sagada* — *Chaldaei* (Plin. 37.181); *zamilampis* — *Euphrates* (Plin. 37.189).

The location of *myrrhitis* in Parthia (*myrrhites*, Plin. 37.174) is transferred from another place in *Natural History*, where *myrrhina* is mentioned, Plin. 37.21:

oriens myrrhina mittit. inveniuntur ibi pluribus locis ... nec insignibus, maxime Parthici regni (the Orient produces myrrhina, where it is found in numerous places..., especially in the Empire of the Persians).

Here, Solinus failed to recognize that *myrrhina* (fluorspar, fluorite, blue John [Healy 1999: 228–235]), and *myrrhites* (a kind of bitumen) reported by Pliny were different minerals.

Pliny treated a geographical localization as non-obligatory information added to a few items of the catalogue of stones:

List of stones → *sagada* → *Chaldaei*

This subordination was inverted by Solinus:

List of areas → *Chaldaei* → *sagada*

Solinus follows the same approach in non-geographical sections as well. Pliny provides a list of enormously strong men (Plin. 7.81–83), among whom the famous Olympic victor Milo of Croton is mentioned. Solinus abridged this section (Sol. 1.75–77), but he found it necessary to attach the stone *alectoria* to the note on Milo, because Milo had used this stone to strengthen his body. As in the case of *achates*, Solinus inverted the order of items. For he found the *alectoria* in the same alphabetical list of stones (Plin. 37.144) where Pliny mentions Milo as an item of additional remarkable information:

Pliny: *stones* → *alectoria* → *Milo*
 Solinus: *strong men* → *Milo* → *alectoria*

The same approach is followed with regard to non-Plinian sources. From Book 4 of *Natural History* Solinus received the statement that the Borysthenes originated in the Land of the Neuri (Sol. 15.1 82,5 M → Plin. 4.88). Mention of the Neuri hosts a series of excerpts about peoples of Scythia from Pomponius Mela (2.1, 6–14), and other interpolations on the same matter collected from Pliny. This block of interpolations ends with a description of the *Albani* gathered from two different books of *Natural History* (Sol. 15.5 83,3 M → Plin. 6.38; 7.12). From here Solinus moves to that point of Book 8 where Albanian dogs are described (Sol. 15.6 83,7 M → Plin. 8.149). Further on, the entry about Albanian dogs hosts a collection of items about dogs taken from Book 8, but in *Natural History* they all precede the Albanian dogs (Plin. 8.142–148). Although the composition of this section is very complicated, it is clear that the Plinian text served as a substratum for all those interpolations.

Similarly, one of the great routes of the *Collectanea* begins with an overview of the Black Sea, proceeds to the Caspian region, and ends with the description of tigers and panthers that dwell in Hyrcania (Sol. 17.4–17.11 90,8 M–91,19 M). The last section is taken from Plin. 8.43–101. Here, Solinus inserts the second description of the Pontus and the Caspian region, which is borrowed from Books 4 and 6, and leads as far as the eastern borders of *Germania*. At the end of this section, however, Solinus returns to Book 8, almost at the same point where he has left it in Hyrcania, and describes the animals of Scythia (19.9–18 94,3 M–95,14 M → Plin. 8.101–120).

4. Solinus: A ramifying catalogue and patterns of memory

Solinus had to do meticulous and arduous work in order to rearrange the mass of names and facts he gathered from *Natural History*. As a result, he created a universal continuum of information that looks somewhat similar to a modern database structure. This structure, which may be called a ramifying catalogue, has a clear internal logic, and is likely to have been created with mnemonic purpose as a response to enormous size of *Natural History*.

Solinus' ramifying catalogue is indeed similar to the technique of topical memory first described by the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (3.30–32), and later by Cicero (*De Oratore* 2.351–358) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 11.2, 17–22)¹⁹. The use of topical memory is likely to have been widely practiced in rhetorical schools. One should find a continuum full of remarkable 'places', and then 'put' in those places ideas to be remembered. So Cicero says, *De Oratore*: 2.354:

itaque eis, qui hanc partem ingeni exercerent, locos esse capiendos et ea, quae memoria tenere vellent effingenda animo atque in eis locis conlocanda; sic fore, ut ordinem rerum locorum ordo conservaret, res autem ipsas rerum effigies notaret atque ut locis pro cera, simulacris pro

¹⁹ Visual and topical memory has been discussed in detail by [Elsner, Squire 2016].

litteris uteremur (... persons desiring to train this faculty [i. e. memory] must select localities and form mental mages of the facts they wish to remember and store those images in the localities, with the result that the arrangement of the localities will preserve the order of the facts, and images of the facts will designate the facts themselves, and we shall employ the localities and images respectively as a wax writing tablet and the letters written on it — trans. by Sutton and Rackham).

Topical memory relies on visualization, and exploits visual memory to deal with invisible things; visualized mental objects require a visible space²⁰, a substratum for places of memory. This large spatial continuum contains a number of smaller ‘places’ disposed in a clear order: Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.2,18, recommends a big house with many inner rooms, but public buildings, and even pictures, and imaginary objects can also be used (*Inst.* 11.2,21). Each individual item to be remembered is stored in a place, such as a room, while a large continuum, such as a house, preserves the order of items. What is particularly important is that the recollection of individual items implies an imaginary movement from one place to another following the disposition of a large substratum space. Quintilian gives examples of ‘a long journey’, and ‘a walk through a city’ (*in itinere longo et urbium ambitu*, 11.2).

Topical memory needs a continuum, which itself must be visualized, such as those mentioned by Quintilian. In the case of the *Collectanea*, an obvious suggestion would be that Solinus used a global map which allowed him to construct an extremely complex, and in general consistent system of routes and geographical areas. In terms of the recommendations made by Quintilian, a map can be considered a kind of picture, maybe an imaginary one.

Though perhaps unexpected, this suggestion is not new: after having summarized Solinus’ innovations in managing the large-scale geographical material, Brodersen allowed the possibility that, unlike the ‘mapless’ Pliny and Pomponius Mela, “Solinus or his readers” might use a map [Brodersen 2011: 87].

Could Solinus use a world map as a wax tablet of memory?

A definite answer is impossible, but two further problems arise from this question.

The technique of topical memory appeals mainly to personal experience. Quintilian, however, speaks about a private house as a preferable locus of memory, and we know, that the Roman house had a standard plan, and this was also true of public buildings and the planning of ordinary Roman towns. Pictures mentioned by Quintilian could be understood as copies of well-known works of famous painters. It seems likely that objects with more or less uniform structure were used in rhetorical schools during the training of topical memory. Presumed world-maps are very ambivalent in this context. They existed in the 3rd–4th centuries when Solinus was

²⁰ This point is duly stressed by Cicero, *De oratore* 2, 357–358: *ut res caecas et ab aspectus iudicio remotas conformatio quaedam et imago et figura ita notaret, ut ea, quae cogitando complecti vix possemus, intuendo quasi teneremus. His autem formis atque corporibus, sicut omnibus, quae sub aspectum veniunt, [...] sede opus est ...* (things not seen and not lying in the field of visual discernment are earmarked by a sort of outline and image and shape so that we keep hold of as it were by an act of sight things that we can scarcely embrace by an act of thought. But these forms and things, like all the things that come under our view require an abode... — trans. by Sutton and Rackham).

active²¹, and they must have been uniform, as far as the disposition of the main geographical regions and areas is concerned. But large maps were rare, so if Solinus could use a map as a substratum image, he could hardly appeal to a wide reading public. Meanwhile, a reader who does not have a sufficiently detailed idea of the coherent geographical universe, would find the *Collectanea* only a messy conglomeration of names and facts. Understanding Solinus requires an ability to follow his world-wide journey and to construct a mental universal space, perhaps without the help of visible maps, but a reader of the *Collectanea* must have had a global map in his mind.

The second problem concerns the non-geographical content of geographical host-cells which could not be intuitively clear to anyone but the author. For one may guess that the crocodile should be located in Egypt, but it is difficult to understand why the dolphin is anchored to the Propontis, or Persia serves as a cell for a catalogue of gems, and Africa (where no bears live) is a place where bears are described.

Eventually, it may be suggested that the *Collectanea* were originally written exclusively for the personal use of the author, and a narrow circle of his friends.

5. Solinus: Did he knew Rome?

At the transition point from the historical to anthropological part Solinus listed women who became famous for their extraordinary fertility. Here a certain Eutychis is mentioned, 1.52 12,21–23 M:

legimus Cn. Pompeium Eutychidem feminam Asia exhibitam, quam constabat tricies enixam, cum viginti eius liberis in theatro suo publicasse (we have read that Gnaeus Pompeius required from Asia a woman called Eutychis, who was known to have given birth to thirty children, and he exposed her together with her twenty children to a public show in his theatre).

When we look at the corresponding text of *Natural History*, we find immediately that Solinus' version of the story indulges in a gross misrepresentation. For Pliny (7.34) says that, first, the marvelous woman died long ago, and it was at her funeral procession that she was accompanied by 'twenty children', second, it was Eutychis' image that was exposed in the Theatre (more precisely, it stood in the *Porticus Pompei*)²²:

Pompeius Magnus in ornamentis theatri mirabiles fama posuit effigies... inter quas legitur Eutychis a XX liberis rogo inlata Trallibus, enixa XXX partus... (Pompey the Great among the decorations of his theatre placed

²¹ "... the pre-modern Greco-Roman world generally managed without maps" [Brodersen 2012: 109]. Brodersen has stressed elsewhere that "the first undisputed reference to a map on display dates to AD 297 [Brodersen 2011: 87]. The imaginary map in question is described by Eumenus, *De instaurandis scholis*, 20, 2 (*Panegy. Lat.* 9[4]): [Brodersen 2011: 106; Campbell 2012: 80]. It must be added that Solinus' text does not allow one to distinguish between a painted map and an imaginary map (or a non-iconic representation of the disposition of the World).

²² The statue of Eutychis was made by Periklymenos [Coarelli 1996: 365].

images of celebrated marvels, ... among them we read of Eutythis who at Tralles was carried to her funeral pyre by twenty children and who had given birth 30 times... — trans. by Rackham).

The deviation from Pliny cannot be explained by mere linguistic misunderstanding, and I would suggest, as a possibility, that for this passage Solinus used a corrupt text of *Natural History*, from which, at a minimum, the word *rogo* vanished: as a result, he could understand the Plinian phrase *inlata Trallibus* 'brought to (the pyre) in Tralles' as 'brought into (Rome) from Tralles', and rendered it as *Asia exhibitam*. Despite this dramatic error, Solinus provided an internally coherent and self-consistent text, which implies that he managed to get an idea of the case of Eutythis from his corrupt source manuscript. Solinus, of course, wrongly understood the situation inferred by Pliny as *spectaculum*, but it is not surprising that, living in 3rd–4th cent. AD, he did not realize that during the period of the late Republic a woman could not be exposed in a public show in a theatre. It is especially interesting to observe that Solinus' misunderstanding betrays his ignorance of how the Theatre of Pompey was actually built, and how its decoration was arranged, — and ignorance of one of the most important and famous public buildings of Rome²³ may call into doubt the Roman origin of Solinus suggested by Mommsen²⁴. Another point of misunderstanding (which might be a deliberate manipulation) lies in the verb *legere*. Solinus says *legimus*, which implies an unnamed written authority²⁵, while Pliny surely meant *titulus*, an inscription which accompanied the statue, when he said *effigies... inter quas legitur Eutythis*.

6. Theodericus: The limits of visualization

The *Collectanea* gained an enormous and incomprehensible success in the Middle Ages, when its readers were deprived of a key capacity needed to understand Solinus' work: the ability to visualize the global geographical space. From this point of view, the *Collectanea* were the least suitable text to become a popular encyclopedia, and it seems that it was medieval love for obscurity and artificial complexity that made it one of the most widely read books. The lack of

²³ Discoveries of female statues in relatively good condition, which belonged to the *Porticus Pompei* [Coarelli 1996: 268–375], prove that the gallery of famous women in the *Porticus* existed until the end of Ancient Rome, and it might have been known to Solinus. — The Theatre of Pompey has a rich literary history, see, e. g., [Pitcher 2012: 262]. I shall limit myself to one quotation closely related to the theme of Rome as the World. In a letter written by Cassiodorus, and addressed to Symmachus in the first years of the 6th cent. the Ostrogothic king Theoderic stated regarding the grandeur of the Theatre, Cassiodorus, *Varia* 4.51,4 Mommsen: *fecerunt antiqui locum tantis populis parem, ut haberent singulare spectaculum, qui mundi videbantur obtinere dominatum* (the ancients built a place equal to such a people, so that those would have an exclusive spectacle, who were seen to obtain the power over the World).

²⁴ Quo loco libellus scriptus sit, ex ipso non intellegitur, nisi quod cum provinciae omnes memorentur, nulla emineat, inde conicere possis auctorem scripsisse Romae vel certe in Italia [Mommsen 1895: vi] ; for recent discussion see [Brodersen 2011: 64, n. 10].

²⁵ The same formula is used elsewhere in the *Collectanea* for anonymous references to Pliny, e. g. 15.7 83,7 M (Albanian dogs), 19.17 95,10 M (deer).

necessary visual support inspired copyists to add maps to Solinus' manuscripts [Brodersen 2011: 88]. Attempts to visualize the *Collectanea* led to the reverse influence of the *Collectanea* upon medieval cartography. Solinus was the most fruitful source of the great Hereford map (ca. 1300)²⁶, where we can see images of many *mirabilia* illustrated by inscriptions which heavily depend on the text of the *Collectanea*. A large part of the items mentioned by Theodericus is shown on the Hereford map, but Theodericus omitted many important objects and places (such as seas and great rivers) which were necessary constituents of even the most simple and schematic maps, and in no way did Theodericus attempt to give a general image of the world that could be suitable for cartographic representation. On the other hand, he preserved a number of minute items that would require the space of a large and detailed map in which to be visualized, but it is very unlikely that Theodericus could have something like the Hereford map at his disposal.

Single items could be easily represented as visual images, and, like the Hereford map, the poem can be interpreted as a space where the pictures of *mirabilia* are located²⁷. However, Theodericus apparently failed to manage the global continuum of the *Collectanea*, and the space implied by the poem is loosely structured and cannot be directly associated with any attested type of medieval maps. Theodericus is again 'mapless', and the lack of an internal map is even more manifest in the abridgement by Pseudo-Ovidius (§ 1 above), which consists of short notes arranged as inscriptions to pictures.

7. Theodericus: The World without a center. Persistence of Roman memory

Global geography was not the only victim of simplification in Theodericus' poem. The first part of the *Collectanea*, which deals with Roman history, is totally removed from the *De mirabilibus*. The text of the poem proves that omission was not accidental or due to textual corruption. In the Prologue, Theodericus says that he intentionally begins with the second, anthropological part of the *Collectanea*:

34 *principium sit homo mihi carminis ordine primo*

(let the human being be for me the beginning, the first unit in the disposition of the poem...)

The approach to the history of other nations is essentially the same. The historical notes and excurses of the geographical part are omitted. This may be demonstrated by looking at the section on India. Theodericus was very interested in that main land of wonders, and the description of India is one of the largest in the poem (65 lines), but he does not say a single word about the Indian

²⁶ The problem of the relationship between the Hereford Map and the *Collectanea* has been revisited in [Kline 2001]. The text of the Hereford map is available with a commentary in a new edition [Westrem 2001].

²⁷ See [Scully 2017] for the iconography of medieval maps, including the Hereford Map.

campaign of Alexander the Great, as he does not mention the defeat of Darius (if we turn to Persia) or the numerous cities founded by Alexander. Solinus says about the land of Arbela that "Alexander's victory (scil. at Gaugamela) does not allow to miss this place" (*quem locum victoria Alexandri Magni non sinit praeteriri*, 46.1 174,5 M). But for Theodericus, the great historical importance of names and facts is likely to have been a reason to exclude them. His idea of *mirabilia* is generally limited to minor anecdotal matter, consequently, he preserved marginal episodes in which historical figures such as Alexander were involved. Alexander appears in an item about *Lacon* who was an extraordinarily quick messenger of the Macedonian king²⁸, Alexander acts in two stories about animals: he examines Albanian dogs (Th. 313), and organizes a study of longevity of deer (Th. 366). It is difficult to understand why Alexander was erased from the story about a Babylonian dolphin²⁹. Bucephalus, of course, is not silenced (Th. 953).

The Bucephalus episode³⁰ is worth considering in detail, because it shows the rarest instance of Theodericus' intervention into Solinus' text.

958 *quem crebro sepe fera per discrimina pugne*
 959 *eripiens, Indi demum post praelia Pori*
 960 *funeris exequias regali munere dignas*
 961 *defunctus meruit sibi quas rex ipse peregit.*
 962 *eius et ob nomen preclaram condidit urbem*
 963 *eque Bucephalam parili de nomine dictam*

([Bucephalus] often snatched (Alexander) away from dangers of savage battles, at last, he died, and after the fight with Indian Porus, he deserved burial that the King would prepare for himself. Honoring the horse's name, the King founded a glorious city, called from the same name Bucephala).

Solinus added to the Plinian chapter about Bucephalos the statements that the horse had often saved Alexander, and that he had died in India. Theodericus brings in another detail, probably borrowed from Orosius³¹, that Bucephalus was killed in the battle with Porus. The name of Porus is, indeed, superfluous in the story about the horse, unlike the account of the battle, narrated by Orosius, where the name of the Indian king was necessary. The most probable reason of this unexpected addition is that Theodericus wished to demonstrate his scholarly erudition; this might have been seen as ostentatious, because the original source texts of Solinus and Orosius were surely known to Theodericus' readers. I

²⁸ Th. 139 → Sol. 1.98 25,11 M → Plin. 7.84. Here Theodericus misunderstood his source: the runner's name was *Anystis*, and he was from Sparta: *Lacon* (*Lacedaemonius*, Plin.).

²⁹ Th. 286 → Sol. 12.70 79,13 M → Plin. 9.27.

³⁰ Th. 952–963 → Sol. 45.8–9 174,15–175,8 M → Plin. 8.154; the name *Bucephala* was taken by Solinus from Plin. 6.77.

³¹ Orosius, *Hist. Adv.* pag. 3,19,3–4 Zangemeister: ... *Alexander cum ipso Poro singulariter congressus, occisoque deiectus equo, concursu satellitum praesentiam mortis evasit ... duas ibi condidit civitates, Niceam et Bucephalam, quam de nomine equi sui ita vocari praecipit* (... Alexander, when he met Porus himself in a single combat and fell from his horse which had been killed, escaped on coming death by the gathering of his bodyguards ... he founded two cities there, Nicaea and Bucephale, which he ordered to be called after the name of his horse — trans. by Deferrari). Porus is not mentioned anywhere by either Pliny or Solinus.

would suggest that, for the same reason, a large number of personal names were preserved in the poem. But whatever the motives behind Theodericus' choice in each particular case, his general tactic was certainly aimed at reducing information of historical value.

The second part of the *Collectanea* is paraphrased at length (Th. 39–170), but the section about moral and mental virtues vanished together with the large part of Roman personages, and we may suggest that Theodericus deliberately excluded Roman history from his abridgement. Looking ahead, I would say that the description of Italy, radically reduced by Solinus, almost disappeared from the poem.

Theodericus thus entirely abandoned the idea of Rome as the center of the World.

Theodericus, however, provides a nearly full chorographical account of Palestine (Th. 844–979). The completeness of this section could be due to the poet's religion, but nothing indicates that the Holy Land and Jerusalem were for Theodericus the center of the World, as Jerusalem is shown on the Hereford map³².

Theodericus did not add any Christian content to the description of *Iudaea*. In this, he followed Solinus, who, in the corresponding section, did not list Jewish or Christian monuments. But Solinus mentioned an essentially Roman episode which Theodericus carefully reproduced: Marcus Aemilius Scaurus transferred from Jaffa, and showed in Rome fossils believed to be the bones of the sea-monster (*belua*) that had threatened Andromede.³³

838 *eius reliquias immania scilicet ossa*

839 *invexit Romam Marcus cognomine Scaurus*

(Its remains, that is to say, the immense bones, were introduced to Rome by Marcus, whose surname was Scaurus).

The Jaffa monster is not the only item related to Roman games and triumphs which survived in *De mirabilibus*. It is difficult to decide whether Theodericus recognized the Roman *spectacula* as a special theme, or the persistence of those items could be explained by their frequency in Pliny's *Natural History*, and then in the *Collectanea*. In any case, the *spectacula* mentioned by Theodericus contribute to an image of that Ancient Rome as an extravagant wonderland.

It is not surprising that two continuous notes related to *spectacula* are about African beasts³⁴:

661 *pardalem dicunt Latio sermone camelum*

662 *viderat hoc animal Latium te consule Cęsar*

663 *viderat et monstra quę sunt cęfusa vocata*

...

666 *Pompei ludis spectacula rhinocherotis*

667 *vidit Roma potens. cornu prę naribus ingens || surgit...*

³² Jerusalem on the Hereford map has been discussed inter alia by [Deam 2015: 16; Birkholz 2004: 17, 70].

³³ Paleontological aspects of Scaurus' monster have been examined in [Mayor 2000: 138].

³⁴ Th. 661–667 → Sol. 30.19–21 133,20–134,7 M → Plin. 8.69, 71.

([The beast *navus*³⁵] is called in Latin tongue *camelopardalis*³⁶, Latium saw that animal when you, Caesar, were the consul, and another monsters were seen, which are called *cefusa* ... At Pompey's games, mighty Rome saw a spectacle of rhinoceros: a huge horn rises in front of his nostrils ...)

The words *Roma potens* (Th. 667) have no correspondence in the *Collectanea*, but the addition does not necessarily prove that Theodericus was willing to glorify ancient Rome. He is likely to have borrowed the whole hemistich directly from thematically similar Horace, *Epist.* 1.1,61: *arto stipata theatro || spectat Roma potens*, — and this quotation, again, merely demonstrates the author's erudition. A metrical pattern could also influence the poet: the expression *Roma potens* neatly fits the pre-caesural position, and has a good rhyme — *ingens*. It appears in the same position in classical and early medieval poetry³⁷, and Theodericus could treat it as a metrical cliché³⁸.

The last episode to be considered here is the show of Eutyichis discussed in § 5 above.

45 *Eutycides Asię mira pręgnans novitate*
46 *ter deno partu, Romę — mirabile visu —*
47 *secum bis denos dedit ad spectacula natos*

(The pregnancy of Eutyichis³⁹ of Asia was something admirable and never known before with her thrice ten births, and — wonderful sight — in Rome she offered herself together with her twice ten sons to a spectacle).

Theodericus renders accurately the content of Solinus' erroneous account. In line with the tendency described above, the poet removed the mention of Pompey, and 'his theatre' was replaced by the wider name of Rome. This change has a remarkable implication: Theodericus still knew that the Theatre of Pompey had been situated in Rome⁴⁰.

8. Theodericus: The World without an order

Solinus begins large geographical sections with general overviews, and he is always explicit in descriptions of geographical situations of regions and areas. Theodericus preserves such a landmark only once, when he deals with the transition from the main part of Libya to its wild Oceanic periphery (Th. 309 → Sol. 31.1 136,13 M):

post gentes Lybicas quas terminat astrifer Athlas
(in the rear of the tribes of Libya whose limits are laid down by starry Atlas)

³⁵ The best mss of Solinus read *nabum*, ναβουϛ was probably a genuine vernacular appellation of the giraffe: [Morta 2014].

³⁶ One should notice a fantastic hyperbaton in Th. 661.

³⁷ Ovidius, *Fasti*, 4,106; Statius, *Silv.*, 4.1,28; Alcuin, *Carm.*, 224,2 PL, 101,778 D.

³⁸ The combination of a trochee- and iambus-shaped word in the pre-caesural position was positively admitted, but not particularly favored by Theodericus: according to my calculations, it occurs 54 times (about 5%), while the prosodically identical clausula, which consists of one choriambic word, occurs 105 times.

³⁹ Theodericus used a form, *Eutycides*, incorrectly derived from *Eutyichidem*.

⁴⁰ This knowledge was by no means trivial in the 11th century. It could be extracted from Lucan, *Pharsalia*, 7, 9 sqq.

In *De mirabilibus*, names of large regions are all omitted with few exceptions. Thus, Theodericus does not mention Europe, Asia, Italy, Greece, Scythia, Syria, and so on, though he includes in his epitome places and items from those regions. Eventually, there are only three sections in the poem where the name of a respective area stands in the initial verse which can be read as a rubric: *Sicula ora* Th. 195, *Iudea* Th. 44 *India* Th. 974. And only these three are rendered with chorographical details more or less fully preserved.

Geographical host entries of the *Collectanea* are largely lost in Theodericus, who, e. g., retells the story about the ring made of *achates*, but says nothing about the river Achates and the stone itself (Th. 231). Nonetheless, the episode retained a place in the list of rivers.

Geographical names are sometimes preserved as localizations of lower-level non-geographical items. Theodericus thus does not use the name 'Egypt' in his long description of creatures of that land, but he speaks about the *ficus Egiptia* (Th. 784) and *palma Egiptia* (Th. 795). Localizations, however, are removed from a considerable number of items. Long stories about animals lack geographical anchors: dolphins (Th. 257), elephants (Th. 398), lions (Th. 457), horses (Th. 977), and others are described without geographical linkage. The notorious Numidian bears lost their address as well, nonetheless, they retained their position among animals located in Libya. As a result, Theodericus' section about bears (Th. 439–456) is placed between elephants and lions.

Any idea of movement through the World disappeared together with indications of large regions.

Not only the large areas, but almost all geographical localizations which formed the knots of Solinus' ramifying catalogue are erased. Theodericus mentions Seleucia and *mons Cassius* (Th. 880, 881), which are situated in Syria, but all subsequent geographical indications down to India are removed, except for two marginal items. Theodericus tells us about an enigmatic lake *Arethusa* (it will be dealt with in § 10). He then proceeds to the list of stones (Th. 887–910), then an odd creature named *animal bonachus* appears without any explanation or localization (Th. 911). In order to encounter those items, a reader of the *Collectanea* would move from the area of Media and the upper Tigris (where the lake is located), through Persia (the list of the stones) to Asia Minor where the *bonachus* dwells. The *bonachus* opens a series of marvelous animals of Asia (still not named), and Theodericus states about the chameleon that 'Theutrania sends'⁴¹ that animal (Th. 919). It seems likely that 'Arethusa' and 'Theutrania' are another examples of showy erudition. It is highly unlikely that Theodericus and his milieu knew anything about Teuthrania as a real place, but he probably hinted at his knowledge of Martianus Capella⁴².

In summary, it would be impossible to say that the geographical continuum of the *Collectanea* was reduced or recomposed by Theodericus, because after being totally destroyed, it was not replaced by any other unifying structure. Large regions are entirely omitted, or mercilessly truncated: no more than 20 lines together are

⁴¹ *mittit* is a Plinian formula (e. g. Plin. 37.21 about *myrrhina* quoted above § 3 above) which is favoured by Solinus, e. g. 30.24 134,23 M: *Aethiopia mittit lycaonem* 'there is the lycaon in Ethiopia'.

⁴² Martianus Capella, *De nupt.* 6.686,6: *Supra Troadem in mediterraneo Teuthrania est, quae regio Moesorum fuit, ciuitas vero Teuthrania Caico flumine alluitur.*

devoted to Greece, Thrace and the Aegean Islands. From Solinus' description of Italy, Theodericus took only three items, which occupy about 15 verses:

— there are particular hairs (*vilum*) in tail of the wolf, they are good as an aphrodisiac (Th. 171 → Sol. 2.35);

— a stone found in the urine of the lynx is a useful medicine (Th. 174 → Sol. 2.38);

— corals born in the Ligurian Sea are powerful stones (Th. 179 → Sol. 2.41).

Theodericus apparently was not interested either in local chorography, or in universal geography, and no idea of the World as a whole can be elicited from his poem.

Theodericus shows a tendency to reduce the matter of the *Collectanea* to thematic units. Three items extracted from Solinus' description of Italy are likely to form a unit devoted to medical (or magical) remedies. Items concerning rivers and waters were preferred by Theodericus when he abridged the descriptions of Sicily and Greece (Th. 184–247). From Asia Minor he selected animals, including two large stories about the chameleon and horse (Th. 920–939, 947–973). But Theodericus never moved entries from the places they occupied in the geographical grid of the *Collectanea*⁴³. As a result, the thematic arrangement of items is never consistently followed through.

9. Theodericus: The rubric structure

The composition of *De mirabilibus* is strictly linear and unidimensional. Theodericus puts the items of the World catalogue of the *Collectanea* into separated notes, without transitions and logical connections. This text-building tactic may be illustrated by the transformation of the story of the Olympic victor Milo: it became divided into two notes, one about Milo, and another about the *alectorius* stone, so that the logical connection between both items (Milo used the stone) was lost:

- 98 *plus quam possit homo potuit quoque robore Milo,*
 99 *qui taurum nudi mactavit uerbere pugni,*
 100 *mactatumque die solidum consumpsit eadem.*
 101 *est allectorius gallorum ventre lapillus:*
 102 *ut faba cristallus specie, pugnantibus aptus.*

(and also Milo was strong above the human strength who killed a bull by a single blow of naked fist, and, during the same day, he ate a killed bull whole. There is a stone *alectorius* in the cock's stomach, a crystal which looks like a bean, this is very good for fighters).

The whole poem displays a typical medieval pattern, with separate isolated chapters that are in large part very short, and that contain no internal information about the global content and structure of the text. This pattern requires regular supra-textual pointers (or simply headings, or rubrics) which would make the content and composition explicit. We need rubrics to understand *De mirabilibus*, as we need a map to understand the *Collectanea*. In this regard, the cod. Bruxellensis BR 10615–729, shows a rather unusual and inconvenient lay-out: rubrics are not written in the

⁴³ Few transpositions can still be found, see *Appendix II*, 10.21; 12.2; 31.1.

body of the poem, but are collected in a separate block after the Preface⁴⁴, so that they look like a modern table of contents. Most rubrics of the cod. Bruxellensis are related to individual items, and they could be very useful if written within the text, which, in its actual form, is very difficult to navigate through. Some rubrics cover thematic groups, e. g. the section around Milo is rubricated as follows:

— *De viribus hominis* (covering the gladiator Tritannus, a soldier of Pompey and Milo),

— *De allectorio lapide*,

— *De similitudine hominum* (a series of examples).

In two instances, a rubric is a higher-level heading which stands before a series of subordinated individual rubrics:

— *Africa in ea serpentes* ‘Africa, snakes in (Africa)’: this is followed by individual rubrics related to snakes: *aspis*, *cerastis*, *amphisibena*, etc. (ad 525 sqq.)

— *Mira in India in ea de populis* ‘wonders in India, in (India) about nations’ (ad 975 sqq.): followed by rubrics related in large part to animals, but ‘nations’ have no special rubrics.

Few individual items are represented by geographical rubrics where geographical names can be combined with thematic information: *De Sardoniis herbis et aquis* ‘about Sardinian herbs and waters’ (ad 184), *Mons Caucasus piper gignit* ‘the mount Caucasus generates pepper’ (ad 1138), *De Gorgada insula in ea de mulieribus setosis* ‘about the Isle Gorgada, and in (Gorgada) about furred women’ (ad 1167), section on giant snakes from Ganges (Th. 1079) is rubricated as *Ganges flumen*.

Geographical entries of different higher levels are thus recognized in the list of rubrics, but rubrics offer no additional geographical information which could not be found in the poem. Consequently, most geographical knots are lost in the rubrics, as they are lost in the text. It must be added that the composer of the rubrics⁴⁵ likewise failed to create an overview of the poem based on the thematic principle.

10. Theodericus: Faults of the source text

Since Theodericus had but a very vague idea of how the World was arranged in geographical space, he could not recognize scribal errors of his Solinus manuscript, and this affected the coherence of the geographical continuum.

A large section on India (Th. 974–1140) is followed by a short note on abnormal astronomical phenomena observed on the Island of Taprobane (Th. 1141–1146 → Sol. 53.6 197,1 M). Here the description of Taprobane is interrupted, and the next section of the poem again refers to India, though it contains two items from Solinus’ account of Taprobane: the giant long-living people, and the giant sea turtle (Sol. 53.11 198,1–5 M; 53.20 199,5–8 M → Plin. 6.91; 9,35). The description of the longlivers begins in the *Collectanea* with a phrase: *ergo inde homines corporum magnitudine omnes homines antecedunt* ‘so the people from

⁴⁴ The Vienna excerpt has five rubrics written in the text which are related to the monstrous nations of India (Th. 1000–1021 = W 20–45 Hünemörder), they all are lacking in the cod. Bruxellensis.

⁴⁵ The authorship of Theodericus cannot be either proved or rejected.

there exceed all other peoples in body size'. The word *inde* became *Indi* in three Solinus' manuscripts including G (Guelferbutanus 163, Gud. Lat.): *ergo indi homines*...

The corrupt reading was rendered by Theodericus as:

1147 *sunt homines Indi nostro plus corpore magni*
(the people of India have bodies bigger than ours)

It is only logical that Theodericus thought that the sea turtle also is related to the people of India; this allowed him to create an uninterrupted narrative about India:

1153 *Indis tam patula crescit testudo marina*
(the sea-turtle grows so big for the people of India...)

This passage is remarkable for the descriptive designation of the tortoise shell, which is simply called *superficies* by Solinus and Pliny⁴⁶:

1154 *Indus ut ipse sibi cratis convexa superni*⁴⁷
1155 *Construat hospitium multis habitantibus amplum*
(... that the people of India construct dwelling places for themselves using the vault of the upper cranial cover: it is large enough for many inhabitants)

Geographical objects were duplicated in two other episodes, so that one name appeared twice in different areas due to scribal errors in the source manuscript. In both cases Theodericus preserved only one of those false homonyms, and in both cases he chose the wrong one.

Theodericus read *Arethusa* instead of *Aretisa* (Aretissa Barrington Atlas 89 F2), as in some of the extant Solinus manuscripts, including L (Leidensis Vossianus Q.37) and again G. When he described the lake *Arethusa* located somewhere in Armenia (→ Sol. 37.6 157,14 M), he found it necessary to comment that the lake had received its name from Sicily, and this addition proves that the wrong reading was not Theodericus' own error:

884 *est lacus a Sicula nomen ducens Arethusa*
(there is a lake which drove its name from Sicilian Arethusa)

However, Theodericus does not mention the famous Sicilian stream at all, though he carefully reports the marvels of Diana and Helbesus, Sicilian rivers which are referred to by Solinus immediately after *Arethusa* (Th. 209–212 → Sol. 15.16 51,7–14 M).

⁴⁶ The most widely used word for tortoise shell is *testudo* itself, but Pliny had a rich variety of special words: *cheliu* 6.173; *putamen* 9.39; *cortex* 9.40; 11.228; *tegumen* 11.188; *tegimentum* 32.34, — to which two more can be added from other classical authors: *testa* (an etymology of *testudo* in Varro, *Ling. Lat.* 5.79), and *concha* Calpurnius, *Ecl.* 6, 68.

⁴⁷ The expression used by Theodericus is similar to Pliny's description of the swamp turtle, 32.39: *nec convexo curvata calice*, — but this similarity does not prove the textual dependence of Theodericus on Pliny, because *testudo* is a common word for vault (cf. Serv. et Serv. Auct. in *Aen.* 1,505, p. 1, 157,18 sqq. Thilo-Hagen).

Similarly, a false *Tygris* emerges in Libya (Th. 674 → Sol. 17.4 90,8 M) because Theodericus read *Tigrim* instead of *Nigrim* in his source manuscript, again in accordance with the codd. LG. Theodericus does not mention the true Tigris, a great river which was known as one of the rivers of Paradise, but we certainly know that he carefully read the related entry in the *Collectanea*, where Solinus explains the etymology of the river Tigris: *ita enim nominant Medi sagittam* (Sol. 37.5 157,14 M). From this etymological note Theodericus borrowed the comparison of the tiger (an animal found in Hyrcania) and the arrow, which is absent from the original description of the tiger by Solinus:

341 *fertur ut emissa nervo stridente sagitta*
(it rushes like an arrow shot by a screeching string)

Finally, Theodericus twice mentions an unheard of nation of *Egibanes*. This resulted from a trivial phonetic error, the correct form being *Aegipanes* (Αἰγίπανες), but in this case the wrong reading is not attested in Solinus' manuscripts recorded by Mommsen. It seems unlikely that the accidental error was repeated twice independently, and unification of the wrong spelling was probably due to deliberate efforts by Theodericus. Like the other textual errors examined in this section, the *Egibanes* prove that *De mirabilibus* appeared as the result of a careful reading of the *Collectanea*.

11. Theodericus: The spaces of the marvelous

The World of Theodericus is clearly divided in two parts: the Our World of the poet is shown in the Prologue and Epilogue, where Theodericus is shown speaking with his friend Stephanus and working hard on the abridgement of the *Collectanea*. The Other World existed on the pages of Solinus' manuscript as a mixture of Theodericus' poetic imagination and Solinus' encyclopedic learning.

The poet deleted almost all geographical data from his abridgment, and no geographical reality supported the selection of matter in *De mirabilibus*. Nonetheless, Theodericus strictly observes a global border of crucial importance: the space he totally ignores in his narrative closely corresponds to the limits of the Christian World as it was established ca. 1100, where Byzantine Greece and Italy (in large part Byzantine too) formed a transitory zone. Arab Sicily was conquered by the Normans by 1072, and it belongs to the zone covered by *De mirabilibus* as a non-Christian country. Palestine and the entire central zone of the medieval Mappa Mundi is equally included in that Other World⁴⁸. The Our World is carefully silenced by Theodericus in the body of the poem, but apart from Christian Europe there is another silenced zone in *De mirabilibus* which is situated in the Far East: this is the eastern periphery of the World where the medieval Paradise was usually located⁴⁹. Again, Theodericus carefully avoided the theme of the Terrestrial Paradise,

⁴⁸ The density of monsters and marvels increased to the periphery, and monsters are generally located in the periphery of medieval maps [Mittman 2006: 45–59]

⁴⁹ See inter alia the evidence collected in [Mittman 2006: 48].

and he said nothing about the rivers of Paradise, which were one of the key elements of medieval cosmology (see the river Tigris above).

It must be added that no special geographical zone of marvels was established by Pliny or Solinus. Classical thought viewed marvelous events and things as immanent to Nature⁵⁰, and Pliny collected *mirabilia* throughout the World as precious embellishments of the Roman Empire.

The Other World described by Theodericus was inhabited by strange, often dangerous, and suspect creatures, but he knew that, though segregated in space, monsters were a part of the World created by God. This idea is explicitly expressed in the Prologue, where the poet says that God is a *mirabile* who creates all *mirabilia*:

38 *quę volo mirari mirabilis ipse creasti*
(Thou, admirable, created what I want to admire)

Monsters and other marvelous things were seen as manifestations of God's will and Providence⁵¹, and one might expect that Theodericus would pay attention to this aspect of his theme, but he again says nothing explicitly. I would suggest that the apparent silence provides a key for understanding the significance of the poem, which was probably intended to be read as a multilevel allegory⁵².

I would refer here to a large description of elephants (Th. 398–438), which has two allegorical dimensions clearly highlighted by the poet.

The first is the moral allegory, by no means is it hidden. Elephants are good animals of the medieval bestiary, and their moral virtues are described at length by Theodericus, who pays special attention to the 'marriage of elephants'. The sexual behavior of animals and exotic peoples is often reported by Theodericus, but the marriage of elephants has a particular significance: it is widely attested as a theological, or so called anagogic allegory which should induce a spiritual meaning. A pair of male and female elephants could represent Adam and Eve [Hassig 1995: 131–133]. The section ends with the scene of a fight between elephants and dragons, where the elephant is identified with Christ. The allegorical meaning of this episode is self-evident, but it is additionally emphasized by the numerous Christological allusions listed in *Appendix I*.

⁵⁰ The illuminating study of the history of the notion of miracle can be found in [Grant 1952].

⁵¹ See [Friedman 1981; Verner 2005] for the problem of adapting *mirabilia* to the theological frame. In a personal conversation, prof. Isabel Velázquez has pointed me to the fact that the problem was known to Isidore (11.3.4).

⁵² Cf. the poem *De lapidibus* by Marbode of Rennes, which was supplemented by an allegorical commentary soon after it was written [Riddle 1977: 125–129].

Appendix I. Elephant as Christ

426. Hi sevos hostes patiuntur sepe
dracones — *Ad sextam, Analecta Hymnica* 51, 16, s. 8: *Advenus omnes impetus || Quos saevus hostis incutit*
427. Qui **circumventos astu**
spirisque ligatos* — Gregorius Turonensis, *Historia Francorum*, 6, 5 p. 270, 13, *Krusch-Levison: Deus hominem creavit innoxium, sed astu serpentis circumventus, praevaricator praecepti factus est: et ideo a sede paradisi eiectus, mundanis laboribus deputatus est; qui per mortem Unigeniti Dei Christi Deo reconciliatus est Patri.*
428. Cruribus et pedibus
compellunt figere gressus
429. Ne valeant **truncis** se vel
coniungere saxis* — Hieronymus, *Dialogus contra Luciferianos*, PL 23, 170A: ... *haerere certe trunco crucis, nec prius amitterem, quam misericordiam impetrarem*
430. Et perimant hostes collisos
mole **terentes***
431. His nam deceptis **astu**
sollertior hostis
432. **Absorbet largum captati**
sanguinis haustum — *Cantus in dedicatione ecclesiae, Analecta Hymnica* 51, 103, s. 3: *Haec domus rite tibi dedicata || Noscitur, in qua populus sacatum || corpus assumit, bibit et beati || Sanguinis haustum*
433. Donec ad **extremum terra** se
proicit ipsum — *Act. 13, 47: ut sis in salutem usque ad extremum terrae* (Isa. 49, 6)
434. Emoriens elephas exhaustus
sanguine venas
435. **Vincens victorem** quem casu
proterit hostem — Alcuinus, *Epistola CCII. De comparatione numerorum* (PL 100 477B: *Tribus modis Adam tentatus est ... Tribus his modis (iterum) Christus tentatus est, et vicit victorem Adae.*
— Cyprianus, *Iesus Nave*, 395: *desuper incurrens securum proterit hostem || omnia caede madent tellusque infecta cruore est.*
436. Quorum conspersa permixto
sanguine terra
437. Fiet cinnabaris vulgo cruor
ipse draconis
438. Dictus picturę satis utilis et
medicinę

* Solinus 25, 10–15 p. 112, 18 113, 7 M → Plinius 8, 32–34 *denique insidiae hoc astu praeparantur ... primumque pedes nodis ligant, ut laqueatis cruribus inpediant gradiendi facultatem: nam elephant, nisi praeventi hac spirarum mora, vel arboribus se vel saxis applicant, ut pondere nitibundo attritos necent angues ... ob id a draconibus avidissime torrente captantur aestu ...*

Appendix II. Correlation between the geographical parts of the *Collectanea* and *De mirabilibus*

Braces indicates items where Theodericus does not provide a geographical location.

† marks the textual errors discussed in § 10.

Solinus §§	Solinus: Regions of the Geographical Part	Theodericus: Terrae	Theodericus: Gentes
	Italy₁: from Liguria to Sicily		
2.19	Italy, general description	—	
2.24	primus Eropae sinus		
2.24	secundus Europae sinus		
2.26	<i>Memorabilia</i> of Italy		
		[Medicines]	
2.35	<i>Italia lupos habet</i>	{cauda lupi: 170	
2.40	<i>Cicadae apud Reginos multae</i>	—	
2.45	<i>Insula Diomedis</i>	—	
2.41	<i>Ligusticum mare</i>	<i>equora Ligustrica</i> : 179	
2.51	Italy₂: <i>Italicus excursus</i>		
2.51	Dalmatia, Illyricum		
3.1	the Islands near the western shore of Italy	—	
3.2/3	Corsica	—	
4.1	Sardinia	Sardonias herba: 184	
		[Waters]	
5.1	Sicily	Sicula ora: 195	
5.9	Aethna	Æthna: 202	
	—	Æthnensis campus: 207*	
5.16	Arethusa	—	
5.16	Diana	fons Dianæ: 209	
5.17	Helbesus	Helbesus: 211	
5.17	Himeraea	Hemereus: 213	
5.18	sal Agrigentinus	Agrigentinus sal: 218	
5.18	Aethna: sal purpureus	Æthna: sal purpureus: 220	
5.20	Halesina regio	fons Alisine: 221	
5.21	Gelonium stagnum	Gelonium: 225	
5.24.	Ager Agrigentinus	Ager Agrigentinus: 228	

[**Balkan region:** *Dalmatia, Raetia, Noricum, Pannonia, Moesia*. The region, which was covered by the province of Illyricum, is described by Pliny (3.141–150) as a side route from Histria to Moesia. It is entirely omitted by Solinus. A short list of the areas of Illyricum is inserted in the section on Gallia:]

7.1	Tertius Europae sinus Greece: from Epirus to Thessaly	—
7.2	Epirus: a miraculous spring	fons Epiri: 237
7.3/4	Achelous	Achelous: 241
7.5	Greece: from Patrae to Magnesia in Thessaly from Thessaly to the Propontis	—
9.1	Macedonia	—
10.1	Thrace	—
10.17	Propontis	—
10.21	Propontis: Abydos and Sestos	[moved to the section related to 12.2]
11.1	Aegean Islands and Crete	—
11.3	Crete	—
		[no unifying theme]
11.15	Euboea ₁ ; Carystos	Caristos: 248
11.17	the Cyclades	—
11.24	Euboea ₂	—
11.26	the Islands	—
11.33	Lemnos, Myrina, Athos	Lemnos, Myrina, Athos: 250–253
12.1	quartus Europae sinus	
12.2	Hellespontus: Xerxes' bridge	Hellespontus: Xerxes' bridge: 254 Abydos and Sestos: 256 (transferred from 10.21)
	from Hellespontus to Scythia	
		[The dolphin]
13.1	Hister	—
13.2	Pontus₁	—
15.1	Borysthenes apud Neuros Nations of Northern Scythia	— [Marvelous nations]
15.2	Neuri	Neuri: 298
15.3	Geloni	[Geloni: 302]
15.3	Agathyrsi	[Agathyrsi: 303]**
15.4	Anthropophagi	Andropophagi 305
15.5	Chalybes. Dahae	—
15.5	Albani	Albani: 308
15.13	Essedones	Essedones: 326
15.14	Scythi	—
	From Pontus₁ to Hyrcania₁	
15.17	Dioscoridas, urbs Colchorum	—
15.18	The Caspian region: general description, <i>Araxes</i> , <i>Euphrates</i> are mentioned	Euphrates — Araxes — Caspius: 333
15.20	Arimaspi ₁	monoculi Arimasri: 335
15.20	Riphaeum iugum	Riphei: 335
15.22	Asiatica Scythia (<i>grypes</i>)	—
15.23	Arimaspi ₂ (<i>grypes</i>)	—
16.1	Hyperborei	—
17.1	Arimphaei	—
17.3	Cimerii	—

17.3	Amazones		—
17.3	a channel from <i>Caspium mare</i> to <i>Scythicus Oceanus</i>		—
	From the Far North back to the South (<i>magnis spatiis intercedentibus</i>)	[Marvelous animals]	
17.4	Oxus		—
17.4	(Hyrkania ₁) Hyrcani (<i>tigres</i>)	Hircania (<i>tigres</i>): 336	Hircani (<i>pantera</i>): 342
	Hyrkania ₁ (<i>pantheres</i>)		
18.1	Pontus ₂		—
19.4	mare Caspium ₂		—
19.6	from Pontus to insula Abalcia: nations of Abalcia region:		—
19.7	Hippopodes		Hippopodi: 352
19.8	Phanesii		Phanesii: 353
19.9	animals of Scythia		—
	Germania: from <i>mons Saevo</i> to Rhine		—
20.1	Germania: a general description		—
20.3	<i>Saltus Hercynius</i>	animals of Hircinia: 373	—
20.7	Germania from <i>Gangavia insula</i> to Rhine		—
21.1	Gallia from Rhine to the Pyrenees	—	—
22.1	Britannia ₁	—	—
21.2	The eastern neighbours of Gallia: Raetia, Noricum, Pannonia, Moesia are listed	—	—
22.2	Hibernia	—	—
22.9	Thyle	—	—
22.10	Britannia ₂	—	—
23.1	Hispania	—	—
23.5	Lusitania	—	—
23.13	<i>Gaditanum fretum</i> , an overview of the <i>Oceanus</i>	—	—
24.1	<i>Excursus</i> from Hispania to Libya, the Pillars of Hercules a general description of the African continent	—	—
24.6	<i>Sala oppidum</i>	—	—
	Libya: the Mediterranean zone from the Atlas to Cyrene		
24.7	<i>Atlas mons</i> : <i>Aegipanes</i> ₁	Athlas: 393	† Egibanes: 395
25.1	Tingitana: elephants	{elephants: 398	
25.16	Caesarea in Numidia	—	
26.1	Numidia	—	
26.3	<i>Numidici ursi</i>	{bears: 439	
27.1	Africa and Carthage		
27.13	animals of Africa: lions, <i>etc.</i>	{lions: 457	
27.27	snakes of Africa	Africa, serpentes: 525	
		remains of a basilisk preserved in Pergamon: 564	
27.38	Syrtes	Syrtes, Cyrene 580	
27.41	Psylli		Psylli: 589
27.44	Cyrene	—	
27.53	Cyrene: the basilisk, remains of a basilisk preserved in Pergamon	[moved to the section related to 27.27]	

	Libya, the inner zone: from Cyrene to 'Ethiopia', and westwards to the Atlas		
		[Marvelous nations]	
27.55	The region of the <i>Garamantes</i> : an overview		
28.1	<i>gens Amantum</i>	—	
29.1	<i>Garamantum oppidum Debris</i>	Debris castrum: 597	gens Garamantum: 597
29.8	Gauloe insula	Gaulensis insula: 609	
30.1	<i>Aethiopes</i> vs <i>gentes Atlanticae</i>		customs of <i>Garamantes</i> : 625
30.2	<i>Garamantici Aethiopes</i>		
30.4	<i>Nomades</i> , etc: a catalogue of peoples		
30.8	<i>Cynomolgi</i>		Cynomolgi: 621
30.8	<i>Artabatitae</i>		Artabatiti: 622
30.9	Meroe		
30.10	<i>Macrobia</i>		Macrobia: 625
30.12	Monstruosae gentes		monstriferae gentes: 632
		[Animals]	
30.14	Ethiopia: a detailed description, including: <i>dracontia lapis</i>		
30.22	<i>Nigris fluvius: catoblepas</i>	†Tygris: 674	
30.29	<i>Aethiopici lupi</i>	<i>Ethiopum lupus</i> : 698	
31.1	Libya: the Oceanic periphery, moving to the East from the Atlas to Egypt		
30.2	a catalogue of people	[Marvelous nations]	
31.1	Atlantes		[moved to 31.3***]
31.3	Trogodytae		Trogoditē: 710 Athlantes: 716
31.4	Augilae		—
31.4	Gamphasantes		—
31.5	Blemyae		Blemyae: 720
31.6	Satyri		Satyrae: 722
31.6	Aegipanes ₂		Egibanes: 724
31.6	Himantropodes		Himandropodes: 727
31.6	Pharusi		—
32.1	Egypt and Nile: a detailed description, including	[Egypt and Arabia]	
32.16	a note about 'expirations' of Nile	Non spirat nebulas Nilus: 729	
32.34	ficus Aegyptia	Egyptia ficus: 784	
32.36	palma Aegyptia	Egyptia palma: 793	
32.41	Alexandria	—	
33.1	Arabia: a digression from Pelusium to Arabia and back to Pelusium		
		mare Rubrum: 796	
33.11	Phoenix	Phoenix: <i>Araps</i> = Arabia: 811	
33.18	precious stones of Arabia, including		
33.21	<i>androdamas</i>	{ <i>andradamas</i> : 831	

From Pelusium to Palestine and Syria, up to the <i>mons Cassius</i>		
34.1	<i>an overview of Palestine and Syria</i>	—
		[Judea and Syria]
31.2	Iope	castrum Ioppe: 832
35.1	Iudaea	Iudēę regio: 844
35.1	Iordanis	Iordanis: 845
35.1	Paneas	Paneas: 846
35.2	Asphaltites lacus	Asfaltites: 848
35.3	lacus Sara	—
35.3	lacus Tiberiadis	Tiberias: 853
35.4	Hierosolyma	Iherosolim: 856
35.4	Hierichus	Iherichus: 858
35.4	Calliroe	Calliroe: 860
35.7		Gomorrhum, Sodomum: 876
35.9	Esseni Syria	—
36.1	a list of cities of Syria, including	
36.2	Seleucia	Seleucia: 880
36.2	<i>mons Cassius</i>	<i>mons Cassius</i> : 881
	Armenia: the upper Euphrates and Tigris	
37.1	a detailed description of the region, including	—
37.6	<i>Aretisa lacus</i> the upper Mesopotamia and Persis	<i>lacus Arethusa</i> : 884
		[Stones]
37.7	<i>a catalogue of Stones: Chaldei, Parthi Persis</i>	{sagada petra: 887, and other stones
	From Mesopotamia to the West: Asia	
38.1	Cilicia	—
40.1	Asia (in narrow sense)	—
40.7	Phrygia	—
		[Animals]
40.10	Phrygia: bonachus	{animal bonachus: 911
40.12	Ionia	—
40.20	Teuthrania	Theutrania: 919
40.21	Asia: Chamaeleon	Theutrania: chameleon: 919
40.25	<i>Pythones come</i> : ciconia	{ciconia: 940
41.1	Galatia	—
42.1	Bithynia	—
43.1	Ora Pontica	—
44.1	Paphlagonia	—
45.1	Cappadocia	—
45.5	Cappadocia: the horse	{the horse: 947
	From Cappadocia to Assyria, and to Far East	
46.1	Assyria	—
46.4	Media	—
47.1	<i>Portae Caspiae: Lapiri, Narici, Hyrcani</i>	—

48,1	from <i>Caspia</i> to the East	—	
49.1	Oxus	—	
49.2	Bactri	—	
50.1	<i>longa deserta</i>	—	
50.1	Anthropophagi	—	
50.2	Tabin	—	
50.2	Seres	—	
51.1	Attacenus sinus	—	
	India and Taprobane		
52.1	<i>Medi montes</i> , India	India: 974/975 [Nations]	
	A detailed description of India, including a catalogue of peoples	nations of India: 977	
52.30	<i>fons Gangis</i> : people feeding on smells	Gangis fons: 1011, people feeding on smells	
52.33	India: snakes	Serpentes Indi: 1032	
52.34	animals of India, including	[Animals]	
53.36	Indici tauri	Indi tauri: 1052	
52.37	mantichora	India: manticora: 1059/1060	
52.42	Indica maria: Balenae	Indica aeqora: balenae: 1089	
52.46	India: ficus	Indica ficus: 1111	
52.49	Tylos Indiae insula	Tylos insula: 1125	
52.50	mons Caucasus	montes Caucassii: 1128	
53.8	Taprobane	Taprobane: 1141	
53.11	people of Taprobane	homines †Indi: 1147	
53.20	the tortoise of Taprobane	testudo marina: 1153	Indus
54.1	Western India	—	
54.2	Indus flumen	—	
54.4	From Indus to Alexandria	—	
54.5	Periplus from Alexandria to India: an overview	—	
54.11	Carmania	—	
54.12	Rubrum Mare	—	
54.13	Persis	—	
55.1	Parthia	—	
56.1	Chaldaea gens: Babylonia	—	
56.4	Oceanic shores of Libya	—	
	nations of Ethiopian deserts:	[Nations]	
56.9	Trogodytae,	Trogoditę: 1162	
56.9	Ichthyophagi	Hicthyophagi: 1164	
56.10	Gorgades insulae	Gorgada insula: 1167	
56.16	Iunonia insula	—	
56.17	Capraria, Nivaria, Canaria insulae	—	

* An addition from an unknown source.

** The three nations are confused, and described as Neuri, this may be a fault of the source ms.

*** Perhaps a scribal error of the cod. Bruxellensis.

References

- Birkholz, D. (2004). *The king's two maps: Cartography and culture in Thirteenth-Century England*. New York: Routledge.
- Brodersen, K. (2011). Mapping Pliny's world: The achievement of Solinus. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 54(1), 63–88.
- Brodersen, K. (2012). Cartography. In D. Dueck. *Geography in Classical Antiquity*, 99–110. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Brodersen, K. (Ed.) (2014). *Solinus: New studies*. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike.
- Campbell, B. (2012). *Rivers and the power of Ancient Rome*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press.
- Coarelli, F. (1996). Il complesso pompeiano di Campo Marzio e la sua decorazione scultorea. In F. Coarelli. *Revixit ars: arte e ideologia a Roma: dai modelli ellenistici alla tradizione repubblicana*, 360–381. Roma: Quasar. (In Italian).
- Deam, L. (2015). *A world transformed: Exploring the spirituality of medieval maps*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Dover P. (2013). Reading Pliny's 'ape' in the Renaissance: The Polyhistor of Caius Julius Solinus in the first century of print. In J. König, G. Woolf (Eds.). *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, 414–443. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Elsner, J., Squire, M. J. (2016). Sight and memory: The visual art of Roman mnemonics. In M. J. Squire, J. Elsner (Eds.). *Sight and the ancient senses*, 180–204. London: Routledge.
- Flint, V. I. J. (1982). Honorius Augustodunensis. Imago mundi. *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 49, 7–153.
- Friedman, J. B. (1981). *The monstrous races in medieval art and thought*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Geus, K. (2016). Paradoxography and geography in antiquity: Some thoughts about the *Paradoxographus Vaticanus*. In Fr. J. González Ponce, Fr. J. Gómez Espelosín, A. L. Chávez Reino (Eds.). *La letra y la carta: Descripción verbal y representación gráfica en los diseños terrestres grecolatinos; Estudios en honor de Pietro Janni*, 243–257. Madrid: Universidad de Alcalá, Servicio de Publicaciones: Sevilla: Editorial Universidad de Sevilla.
- Grant, R. (1952). *Miracle and natural law in Graeco-Roman and early Christian thought*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Hassig, D. (1995). *Medieval bestiaries: Text, image, ideology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Haupt, M. (1876). Index lectionum aestivarum 1863. In M. Haupt. *Opuscula* (Vol. 2), 218–252. Lipsaie: Impensis Salomonis Hirzelii. (In Latin).
- Healy, J. F. (1999). *Pliny the Elder on science and technology*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Hünemörder, Ch. (1976). Das Lehrgedicht "De monstribus Indie" (12. Jh.). Ein Beitrag zur Wirkungsgeschichte des Solinus und Honorius Augustodunensis. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 119(3), 267–284. (In German).
- Jakobi, R. (2002). Indien in der Solin-Paraphrase des Theodericus. *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch: internationale Zeitschrift für Mediävistik*, 37(2), 247–256. (In German).
- James, M. R. (1913). Ovidius de Mirabilibus mundi. In E. C. Quiggin (Ed.). *Essays and studies presented to William Ridgeway on his sixtieth birthday August 1913*, 286–298. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Janni, P. (1984). *La mappa e il periplo: cartografia antica e spazio odologico*. Roma: Bretschneider. (In Italian).

- Kaffarnik, A. (2011). *Querela magistri Treverensis. Neuedition, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Mit einer Beschreibung der Handschrift Bruxelles, BR 10615–729*. Bern: Peter Lang. (In German).
- Kline, R. N. (2001). *Maps of medieval thought: The Hereford paradigm*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press.
- McDermott, W. C. (1938). *The ape in antiquity*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Manitius, M. (1914). Zur poetischen Literatur aus Bruxell. 10615–729. *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 39, 155–175. (In German).
- Mayor, A. (2000). *The first fossil hunters: Paleontology in Greek and Roman times*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Mittman, A. S. (2006). *Maps and monsters in medieval England*. New York: Routledge.
- Mommsen, Th. (Ed.) (1895). *C. Iulii Solini Collectanea rerum memorabilium. Iterum recensuit Th. Mommsen*. Berolini: Apud Weidmannos. (In Latin).
- Morta, K. (2014). Did Agatharchides mention an African name of giraffe? *Živa antika = Antiquité vivante*, 64, 73–92.
- Murphy, T. (2004). *Pliny the Elder's Natural History: The Empire in the encyclopedia*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Naas, V. (2011). Imperialism, mirabilia and knowledge: Some paradoxes in the *Naturalis Historia*. In R. K. Gibson, R. Morello (Eds.). *Pliny the Elder: Themes and contexts*, 57–70. Leiden: Brill.
- Pavlock, B. (2014). Paradox and the journey in the dedicatory Preface of Solinus' *Collectanea*. In K. Brodersen. (Ed.). *Solinus: New Studies*, 24–31. Heidelberg: Verlag-Antike.
- Pitcher, L. V. (2012). Cassius Dio. In I. J. F. de Jong (Ed.). *Space in Ancient Greek literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Vol. 3), 257–268. Leiden: Brill.
- Ramosino, L. C. (2005). Mamilio Sura o Emilio Sura? Alcune considerazioni sulla teoria della successione degli imperi nella 'Naturalis Historia' di Plinio il Vecchio. *Latomus*, 64(4), 945–958. (In Italian).
- Reiffenberg, Fr. de. (1841). Notice d'un manuscrit de la bibliothèque royale. *Bulletin de l'Académie royale de Bruxelles sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique*, 8(2), 247–267. (In French).
- Riddle, J. M. (Ed.) (1977). *Marbode of Rennes' De Lapidibus: Considered as a medical treatise with text, commentary, and C. W. King's translation, together with text and translation of Marbode's Minor works on stones*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Rutledge, S. H. (2012). *Ancient Rome as a museum: Power, identity, and the culture of collecting*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Schmidt, P. L. (1995). Solins Polyhistor in Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Geschichte. *Philologus*, 139(1), 23–35. (In German).
- Scully, D. (2017). Medieval maps and diagrams. In C. Hourihane (Ed.). *Routledge companion to medieval iconography*, 399–411. London: Routledge.
- Seel, O. (1982). Pompeius Trogus und das Problem der Universalgeschichte. In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Vol. 2.30.2), 1363–1423. Berlin: W. de Gruyter. (In German).
- Talbert, R. J. A. (2008). Greek and Roman mapping: Twenty-first century perspectives. In R. J. A. Talbert, R. W. Unger (Eds.). *Cartography in antiquity and the Middle Ages: Fresh perspectives, new methods*, 9–27. Leiden: Brill.
- Verner, L. (2005). *The epistemology of the monstrous in the Middle Ages*. New York: Routledge.
- Verweij, M. (2015). Florus and his 'Vergilius Orator an Poeta': The Brussels Manuscript revisited. *Wiener Studien*, 128, 83–105.

- Westrem, S. D. (2001). *The Hereford map: A transcription and translation of the legends with commentary*. Turnhout, Belgium: The Folio Society.
- Woodard, R. D. (2006). *Indo-European sacred space: Vedic and Roman cult*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.
- Ziolkowski, J. M., Putnam, M. C. J. (Eds.). *The Virgilian tradition: The first fifteen hundred years*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.

Информация об авторе

Александр Евгеньевич Кузнецов

доктор филологических наук
доцент, филологический факультет,
кафедра классической филологии,
Московский государственный
университет им. М. В. Ломоносова
Россия, ГСП-1, 119991, Москва,
Ленинские Горы, 1-й корпус
гуманитарных факультетов
Тел.: +7 (495) 939-32-77
сотрудник, Эйништейн-Центр Chronoi,
Свободный университет Берлина (Freie
Universität Berlin)
Otto-von-Simon-Str., 7
14195, Berlin, Germany
Тел.: +49 (30) 838-52768
✉ recubanssub@googlemail.com

Information about the author

Alexander E. Kuznetsov

Dr. Sci. (Philology)
Assistant Professor, Philological Faculty,
Department of Classical Philology,
Lomonosov Moscow State University
Russia, 119991, Moscow, Leninskie Gory,
GSP-1, 1st Corpus of the Humanities
Tel.: +7 (495) 939-32-77
Fellow, Einstein Centre Chronoi, Free
University of Berlin
Otto-von-Simon-Str., 7
14195, Berlin, Germany
Тел.: +49 (30) 838-52768
✉ recubanssub@googlemail.com

S. G. Mereminskiy

ORCID: 0000-0003-4513-7329

✉ mereminskiy@gmail.com

*Российская академия народного хозяйства
и государственной службы при Президенте РФ
(Россия, Москва)*

PLINY AND THE CLASSICAL TRADITION OF THE DESCRIPTION OF BRITAIN

Аннотация. Статья посвящена описанию Британии в «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего. Прослеживаются источники, которыми пользовался Плиний, а также место, которого это описание занимает в античной географической традиции. Римский автор имел возможность опереться на сочинения целого ряда своих предшественников, начиная с Пифея из Массалии, предположительно совершившего в IV в. до н. э. плавание на север вдоль западного побережья Европы. В трудах географов эллинистического (Посидоний, Гиппарх) и римского (Страбон, Диодор Сицилийский) времени сложился достаточно устойчивый набор элементов характеристики Британских островов. Хотя ко времени, когда Плиний писал свой труд, Британия уже стала провинцией Римской империи, в «Естественной истории» использована главным образом предшествующая ученая традиция, а не свидетельства очевидцев. Плиний не успел включить в свой труд материалы, полученные экспедицией Марка Випсания Агриппы. Образ Британии, сложившийся на основании трудов Плиния и др. римских и греческих авторов, обладал рядом устойчивых, повторяющихся характеристик: это остров в Океане, находящийся на самом краю ойкумены, далекий и труднодоступный, но при этом плодородный и обладающий природными богатствами. Поскольку Океан в античной географии обозначал водное пространство, опоясывающее весь обитаемый мир, Британия и соседние с ней острова иногда рассматривались, как «другой мир» (*alter orbis*). Для римских авторов завоевание Британии было закономерным завершением процесса распространения власти Вечного Города до самых отдаленных пределов мира. Заключительная часть статьи посвящена анализу влияния, оказанного сочинением Плиния на средневековые представления о географии Британских островов. Сделан вывод, что по крайней мере некоторые авторы XII–XIII вв. (включая знаменитого английского хрониста Матвея Парижского) обращались за информацией непосредственно к «Естественной истории», а в некоторых случаях сопоставляли друг с другом различные источники, отмечая расхождения между ними.

Ключевые слова: Британия, Англия, античная география, географические представления, Плиний, Орозий, Гильда, Беда Достопочтенный, Матвей Парижский

Для цитирования: Mereminskiy S. G. Pliny and the classical tradition of the description of Britain // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 146–157. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-146-157.

Статья поступила в редакцию 17 октября 2019 г.
Принято к печати 12 декабря 2019 г.

Shagi / Steps. Vol. 6. No. 1. 2020
Articles

S. G. Mereminskiy

ORCID: 0000-0003-4513-7329

✉ mereminskiy@gmail.com

The Russian Presidential Academy
of National Economy and Public Administration
(Russia, Moscow)

PLINY AND THE CLASSICAL TRADITION OF THE DESCRIPTION OF BRITAIN

Abstract. The paper deals with the description of Britain in the *Natural History* of Pliny the Elder. The author traces the sources of Pliny and the place of his description in the classical geographical tradition. The Roman author had the opportunity to rely on a number of predecessors, starting with the semi-legendary Pitheas of Massalia (fourth century BCE) who allegedly navigated to the north along the western coast of Europe. Though by the time Pliny wrote Britain had already been a Roman province, the author of the *Natural History* mostly uses scholarly tradition rather than eyewitness accounts. The *Natural History* became the basis for most of the Late Antique and medieval descriptions of Britain (by Solinus, Orosius, Gildas, Bede etc.). It included several of the usual topoi: Britain is an island in the Ocean, it is situated at the edge of the known world, it is remote and hard to reach, but is also fertile and rich in nature resources. For Roman authors, the conquest of Britain was a natural end to the spread of the power of the Eternal City to the remotest limits of the world. The last part of the article is devoted to an analysis of Plinian influences on medieval views on the geography of Britain. It is demonstrated that at least some 12th and 13th-century writers (including the chronicler Matthew Paris) drew information directly from *Natural History* and sometimes compared various sources, noting their discrepancy.

Keywords: Britain, England, classical geography, geographical imagination, Pliny, Orosius, Gildas, Bede the Venerable, Matthew Paris

To cite this article: Mereminskiy, S. G. (2020). Pliny and the classical tradition of the description of Britain. *Shagi / Steps*, 6(1), 146–157. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-146-157.

Received October 17, 2019
Accepted December 12, 2019

Towards the beginning of the 1st century CE, both Hellenistic and Roman geographers gathered a considerable amount of information concerning the British Isles. It came mostly through trade expeditions by Carthaginian and Greek sailors. Probably the earliest name of the island in the classical tradition was “Albion” (*insula Albionum* in the 4th-century CE poem *De ora maritima* of Rufus Sextus Avienus, thought to be based on a lost Massalian periple of 6th or 5th century BCE) [Ekwall 1930: 149–150].

The spread of the name “Britannia” among Greek and later Roman authors is traditionally associated with the semi-legendary sailor Pitheas of Massalia (c. 325 BCE), who is said to have navigated to the north along the western coast of Europe. The work of Pytheas, supposedly called “On the Ocean”, does not survive, and might be only partially restored through references and quotations from later authors. The Greek historian Polybius (Polyb. III.57.3) was the first to write about the “British Isles” (Βρεταννικόν νήσων), noting them as an important source of tin in the 2nd century BCE. He too mentioned Pytheas and doubted his authenticity (Polyb. 3.57.2; 34.5.2). The British Isles had been described by the greatest Hellenistic geographers of the 2nd–1st centuries BCE — Posidonius and Hipparchus, but since their writings also have survived only in a fragmentary condition, we have to rely on later, but belonging to the same tradition, testimonies of Diodorus of Sicily (1st century BCE) and Strabo (early 1st century CE).

Diodorus writes that the island of Britain (Πρεταννική):

is triangular in shape, very much as is Sicily, but its sides are not equal. This island stretches obliquely along the coast of Europe, and the point where it is least distant from the mainland, we are told, is the promontory which men call Cantium, and this is about one hundred stades from the land, at the place where the sea has its outlet, whereas the second promontory, known as Belerium, is said to be a voyage of four days from the mainland, and the last, writers tell us, extends out into the open sea and is named Orca. Of the sides of Britain the shortest, which extends along Europe, is seven thousand five hundred stades, the second, from the Strait to the (northern) tip, is fifteen thousand stades, and the last is twenty thousand stades, so that the entire circuit of the island amounts to forty-two thousand five hundred stades (Diod. V.21.3–4, trans. C. H. Oldfather).

The description by Strabo is rather similar:

Britain is triangular in shape; and its longest side stretches parallel to Celtica, neither exceeding nor falling short of the length of Celtica; for each of the two lengths is about four thousand three hundred — or four hundred — stadia: the Celtic length that extends from the outlets of the Rhene as far as those northern ends of the Pyrenees that are near Aquitania, as also the length that extends from Cantium (which is directly opposite the outlets of the Rhene), the most easterly point of Britain, as far as that westerly end of the island which lies opposite the Aquitanian Pyrenees. This, of course, is the shortest distance from the Pyrenees to the Rhene, since, as I have already said, the greatest distance is as much as five thousand stadia; yet it is reasonable to suppose that

there is a convergence from the parallel position which the river and the mountains occupy with reference to each other, since at the ends where they approach the ocean there is a curve in both of them (Strab. IV.5.1, trans. H. L. Jones).

Among the Roman writers, the first to give an extended description of Britain was Julius Cesar, who launched two military expeditions on the island from Gaul (55–54 BCE). However, analysis has demonstrated that Cesar's text was largely based not on first-hand experience but on Hellenistic stock learned tradition [Krebs 2018: 103–112]:

Insula natura triquetra, cuius unum latus est contra Galliam. Huius lateris alter angulus, qui est ad Cantium, quo fere omnes ex Gallia naves appelluntur, ad orientem solem, inferior ad meridiem spectat. Hoc pertinet circiter mila passuum quingenta. Alterum vergit ad Hispaniam atque occidentem solem; qua ex parte est Hibernia, dimidio minor, ut aestimatur, quam Britannia, sed pari spatio transmissus atque ex Gallia est in Britanniam. In hoc medio cursu est insula, quae appellatur Mona: complures praeterea minores subiectae insulae existimantur, de quibus insulis nonnulli scripserunt dies continuos triginta sub bruma esse noctem. Nos nihil de eo percontationibus reperiebamus, nisi certis ex aqua mensuris breviores esse quam in continenti noctes videbamus. Huius est longitudo lateris, ut fert illorum opinio, septingentorum milium. Tertium est contra septentriones; cui parti nulla est obiecta terra, sed eius angulus lateris maxime ad Germaniam spectat. Hoc milia passuum octingenta in longitudinem esse existimatur. Ita omnis insula est in circuitu vicies centum milium passuum (The island is triangular in form; one of its sides lies opposite Gaul. One angle of this side, which is in Kent, where almost all the ships from Gaul arrive, faces east; the lower angle looks to the south. This side extends for about five hundred miles. The second side protracts towards Spain and the west, in which part lies Ireland, smaller by one-half, as they think, than Britain. However, the sea-passage is of equal length to that from Gaul to Britain. In the middle of the way is an island called Mona; besides it, several smaller islands are supposed to lie close to land. About those islands, some have written that at the time of winter solstice night there lasts for thirty whole days. We could discover nothing about that matter in our inquiries; however, by exact measurements with water, we observed the nights to be shorter than on the continent. The length of this side, as they believe, is seven hundred miles. The third side extends to the north, and has no land opposite it; but the angle of that side faces on the whole Germany. The side is believed to be eight hundred miles long. Thus, the circumference of the whole island is two thousand miles — *De bello Gallico* V.13).

In the 1st century CE, in the reign of Claudius (41–54), most of the island was conquered by the Romans, and the province *Britannia* was established. Under the Roman governor Gnaeus Julius Agricola (c. 78–85), the Roman fleet allegedly made the first circumnavigation of the whole island, which not only gave new valuable geographical information, but also delivered a clear symbolic message, consolidat-

ing Roman power over Britain. But that remarkable expedition unfortunately took place too late for Pliny the Elder, who had to base the description of Britain in his *Natural History* (*Nat. Hist.* IV.16.102) chiefly on stock material derived from Greek authors (Pytheas and Isidore of Charax), as well as on the geographical treatise of Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa (1st century BCE), now lost. Pliny also tried to reconcile the contradictory information in his sources, stating that Albion was the former name of the island, and Britain — the modern one:

Ex adverso huius situs Britannia insula, clara Graecis nostrisque monumentis, inter septentrionem et occidentem iacet, Germaniae, Galliae, Hispaniae, multo maximis Europae partibus, magno intervallo adversa. Albion ipsi nomen fuit, cum Britanniae vocarentur omnes de quibus mox paulo dicemus. haec abest a Gesoriaco Morinorum gentis litore proximo traiectu L. circuitu patere |XXXXVIII|·LXXV Pytheas et Isidorus tradunt, XXX prope iam annis notitiam eius Romanis armis non ultra vicinitatem silvae Calidoniae propagantibus. Agrippa longitudinem DCCC esse, latitudinem CCC credit, eandem Hiberniae, sed longitudinem CC minorem (Opposite to this region lies the island of Britain, famous both in the records of the Greeks and in our own. It lies to the north-west, facing, across a great distance, Germany, Gaul and Spain, which constitute bigger parts of Europe. Its name was of old Albion, while all the islands about which we shall soon briefly speak were called the Britains. It is situated on the shortest distance of 50 miles from Gesoriacum on the coast of the Morini. Pytheas and Isidore report that its circumference is 4875 miles. About thirty the Roman army achieved its exploration, but only to a point not far from the Caledonian Forest. Agrippa believes the length of the island to be 800 miles and its breadth 300, and the breadth of Hibernia the same but its length 200 miles less).

Pliny's description synthesized previous tradition and, in turn, became a basis for most of the Late Antique and medieval descriptions. It included several standard *topoi*: Britain is an island in the Ocean, it is situated at the edge of known world, it is remote and hard to reach, but it also is fertile and rich in natural resources. Since the Ocean in ancient geography denoted the water space encircling the entire inhabited world, Britain and its neighboring islands were sometimes regarded as "another world" (*alter orbis*). For the Roman authors, the conquest of Britain was a natural end to the spread of the power of the Eternal City to the remotest limits of the world. A 4th-century Christian author, known as Pseudo-Hegesippus, in his Latin translation of Joseph Flavius' *The Jewish War* [Ussani 1932: 150], expresses that view, for example.

The lasting influence of Plinian description of Britain is easily recognized in later influential and popular works by Gaius Julius Solinus (early 3rd century CE?) and Orosius (early 5th century CE).

Solinus has:

Finis erat orbis ora Gallici litoris, nisi Britannia insula non qualibet amplitudine nomen pæne orbis alterius mereretur: octingenta enim et amplius millia passuum longa detinet, ita ut eam in Calidonicum usque angulum metiamur. In quo recessu Vlixem Calidoniae appulsum manife-

stat ara Graecis litteris scripta [votum] (The shore of Gaul was the end of the world, except the island of Britain, which for not insignificant size almost deserves the name of another world. It stretches for eight hundred and even more miles in length, as far as we were able to measure it to the Caledonian angle. It is obvious that Ulysses once reached Caledonia, as there are in that faraway place an altar inscribed with Greek letters — Solin. *Coll. rer. memor.* XXII.1).

Orosius is more specific:

Britannia oceani insula per longum in boream extenditur; a meridie Gallias habet. cuius proximum litus transmeantibus ciuitas aperit, quae dicitur Rutupi portus; unde haud procul a Morinis in austro positos Menapos Batauosque prospectat. haec insula habet in longo milia passuum DCCC, in lato milia CC. A tergo autem, unde oceano infinito patet, Orcadas insulas habet, quarum XX desertae sunt, XIII coluntur (Britain is an island in the ocean that extends far into north. To the south it has Gaul. Those, who cross the sea have as the nearest landing place on its shore a city called the Port of Rutupi. It is situated not far from the Morini and looks upon the Menapi and the Batavi in the south. The island has eight hundred miles in length and two hundred miles in breadth. From its rear end, where the infinite ocean stretches, it has the Orkney islands, of which twenty are uninhabited and thirteen are peopled — Oros. *Hist. adv.* I.1.76–78).

Note, however, that Orosius (probably due to a scribal mistake at some stage of transmission) gives the breadth of the island as 200 miles vs. 300 miles in Pliny.

Apparently, during the period of Roman dominion, there occurred the forging of a collective identity of at least a part of the local population. They began to regard themselves as “Britons” (*Brittones*). The most important text where this “British” identity found an expression is “De Excidio Britanniae” by a cleric called Gildas the Wise. The genre and date of his work remain highly controversial; according to different estimates, it was written between the late 5th century and the middle of the 6th century CE. The description of Britain, placed by Gildas at the beginning of the work, follows the above-mentioned ancient tradition, but at the same time, it significantly enhances the traits characteristic of the classical *topos* of the “beautiful place” (*locus amoenus*) and of the biblical image of the “Promised Land”:

Britannia insula in extremo ferme orbis limite circium occidentemque versus, divina, ut dicitur, statera terrae totius ponderatrice librata ab Africo boreali propensius tensa axi, octingentorum in longo millium, ducentorum in lato spatium, exceptis diversorum prolixioribus promontoriorum tractibus, quae arcuatis oceani sinibus ambiuntur, tenens, cuius diffusiore et, ut ita dicam, intransmeabili undique circulo absque meridianae freto plagae quo ad Galliam Belgicam navigatur; vallata, duorum ostiis nobilium Tamesis ac Sabrinae fluminum veluti brachiis, per quae eidem olim transmarinae deliciae ratibus vehebantur, aliorumque minorum meliorata, bis denis bisque quaternis civitatibus ac nonnullis castellis, murorum turrium serratarum portarum domorum, quarum culmina minaci proceritate porrecta in edito forti compage pangebantur; muni-

tionibus non improbabilius instructis decorata; campis late pansis colibusque amoeno situ locatis, praepollenti culturae aptis, montibus alternandis animalium pastibus maxime convenientibus, quorum diversorum colorum flores humanis gressibus pulsati non indecentem ceu picturam eisdem imprimebant, electa veluti sponsa monilibus diversis ornata, fontibus lucidis, crebris undis niveas veluti glareas pellentibus, pernitidisque rivis leni murmure serpentibus ipsorumque in ripis accubantibus suavis soporis pignus praetendentibus, et lacubus frigidum aquae torrentem vivae exundantibus irrigua (Britain, an island almost at the extreme edge of the [earth] circle, is aligned from the south-west in the direction of the west and north-west-west with divine, as they say, scales that weigh the whole world, taking a place closer to the north pole. It takes a length of eight hundred miles, a width of two hundred, not counting the various capes with long braids that are washed by the curved bends of the ocean. It is fenced by this very extensive and, I will even say, impassable circle from everywhere, with the exception of the channel at the southern coast, which floats to the Belgian Gaul. It is irrigated by the mouths of two noble rivers – Thames and Severn, as if by the sleeves through which the little ships once brought overseas luxury goods, as well as other, smaller [rivers]. It is decorated with twice ten and twice four cities, and many fortifications, and useful structures – walls, battlements, gates of houses, the roof skates of which formidable cliffs stretched upwards, fastened with a powerful brace. It is endowed with wide-spread fields and picturesque hills, suitable for powerful agriculture, interspersed with mountains, highly suitable for pasturing animals; their flowers are multicolored when they are swayed by human steps, as if gracefully imprinted the same picture as a chosen bride, gifted with various ornaments; bright springs with frequent streams playing pebbles, white as snow, and brightly shining rivers snaking languid babble and giving those who lay down on their banks, the guarantee of a sweet dream; washed and cold lakes, beating over the edge with a stream of living water) [Winterbotton 1978: 89–90].

This image corresponded to the task undertaken by Gildas, who wished to represent the Britons as a “new Israel”, a chosen people who violated the covenant with God and now must bring repentance for the committed sins. Gildas’ book, as well as the works of Roman authors, in particular Pliny and Orosius, were in circulation in the 7th–8th centuries among educated Anglo-Saxons, mostly ecclesiastics. Those books were studied in a school founded in Canterbury by Archbishop Theodore and Abbot Hadrian, and they were well-known to Bede the Venerable. His description of Britain reveals obvious traces of borrowings from Pliny, Orosius, and Gildas:

Brittania Oceani insula, cui quondam Albion nomen fuit, inter septentrionem et occidentem locata est, Germaniae, Galliae, Hispaniae, maximis Europae partibus, multo intervallo aduersa. Quae per milia passuum DCCC in Boream longa, latitudinis habet milia CC, exceptis dumtaxat prolixioribus diuersorum promontiorum tractibus, quibus efficitur, ut circuitus eius quadragies octies LXXV milia conpleat. Habet a meridie Galliam Belgicam, cuius proximum litus transmeantibus aperit ciuitas, quae dicitur Rutubi portus, a gente Anglorum nunc corrupte Reptacæstir

uocata, interposito mari a Gessoriaci Morynorum gentis litore proximo, traiectu milium L, siue, ut quidam scripsere, stadiorum CCCCL. A tergo autem, unde Oceano infinito patet, Orcadas insulas habet. Opima frugibus atque arboribus insula, et alendis apta pecoribus ac iumentis; uineas etiam quibusdam in locis germinans; sed et auium ferax terra marique generis diuersi; fluuiis quoque multum piscosis ac fontibus praeclara copiosis, et quidem praecipue issicio abundat, et anguilla. Capiuntur autem saepissime et uituli marini, et delphines, nec non et balenae; exceptis uariorum generibus concyliorum; in quibus sunt et musculae, quibus inclusam saepe margaritam omnis quidem coloris optimam inueniunt, id est et rubicundi, et purpurei, et iacintini, et prasini, sed maxime candidi. Sunt et cocleae satis superque abundantes, quibus tinctura coccinei coloris conficitur, cuius rubor pulcherrimus nullo umquam solis ardore, nulla ualet pluuiarum iniuria pallescere; sed quo uetustior, eo solet esse uenustior. Habet fontes salinarum, habet et fontes calidos, et ex eis fluuios balnearum calidarum omni aetati et sexui per distincta loca iuxta suum cuique modum accomodos. Aqua enim, ut sanctus Basilius dicit, feruidam qualitatem recipit, cum per certa quaedam metalla transcurrit, et fit non solum calida, sed et ardens. Quae etiam uenis metallorum, aeris, ferri, et plumbi, et argenti, fecunda, gignit et lapidem gagatem plurimum optimumque; est autem nigrogemmeus, et ardens igni admotus, incensus serpentes fugat, adritu calefactus adplicita detinet, aequae ut sucinum. Erat et ciuitatibus quondam XX et VIII nobilissimis insignita, praeter castella innumera, quae et ipsa muris turribus, portis, ac seris erant instructa firmissimis (Britain, whose former name was Albion, is an island of the ocean. It lies to the north-west, opposite to main parts of Europe, such as Germany, Gaul, and Spain, however at a great distance from them. It extends 800 miles to the north; its breadth is 200 miles broad, if we do not take into account various promontories that stretch out further. When counting them, the whole circuit of the island is 4,875 miles. To the south, it has Belgic Gaul. For those, who travel by sea, the closest port to that shore is the city called Rutubi Portus, which the English now corruptly call Reptacaestir. It is situated opposite the closest place in the land of the Morini, called Gessoriacum, at the distance of fifty miles or, as some writers say, 450 stadia. Behind the island, where it lies open to the immense ocean, are the Orkney Islands. The island is rich in crops and in trees, and has good pastureland for cattle and livestock. Some regions of it produce vine as well, and it is abundant of fowl of various kinds. It is remarkable for its rivers, which are rich in fish, particularly salmon and eels, and for copious springs. There are often captures seals, dolphins, and even whales. Besides these, there are various kinds of shellfish, including mussels, and enclosed in these they often find excellent pearls of various colours, red and purple, violet and green, but mostly white. There is also a great plenitude of whelks, from which a scarlet-coloured dye is produced, a most beautiful red, which neither fades through the heat of the sun nor damage of the rain; but the older it is the more beautiful it gets. There are in this land salt springs and warm springs and from the latter there flow streams, which make hot baths, suitable for all ages and both sexes, in separate places and according to the needs of each. That happens because, as St. Basil says, the water acquires the quality of heat when it

passes through certain metals, so that it not only becomes warm but even scorching hot. The land also possesses rich veins of metal, copper, iron, lead, and silver. It gives birth to a great deal of excellent jet, which is shiny black and burns when one puts it into the fire. And, when kindled, it drives away serpents. If one rubs it, it gets warm and attracts whatever is applied to it, just as amber does. Once this country was famous for its twenty-eight noble cities as well as innumerable fortified places equally well protected by the strongest of walls and towers, gates and hasps — Bed. *Hist. eccl.* I.1).

It was Bede's description of Britain that became the basis for all subsequent Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman tradition. The Jarrow monk, following Gildas, gives Britain certain features of the Promised Land, but does this, of course, for his own purposes, trying to present as a God-chosen people not Britons who, from his point of view, were unworthy to own such a fertile country, but the new conquerors — the English (*Angli*). Bede shared the ancient idea that Britain is situated on the edge of the world or in its "corner" (*in extremo mundi angulo* — perhaps a play of words, built on the consonance of the Latin word for "corner", *angulus*, and the ethnonym *Angli*). The notion that Britain is situated in the corner of the oecumene and is a sort of "another world" is reflected in the so-called "Cotton mappa mundi" (preserved in a manuscript from the first half of the 11th century, now London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. v, fol. 56v). There the outlines of Britain and Ireland, as if on a reduced scale, repeat the outlines of the rest of the inhabited world. It is noteworthy, however, that the geographical nomenclature on this map does not reveal obvious parallels with the ancient authors (with the possible exception of the Old English translation of the *History* of Orosius) or with Gildas and Bede [Foys 2004].

As the successors of King Alfred in the 10th century significantly expanded their realm thanks to a series of military and diplomatic victories, various expressions appeared in their titles, often deliberately archaic, denoting power over the whole island: *rex totius Britanniae*, *totius Brittanni basileus*, *monarchus Brittanum*, *totius Albionis imperator* [Molyneaux 2011]. Parallel to this, the Celtic (British) population in the territory of modern Wales and Cumberland has retained the idea of Britain as a geographical and political community, the power over which the Saxons have taken from the Britons. The most aggressive expression of such anti-Anglo-Saxon sentiments is found in the poem *The Prophecy of Britain* (*Armes Prydein*), written in the 10th century and preserved in a 14th century manuscript. Its author calls on compatriots to unite and expel from the island the "Saxons" (*Saesson*). For him, the extreme points of Britain were the Orkney Islands (*Ynys Weir*) in the North and Sandwich in Kent (*Aber Santwic*) in the South [Breeze 2011]. The idea of the "monarchy of Britain" (*Unbeinyaeth Prydein*) was also a distinct feature of the later medieval Welsh literary tradition, including the collections of laws and "antiquarian" texts, such as *Enwau Ynys Prydain* and the *Triads of the Isle of Britain* (*Trioedd Ynys Prydein*) [Owen 2000: 229–232].

At the same time, in the last decades of the 10th century a new geographical concept arose among the Anglo-Saxon elites — "England" (*Engla lond* in texts in Old English, *Anglia* in Latin ones). After the Norman Conquest of 1066, the notion of "England" acquired a certain duality, as it could be used both in a broad sense (the new name of the entire island of Britain) and in a narrow one, as the core of

royal possessions, with fairly developed institutes of local government (counties and hundreds), judicial bodies and system of tax-collection. A good illustration of this duality, as well as of the vitality of the classical (ultimately Plinian) geographical tradition, is found in a brief text that contains a description of the size of the island, as well as lists of English counties and church dioceses. It is preserved in one version in Old English [Morris 1872: 145–146] and in two independent Latin translations. One of these is preserved in a single late 12th century manuscript, probably from Durham [Hodgson Hinde 1868: 220–222]. The second translation (hereafter — version R) has survived in quite a number of manuscripts, but has not been specifically studied and remains unpublished. Its earliest copy is a mid-12th century manuscript from East Midlands (Cambridge University Library, MS. Mm.5.29), but the version closest to the original might be found in an early 13th century miscellany from St. Albans (London, British Library, MS. Royal 13.D.v). Based on its contents it can be established that the original version of this treatise was written at the turn of the 11th–12th centuries, between 1090 and 1109 (it mentions the transfer of the episcopal seat from Wells to Bath in 1090, but says nothing about the creation of the new diocese of Ely in 1109).

The treatise begins with an indication of the size of “England” (*Engle lond* in Old English version, *Anglia* in Latin):

...eight hundred miles in length from Cape Penwith, which is fifteen miles behind the church of Michael in Cornwall, and from there to Caithness. The width of England is three hundred miles wide from the church of David to Dover [Morris 1872: 145].

It is noteworthy that this width of 300 miles here corresponds to the figure in Pliny's *Natural History*, but contradicts Orosius, Gildas and Bede, who all give 200 miles.

Could it be that an anonymous compiler deliberately changed the figure in question, relying on his knowledge of the *Natural History*? That might well be the case, since the work of Pliny (both in full and in extracts) was rather well known in 12th century Normandy and England, though the Roman author was not always considered an unquestioned, impeccable authority.

Thus, the famous historian William of Malmesbury (d. c. 1143) made a series of extracts from various parts of *Natural History* (through Book 32) in his florilegium “Polyhistor”, and then commented:

Vellem de Plinio plura sed multa sunt et inania; plurima etiam ipse Plinius a Valerio, Valerius pene omnia que dixit sumpsit a Tullio; hic tamen non incommode posita puto, ut scias quid quisque mutuatus est ex altero (I heavily pluck Pliny, but much of what he says is trifle. Besides, Pliny took much from Valerius, and Valerius had taken virtually everything he said from Tullius. However I do not think inappropriate to put these things here, in order that you might learn what each borrowed from the other) [Testroet Ouellette 1982: 61].

William's younger contemporary and fellow-countryman Robert of Cricklade (died c. 1171) composed, probably in the early 1130s, a shortened 9-book version

(*Defloratio*) of Pliny's *Natural History*. Robert, who dedicated his work to King Henry I (1100–1135) and later rededicated it to his grandson, Henry II (1154–1189), retained the full description of Britain, and in one of its 12th century copies (now Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 160.1 Extrav., fol. 16v) there is a marginal note, “mensuram scilicet”, that demonstrates the interest of at least one medieval reader in the subject of the island's dimensions.

At least one other later medieval author noted the discrepancy in the size of Britain in various sources. On the margin of an early 13th century copy of “version R” of the above-mentioned treatise of English counties and dioceses (London, British Library, Royal 13.D.v, fol. 152r/v), the famous English chronicler Matthew Paris (died 1259) left a note: “Hic est discordia inter h[oc] et Gildam de dimensione Anglie. Respice in principio Gilde”. It refers not to the original work of Gildas (Matthew seems never to read it), but to another historical text in the same manuscript (on fol. 38r), a 9th-century Welsh *Historia Brittonum*, sometimes in the Middle Ages erroneously ascribed to Gildas. Matthew Paris not only noted the discrepancy in his sources, but also clearly preferred the Plinian variant of 300 miles. On his own pioneering map of Britain (in the manuscript Cambridge Corpus Christi College, MS. 16, fol. IVv) he quotes from “version R” and gives the breadth of the island as 300 miles. One cannot be sure that he preferred that variant on the authority of Pliny himself. But we know that in the 13th century Matthew's monastery, the abbey of St. Albans, possessed a copy of *Natural History* (only Books 1–19; now Oxford, New College, MS. 274) and Matthew definitely used information from Pliny in some of his works. Thus, the Plinian tradition of descriptions of Britain probably remained quite influential in medieval England through the High Middle Ages.

References

- Breeze, A. (2011). Durham, Caithness, and Armes Prydein. *Northern History*, 48(1), 147–152.
- Ekwall, E. (1930). Early names of Britain. *Antiquity*, 4(14), 149–156.
- Foys, K. (2004). The virtual reality of the Anglo-Saxon Mappamundi. *Literature Compass*, 1(1), 1–17.
- Hodgson Hinde, J. (Ed.) (1868). *Symeonis Dunelmensis Opera et Collectanea* (Vol. 1). Durham, England: Andrews & Co. (Publications of the Surtees Society; 51). (In Latin).
- Krebs, C. B. (2018). The world's measure: Caesar's geographies of *Gallia* and *Britannia* in their contexts and as evidence of his world map. *American Journal of Philology*, 139(1), 93–122.
- Molyneux, G. (2011). Why were some tenth-century English kings presented as rulers of Britain? *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 21, 59–91.
- Morris, R. (Ed.) (1872). *An Old English miscellany containing a bestiary, Kentish sermons, Proverbs of Alfred, religious poems of the thirteenth century*. London: N. Trübner & Co. (In Old English).
- Owen, M. E. (2000). Royal propaganda: Stories from the law-texts. In T. M. Charles-Edwards et al. (Eds.). *The Welsh king and his court*, 224–254. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press.
- Testroet Ouellette, H. (Ed.) (1982). *William of Malmesbury, Polyhistor: A critical edition*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies. (In Latin).
- Ussani, V. (Ed.) (1932). *Hegesippi qui dicitur Historiae libri v*. Vindobonae: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky. (In Latin).

Winterbottom, M. (Ed.) (1978). *Gildas: The ruin of Britain and other works*. London: Phillimore. (In Latin and English).

* * *

Информация об авторе

Станислав Григорьевич Мереминский

кандидат исторических наук
доцент, кафедра всеобщей истории,
Школа актуальных гуманитарных
исследований, Институт общественных
наук, Российская академия народного
хозяйства и государственной службы
при Президенте РФ
Россия, 119571, Москва, пр-т
Вернадского, д. 82, стр. 9
Тел.: +7 (499) 956-96-47
✉ mereminskiy@gmail.com

Information about the author

Stanislav G. Mereminskiy

Cand. Sci. (History)
Assistant Professor, World History
Department, School for Advanced Studies in
the Humanities,
School of Public Policy, The Russian
Presidential Academy of National Economy
and Public Administration
Russia, 119571, Moscow, Prospekt
Vernadskogo, 82, Bld. 9
Tel.: +7 (499) 956-96-47
✉ mereminskiy@gmail.com

I. M. Nikolsky^{ab}

ORCID: 0000-0001-6428-5357

✉ ivan.nikolsky@mail.ru

^a Национальный исследовательский университет
«Высшая школа экономики» (Россия, Москва)

^b Институт всеобщей истории РАН
(Россия, Москва)

IMAGES OF ANIMALS FROM *HISTORIA NATURALIS* IN POLITICAL RHETORIC OF LATE ANTIQUITY: BLOSSIUS AEMILIUS DRACONTIUS' LION

Аннотация. Проблематика статьи связана с репрезентацией Плиниевых образов животных, известных по «Естественной истории», в эпоху поздней античности. В частности, речь идет об образе льва, показанного самым благородным и милосердным среди хищников в восьмой книге сочинения Плиния. Именно в таком виде его в целом приняла античная традиция, однако я пытаюсь показать, что в ряде случаев, связанных, в частности, с творчеством карфагенского поэта V в. Блоссия Эмилия Драконция этот «благородный» образ использовался лишь как маска, необходимая, чтобы скрыть критический настрой произведений, являющихся по сути политическими памфлетами и направленными против вандалских королей, которые захватили в то время власть в Северной Африке.

Ключевые слова: Плиний, «Естественная история», поздняя античность, рецепция классической традиции, Драконций, вандалская Африка

Для цитирования: Nikolsky I. M. Images of animals from *Historia Naturalis* in political rhetoric of Late Antiquity: Blossius Aemilius Dracontius' lion // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 158–167. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-158-167.

Статья поступила в редакцию 25 сентября 2019 г.
Принято к печати 16 октября 2019 г.

I. M. Nikolsky^{ab}

ORCID: 0000-0001-6428-5357

✉ ivan.nikolsky@mail.ru

^a National Research University Higher School of Economics (Russia, Moscow)

^b Institute of World History, Russian Academy of Sciences
(Russia, Moscow)

IMAGES OF ANIMALS FROM *HISTORIA NATURALIS* IN POLITICAL RHETORIC OF LATE ANTIQUITY: BLOSSIUS AEMILIUS DRACONTIUS' LION

Abstract. The main subject of the paper is the representation of Pliny's 'bestiary' in Late Antiquity. In particular, it concerns the image of the lion depicted in Book 8 of *Historia Naturalis* as the most gentle and merciful of carnivores. I try to argue that a Carthaginian 5th century author, Blossius Aemilius Dracontius, used this image to construct political allegories, but not in a complimentary way; rather, it served as a kind of 'camouflage', an instrument to disguise the criticism present in his texts, which were, in essence, political pamphlets.

The main idea is that texts of different genres, written by Dracontius at different times, can be treated as one system, constructed by using of cross-cutting terms, characters and images in each poem. The image of a lion is one of the most popular in this sequence: it appears both in early works by the Carthaginian poet (dedication to Felicianus Grammaticus, known as *Romulea 1; Controversia de statua viri fortis*) and in later ones (*Satisfactio; De Raptu Helenae; Orestis Tragoedia*). Analysis of intertextual links shows that with the help of this image Dracontius tried to depict Vandal kings as rude and bloodthirsty creatures — not directly, because this could be too dangerous, but rather implicitly: the lion image, traditionally associated with Pliny's description, served here as a kind of mask.

Keywords: Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, Late Antiquity, reception of classical tradition, Dracontius, Vandal Africa

To cite this article: Nikolsky, I. M. (2020). Images of animals from *Historia Naturalis* in political rhetoric of Late Antiquity: Blossius Aemilius Dracontius' lion. *Shagi / Steps*, 6(1), 158–167. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-158-167.

Received September 25, 2019

Accepted October 16, 2019

This paper deals with the question of how ideas and views concerning the surrounding world that had appeared in Pliny's *Historia Naturalis* were adapted in Late Antiquity. It is examined on the basis of works by Blossius Aemilius Dracontius, a poet of the 2nd half of the 5th century — beginning of the 6th century, who wrote in Latin, and lived in Carthage, capital of the Vandal kingdom in North Africa. The textual heritage of this author is distinguished by presence of stable connections between motifs and images in works of different genres and written at different times; some of these recur consistently. Among such images, one of the most frequent is the image of the lion as the most noble predator.

The main source for such a conception, as researchers repeatedly have noted [Tizzoni 2012: 287; Marrón 2017], was the description by Pliny in Book 8 of his *Historia Naturalis* (NH VIII.41–50). Pliny actually does distinguish between the lion and other predators, noting its unique nobility (42; 50: *generositas, praecipua generositas*), in comparison, for example, with leopards: these, most tellingly, lack a mane, an external sign of this nobility (VIII.42)¹.

The main quality where this leonine nobility is manifested is clemency (*clementia*). The lion doesn't attack first or without a reason; it spares children and women. Only armed enemies (typically, hunters) are able to provoke its aggression), and even then only if it has been wounded. As soon as they stop attacking, the predator loses interest in the battle².

Such views concerning the lion as a noble and brave animal, already found, among ancient authors, in Aristotle's works, appeared in political rhetoric with the

¹ *leoni praecipua generositas tunc, cum colla armosque vestiunt iubae; id enim aetate contingit e leone conceptis. quos vero pardi generavere, semper insigni hoc carent; simili modo feminae...* (The lion is specially high-spirited at the time when its neck and shoulders are clothed with a mane, for this occurs at maturity in the case of those sired by a lion, though those begotten by leopards always lack this characteristic; and the females likewise — trans. of Pliny hereinafter by H. Rackham, W. H. S. Jones, D. E. Eichholz).

² NH VIII.48: *Leoni tantum ex feris clementia in supplices. prostratis parcit et, ubi saevit, in viros potius quam in feminas fremit, in infantes non nisi magna fame. credit Iuba pervenire intellectum ad eos precum; in captivam certe Gaetuliae reducem audivit multorum in silvis impetum esse mitigatum adloquio ausae dicere, se feminam, profugam, infirmam, supplicem animalis omnium generosissimi ceterisque imperitantis, indignam eius gloria praedam...* (The lion alone of wild animals shows mercy to suppliants; it spares persons prostrated in front of it, and when raging it turns its fury on men rather than women, and only attacks children when extremely hungry. Iuba believes that the meaning of entreaties gets through to them: at all events he was informed that the onset of a herd of lions in the forests upon a woman of Gaetulia who was captured and got away again had been checked by a speech in which she dared to say that she was a female, a fugitive, a weakling a suppliant to the most generous of all the animals, the lord of all the rest, a booty unworthy of his glory...); NH 50: *generositas in periculis maxime deprehenditur, non illo tantum modo, quo spernens tela diu se terrore solo tuetur ac velut cogi testatur cooriturque non tamquam periculo coactus, sed tamquam amentiae iratus* (The lion's nobility of spirit is detected most in dangers, not merely in the way that despising weapons he protects himself for a long time only by intimidation, and protests as it were that he is acting under compulsion, and rises to the encounter not as if forced by danger but as though enraged by madness...); NH 51: *vulneratus observatione mira percussorem novit et in quantalibet multitudine adpetit; eum vero, qui telum quidem miserit, sed non vulneraverit, correptum rotatumque sternit nec vulnerat. cum pro catulis feta dimicat, oculorum aciem traditur defigere in terram, ne venabula expavescat...* (When he has been wounded he marks down his assailant in a marvellous way, and knows him and picks him out in however large a him but fails to wound him he seizes and whirling him round flings him on the ground, but does not wound him).

assistance of Pliny's contemporary, Seneca, who used the lion's character as an example for Nero in his treatise *On Clemency*, a work composed slightly earlier than the *Historia Naturalis* (*De clementia* I.5.5)³. This image was developed in Martial's epigrams, in the so called 'lion-hare cycle' (Marc. I.6, 14, 22, 48, 51, 60, 104), and later was found, for example, in the works of Claudian, again in a political context (*Carmina minora* 22.18–26).

Dracontius is the latest in this series of authors, and his interpretation of the lion image is of particular interest, because this image passed from one of his works to another, appeared in texts belonging to different genres and, to a certain extent, united them. This allows us to consider his entire literary heritage as a single system.

Before turning to this, central part of our paper, a few words about Dracontius' biography and its connection with his creative work⁴. It is known that he was descended from a noble Roman family (perhaps, senatorial); was educated by Felicianus Grammaticus; and for a time was a successful lawyer and orator. He had access to the political establishment, dominated by the Vandals: following their conquest of North Africa they had preserved the general framework of the Roman administrative system, at a minimum on the local level. At some point in his life Dracontius fell into disfavor and was arrested, it is believed, for political reasons; the most popular view⁵ is that this took place during the reign of king Gunthamund (484–496). A hint about the reasons for his arrest can be found in a work he wrote in prison, *Satisfactio*. Written in verse, this was a plea for pardon addressed to the king of the Vandals: Dracontius asked to be forgiven for writing another panegyric, dedicated to an 'unknown lord', *dominus ignotus*, perhaps some political opponent of Gunthamund⁶. The appeal was unsuccessful; the poet obtained his release only from the next Vandal ruler, Thrasamund (496–523), supposedly after composing another, appropriate panegyric, the text of which has not survived.

Consequently, the literary career of Dracontius also can be divided into three phases⁷: before prison, during his imprisonment, and after it. To the earliest phase some initial works from the compendium *Romulea*⁸ may be assigned, including two dedications to his teacher, Felicianus Grammaticus (*Romulea* 1; 3), and *Controversia de statua viri fortis* (*Romulea* 5). To the prison phase — *Satisfactio*, mentioned above, and the largest known work by Dracontius, *De Laudibus Dei*. To the last,

³ *Elephanti leonesque transeunt, quae impulerunt; ignobilis bestiae pertinacia est* (Elephants and lions pass by those whom they have struck down; inveteracy is the quality of ignoble animals — trans. by A. Stewart).

⁴ Not all details of Dracontius' life are known, but its main points are reconstructed in the scholarly literature. See, for example: [Romano 1959: 10–52; Bright 1987: 14–20; Kaufmann 2005: 19–20].

⁵ See [Romano 1959: 16–23; Bright 1987: 14–20; Schetter 1990: 90; Obermeier 1999: 59–61; Edwards 2004; Merrills 2004].

⁶ See *Satisfactio* (hereinafter *Sat.*) 93–94. It is traditionally considered that the role of this *dominus ignotus* was played by one or another foreign ruler (Anastasius, Zeno or Theodoric — see studies by D. Romano, D. Bright, W. Schetter, A. Obermeier, M. Edwards from the previous note). A Merrills [2004] assumed that it was not a foreign ruler, but a Vandal one, perhaps Huneric, Gunthamund's immediate predecessor.

⁷ For a chronology of Dracontius' works see, for example [Shanzer 1986: 20; Bright 1999].

⁸ This compendium is also known as *Carmina Profana*. The fullest editions can be found in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (*Auctores antiquissimi series*, vol. 14) and in the Les Belles Lettres series, published during the 1980–1990's. For more details see the bibliography.

post-prison phase, a series of *epyllia* that includes, for example, *De Raptu Helenae* (Romulea 8), *Medea* (Romulea 10), and *Orestis Tragoedia*.

The image of the lion is particularly prominent in *Satisfactio*, Dracontius' most biographical and most intensely rhetorical work, in which he appeals to his addressee for mercy and brings up the lion as a prime example of this quality. According to Dracontius, the lion is noble and merciful for two reasons: it doesn't attack a hunter who has given up⁹, and has no interest in easy prey, small animals¹⁰. Both these characteristics (the second one refers, to a greater extent, to Martial, but its base model is still Pliny's description of the lion as the least bloodthirsty animal, one that is not too eager for food) appear, correspondingly, in *Controversia*¹¹ and in *De Raptu Helenae*¹².

⁹ Sat. 137–148: *Sic leo terribile fremit horridus ore cruento / Unguibus excussis dente minante neces; / acius iratus crispato lumine ferri / et mora si fuerit, acius inde furit; / at si venator trepidans venabula ponat / territus et iaceat, mox perit ira cadens. / Temnit praedo cibos, quos non facit ipse cadaver; / ac ferus ignoscit, ceu satis accipiat, / et dat prostrato veniam sine vulnere victo / ore verecundo deiiciens oculos. / Sic tua, regnator, non impia frangitur ira, / cum confessus erit crimina gesta reus* (So a horrible lion terribly roars with a bloody mouth, with claws coming out, threatening to kill. And he becomes angrier because of [the hunter's] swinging a sword, and [the hunter's] slowness makes him even more aggressive. But if a hunter becomes frightened, and in fear drops a spear, the anger soon will pass — for the predator rejects all prey killed not by itself. And this wild beast is able to forgive, as if accepting an apology, and shows mercy to the prostrate and the defeated, does not wound, turns away from the confused [victim's] face. Thus, o ruler, your not unrighteous anger dies down when the malefactor repents of his misdeeds). Trans. of Dracontius from Latin is mine.

¹⁰ Sat. 265–270: *Ut mi irascaris, quis sim <qui> dignior ira / tam magni regis iudicer esse tua? / Quando per aetherias aquila volitante rapinas / praeda cibusque fuit passer hirundo picus? / Quando fames rabidi quamvis ieiuna leonis / ut sit, adoptavit faucibus esca lepus?* (Who am I, that you are angry with me? To be thought the most deserving of your anger — the anger of so great a king? Could it be that a sparrow, swallow or woodpecker would become a meal and prey for an eagle, soaring in the sky, searching a prey? Could it be that hunger, even very great, made a hare food for a furious lion?)

¹¹ Romulea 5 (*Controversia*) 306–311: *Si ratio te nulla movet, si mente cruenta / humana pietate cares, imitare leones / quos feritas generosa iuvat: super arma tenentes / ingruere fremitusque dare procul ore cruento / nobilis ira solet, subjectis parcere gaudent / et praedam rabies contempsit fulva iacentem* (If there are no arguments for you, if because of your bloody spirit you are deprived of human pity, imitate lions! Their generous savagery supports them. The habit formed by their noble anger is to attack those who are armed, and to growl at them from afar with a bloody mouth. But they are glad to spare the submissive, and the red ferocity ignores prone prey).

¹² Romulea 8 (*De Raptu Helenae*) 350–364: *Sic magna leonis / ira fremit, cum lata procul venabula cernens / venantis crispare manu iam verbera caudae / cruribus incutiens spargit per colla per armos / erecta cervice iubas, jam tenditur altus / dentibus illis et pectus grande remugit / (flumina tunc resonant, montes et lustra resultant); / ast ubi venator reiecta cuspidе sollers / sponte cadit pronusque iacet, perit ira leonis, / turpe putans, non dente suo si praeda iacebit; / temnit praedo cibos, quos non facit ipse cadaver; / ignoscens feritate pia, veniale precatus / venator si cesset iners: sic rector Achivus / frangitur et Phrygibus convivia laeta parari / per septem iubet ipse dies* (So a lion's anger thunders when it sees from afar spears quivering in hunters' hands. It beats its sides with the tail, now the lion raises its head, disperses its mane over its neck and shoulders. It rises having snapped its teeth. It emits a loud roar from his breast (so rivers resonate; so mountains and meadows answer with an echo). But when a skillful hunter drops his spear, voluntarily falls flat on the ground and lays there, the lion's anger passes away, as it considers unworthy prey lying dead not because of its bites. And the predator rejects all prey, killed not by itself, forgiving in its pious wildness, if a hunter lying motionless begs for mercy. So the Achaean ruler calms down and gives an order to prepare a seven-day feast for the Phrygians).

At first glance, as in the Plinian ‘original’, the lion in *Satisfactio* and in the other two already mentioned works, embodies nobility and serves as a ‘positive’ model. However, if we look at the structure and the system of characters in these works (particularly in *Controversia* and *De Raptu*), and at other works by Dracontius, in which a lion appears — where comparisons with this animal are not so detailed, but are no less telling — the conclusions may turn out to be directly opposite.

Thus, the plot of *Controversia*, centers on a conflict between a poor man and his rich opponent, ‘brave man’ (*vir fortis*), who tries to rob him — deprive him of his last possession, a statue, — and then kill him. A comparison with the lion, addressed to the wealthy man, turns out to be the last peaceful argument in the dispute. From then on — a civil war, and the *vir fortis* is shown to be its main potential culprit and instigator: his behavior is described as “rage”, *furor*¹³. The author clearly has no sympathy for him.

In turn, in *De Raptu Helenae*, the main antihero appears to be Paris, who kidnapped Helen and by this deed provoked the war between the Greeks and the Trojans¹⁴. Yet, in fact, Telamon, the ruler of Salamis, who is also compared to a lion, is no less villainous: according to the plot, he has been holding Hesione in captivity and has refused to return her to Priam¹⁵.

By themselves, these arguments might be insufficient, but the contexts from other works by Dracontius, where a lion appears, indicate that this is more likely the correct line of reasoning.

In the dedication to Felicianus Grammaticus, the earliest work by Dracontius, the predators, including a lion, serve as a political allegory for the Vandals in their conflict with the Romans, ‘Romulus’s successors’, *Romulides*, who are depicted as herbivores. Accordingly, Felicianus is compared to Orpheus, the only one able to stop the violence, to reconcile the two warring camps of animals. The lion here is no different from other carnivores; Dracontius “awards” him the same epithets with negative connotations as he does the other predators (*fera, cruenta bestia*)¹⁶.

¹³ *Romulea* 5.1: *Quis iste furor novus...* (What new kind of madness...).

¹⁴ Such is the opinion of most researchers. See [Romano 1959: 30–37; Bright 1987: 85–137; Simons 2005: 285–306; Van Zyl Smit 2010; Wasyl 2011: 31–39; 52–59].

¹⁵ *Romulea* 8 (*De Raptu Helenae*) 45–52: *Damnantur gentes, damnatur Graecia sollers / heu magnis viduanda viris; orbatur Eous / Memnone belligero, damnatur Thessalus heros / et Telamone satus, pereunt duo fulmina belli. / Pro matris thalamo poenas dependit Achilles / (unde haec causa fuit), forsan Telamoniui Ajax / sternitur invictus, quod mater reddita non est / Hesione Priamo; sic est data causa rapinae* (Tribes are condemned, condemned to lose her great men is cunning Greece. The East will be deprived of bellicose Memnon; condemned is the Thessalian hero, and Telamon’s children will die, two lightnings in battle! For the mother’s marriage Achilles bears punishment (it was the root cause of all), and, most likely, Ajax, Telamon’s son dies undefeated, because his mother hadn’t been returned to Priam. Here is the cause of the kidnapping).

¹⁶ *Romulea* 1: *Orpheum vatem renarrant ut priorum litterae / cantitasse dulce carmen voce nervo pectine / inter ornos propter amnes adque montes algidos, / (quem benignus grex secutus cum cruenta bestia / audiens melos stupebat concinente pollice: / tunc feras reliquit ira, tunc pavor iumenta, tunc / lenta tigris, cervus audax, mitis ursus adfuit, / non lupum timebat agna, non leonem caprea, / non lepus iam praeda saevo tunc molosso iugiter; / artifex natura rerum quis negat concordiam, / hos chelys Musea totos Orpheusque miscuit): / sancte pater, o magister, taliter canendus es, / qui fugatas Africanæ reddis urbi litteras, / barbaris qui Romulidas iungis auditorio, / cuius ordines profecto semper obstupescimus, / quos capit dulcedo vestri, doctor, oris maxima...* (As our forefathers’ books tell us the poet Orpheus sang a sweet song with his voice, with strings and plectrum among the ash trees, near rivers and as far as the cold mountains

This piece of fiction, in terms of polemical style the most uncompromising of all texts produced by Dracontius, cannot but influence our understanding and interpretation of his other works, in which the same images and characters are used. Willy-nilly we have to consider them in a political context, and a lion as a part of such an allegory is no longer seen as so positive.

In *De Laudibus Dei* (LD) the author mentions lions when he speaks about the prophet Daniel, who was tortured and thrown into their den¹⁷. Here the piety (*pietas*) of the prophet, who chose to serve God and not the ‘Scythian Diana’, i. e. refused to participate in barbarian rites, is contrasted with the “ferocity” (*rabies*) and “rage” (*furor*) of the lions — in this instance they clearly are not on the “light side”.

The allegory is continued and developed in *Orestis Tragoedia* (OT), where Orestes and Pylades, after Clytemnestra’s murder, are compared to ‘lions with a dark red mane’ (OT 796–797). The principal ethical question raised in this work deals with the admissibility of matricide if the mother was responsible for the father’s death, if she betrayed him and was the accomplice of an usurper. The answer is more likely negative. The matricide is described as a result of a ‘blessed rage’ (*pius furor*, OT 19), i. e., the madness of the hero, and Orestes himself — after this murder — suffers from episodes of insanity, also termed *furor* (OT 844–850). Thus, Orestes here is a thoroughly unpleasant personage, and the image of a lion fits that.

It’s interesting that in the other epyllion by Dracontius, *Medea*, the theme of comparison of a negative character and a lion, as it had been depicted by Pliny, was further developed, even if rather implicitly. Medea, depicted by Dracontius as a priestess of the ‘Scythian Diana’, was obliged to sacrifice Jason to this goddess, but, after falling in love with him, refused to do it, justifying her decision by saying he is unworthy of being such a sacrifice (*Medea* 243–244)¹⁸. This rhetoric closely resembles the ‘leonine’ motif of disdain for small game. Here it is articulated by the antiheroine, who ultimately kills all the other characters, including her sons and Jason himself (this is how Dracontius depicts it).

On the basis of the preceding, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. Starting with Dracontius’ earliest work, the dedication to Felicianus Grammaticus, and continuing in his subsequent writings, the lion is the most important link between different images (the barbarian in the dedication — the *vir fortis* in *Controversia* — Gunthamund in *Satisfactio* — Telamon in *De Raptu Helenae* — Orestes in *Orestis Tragoedia*).

(the meek herd that followed him, as well the bloodthirsty beast, on hearing his song and the accompaniment of his fingers fell into a stupor. Then anger left the wild beasts and fear [left] the cattle; then slow became the tiger, brave the deer, the bear gentle; the ewe lamb no longer feared the wolf, the gazelle [no longer feared] the lion, the hare is no longer always prey for savage Molossian dogs. Those to whom the creator, the nature of things, denied concord, Orpheus and the Muses’ lyre mingled them all): o holy father, o master, so you are deserving of praise, you, who return banished learning to the African city, you, who bring together Romulus’s descendants and barbarians in the classroom, whose lessons leave us transfixed, when we are caught unaware by the surpassing sweetness of your words, learned teacher...).

¹⁷ LD 3.188–192: *Saeva Daniele rabies atque ora leonum / non tetigere pium... amphitheatrales qui non tremuere furores...* (Severe ferocity and the mouths of lions didn’t harm pious Daniel... [you], who weren’t be afraid of the madness of the amphitheatre).

¹⁸ *Non est haec victima digna...* (This victim is unworthy).

2. All these characters, compared to a lion, like the lion itself, act as a political allegory, through which one sees an image of the Vandal, a force that Dracontius judges to be hostile. Accordingly, all the conflicts, on which the plots of his works are based, are likewise allegories of the Roman-Vandal conflict (herbivores vs. carnivores in the dedication to Felicianus — the poor man vs the *vir fortis* in *Controversia* — the poet vs the king in *Satisfactio* — the Trojans vs the Greeks in *De Raptu* — Orestes vs Clytemnestra in *Orestis Tragoedia*).

3. The 'nobility' of the lion, which Dracontius takes from Pliny, turns out to be illusory: it hides the true wild, predatory, 'barbarian' nature of this animal. Accentuating it was only a tactical move in the author's anti-Vandal rhetoric. Over time, this rhetoric softened — by comparison to the dedication to Felicianus — but every time referred precisely to it, implicitly showing that the lion's nobility is a falsehood.

Editions of Dracontius' works, used in the paper

- LD = Blossius Aemilius Dracontius. De Laudibus Dei. Libri I–III (1905). In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi* (Vol. 14), 23–113. Berlin: Weidmann. (In Latin);
- Moussy, C., Camus, C. (Ed., Trans.) (1985). *Dracontius. Œuvres*, (Vol. 1) *Louanges de Dieu, Livres I et II*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and in French);
- Moussy, C. (Ed., Trans.) (1988). *Dracontius. Œuvres*, (Vol. 2) *Louanges de Dieu, Livre III. Réparation*, 7–140. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and in French).
- OT = Vollmer, F. (Ed.) (1905). Blossius Aemilius Dracontius. *Orestis Tragoedia*. In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi* (Vol. 14), 197–226. Berlin: Weidmann. (In Latin);
- Bouquet, J. (Ed., Trans.), Bouquet, J., Wolff, É. (Intro.) (1995). *Dracontius. Œuvres*, (Vol. 3) *La Tragédie d'Oreste. Poèmes profanes I–V*, 87–130. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and in French).
- Romulea 1 = Praefatio Dracontii discipuli ad grammaticum Felicianum (1905). In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi* (Vol. 14), 132. Berlin: Weidmann. (In Latin);
- Bouquet, J. (Ed., Trans.), Bouquet, J., Wolff, É. (Intro.) (1995). *Dracontius. Œuvres*, (Vol. 3) *La Tragédie d'Oreste. Poèmes profanes I–V*, 134–135. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and in French).
- Romulea 5 = Blossius Aemilius Dracontius. *Controversia de statua viri fortis* (1905). In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi* (Vol. 14), 140–148. Berlin: Weidmann. (In Latin);
- Bouquet, J. (Ed., Trans.), Bouquet, J., Wolff, É. (Intro.) (1995). *Dracontius. Œuvres*, (Vol. 3) *La Tragédie d'Oreste. Poèmes profanes I–V*, 147–160. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and in French).
- Romulea 8; De Raptu Helenae = Vollmer, F. (Ed.) (1905). Blossius Aemilius Dracontius. De Raptu Helenae. In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi* (Vol. 14), 156–173. Berlin: Weidmann. (In Latin);
- Wolff, É. (Ed., Intro.) (1996). *Dracontius. Œuvres*, (Vol. 4) *Poèmes profanes VI–X. Fragments*, 13–40. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and in French).
- Romulea 10, Medea = Blossius Aemilius Dracontius. Medea (1905). In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi* (Vol. 14), 180–196. Berlin: Weidmann. (In Latin);

- Kaufmann, H. (2005). *Dracontius Romul. 10 (Medea)*. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter. (In German and Latin);
 Wolff, É. (Ed., Intro.) (1996). *Dracontius. Œuvres*, (Vol. 4) *Poèmes profanes VI–X. Fragments*, 52–76. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and in French).
 Sat. = Vollmer, F. (Ed.) (1905). Blossius Aemilius Dracontius. Satisfactio ad Gunthamundum regem Wandalorum. In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi* (Vol. 14), 114–131. Berlin: Weidmann. (In Latin);
 Moussy, C. (Ed., Trans.) (1988). *Dracontius. Œuvres*, (Vol. 2) *Louanges de Dieu, Livre III. Réparation*, 141–224. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and in French).

References

- Bright, D. F. (1987). *The miniature epic in Vandal Africa*. Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma Press.
 Bright, D. F. (1999). The chronology of the poems of Dracontius. *Classica et Mediaevalia. Revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire*, 50, 193–206.
 Edwards, M. J. (2004). Dracontius the African and the Fate of Rome. *Latomus*, 63(1), 151–160.
 Kaufmann, H. (2005). *Dracontius, Romul. 10 (Medea)*. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Heidelberg: Winter. (In German and Latin).
 Marrón, G. (2017). Furor impius / non impia ira. Comparaciones de hombres con leones en la obra de Bloisio Emilio Draconcio. *Euphrosyne: Revista de filología clásica*, 45, 80–95. (In Spanish).
 Merrills, A. (2004). The perils of panegyric: The lost poem of Dracontius and its consequences. In A. Merrills (Ed.). *Vandals, Romans and Berbers: New perspectives on Late Antique North Africa*, 145–162. Aldershot: Ashgate.
 Obermeier, A. (1999). *The History and anatomy of auctorial self-criticism in the European Middle Ages*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
 Romano, D. (1959). *Studi Draconziani*. Palermo: U. Manfredi. (In Italian).
 Shanzer, D. A. (1986). *A philosophical and literary commentary on Martianus Capella's De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, Book I*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
 Schetter, W. (1990). Zur 'Satisfactio' des Dracontius. *Hermes*, 118(1), 90–117. (In German).
 Simons, R. (2005). *Dracontius und der Mythos: Christliche Weltsicht und pagane Kultur in der ausgehenden Spätantike*. Leipzig: De Gruyter. (In German).
 Tizzoni, M. (2012). *The poems of Dracontius in their Vandalic and Visigothic context*. Leeds: The Univ. of Leeds.
 Van Zyl Smit, B. (2010). The amorous queen and the country bumpkin: Clytaemestra and Egistus in Dracontius' Orestis Tragoedia. *Akroterion*, 55, 25–36.
 Wasyl, A. M. (2011). *Genres rediscovered: Studies in Latin Miniature epic, love elegy, and epigram of the Romano-Barbaric age*. Kraków: Jagiellonian Univ. Press.

* * *

Информация об авторе

Иван Михайлович Никольский

кандидат исторических наук
доцент, Институт классического
Востока и античности,
Национальный исследовательский
университет «Высшая школа экономики»
Россия, 105066, Москва, Старая
Басманная ул., д. 21/4, стр. 3
Тел.: +7 (495) 772-95-90
Центр «Восточная Европа в античном
и средневековом мире»,
Институт всеобщей истории РАН
Россия, 119334, Москва,
Ленинский проспект, д. 32а
Тел.: +7 (495) 954-44-82
✉ ivan.nikolsky@mail.ru

Information about the author

Ivan M. Nikolsky

Cand. Sci. (History)
Assistant Professor,
Institute for Oriental and Classical Studies,
National State University Higher School of
Economics
Russia, 105066, Moscow,
Staraya Basmannaya Str., 21/4, Bld. 3-L
Tel.: +7 (495) 772-95-90
Researcher, Center "Eastern Europe
in the Ancient and Medieval World",
Institute of World History,
Russian Academy of Sciences
Russia, 119991, Moscow, Leninsky Prospekt,
32a
Tel.: +7 (495) 954-44-82
✉ ivan.nikolsky@mail.ru

I. Velázquez Soriano

ORCID: 0000-0001-5641-1878

✉ ivelaz@ucm.es

Мадридский университет Комплутенсе
(Испания, Мадрид)

THE INFLUENCE AND USE OF PLINY'S *NATURALIS HISTORIA* IN ISIDORE OF SEVILLE'S *ETYMOLOGIAE*

Аннотация. Статья посвящена такой дискуссионной проблеме, как использование в «Этимологиях» Исидора Севильского в качестве источника «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего — напрямую или косвенным образом. Типология источников, использованных Исидором, рассматривается в соответствии с классификацией Фонтена [Fontaine 1960: 149]: 1) источники, установленные благодаря параллельному тексту; 2) источники, установленные без обращения к письменным текстам; 3) свидетельства предыдущих источников об аналогичном предмете изложения, которые, вероятно, не использовались Исидором; 4) тексты, косвенным образом относящиеся к тексту Исидора и содержащие идентичную с его трудом лексику. Анализируются прямые заимствования из Плиния, косвенное использование его текста, а также предположительное заимствование, если источник не упоминается. Рассматриваются приемы работы Исидора с источниками посредством сравнения отдельных текстов. Творческий метод Исидора при написании «Этимологий» обозначается термином *conflatio*. Изложенное позволяет сделать вывод, что Исидору «Естественная история» была известна и что он использовал ее в качестве источника, хотя он использовал этот материал лишь по необходимости.

Ключевые слова: Плиний Старший, «Естественная история», Исидор Севильский, «Этимологии», использование литературных источников, краткое изложение текста, использование выбранных мест, техника выбранного текста, *conflatio*, оригинальность Исидора Севильского

Для цитирования: Velázquez Soriano I. The influence and use of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* in Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 168–186. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-168-186.

Статья поступила в редакцию 7 октября 2019 г.
Принято к печати 8 ноября 2019 г.

I. Velázquez Soriano

ORCID: 0000-0001-5641-1878

✉ ivelaz@ucm.es

Complutense University of Madrid
(Spain, Madrid)

THE INFLUENCE AND USE OF PLINY'S *NATURALIS HISTORIA* IN ISIDORE OF SEVILLE'S *ETYMOLOGIAE*

Abstract. This article discusses the controversial subject of the use — whether direct or indirect, through intermediary sources or *excerpta* — of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* in Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*. The types of sources used by Isidore are analysed according to the classification established by Fontaine [1960: 149]: 1) sources documented thanks to a specific parallel text; 2) sources used in a non-literal way; 3) evidence from previous sources on the same subject, which Isidore probably did not use himself; 4) texts that, without having a direct relationship to a passage in Isidore, contain a string of words identical to those used by him. On the basis of various examples, some direct mentions of Pliny, other indirect uses and possible direct uses are analysed, even if the author is not mentioned. We also consider how Isidore works, through a comparison of some texts. Here, the technique called 'conflatio' is claimed as a form of work of Isidore when composing his *Etymologies*. In the conclusion, we defend Isidore's knowledge and use of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*. It is likely that Isidore had Pliny's entire work in his library, even if he used it only in a timely manner for what he needed. We also discuss the actual need to carry out an in-depth, systematic study of this issue.

Keywords: Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia*, Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, use of literary sources, text summary, use of the *excerpta*, techniques for selecting texts, *conflatio*, Isidore's originality

Acknowledgements. This study has been carried out as part of research projects HAR2015-65649-C2-1-P (Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness) and S2015-HUM/3377 (Comunidad de Madrid).

To cite this article: Velázquez Soriano, I. (2020). The influence and use of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* in Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*. Shagi/Steps, 6(1), 168–186. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-168-186.

Received October 7, 2019

Accepted November 8, 2019

Introduction. Issues surrounding the use of literary sources in Isidore of Seville

In the old, initial studies on the literary sources used by Isidore of Seville, e. g. [Dressel 1874; Brehaut 1912], etc., we read how he made great use of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*. We are told that Isidore knew the work well and had a copy in his famous library. However, despite the suggestions made by Jacques Fontaine (1959) in his unsurpassable thesis *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, this idea went on to change substantially.

For many years, Fontaine's works [Fontaine 1959; 1960; 1961] represented a benchmark for research into Isidore's literary sources. Without a doubt, the suggestions he made, which I will now review briefly, have guided subsequent studies due to their methodological innovation, and thus helped to advance research¹. However, thanks to this progress, other researchers have started to identify and unravel some problems related to the rigorous application of Fontaine's methods. I refer here to studies such as those conducted by Kindermann [2005], Berno [2010], Naas [2012], Breternitz [2016] and, in particular, Jacques Elfassi².

Fontaine established four types of sources used by Isidore of Seville³:

- 1) sources documented thanks to a specific parallel text;
- 2) sources used in a non-literal way;
- 3) evidence from previous sources on the same subject, which Isidore probably did not use himself;
- 4) texts that, without having a direct relationship to a passage in Isidore, contain a string of words identical to those used by Isidore.

Fontaine also established a difference between a direct and indirect source based on two basic criteria:

- 1) Isidore names the author, proving that he is quoting second hand;
- 2) the older the author, the less likely that Isidore would have a copy of his work in his library.

As Elfassi has suggested in various studies [Elfassi 2009; 2014a; 2014b; 2015], these considerations, which are valid as a starting point for research, have led some scholars to either assume that Isidore was not aware of some previous sources or accept them without further detail. Although it is not our aim to focus on specific examples, we can confirm that a "hypercritical" analysis of Isidore's texts was embarked upon to identify his understanding of sources, and the understanding and use of pagan authors in particular. Elfassi questions how scholars have tackled Isidore's knowledge of Quintilian, Martial and Pliny the Elder in particular. To this we should also add Varro (*De lingua latina*) and Nonius Marcellus (*De compendiosa doctrina*).

Although there are good studies about Isidore's library, I think further studies should be done about his uses of sources. For example, Rodríguez-Pantoja [1995:

¹ See, for example, [Oroz Reta 1987; Guillaumin 2010; 2011; Martín 2013].

² See [Elfassi 2009; 2011; 2014a; 2015]. I would like to thank my colleague and friend Dr. Elfassi for giving me access to the unedited study he completed for his professorship, in which he tackles the issue of Isidore's sources, and in particular the pages devoted to Pliny the Elder [Elfassi 2014b].

³ I take this scheme fundamentally from [Elfassi 2015: 60–61], who takes it, in turn, from [Fontaine 1960: 149].

18–19] states that Isidore is indirectly aware of Nonius, and Fontaine [1983] is of the belief that Varro was not present in Isidore's library.

We should also explore another kind of indirect source, which may also have been part of the author's cultural heritage but may not have left its mark obviously in his work. This may be what happened with Vitruvius, probably at times through indirect sources, such as Palladius and Caetius Faventinus, although I think he may well make use of Vitruvius directly at times [Velázquez 1997].

Although traditionally it has been questioned that Isidore of Seville made direct use of Pliny the Elder, for example, by Fontaine, [1959: 749], in his edition of *De natura rerum* [1960: 42] the scholar seems to suggest the opposite or at least hint at it.

In fact, Fontaine thinks that the last chapter of this book, *De partibus terrae*, must have only be written by Isidore once he had read the second book of *Naturalis Historia*. However, the lack of references to Pliny in this book and in other chapters of *De natura rerum*, may mean that Isidore only had access to Pliny's work once he had started writing both books — *De natura rerum* and *Etymologiae* — and that he then added references to Pliny in them.

Indirect use of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*

1. In *Etym.* 12.2. 20 Isidore states the following:

Isid. *Etym.* 12.2. 20: *Linces dicit Plinius Secundus extra unum non admittere fetum* (Pliny says that lynxes do not bear more than one offspring⁴).

But Pliny makes no such statement. This is 'fake news', taken either from an intermediary source or invented by Isidore himself. It may be that there was a lost source that included this erroneous statement which Isidore had used, but I believe that what may have happened was much simpler: a quote from memory that Isidore attributes to the man he believes holds *auctoritas* when it comes to knowledge about nature and the animal kingdom in particular. Isidore may have just believed that Pliny surely wrote about this and did not bother to check further.

This seems to confirm Fontaine's suggestion that direct mention of the author's name presupposes that Isidore used him either second hand or indirectly.

2. One other explicit mention of Pliny is also clearly an indirect reference:

Isid. *Etym.* 12.2.28: *Lycisci autem dicuntur, ut ait Plinius, canes ex lupis et canibus, cum inter se forte miscuntur* (Dogs born from the chance mating of wolves with dogs are called *lycisci*, as Pliny says).

The passage is directly derived from:

Servius, *Eclog.* 3.18: *Lycisci sunt, ut etiam Plinius dicit, canes nati ex lupis et canibus cum inter se forte misceatur.*

⁴ For the translations into English of Isidore's passages, see [Barney et al. 2006].

It is also true that *lycisci* does not appear in Pliny⁵ and is only attested in Gloss. 5.370.2: *lycisca canis ex lupo et cane datus*).

We should consider this piece of fake news within the context. Isidore is writing about lynxes and is summarising Solinus. At the end of the paragraph he adds the reference to Pliny, perhaps because he wants to complete the information and extrapolate the details Pliny gives on lions, even though this too is false (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 8.43: ... *semel ... edi partum ... uolgum credidisse uideo*).

Isid. *Etym.* 12.2.28: *Lincis dictus quia in luporum genere numeratur bestia maculis terga distincta ut pardus, sed similis lupo; unde et ille lykōs, iste lincis. Huius urinam conuertere se in duritiam pretiosi lapidis dicunt, qui lyncurius appellatur; quod et ipsas linceas sentire hoc documentum probatur: nam egestum liquorem harenis, in quantum potuerint, contegunt inuidia quadam naturae, ne talis egestio transeat in usum humanus. Linceas dicit Plinius Secundus extra unum non admittere fetum* (The lynx is so called because it is reckoned among the wolves (*lupus*) in kind; it is a beast that has spotted markings on its back, like a pard, but it is similar to a wolf; whence the wolf has the name *lykōs* and the other animal, 'lynx.' People say that its urine hardens into a precious stone called *lyncurius* (tourmaline). That the lynxes themselves perceive this is shown by this proof: they bury as much of the excreted liquid in sand as they can, from a sort of natural jealousy lest such excretion should be brought to human use. Pliny Secundus (cf. *Nat. Hist.* 8.43) says that lynxes do not bear more than one offspring).

Solin. *Collect.* 2.38: *In hoc animalium (sc. luporum) genere numerantur et lynceae, quarum urinas coire in duritiem (var. -ciam) pretiosi calculi fatentur qui naturas lapidum exquisitius sunt persecuti. Istud etiam ipsas lynceas persentiscere hoc documento probatur; quod egestum liquorem ilico arenarum cumulis quantum ualent contegunt, inuidia scilicet ne talis egeries transeat in nostrum usum* (This type of animals (wolves) also comprises lynxes, whose urine crystallizes into precious gems — as reported by those who claim to have studied the nature of stones thoroughly. It has been proven that lynxes are very much aware of this on account of the following evidence: they cover up the liquid with heaps of dirt immediately after urinating; that is, they do so to the best of their abilities so as to preclude the excrement from passing on to our service).

Despite this, the properties of lynx urine, which forms a precious stone called *lyncurium* (based on a popular etymology), reveals that Isidore could indeed have read this interesting fact directly in Pliny:

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 8.137: *lyncum umor ita redditus, ubi gignuntur, glaciatur arescitue in gemmas carbunculis similes et igneo colore fulgentes,*

⁵ Pliny (8.148) talks about the crossing of dogs with tigers: *E tigris eos Indi uolunt concipi et ob id in siluis coitus tempore alligant feminas*.

lyncurium uocatas atque ob id sucino a plerisque ita generari prodito. nouere hoc sciuntque lynces et inuidentes urinam terra operiunt, eoque celerius solidatur illa (The water of lynxes, voided in this way when they are born, solidifies or dries up into drops like carbuncles and of brilliant flame-colour, called lynx-water (*lyncurium*) which in the origin of the common story that this is the way in which amber is formed. The lynxes have learnt this and know it, and they jealously cover up their urine with earth, thereby causing it to solidify more quickly)⁶.

3. There is no mention of snakes in Pliny either. Once again, Isidore takes this from Servius:

Isid. *Etym.* 12.4.43: *Dicit autem Plinius, si creditur, quod serpentis caput, etiam si cum duobus euaserit digitis, nihilominus uiuit* (And Pliny says, if it may be believed, that if a snake's head escapes with only two inches of its body, it will still live).

Serv. *Georg.* 3.422: *Nam, ut dicit Plinius, serpentis caput etiam si cum duobus euaserit digitis, nihilo minus uiuit.*

4. In this book, there are other mentions of Pliny on animals that do not suggest a direct consultation of the *Naturalis Historia*.

Isid. *Etym.* 12.2.9: *Nam Plinius dicit animalia cum acutis unguibus frequenter parere non posse; uitiantur enim intrinsecus se mouentibus catulis* (Hence Pliny says that animals with sharp claws are unable to give birth many times, for they are injured by the cubs moving inside the womb).

Cf. Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 8.43: *Semel autem edi partum, lacerato ungulum acie utero in inixu, uolgum credidisse uideo* (But I notice that there used to be a popular belief that the lioness only bears a cub once, as her womb is wounded by the points of its claws in delivery).

Here, Pliny is referring to lions. I believe that Isidore may be aware of this through Pliny or even Gelius 13.7.1–6, who talks about this topic and follows Pliny, and he extends its use to refer to all animals which may have long, sharp claws.

5. Another example:

Isid. *Etym.* 12.2.11: *Leopardus ex adulterio leaenae et pardi nascitur et tertiam originem efficit; sicut et Plinius in Naturali Historia dicit, leonem cum parda, aut pardum cum laena concumbere et ex utroque coitu degeneres partus creari, ut mulus et burdo* (The leopard (*leopardus*) is born from the cross-mating of a lioness and a pard, and yields a third breed. So also, Pliny in his *Natural History* says a lion mates with a female pard, or a male pard with a lioness, and from either union this mixed-breed offspring is created, just like a mule or hinny).

⁶ Text and translation: [Rackham 1997].

But Pliny says no such thing; what he does say, when he writes about lions and leopards, is that Africa produces various hybrid species.

Plin. Nat. Hist. 8.42: *Magna his (sc. leonibus) libido coitus et ob hoc maribus ira. Africa haec maxime spectat inopia aquarum ad paucos amnes congregantibus se feris. Ideo multiformes ibi animalium partus, uarie feminis cuiusque generis mares aut ui aut uoluptate miscente* (Sexual passion is strong in this species, with its consequence of quarrelsomeness in the males; this is most observed in Africa, where the shortage of water makes the animals flock to the few rivers. There are consequently many varieties of hybrids in that country, either violence or lust mating the males with the females of each species indiscriminately).

J. André, the editor of Book 12 [André 1986], suggests that this passage may have a link to the following passage from Solinus:

Solin. Collect. 17, 11: *Quorum (sc. pardorum) adulteris coitibus degenerantur partus leaenarum et leones quidem procreantur, sed ignobiles.*

6. Some of these references demonstrate that Isidore did not check Pliny's work himself but read Servius or Solinus. The Sevillian bishop makes use of other late encyclopaedias, including Solinus and Aulus Gellius above all, and the commentaries on Servius and Virgil. He also uses scholia and excerpts, and St Ambrose of Milan's *Hexaemeron*.

This reason makes it easy to understand Fontaine's suggestion that the greater the difference in time between Isidore (in the 7th century) and his source (in this case, Pliny in the 1st century), the less likely it is that he used this source directly. This argument is a weak one, however, if we remember that Isidore makes use of Virgil, Martial, Lucan and even Servius.

Despite the above, I think that explicit mentions of Pliny by Isidore⁷ should not be dismissed as citations from memory. Isidore remembers a paragraph or phrase and believes he read it in Pliny, although he did not have it at hand at the time to check. We obviously have no idea whether Isidore wants to make a personal statement or include a memorised phrase, the origin of which is unclear or he is unsure of, and so he mentions Pliny as an unquestionable text of authority and reference. I do believe, however, that great familiarity with *Naturalis Historia* lies behind his work.

Direct use of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*?

1. In other examples, the references do suggest direct use of Pliny:

Isid. Etym. 12.6.45: *Torpedo uocata eo quod corpus torpescere faciat, si eam quisque uiuentem tangat. Narrat Plinius Secundus: "Ex Indico mare torpedo etiam procul et e longinquo,*

⁷ In those cases in which we can be sure that the reference is not from other authors who mention Pliny.

*uel si hasta uirgaue adtingatur, quamuis praeualidos lacertos torpescere, quamlibet ad cursum ue-
loces alligare pedes*". Tanta enim uis eius est ut etiam aura cor-
poris sui adficiat membra (The 'electric-ray' (*torpedo*) is named because
it makes the body become numb (*torpescere*) if anyone touches it while
it is alive. Pliny Secundus recounts (cf. *Natural History* 32.7): "From the
Indian Ocean the electric-ray, even if it is far distant, or if it is touched
with a spear or stick, numbs one's muscle, no matter how strong it is, and
fetters one's feet, no matter how swift they are." Its force is such that even
the aura of its body weakens the limbs).

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 32.7: *Quid? non et sine hoc exemplo per se satis esset ex
eodem mari torpedo? Etiam procul et e longinquo, uel
si hasta uirgaue attingatur, quamuis praeualidos
lacertos torpescere, quamlibet ad cursum ue-
loces alligari pedes?* (But surely, even without this example, evidence
enough by itself could be found in the electric-ray, which also is a sea
creature. Even at a distance, and that a long distance, or if it is touched
with a spear or rod, to think that the strongest arms are numbed, feet as
swift in racing as you like are paralysed!)*.

As André suggests [1986: 208, note 397], by not transcribing the first phrase Isidore makes an error. He has, without a doubt, read too quickly or in not enough detail, has "extracted" mistaken information from the first phrase. *ex eodem mari*, that is, 'which also comes from the sea', and this leads him to state that 'it comes from the Indian Ocean'.

2. In what follows, Isidore writes about cuttlefish:

Isid. *Etym.* 12.6.46: *Sepia dicitur quia sepibus interclusa facilius capitur;
in coeundo obscenum genus; ore enim concipit sicut uipera. Cuius
atramento tanta uis est ut lucernae addito Aethiopus
uideri ablato priori lumine quidam tradant* (The
cuttlefish (*sepia*) is named because it is more easily caught when it is
hemmed in by enclosures (*sepes*, i. e. *saepes*). It is a disgusting species
with respect to coition, for it conceives in its mouth as do vipers. There is
so much strength in its black ink that some say that when it is placed in a
lamp, with the light first removed, people appear to be Ethiopian).

Without a doubt, this passage also is taken straight from Pliny:

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 32.141: *Sepiae atramento tanta uis est
ut in lucerna addito Aethiopus uideri ablato priore
lumine Anaxilaus tradit* (The ink of the cuttlefish has so great
power that Anaxilaus reports that poured into a lamp the former light
utterly vanishes, and people appear as black as Ethiopians).

* Text and translation: [Jones 2000].

Isidore prefers to avoid mentioning the Greek author's name here and substitutes the expression *Anaxilaus tradit by quidam tradant*.

3. Another explicit mention can be seen in the following:

Isid. Etym. 12.6.63: *Animalium omnium in aquis uiuentium nomina centum quadraginta quattuor Plinius ait, diuisa in generibus beluarum, serpentium communium terrae et aquae, cancorum, concarum, lucustarum, peloridum, polipporum, solearum, lacertorum et lulliginum et huic similia; ex quibus multa quodam naturae intellectu ordinem temporum suorum agnoscunt, quaedam uero in suis locis sine mutatione uagantur* (Pliny says there are 144 names for all the animals living in the waters, divided into these kinds: whales, snakes common to land and water, crabs, shellfish, lobsters, mussels, octopuses, sole, Spanish mackerel (*lacertus*), squid, and the like. Of these, many recognize the order of their seasons by a kind of natural understanding, while some [wander in their places without change]).

In this example, Isidore seems to be reading the Index of Pliny's work and some other passages and adapting them:

a) Plin. Nat. Hist. 1.32.53: *animalium omnium in mari uiuentium nomina CLXXVI*.

b) Plin. Nat. Hist. 32.142: *Peractis aquatiliū dotibus non alienum uidetur indicare per tota maria, tam uasta et tot milibus passuum terrae infusa extraque circumdata mensura, paene ipsius mundi quae intellegatur, animalia centum quadraginta quattuor omnino generum esse eaque nominatim complecti, quod in terrestribus uolucrisque fieri non quit* (Now that I complete my account of the natural qualities of aquatic plants and animals, it seems to me not foreign to my purpose to point out that, throughout all the seas which are so numerous and spacious and come flooding into the landmass over so many miles and surround it outside to an extent which might be thought of as almost equal to that of the world itself — there are one hundred and forty-four species in all; and that they can be included each under its own name, a thing which, in the case of creatures of the land and those which fly, cannot be done).

c) Plin. Nat. Hist. 9.71: *Has intellegi ab iis causas seruarique temporum uices magis miretur si quis reputet quoto cuique hominum nosci uberrimam esse capturam sole transeunte piscium signum* (Their understanding these reasons and their observing the changes of the seasons would seem more surprising to anybody who considers what fraction of mankind is aware that the biggest catch is made when the sun is passing through the sign of the fishes).

If we look at the context here, Isidore mentions Pliny explicitly a number of times in just a few lines of Book 12 of his *Etymologiae*, which deals with animals. It is very likely that for this subject he did refer directly to the *Naturalis Historia*, combining this source with other passages taken from Solinus and Servius.

As Gasti [2010: 40] notes, in Book 12 Pliny is cited directly 6 times, and Isidore's work is probably indirectly dependent on Pliny in at least 45 other places in the text.

4. In Book 13 of *Etymologiae*, which deals with the world and its parts (*De mundo et partibus*), there are several passages in which Isidore follows Pliny directly, apparently with no intermediary author in between them. The following passage of Isidore includes two almost consecutive passages of Pliny:

Isid. *Etym.* 13.12.3: *Aquarum elementum ceteris omnibus imperat. Aquae enim caelum temperant, terram fecundant, aerem exhalationibus suis incorporant, scandunt in sublime et caelum sibi uindicant. Quid enim mirabilius aquis in caelo stantibus?* (The element of water rules over all the rest, for water tempers the sky, makes the earth fertile, gives body to the air with its exhalation, ascends to the heights, and claims the sky for itself. Indeed, what is more amazing than water standing in the sky?)

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 31.1.1: *Hoc elementum (sc. aqua) ceteris omnibus imperat.*

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 31.1.2: *scandunt in sublime et caelum quoque sibi uindicant... Quid esse mirabilius aquis in caelo stantibus?*

In Gasparotto's edition of this book [Gasparotto 2004], he notes at least 23 references to Pliny and 25 to Solinus. This ratio leads us to believe that the use of Pliny is not limited to indirect references. Researchers do not tend to question the use of Solinus as they do of Pliny. In Book 13, in particular, the references to both are very balanced.

5. In Book 16, which tackles stones and metals, Isidore makes considerable use of Pliny, in particular his Books 31, 34, 36 and 37. In addition, we find frequent references to Pliny's Books 21, 33, 35 and some references to 7, 9, 18 and 20. In many cases, cross-checking the texts unveils a direct link between both authors.

This is proved by a careful reading of the copious notes on the sources found in the most recent edition of this book [Féans Landeira 2011]. However, this scholar assumes Fontaine's hypothesis [Fontaine 1961: 21] as already established, without querying it; that is to say, he considers Pliny as an ultimate or distant source, so much so that between the distant source and Isidore "the hypothesis of one or several intermediaries prevails," as well as the relevant role of the "patristic screen." He further adds, "thus, once the idea of a basic work has been eschewed, scholars look for handbooks, compilations, summaries and abstracts, anthologies, florilegia, etc., hence, Isidore would get to know Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* through a summary that may or may not have served as a handbook of mineralogy or botany" [Féans Landeira 2011: lvix–lx].

Oroz Reta [1987] devoted a monographic study to the presence of Pliny in Book 16 of the *Etymologiae*, emphasising several passages with obvious textual parallels, such as the description of various kinds of marble, e. g., *ophite* (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 36.55–56 and Isid. *Etym.* 16.5.4), *basanites* (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 36.58 and Isid. *Etym.*

16.5.6), *coralliticus* (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 36.62–64 and Isid. *Etym.* 16.5.9–11)⁹. The author points out that there are at least 270 passages where Pliny's influence can be detected. Some of these are almost identical. Thus, à propos of *onyx* or *alabastrites*:

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 36.60: *Quem cauant et ad uasa unguentaria quoniam optime seruare incorrupta dicatur.*

Isid. *Etym.* 16.5.7: *Cauant enim hunc ad uasa unguentaria quoniam optime seruare incorrupta dicitur.*

Nevertheless, Oroz Reta, like Féans Landeira years later [2011], deems that the differences between Pliny's original texts and Isidore's hint at the existence of textual collections or formulae, the *excerpta*, so frequently found in the Middle Ages [Oroz Reta 1987: 296]. This idea, almost systematically upheld by most scholars and pundits, prevails in a "hypercritical way" — as Elfassi [2014] argues — even though as yet no actually proper and accurate analysis of the data has been carried out. That is true even in the case of Oroz Reta's work, despite the fact that, right after discussing the use of the *excerpta*, he delves into one of the key concepts any scholar should assume in order to analyse the use of the *Naturalis Historia* in both Pliny and Isidore — or the use of any source whatsoever by the author — to wit, the synthesising and summarising character of the *Etymologiae*, which qualifies it as reductionist in kind.

We can see one example here:

Isid. *Etym.* 16.3.9: *Gypsum cognatum calci est; et est Graecum nomen. Plura eius genera; omnium autem optimum lapidi speculari; est enim signis aedificiorum et coronis gratissimus* (Gypsum (gypsum) is related to limestone; it is a Greek term. There are many varieties, and the best of all is from *specularis lapis* (i. e. a kind of transparent stone). It is most pleasing for the molded figures and cornices of buildings).

The passage also appears in *Etym.* 19.10.20 and corresponds to some phrases taken from a much longer paragraph from Pliny.

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 36.182–183: *Cognata calci res gypsum est. Plura eius genera. Nam et e lapide coquitur, ut in Syria ac Thuriis, et e terra foditur, ut in Cypro ac Perrhabeia; e suma tellure et Tymphaicum est. Qui coquitur lapis non dissimilis alabastritae esse debet aut marmoroso. In Syria durissimos ad id eligunt cocuntque cum fimo bubulo, ut celerius urantur. Omnium autem optimum fieri compertum est e lapide speculari squamamue talem habente. Gypso madi-do statim utendum est, quoniam celerrime coit; tamen rursus tundi se et in farina resolui patitur. Vsus gypsi in albariis, sigillis aedificiorum et coronis gratissimus* (There is an affinity between lime and gypsum, a substance of which there are several varieties. For it can be produced from a heated mineral, as in Syria and Thuriis; it can

⁹ See also [Velázquez 2003: 303] for balanites, Isid. *Etym.* 16.15.10 and Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 37.149.

be dug from the earth, as in Cyprus and Perrhaebia. There is also that of Thymphaea, which is stripped from the earth's surface. The mineral that is heated ought to be like onyx marble or crystalline limestone. In Syria the hardest stones possible are selected for the purpose and are heated along with cow dung so that the burning may be accelerated. However, it has been discovered that the best kind is prepared from specular stone or from stone that flakes in the same way. Gypsum, when moistened, should be used instantly, since it coheres with great rapidity).

Here, Isidore has restricted himself to just selecting the basic information that he needs from his source. In Book 16, he describes vulgar or common stones (*de lapidibus uulgaribus*) in a somewhat irregular classification that includes very diverse items. In 19, he writes of materials that are used in construction (*De constructione*) and lists them: different types of stones, sand, lime, *tegulae* (tiles), and also *gypsum* and its types.

The selection of phrases taken from Pliny is clearly in line with Isidore's aim to provide only the basic information on each material and explain the meaning of its name.

6. The same is true of Book 19, which deals with ships, buildings and clothing. Some passages demonstrate a direct dependence on Pliny. I transcribe here two different passages where, in my opinion, we can see this dependence.

a) Isid. *Etym.* 19.17.15: *Purpurissum ex creta argentaria; cum purpuris pariter tingitur bibetque eum colorem celerius lanis. Praecipuum est tamen aliud quod adhuc uaso rudibus medicamentis inebriatum; proximum est egesto eo addita creta in ius idem, et quotiens id factum est eleuatur bonitas. Pretiosissimae purpurae causa est quod hysgino maxime inficitur rubeaque* (The 'purple pigment' (*purpurissum*) is made from silversmiths' chalk; this chalk is dyed with murex and soaks up the color in the same way that wool does but more quickly. Nevertheless, the superior pigment is something else that has been soaked in a vat with rawdye-stuffs, and the next best is when silversmiths' chalk is added to the dye liquid once the first batch has been removed. The quality diminishes each time this is done. The origin of the most precious purple (*purpura*) is what is colored with *hysginum* (i. e. the dark red pigment from the plant called *hýsgē* in Greek) and with *rubea* (i. e. *rubia*, the red dye from madder root).

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 35.44–45: *E reliquis coloribus, quos a dominis dari diximus propter magnitudinem pretii, ante omnes est purpurissum. Creta argentaria; cum purpuris pariter tingitur bibetque eum colorem celerius lanis. Praecipuum est primum feruente aheni rudibus medicamentis inebriatum; proximum egesto eo addita creta in ius idem, et quotiens id factum est, eleuatur bonitas pro numero dilutiore sanie.* (45) *Quare Puteolanum potius laudetur quam Tyrium aut Gaetulicum uel Laconium; unde pretiosissimae purpurae. Causa est quod hysgino maxime inficitur rubiaque cogitur sorbere.* (Among the remaining colours which because of their

high cost, as we said, are supplied by patrons, dark purple holds the first place. It is produced by dipping silversmiths' earth along with purple cloth and in like manner, the earth absorbing the colour more quickly than the wool. The best is that which being the first formed in the boiling cauldron becomes saturated with the dyes in their primary state, and the text best produces when white earth is added to the same liquor after the first has been removed; and every time this is done the quality deteriorates, the liquid becoming more diluted at each stage).

b) Isid. *Etym.* 19.17.2–3: *Colores aut nascuntur aut fiunt: nascuntur ut Sinopis, rubrica, Paratonium, Melinum, Eretria, auripigmentum; ceteri finguntur aut arte aut permixtione.* (3) *Sinopis inuenta primum in Ponto est: inde nomen a Sinope urbe accepit. Species eius tres: rubra et minus rubens et inter has media* (Colorings either occur naturally or are manufactured. They occur naturally, as for example, red ochre, red earth, *Paraetonium*, *Melinum*, *Eretria*, and gold-coloring. The others are manufactured either by artifice or by mixture. (3) Red ochre (*sinopis*) was found first along the Black Sea, whence it takes its name from the city Sinope. There are three kinds: red, less-red, and something between these two).

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 35.30: *Sunt autem colores austeri aut floridi utrumque natura aut mixture euenit. Floridi sunt -quos dominus pingenti praestat- minium, Armenium, cinnabaris, chrysocola, Indicum, purpurissum; ceteri austeri. Ex omnibus alii nascuntur, alii fiunt. Nascuntur Sinopis, rubrica, Paraetonium, Melinum, Eretria, auripigmentum. Ceteri finguntur....* (31) *Sinopis inuenta primum in Ponto est: inde nomen a Sinope urbe... species sinopidis tres: rubra et minus rubens atque inter has media* (Some colours are sombre and some brilliant, the difference being due to the nature of the substances or to their mixture. The brilliant colours, which the patron supplies at his own expense to the painter, are cinnabar, *Armenium*, dragon's blood, gold-solder, indigo, bright purple; the rest are sombre. Of the whole list some are natural colours and some artificial. Natural colours are sinopis, ruddle, *Paraetonium*, *Melinum* Eretrian earth and orpiment; all the rest are artificial, and first of all those which we specified among minerals, and moreover among the commoner kinds yellow ochre, burnt lead acetate, realgar, sandyx, Syrian colour and black.... (31) there are three kinds of Sinopis, the red, the faintly red and the intermediate).

7. In Book 19, we see numerous passages from Pliny in passages that discuss painting and colours. We could say that Pliny is used as a benchmark for the history of materials, lists and the characteristics of some of them, and Isidore follows him literally. The complete descriptions given by Pliny on each type are summarised and simplified by Isidore.

Either we find the actual intermediary sources, as is the case on numerous occasions — especially with Servius, and above all Solinus for Pliny, St. Agustin and other Christian sources, or we find the famous *excerpta*. Were it otherwise, I deem

it gratuitous and untenable to assume that Isidore did not make direct use of Pliny in a passage that bespeaks textual connections, formal resemblance, sometimes even thematic affinities, but for which we cannot detect any intermediate sources.

The way Isidore summarises could very well stem from *excerpta* gathered previously from Pliny, but may also demonstrate a personal reading of Pliny's entire work and subsequent use of whatever he needs for his text. We are unable to prove either of the two, unless we should come across the *excerpta* that correspond to Isidore's selection. I do think that this selection must exist, and may have been carried out by Isidore himself or perhaps prepared for him by his helpers in his *scriptorium*. It would have been drawn up using entire works, or at least some of the books of these on account of their subject. It is very likely that Isidore owned the full versions of these, especially the last seven (31 to 37).

8. Guillaumin¹⁰ holds similar views as Oroz Reta [1987] regarding the sources used by Isidore and the indirect use of Pliny with regards to Book 20 of the *Etymologiae*. Pliny's presence in this book seems perfunctory, despite some obvious textual coincidences the scholar detects. He only finds seven entries that might mirror Pliny, regarding *farina* (flour), *axungia* (a type of cooking animal fat), *mel* (honey), *rosa* (rose), *faecula* (fecula), *salsugo* (brine), *muria* (a type of honey), and *ficillia* (ceramics) in chapter 3, *De uasis escariis*. Other passages might be added to the list, for at least Isidore may have used them, albeit indirectly. Consider, for instance, a reference to a type of bread called *spungia*, Isidore's unique innovation to designate a soft, sodden bread that Pliny discusses in *Nat. Hist.* 18.105 using the term *Parthicus* or *aquaticus*, but "*quoniam aqua trahitur ad tenuem et spongiosam inanitatem*." Isidore may have been inspired by Pliny's description to use the term *spungia* [Velázquez 2003: 382–383].

The influence of Pliny in Book 20 of the *Etymologiae* seems perfunctory; maybe Isidore did not handle it directly, he may or may not have had access to it, or he just found it uninteresting, thus resorting to other sources. By and large, the use of Pliny is much more prominent elsewhere, in such Books as 16, 12 or 19. Notwithstanding, scholars have absolutely eschewed the idea that Isidore does not resort to a single source, yet that does not prove he would only have had access to anthologies or *excerpta* of his sources, nor that he could have gotten some of those sources (almost) in full, thereby he or his associates being in charge of the actual textual selection.

Rohr's discussion [2017: 55–60], however fleeting, of Pliny's influence over chapter 13 of the *Etymologiae* is far more compelling. His remarks deal with chapters devoted to time, such as *De tonitruo*, but Pliny's influence can also be traced back to *De Natura rerum*, insofar as these chapters have never been discussed by Solinus or any other compiler in late antiquity. Rohr unequivocally upholds Isidore's direct usage of Pliny.

Lastly, let us not forget that Guy Serbat [1986] had already endorsed the direct usage of Pliny by Isidore.

¹⁰ Guillaumin [2011: 15, note 2] points out that readers should not expect too much of this work, after the "mise au point" by Serbat [1986]. I assume he believes that the work deals with Book 16 of the *Etymologiae*, rather than Book 20, which is the one Guillaumin discusses in his essay. My assumption is that the chapter is indeed quite useful and he should have referred to it accordingly. His remarks on the use of the sources by Isidore — which owes in turn to Fontaine in both cases — are quite similar too.

How Isidore worked

Isidore's working methodology often involved the "juxtaposition and addition of various sources". I believe this is clear in the case of Book 19. In the section dealing with building, constructions, materials, colours, etc. there is constant use of Pliny, Vitruvius and Caetius Faventinus. The former is often referred to via Faventinus, but I believe that others are referred to directly. This combination of sources reflects the way in which Isidore worked, selecting phrases from various sources, requiring a close manipulation of the sources. Some scholars believe the opposite, given Isidore's *breuitas* and his simplification of ideas in order to provide general and complete information. Sometimes he definitively works quickly and his choice is not correct. He even makes mistakes and writes misleading text.

1. An example can be seen here. On the topic of mosaics (*de lithostrotis*) he writes the following:

Isid. *Etym.* 19.14: *Lithostrota sunt elaborata arte picturae paruulis crustis ac tessellis tinctis in uarios colores. Teselli autem a tesseris nominati, id est quadratis lapiliis per diminutionem* (Mosaics (*lithostrotum*) are crafted by the art of making pictures with small chips and cubes tinted in various colours. Cubes (*tessella*) are named from blocks (*tessera*), that is, from square stones, by forming a diminutive).

A similar passage can be found in:

Isid. *Etym.* 15.8.10: *Pauimenta originem apud Graecos habent elaborata arte picturae; lithostrota paruulis crustis ac tessellis tinctis in uarios colores.* (Pavements (*pauimentum*) that are worked out with the skill of a picture have a Greek origin; mosaics (*lithostrota*) are made from little pieces of shell and tiles colored in various hues).

The source for the latter is without a doubt this one:

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 36.184: *Pauimenta originem apud Graecos habent elaborata arte picturae ratione, donec lithostrota expulere eam. Celeberrimus fuit in hoc genere Sosus, qui Pergami stratu it quem uocant asaroton oicon, quoniam purgamenta cenae in pauimentis quaeque euerri solent uelut relictas fecerat paruulis tessellis tinctisque in uarios colores* (Paved floors originated among the Greeks and were skilfully embellished with a kind of paintwork until this was superseded by mosaic. In this latter field the most famous exponent was Sosus, who at Pergamum laid the floor of what is known in Greek as 'the Unswept Room' because, by means of small cubes tinted in various shades, he represented on the floor refuse from the dinner table and other sweeping, making them appear as if they had been left there).

The mention of the *paruulis crustis* seems to have been taken from another closely related passage by Pliny. This suggests that Isidore read it closely with a view to selecting parts and then combining both passages:

Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 36.189: *Lithostrota coeptauere iam sub Sulla; par uol is certe crustis exstat hodieque quod in Fortunae delubro Praeneste fecit* (Mosaic came into use as early as Sulla's regime. At all events, there exists even to-day one made of very small cubes which he installed in the temple of Fortunae at Palestrina).

2. At times, it has been suggested that the author was not able to prepare a “conflatio” of sources; that is, he was not able to create a new passage using passages that he selected and copied from elsewhere. In many cases it is clear that the text is just the result of a juxtaposition of passages and/or phrases, but at other times we do see evidence of reworking. Sometimes it is just a case of mere summaries and other times we see modifications with a view to providing a more clear and concise explanation, offering information through the origin of words. To be more precise, the author's method consists of arguing and demonstrating the validity of the terms that he uses, the authenticity of the etymologies he proposes, through the explanations he offers. His sources, whether they are explicit or not, are for Isidore the authentic *auctoritates* on the subject at hand in each case.

Conclusion

There are many references to Pliny in Isidore's work and not just in the *Etymologiae*, but also in other books, such as his *Differentiae*, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, *Chronica*, *Historia Gothorum* (at least in Books 1–2, 5–10, 12, 15–16, 18–21, 25 and 29–37 [Elfassi 2015: 64]).

Guillaumin [2011: 16–17] has suggested that Isidore must have had long extracts of the *Naturalis Historia*, but, as Elfassi [2015: 65] rightly asks: Why long passages of the work and not the whole thing? The reason behind Guillaumin's proposal is ultimately based on the hypercritical tendency to assume that Isidore had limited knowledge of sources in a restrictive and “ultra-safe” way.

We should add here that Isidore of Seville made use of all the sources of information available to him to in order to attempt his *Etymologiae*, an encyclopaedic work that tackles all areas of knowledge and shows what these were in Hispania of the 6th–7th centuries. The study of Isidore of Seville's possible library has been undertaken on a number of occasions, using the hypercritical approach I have mentioned before.

Without a doubt, Pliny must have been an author of reference for the *Etymologiae*, alongside Varro and Solinus, Suetonius' *Prata* and Servius, since we can see many of the subjects dealt with by Isidore in Pliny, such as animals, plants, biological and physiological aspects relating to humans, instruments, objects, etc.

I think it is essential that we continue researching the sources that Isidore of Seville used and his complex methodology of extracting, summarising, and adapting them. I deem it vital that we update the data and combine them with other reports of the period, since he was a prime witness to it¹¹. We need to find the textual link that allows us to establish the indirect or direct dependence on these texts, but we also need to approach the following questions in a comprehensive way:

¹¹ Regarding these issues in connection primarily to lexical innovations, see Velázquez 2003.

a) The type of sources used for each topic, whether these be lists, notes or histories. Is the proposed etymology from the same author and/or passage or another source, or is it offered as an innovative suggestion.

b) Collective use of passages and books, as we have seen in Book 19 and 12 regarding the use of Pliny.

c) The location of passages in the work of every author who serves as source, overtly in chapter 16, where Isidore rearranges the material and concocts a personal composition that he could hardly have devised had he not had access to the full book¹².

d) Case-by-case study of the process of preparation, selection and, where applicable, adaptation of passages.

e) Combination of authors and where they appear and analysis of the elements that appear and those that are avoided.

This affects the internal study of Isidore's work, but I would like to finish with a final comment that I believe is of importance.

If Isidore makes use of Pliny, Solinus, Vitruvius, Servius, Gellius and Faventinus, as well as the Christian authors (and St. Augustine especially), it is because these are authors of encyclopaedic works. Their work is in line with Greek-Latin tradition and gathers together the knowledge of each period in a descriptive, generalist way. The nature of their works is that of a "compendium of knowledge" with a clear didactic aim. Of course, we will not enter into certain aspects in some different examples, for instance Vitruvius.

A final thought.

Isidore was the last great encyclopaedic author of the ancient world, and he and his sources became the benchmark sources of reference for the Middle Ages, especially the group consisting of Pliny, Solinus and Isidore, whose works initiate a great didactic and cultural tradition.

References

- André, J. (Ed.) (1981). *Isidore de Séville. Étymologies. Livre XVII. De l'agriculture*. Paris: ALMA; Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and French).
- André, J. (Ed.) (1986). *Isidore de Séville. Étymologies. Livre XII. Des animaux*. Paris: ALMA; Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and French).
- Barney, S. A., Lewis, W. J., Beach, J. A., Beghof, O. (Trans.), with the collaboration of Hall, M. (2006). *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Berno, F. R. (2010). Plinius d. Ä (Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus maior). *Naturalis historia*. In B. Egger, C. Balde (Eds.). *Die Rezeption der antiken Literatur. Kulturhistorisches Werklexikon, (Der neue Pauly. Supplemente 7)*, 697–726. Stuttgart; Weimar: J. B. Metzler. (In German).
- Brehaut, E. (1912). *An encyclopedist of the Dark Ages. Isidore of Seville*. New York: Columbia Univ.
- Breternitz, P. (2016). Was stand in Isidors Bibliothek? Zur Petronrezeption in den Etymologien Isidors von Sevilla. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 159, 99–112. (In German).
- Dressel, H. (1874). *De Isidori Originum fontibus*. Augustae Taurinorum: Vincentius Bona, Typographa. (In Latin).

¹² Regarding this and despite its brevity, Féans Landeira's [2011] Introduction is particularly compelling.

- Elfassi, J. (Ed.) (2009). *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Synonima*. Turnhout: Brepols. (CCSL 111B). (In Latin).
- Elfassi, J. (2011). Quelques sources non repérées du premier livre des “différences” et des “étymologies” d’Isidore de Séville, ou comment deux oeuvres s’éclairent mutuellement. *Voces*, 22, 25–38. (In French).
- Elfassi, J. (2014a). Festus chez Isidore de Séville. *Eruditio antiqua*, 6, 153–214. (In French).
- Elfassi, J. (2014b). *Les sources d’Isidore de Séville: éléments pour l’étude d’une bibliothèque de l’Espagne wisigothique* (2 Vols.). Paris (Unpublished Memory of HDR, Paris IV–Sorbonne). (In French).
- Elfassi, J. (2015). Connaître la bibliothèque pour connaître les sources: Isidore de Séville. *Antiquité Tardive*, 23, 59–66. (In French).
- Féans Landeira, J. (Ed.) (2011). *Isidoro de Sevilla. Etimologías. Libro XVI. De las piedras y de los metales*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and Spanish).
- Fontaine, J. (1959). *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l’Espagne wisigothique* (2 Vols.). Paris: Études augustiniennes. (In French).
- Fontaine, J. (Ed.) (1960). *Isidore de Séville: Traité de la nature*. Bordeaux: Féret (repr. Paris: Institut d’Études Augustiniennes, 2002). (In Latin and French).
- Fontaine, J. (1961). Problèmes de méthode dans l’étude des sources isidorienne. In Isidorus Hispalensis, H., Díaz y Díaz, M. C. (Eds.). *Isidoriana*, 115–130. León: Centro de Estudios San Isidoro. (In Spanish).
- Fontaine, J. (1983). Isidorus. Varro christianus? In *Bivium. Homenaje a Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz*, 89–106. Madrid: Gredos. (In Spanish).
- Gasparotto, G. (Ed.) (2004). *Isidoro di Siviglia. Etimologie. Libro XIII. De mundo et partibus*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and Italian).
- Gasti, F. (Ed.) (2010). *Isidoro di Siviglia. Etimologie. Libro XI. De homine et portentis*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and Italian).
- Guillaumin, J.-Y. (Ed.) (2010). *Isidore de Séville. Étymologies. Livre XX. De penu et instrumentis domesticis et rusticis*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and French).
- Guillaumin, J.-Y. (2011). Pline l’Ancien dans le livre XX des Étymologies d’Isidore de Séville. *Archives internationales d’Histoire des sciences*, 61, 15–25. (In French).
- Jones, W. H. S. (Ed. and Trans.) (2000). *Pliny. Natural History. Books 28–32*. London: Loeb Classical Library. (1st ed. 1963).
- Kindermann, U. (2005). Isidor von Sevilla (560–636 n.Chr.). In W. Ax (Ed.). *Lateinische Lehrer Europas. Fünfzehn Portraits von Varro bis Erasmus von Rotterdam*, 273–290, Köln: Böhlau. (In German).
- Martín, J. C. (2013). La biblioteca cristiana de los Padres hispanovisigodos (siglos VI–VII). *Veleia*, 30, 259–288. (In Spanish).
- Naas, V. (2012). Plinius Secundus (Caius). In R. Goulet (Ed.). *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* (Vol. 5a), 876–884. Paris: CNRS Éditions. (In French).
- Oroz Reta, J. (1987). Présence de Pline dans les “Etymologies” de saint Isidore de Séville. *Helmantica*, 38(115–117), 295–306. (In French).
- Rackham, H. (Ed. and Trans.) (1997). *Pliny. Natural History* (Books 8–11). London: Loeb Classical Library. (1st ed. 1983).
- Rodríguez-Pantoja, M. (Ed.) (1995). *Isidoro de Sevilla. Etimologías. Libro XIX. De naves, edificios y vestidos*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. (In Latin and Spanish).
- Rohr, C. (2017). Von Plinius zu Isidor und Beda Venerabilis. Zur Übernahme antiken Wissens über Witterungsphänomene im Mittelalter. In S. Dusil, G. Schwedler, R. Schwitter (Eds.). *Exzerpieren — Kompilieren — Tradieren. Transformationen des Wissens zwischen Spätantike und Frühmittelalter*, 49–67. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter. (In German).

- Serbat, G. (1986). Pline l'Ancien. État présent des études sur sa vie, son oeuvre et son influence. In W. Haasse (Ed.). *Sprache und Literatur der Julisch-Claudischen und der Flavischen Zeit* (Vol. 32.4), 2069–2200. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter. (Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt = ANRW). (In French).
- Velázquez, I. (1997). *Aedificiorum uenustas*: la recepción de un término clásico en Isidoro de Sevilla, *Etym.* 19, 6. *Antigüedad y Cristianismo*, 14, 229–248. (In Spanish).
- Velázquez, I. (2003). *Latine dicitur; uulgo uocant. Aspectos de la lengua hablada y escrita en las obras gramaticales de Isidoro de Sevilla*, Logroño: Fundación San Millán de la Cogolla. (In Spanish).

* * *

Информация об авторе

Исабель Веласкес Сориано

PhD

*профессор, директор кафедры
классической филологии, филологический
факультет, Мадридский университет
Комплутенсе (Universidad Complutense de
Madrid)*

Plaza Menéndez Pelayo s/n

E-28040 Madrid, España

Тел.: +34 913945300

✉ ivelaz@ucm.es

Information about the author

Isabel Velázquez Soriano

PhD

*Professor, Director, Classical Philology
Department, Faculty of Philology,
Complutense University of Madrid
Plaza Menéndez Pelayo s/n
E-28040 Madrid, Spain*

Tel.: +34 913945300

✉ ivelaz@ucm.es

О. В. Ауров

ORCID: 0000-0002-0755-9902

✉ olegaurov1@yandex.ru

Российская академия народного хозяйства
и государственной службы при Президенте РФ
(Россия, Москва)

SEGUND DIZ PLINIO...: «Естественная история» Плиния Старшего как возможный источник «Истории Испании» Альфонсо X Мудрого

Аннотация. Статья посвящена проблеме использования «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего (ок. 23–79) как одного из источников средневековой хроники «История Испании» («*Estoria de Espanna*»), составленной на разговорном (средневековом кастильском) языке при дворе Альфонсо X Мудрого (1252–1284) после 1270 г. Прямых рукописных свидетельств использования Плиниева текста в королевском скриптории не сохранилось. Анализ текста хроники показывает, что в «Истории Испании» (как, впрочем, и во «Всеобщей истории», создававшейся в том же скриптории) заимствования из «Естественной истории» имеют явно вторичное происхождение. Вместе с тем не вызывает сомнений высокий авторитет трудов Плиния в Кастилии и Леоне указанного периода, ставший следствием общего роста интереса к античной культуре в контексте «долгого XII века». Этот интерес лишь нарастал в следующее столетие, в период укрепления культурных связей с Италией и влияния итальянского Возрождения. Среди прочего эта тенденция четко прослеживается и на примере рукописной традиции «испанского Плиния» XIV в.

Ключевые слова: Плиний Старший, «*Naturalis Historia*», Альфонсо X Мудрый, «*Estoria de Espanna*», средневековая историография, рукописная традиция, Королевство Кастилия и Леон

Для цитирования: Ауров О. В. *Segund diz Plinio...: «Естественная история» Плиния Старшего как возможный источник «Истории Испании» Альфонсо X Мудрого* // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 187–213. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-187-213.

Статья поступила в редакцию 7 октября 2019 г.
Принято к печати 8 ноября 2019 г.

O. V. Aurov

ORCID: 0000-0002-0755-9902
✉ olegaurov1@yandex.ru

The Russian Presidential Academy
of National Economy and Public Administration
(Russia, Moscow)

SEGUND DIZ PLINIO...: PLINY THE ELDER'S NATURALIS HISTORIA AS A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF ALFONSO THE WISE'S *ESTORIA DE ESPANNA*

Abstract. The article is devoted to the forms and methods of using Pliny the Elder's (c. 23–79) *Natural History* as a source of some episodes described in the medieval chronicle *Estoria de Espanna* (*EE*), compiled in the vernacular (Castilian) language after 1270 at the court of Alfonso X the Wise, king of Castile and Leon (1252–1284). Manuscript materials of the period do not contain any direct evidence of Pliny's book being used in the royal *scriptorium*. Analysis of the *EE* text demonstrates that the allusions to the *Natural History* (*Nat. Hist.*) were not taken directly from its text. But the great prestige of Pliny's text in Castile and Leon of the 13th century is obvious; it was one of the consequences of the "long 12th century" culture. Vivid interest in the *Natural History* only grew in the next century. The manuscript tradition of the *Nat. Hist.* from the end of the 13th century to the 14th century (manuscripts BNE MSS/10042 (National Library of Spain), Ms. Q-I-4 and R-I-5 (Royal Library of El Escorial), manuscript catalogs of some medieval ecclesiastical and private libraries) demonstrates that the 14th century opened a new period in history of the "Spanish" Pliny, which became an object of the great interest of the scholars. This interest appeared at a time when the *Primitive Version* of the *EE* was already finished.

Keywords: Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia*, Alfonso X the Wise, *Estoria de Espanna*, medieval historiography, manuscript tradition, Kingdom of Leon and Castile

To cite this article: Aurov, O. V. (2020). *Segund diz Plinio...: Pliny the Elder's Naturalis Historia as a possible source of Alfonso the Wise's Estoria de Espanna*. *Shagi / Steps*, 6(1), 187–213. (In Russian). DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-187-213.

Received October 7, 2019

Accepted November 8, 2019

Вступительные замечания

Один из наиболее выдающихся памятников средневекового историописания, хроника «История Испании» (ст.-каст. «*Estoria de Espanna*») была составлена на старокастильском языке под руководством короля Кастилии и Леона Альфонсо X Мудрого (исп. *Alfonso el Sabio*) (1252–1284) в 1270–1280-е годы. Текст содержит две прямые отсылки к «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего (ок. 23–79). Первая из них (*EE* 78, фрагмент которой представлен в заглавии)¹, касается характеристики птицы феникс и восходит к фрагменту 10-й книги (*Plin. Nat. Hist. X.2*)², посвященной описанию птиц. Другая отсылка (*EE* 105) содержит восторженную характеристику римского политика и полководца Помпея Великого; в ней не только указаны имя римского писателя и название его сочинения, но и приведен номер главы и книги «Естественной истории», ставшей источником соответствующей информации³.

Из сказанного можно было бы заключить, что хронистам, трудившимся в королевском скриптории Альфонсо X, были доступны какие-либо рукописные версии Плиниевой «Естественной истории», следовательно, это сочинение можно уверенно отнести к числу прямых источников знаменитой «национальной» хроники. Именно эта точка зрения утвердилась в литературе, посвященной проблеме изучения источников историографических памятников эпохи Альфонсо X, причем не только «Истории Испании» [*Solalinde et al.* 1955], но и «Всеобщей истории» [*Sánchez-Prieto Borja* 2001: lxiii], составлявшейся параллельно с последней и являвшейся второй частью историографической дилогии [Ауров 2019: 81–86].

Полагаю, однако, что сложившиеся историографические представления как минимум требуют тщательной проверки уже потому, что (как это хорошо известно [*Гене* 2002: 133]) средневековые авторы, стремясь создать преувеличенное представление о своей эрудиции, слишком часто дополняли ссылки на авторитетные имена и тексты, с которыми были знакомы в лучшем случае из вторых рук. Между тем «Естественная история» Плиния Старшего достаточно рано вошла в число авторитетных сочинений, хорошо известных средневековым интеллектуалам ([*Sandys* 1921: 453–454, 456–457, 471–473] и др.); уже само по себе это заставляет тщательно проверять прямые ссылки на этот текст и с осторожностью относиться к попыткам видеть в сочинении Плиния прямой источник средневековой историографии (не отрицая, разумеется, такой возможности в принципе).

¹ *Segund diz Plinio* (Как сообщает Плиний... — *EE* 78).

² «...Et aun, segund diz Plinio, y auien la aue que dizen fénix, et por esto entendet que segund aquellos que lo cuentan, que destas aues no a mas de una» (*EE* 78). Cfr.: «*Aethiopiae atque Indis discolores maxime et inenarrabiles esse ferunt aves et ante omnes nobilem Arabiae phoenicem, haut scio an fabulose, unum in toto orbe nec visum magno opere. Aquilae narrantur magnitudine, auri fulgore circa colla, cetero purpureus, caeruleam roseis caudam pinnis distinguuntibus, cristis fauces, caputque plumeo apice honestate*» etc. (*Plin. Nat. Hist. X.2*). Здесь и далее выделено мной.

³ «De la alabança que cuenta Plinio de Ponpeyo el Grand. Plinio fabla de las naturas et de las noblezas de los omnes en el XXVII capitulo del seteno libro de la Natural Estoria, et dize sobre razon de alabar los nobles fechos de Ponpeyo el Grand et de Julio Cesar...» (*EE* 105).

Кроме того, применительно непосредственно к Испании дополнительные основания для сомнений дает тот факт, что даже такой глубоко эрудированный автор, как Исидор Севильский (ок. 560–636), при создании своих «Этимологий» воспользовался лишь двумя книгами Плиниева сочинения — 8-й (посвященной животным) и 32-й (откуда были заимствованы сведения о рыбах)⁴; это весьма удивительно, если учесть несомненную тематическую близость целого ряда разделов «Этимологий» и «Естественной истории». Возникает впечатление, что уже в VII в. полный текст последней отсутствовал даже в лучших испанских библиотеках (каковой, в частности, являлась сеvilская времен Исидора [Bonilla Martínez, Delgado Romero 2014]), позднее же обращение испанских авторов к «Естественной истории» практически прекратилось. Затянувшаяся пауза в испанской истории Плиниева текста прервалась лишь в эпоху Альфонсо X Мудрого.

Ниже я постараюсь ответить на вопрос о том, могли ли «Мудрый король» и его соавторы по составлению «Истории Испании» работать с рукописями «Естественной истории» или же они знали о ее содержании лишь из вторых рук. (В последнем случае становятся актуальными причины прямых отсылок к сочинению Плиния.)

1. «Историографическая мастерская» Альфонсо X и рукописная традиция «кастильского» Плиния: пример рукописи 10042 из мадридской Национальной библиотеки

В противоположность Европе к северу от Пиренеев, где число рукописей «Естественной истории» измеряется десятками уже применительно к раннему Средневековью, а общее их количество превышает 100 (а по мнению некоторых исследователей достигает даже 200) [Sandys 1921: 654; Reynolds 1983; Reeve 2006: 142–175; Doody 2010], на Пиренейском полуострове практически не представлена рукописная традиция, предшествующая первой половине —

⁴ Isid. *Hist.* XII.2.9: «Nam Plinius dicit animalia cum acutis unguibus frequentur parere non posse; vitiantur enim intrinsecus se moventibus catulis» (cfr.: Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VIII.43); Ibid. XII.2.11: «...sicut et Plinius in Naturali Historia dicit, leonem cum parda, aut pardum cum leaena concumbere et ex utroque coitu degeneres partus creari, ut mulus et burdo» (cfr.: Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VIII.42); Ibid. XII.2.20: «Lynces dicit Plinius Secundus extra unum non admittere fetum» (cfr.: Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VIII.43); Ibid. XII.2.28: «Lycisci autem dicuntur, ut ait Plinius, canes nati ex lupis et canibus, cum inter se forte miscuntur» (cfr.: Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VIII.148); Ibid. XII.4.43: «Dicit autem Plinius, si creditur, quod serpentis caput etiam si cum duobus evaserit digitis, nihilominus vivit» (источник этой информации о змеях установить не удалось); Ibid. XII.6.45: «Narrat Plinius Secundus: Ex Indico mare torpedo etiam procul et e longinquo, vel si hasta virgaque attingatur, quamvis praevalidos lacertos torpescere, quamlibet ad cursum veloces alligare pedes» (cfr.: «Quid? non et sine hoc exemplo per se satis esset ex eodem mari torpedo? etiam procul et e longinquo, vel si hasta virgave attingatur, quamvis praevalidos lacertos torpescere, quamlibet ad cursum veloces alligari pedes?») (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* XXXII.7) — почти точная цитата; различия помечены полужирным шрифтом); Ibid. XII.6.63: «Animalium omnium in aquis viventium nomina centum quadraginta quattuor Plinius ait, divisa in generibus beluarum, serpentium communium terrae et aquae, cancrorum, concharum, lucustarum, peloridum, polyporum, solearum, lacertorum, et lulliginum, et huic similia...» (cfr.: Plin. *Nat. Hist.* XXXII.142).

середине XIV в., времени изготовления эскориальских рукописей «Естественной истории» Q-I-4 и R-I-5 и еще более поздних манускриптов [Reeve 2006: 151–152]. Единственным исключением является более ранняя (изготовленная не позднее XIII в.⁵) рукопись BNE MSS/10042, прежде принадлежавшая Библиотеке капитула Толедского собора Св. Марии (где она имела шифр *Cajon 47 num. 11*), а в 1869 г. переданная в мадридскую Национальную библиотеку [Haenel 1830: 994; Domínguez Bordona 1933: 293; Rubio Fernández 1984: 359–360; Hernández Aparicio 2000: 321; Reeve 2006: 152–157].

Связь этой рукописи с толедским собранием весьма симптоматична. В Средние века библиотека капитула, располагавшаяся в Толедо — церковном центре полуострова, резиденции примаса Испаний, средоточии высокой культуры эпохи «долгого XII века» [Nieto Soria 2002: 331–339], — была едва ли не лучшей в Кастилии [González Ruiz 1997]. Вряд ли следует считать случайным тот факт, что первое известное мне упоминание «Естественной истории» в Кастилии и Леоне применительно к XIII столетию содержится в тексте, написанном в Толедо и, надо полагать, главным образом (если не исключительно) на основе материалов местной библиотеки. Речь идет о латинской хронике «Об испанских делах»⁶, крупнейшем памятнике средневековой латинской историографии Кастилии и Леона, автором которой являлся выдающийся политический и церковный деятель Родриго Хименес де Рада (ок. 1170–1247) (известный также как Родриго Толедский) [Lomax 1977; Ward 2003]. В течение длительного времени (1209–1247 гг.) он являлся толедским архиепископом и примасом Испаний [Crespo López 2015: 9–13]. В хронике содержится прямая ссылка на «Естественную историю», из которой (по словам хрониста) заимствован перечень городов, находившихся на землях кельтиберского племени карпентанов. Настораживает, однако, что наряду с сочинением Плиния Родриго Толедский в том же месте ссылается и на неназванное сочинение вестготского короля Сисебута (612–620). Этот правитель действительно отметился на литературном поприще [Ауров 2017: 240–241], но, насколько известно, ни в одном из своих произведений он не касался карпентанов и их городов. Именно поэтому (а также в силу ряда неточностей в передаче Плиниева оригинала) современная французская исследовательница С. Ж.-М. Гирардель считает рассмотренную ссылку фальсификацией. Впрочем, она же уверена в том, что, тем не менее, хронист был знаком с содержанием «Естественной истории» хотя бы в самых общих чертах [Guirardel 2007: 102–106].

⁵ Существуют и более поздние датировки (до XIV в. включительно), но они не подтверждаются большинством исследователей [Hernández Aparicio 2000: 321].

⁶ Rod. Hist. I.3.34: «Hanc Carpentaniam, que in se IIIor habet oppida, scilicet Aucam, Calagurram, Tirasonam et Auripam, que post Cesaraugusta ab Augusto Cesare fuit dicta, uis Romanorum principum occupauit, que tamen, sicut refferunt Plinius et Sisebutus, ad Cartaginensem prouinciam pertinebat». Cfr.: «Caesaraugusta colonia immunis, amne Hiberno adfusa, ubi oppidum antea vocabatur Salduba, regionis Edetaniae, recipit populos LV: ex his ciuium Romanorum Bilbilitanos, Celsenses ex colonia, Calagurritanos qui Nasici cognominantur, Ilerdenses Surdaonum gentis, iuxta quos Sicoris fluius, Oscenses regionis Suessetaniae, Turiasonenses; Latinorum veterum Cascantenses, Ergavicenses, Graccuritanos, Leonenses, Osicerdenses; foederatos Tarracenses; stipendiarios Arcobrigenses, Andelonenses, Aracelitanos, Bursanenses, Calagurritanos qui Fibularenenses cognominantur, Conplutenses, Carenses, Cincienses, Cortonenses, Damanitanos, Ispallenses, Ilursenses, Iluberitanos, Iacetanos, Libienses, Pompelonenses, Segienses» (Plin. Nat. Hist. III.3.24).

Точный источник этих знаний (конкретная рукопись сочинения Плиния, сохранившаяся или утраченная) неясен. Полной информации о библиотеке Родриго Толедского источники не дают. Правда, сохранился перечень книг, переданный архиепископом из своего собственного собрания в цистерцианский монастырь Св. Марии в Уэрте (в современной провинции Сория), которому он покровительствовал, тем более что аббатом этой обители некоторое время являлся его дядя, Мартин де Финохоса (ок. 1140–1213); впоследствии в монастырской церкви был похоронен и сам прелат. Очевидно, что книги, подаренные монастырю, составляли лишь часть собрания архиепископа; тем не менее присутствие в их ряду (наряду с сочинениями христианских писателей) «Трагедий» Сенеки и «Метаморфоз» Овидия явно указывает на интерес Родриго к римской литературе. Однако «Естественной истории» в перечне подаренных монастырю книг нет [Aguilera y Gamboa 1908: 247–248]. Видимо, не было ее и в оставшейся части библиотеки архиепископа, попытки реконструкции состава которой предпринимались рядом исследователей [Rojo Orcajo 1929a; González Ruiz 1997: 174–179]. Исследователи источников хроники «Об испанских событиях» [Lomax 1977: 587–592; Fernández Valverde 1987; 1989: 34; Falque 2003: 151–161] также не фиксируют присутствие в их ряду Плиниева текста. В этом контексте изучение мадридской рукописи BNE MSS/10042, изготовленной во времена Родриго Толедского и Альфонсо X Мудрого, представляется особенно интересным.

Пергаментная рукопись в переплете, обтянутом тисненой кожей и снабженном застегками, содержит большую часть текста «Естественной истории». Лакуны относительно невелики: утрачена лишь последняя, 37-я книга, посвященная описанию драгоценных камней; от нее сохранилось лишь название («Incipit liber eiusdem XXXXVII qui est ultimus continens de gemmis et pretiosis lapidibus...» — fol. 230r). Этот случай нельзя считать исключением: последняя книга «Естественной истории» вообще довольно фрагментарно представлена в средневековой рукописной традиции, в том числе в испанской. Так, в упомянутых выше рукописях Q-I-4 и R-I-5 хотя часть Plin. *Nat. Hist.* XXXVII и присутствует, однако текст книги обрывается уже в середине 13-й главы (всего в ней 78 глав): в обеих рукописях последние слова Плиниева текста — «...pluribus modis constant primum pondere». В парижской же рукописи из Национальной библиотеки Paris B.N. Lat. 6797, с которой генетически связано содержание BNE MSS/10042 [Reeve 2006: 155], текст завершается еще раньше — на первых строках 12-й главы.

И характер письма, и роскошное оформление рукописи, включающее цветные инициалы (обозначающие начало каждой книги «Естественной истории») и миниатюры⁷, дают достаточный материал для определения места производства кодекса — Северная Италия или Прованс [Reeve 2006: 153]. На французский и итальянский векторы указывает и содержание начальной части текста, которая в средневековой рукописной традиции неодинакова. Поми-

⁷ Так, в начале пролога в инициал L («Libros Naturalis Historiae, novitium Camenis Quiritium tuorum opus...» etc.) вписано изображение писателя, читающего свою книгу (помещенную на пюпитр) слушателям (fol. 1r). В начале второй книги в инициал M («Mundum et hoc — quocumque nomine alio caelum appellare...» etc.) вписаны изображения беседующих монаха и мирянина (fol. 15v) и т. п.

мо часто встречающегося жизнеописания Плиния Старшего из сборника «О знаменитых мужах» Светония [Reeve 2011], в BNE MSS/10042 присутствуют *summarium* (краткие изложения всех книг «Естественной истории») и два фрагмента «Хроники Евсевия-Иеронима», содержащие краткие сообщения о жизни Плиния и его литературном наследии⁸. Последние встречается в изгот-товленной примерно в тот же период флорентийской рукописи BML Plut. 82.1 (XIII в.) из Библиотеки Лауренцианы, а также в более поздней ватиканской рукописи Vat. Lat. 1953 (ок. 1401–1425). Учитывая происхождение перечисленных рукописей, складывается своеобразный треугольник Италия — Южная Франция — Испания (Кастилия и Леон (Тоledo)), который как будто намечает возможную траекторию распространения текста «Естественной истории» южнее Пиренеев.

Однако сам по себе факт, что рукопись BNE MSS/10042 была создана во времена Альфонсо X или даже ранее, не позволяет утверждать, что в последней трети XIII в., в период создания «Истории Испании», она уже находилась в Тоledo — там, где ее присутствие четко фиксируется позднее. Кодекс, ныне известный как рукопись BNE MSS/10042, отсутствует в описи книжного собрания Толедского собора, хранящейся в Национальном историческом архиве (Мадрид) (AHN Codices, 987B)⁹ и составленной при архиепископе доне Санчо Арагонском (?) (1251–1261) либо, что более вероятно, при его преемнике доне Доминго Паскуале (1262–1265); более того, «Естественная история» вообще не фигурирует в этом перечне. Правда, опись середины XIII в. не претендует на исчерпывающую полноту (как, впрочем, и опубликованная в 1926 г. Л. Пересом де Гусманом опись 1338–1339 гг. [Pérez de Guzman 1926]¹⁰): книжное собрание Толедского собора приобрело стабильный характер только к концу XIV в. [González Ruiz 1973: 55]; первый полный каталог библиотеки был составлен лишь в 1455 г. [Millás Vallicrosa 1942: 20–21]. В этом каталоге, сохранившемся в двух рукописях мадридской Национальной библиотеки — в оригинале (BNE MSS/13596) и в его современной нотариальной копии (BNE MSS/13471), — не только упоминается сама книга, но и (судя по совпадению приведенных в каталоге инципитов первого и последнего листов) речь идет именно о рукописи BNE MSS/10042¹¹.

Очевидно, рукопись оказалась в Тоledo ранее 1455 г. Можно даже приблизительно определить, насколько ранее. На последнем листе кодекса письмом XIV в. начертано: «Iste liber est domini E. Archiepiscopi». В XIV столетии толед-

⁸ Euseb.-Hieron. *Chron.* a. 100 p. Chr.; a. 109 p. Chr.

⁹ Текст описи (De los libros & del thesoro de la Iglesia) включен в состав картулярия «Книга привилегий Толедской епархии» (Liber Privilegiorum Ecclesie Toletane) (AHN Codices, 987B, fol. 7v — название, 89r–90r — текст), включающего документы XII–XIV вв. и хранящегося в Национальном историческом архиве (Мадрид). О датировке перечня см.: [González Ruiz 1973: 34].

¹⁰ Шифр оригинала в публикации отсутствует; рукопись (которая в настоящее время для меня недоступна) находится в Национальном историческом архиве: AHN Clero, Legajo 7217/2 [González Ruiz 1997: 23].

¹¹ BNE MSS/13596, fol. 7r (= BNE MSS/13741, fol. 9r): «Item Plinius Secundus De Naturali Historia mundi ad Vespasianum Caesarem in pergameno magno uolumine scriptus cum tabulis corio nigro cooptus. Cuique primum folium incipit “non ceciliania”. Ultimum folium incipit: “elephantos remisit”». Cfr.: BNE MSS/10042, fol. 2r, 230r.

скими прелатами, имена которых начинались с буквы *E*, являлись Химено (лат. *Eximinius*) Мартинес де Луна (архиепископ в 1328–1338 гг.) и его преемник, знаменитый Хиль (лат. *Egidius*) Альварес де Альборнос-и-Луна (1303–1367, в Толедо — в 1338–1350 гг.). Последний вариант априори представляется более предпочтительным: значительная часть жизни и карьеры этого прелата были связаны с Провансом и Италией. Так, каноническое право Хиль де Альборнос изучал в Монпелье, а после смерти короля Альфонсо XI (1312–1350) он направился в Авиньон, где получил сан пресвитера-кардинала при базилике Св. Климента в Латеране, отказавшись при этом от толедской кафедры. С этого времени жизнь Хиль де Альборноса протекала на Апеннинском полуострове (где он дважды — в 1353–1357 и в 1358–1367 гг. — исполнял функции папского легата), а также при авиньонском дворе пап Климента VI (1342–1352), Иннокентия VI (1352–1362) и Урбана V (1362–1370) [Beneyto Pérez 1986; Ferrer i Mallol 2002]. В конце жизни Хиль де Альборнос стал основателем Испанского коллегия при Болонском университете (создан в 1369 г. по завещанию кардинала, составленному в 1364 г.) [Cros Gutiérrez 2018: 17–42].

С учетом изложенных фактов британский исследователь М. Рив предполагает возможность отождествления одного из владельцев рукописи BNE MSS/10042, доставившего ее в Кастилию, с Хилем де Альборносом [Reeve 2006: 153–154]. Однако в период написания статьи М. Рив (по его собственному признанию) лишь из вторых рук знал содержание описи библиотеки Толедского собора, составленной в начале XVI в. и сохранившейся (среди прочих материалов XVI–XVIII вв.) в эскориальской рукописи L-I-13¹², где передача «Естественной истории» Толедскому собору прямо атрибутируется Хилью де Альборносу. М. Рив посчитал это свидетельство поздним, сомнительным и даже избыточным [Ibid.: 154], на мой взгляд — без достаточных на то оснований.

Хотя в данный момент рукопись L-I-13 мне недоступна, однако удалось поработать с ее поздней копией, содержащейся в рукописи Национальной библиотеки Испании (Мадрид) BNE MSS/13630 (fol. 46r–63v). Этот документ прямо подтверждает факт передачи кодекса в соборную библиотеку Хилем де Альборносом: «*Plinio de mano, antiquo, que dió el cardenal Don Gil de Albornoç a la Iglesia*» («старая рукопись Плиния, которую передал собору кардинал дон Хиль де Альборнос»). Эта информация дополнительно продублирована па полях слева напротив записи: «передал Хиль де Альборнос» (*dió Gil de Albornoç*, BNE MSS/13630, fol. 51v). Изучение полного текста описи объясняет причину двойной (в основном тексте и на полях) фиксации этого факта. Дело в том, что к моменту ее составления библиотека имела уже и другое, печатное издание «Естественной истории» (BNE MSS/13630, fol. 50r). Судя по содержанию записи о «печатном Плинии» (*Plinius de molde, impreso en Roma Año de 1473, impreso por Contrado primer impresor* — «Печатный Плиний, выпущенный в Риме в 1473 г., выпущенный в свет первым печатником Конрадом»), речь идет об издании, осуществленном в 1473 г. в Риме Конрадом Швейнхеймом и Арнольдом Паннарцем под руководством гуманиста Никколо Перотти (1430?–1480); имя последнего в печатном тексте не фигурирует. Это издание (вопре-

¹² Судя по электронному каталогу библиотеки, эта опись (*Memoria de los libros que estan en la libreria de la santa yglesia de Toledo*) занимает fol. 107r–133v. См.: Catálogo RBME. URL: <http://rbmecat.patrimonionacional.es/cgi-bin/koha/opac-detail.pl?biblionumber=963>.

ки указанному в описи «primer impresor») не было первым: оно представляло собой переработку версии 1470 г., подготовленной теми же издателями; если же рассматривать его в контексте истории издания «Естественной истории» в целом, то оно являлось четвертым (ему предшествовали издания 1469, 1470 и 1472 гг.) [Rizzi 2018: 121–124]. Тем не менее ценность его в эпоху составления описи начала XVI в. представлялась очевидной, а потому составитель последней сознательно подчеркнул достоинства «старой» (antiguo) рукописи, которые вовсе не умалялись фактом наличия более поздней по времени изготовления инкунабулы¹³.

Таким образом, даже самая ранняя из имеющихся «испанских» рукописей попала в Кастилию и Леон не прежде середины XIV в.; эскориальские же рукописи Q-I-4 и R-I-5, североитальянское происхождение которых несомненно, оказались там еще позднее; остальные манускрипты «испанского» Плиния относятся к периоду начиная с конца XIV в. [Reeve 2006: 157–161]. Все эти рукописи не имеют никакого отношения к скриптории Альфонсо X Мудрого, скончавшегося в 1284 г.

2. Могла ли другая рукопись «Естественной истории» попасть в кастильские библиотеки времен Альфонсо X? Пример книжного собрания капитула Толедского собора

Означает ли сказанное выше, что в скриптории Альфонсо X не могли присутствовать какие-либо другие рукописи Плиниевой «Естественной истории»? Разумеется, нет. И состав библиотеки столь авторитетного церковного учреждения, как Толедский собор — главный храм не только Кастилии и Леона, но и всей Испании, место служения толедского архиепископа, митрополита Испаний — косвенно подтверждает по меньшей мере правомерность выдвижения такой гипотезы.

Следует учесть, что до конца XIV в., а возможно и позднее, библиотеки даже такого уровня, как та, о которой идет речь, находились лишь в стадии формирования. Показательно, в частности, уже то, что в описях середины XIII в. (AHN Codices, 987B, fol. 89v–90r) и 1338–1339 гг. [Pérez de Guzmán 1926: 382–419] книжное собрание даже не было отделено от церковной утвари и облачений, хранившихся в ризнице (sagrario). Книги из библиотеки капи-

¹³ Следует учесть, что для утилитарных целей печатные книги были предпочтительнее рукописных, большинство которых к тому же к XVI в. нередко находилось не в лучшем физическом состоянии. Неслучайно, в частности, постановление капитула собора Успения Девы Марии (г. Бурго-де-Осма в современной провинции Сория) от 19 октября 1595 г., прямо требовавшее при наличии возможности заменять рукописные книги их печатными дублетами, а ставшие ненужными манускрипты — продавать (правда, при этом документ предостерегал и от излишнего рвения): «...Se habían ordenado los libros de la librería y desechado muchos viejos, y de mano, por haberlos de molde, y que se habían apartado para venderlos... El Cabildo dice que los vuelvan a reveer y procuren desechar los menos posibles de mano». Из принятого месяцем ранее (16 сентября того же года) постановления капитула по тому же вопросу следует, что после составления описи и удаления из библиотеки ненужных книг последние были на вес проданы городскому книготорговцу: «...Se ha hecho inventario de los libros por abecedario, y los viejo que no son de provecho se han vendido a peso al librero de esta villa» (цит. по: [Rojo Orcajo 1929b: 664]).

тула уходили к частным лицам (главным образом архиереям) и приходили в собрание от них же. Динамику этого процесса в известной мере отражают картулярные копии документов Толедского собора, скопированные выдающимся испанским эрудитом, священником-иезуитом о. Андресом Маркосом Бурриэлем-и-Лопесом (1719–1762) в период между 1750 и 1756 г., когда в качестве директора Комиссии по архивам он среди прочего занимался упорядочением и описанием документального собрания Толедской епархии. Записи о. Бурриэля уникальны, поскольку отнюдь не все из скопированных им документов пережили бурные события испанской истории XIX–XX вв. Интересующие нас материалы (в большинстве своем завещания прямо или косвенно связанных с Толедской епархией высокопоставленных клириков и описи имущества, находившегося в их личном пользовании) содержатся в рукописях мадридской Национальной библиотеки BNE MSS/13022 и BNE MSS/13023. Основное содержание этих документов детально описано Х. М. Милясом Валликросой, работа которого до сих пор не утратила своего научного значения [Millás Vallicrosa 1942: 14–19]. В отличие от последнего (интересовавшегося главным образом средневековыми латинскими переводами восточных текстов), обращу внимание на богатство и разнообразие памятников античной литературы в личных собраниях высокопоставленных представителей духовенства, возникших в период правления Альфонсо X — в 1252–1284 гг.

Так, в числе книг умершего в 1248 г. толедского архиепископа дона Хуана де Медина де Помар (занимавшего кафедру всего несколько месяцев — с февраля по июль 1248 г.) был сборник писем Плиния Младшего (BNE MSS/13022, fol. 119r). Другой архиепископ, дон Санчо Арагонский (1266–1275), современник и сподвижник Альфонсо X, среди прочего личного имущества оставил *post mortem* и книжное собрание, описанное уже при одном из его преемников — доне Гонсало Гарсии (или Петресе) «Гудьеле»¹⁴ (1280–1298), — в числе другого личного имущества покойного. Родившийся арагонским инфантом, сыном короля Жауме I Завоевателя, и благодаря этому уже в 16-летнем возрасте ставший архиепископом Толедо и митрополитом Испаний, дон Санчо (1250–1275), несмотря на трагически короткую жизнь, успел получить хорошее образование (вероятно, в Париже и Болонье) [Rodríguez Lajusticia 2019: 40–41]. Его личная библиотека насчитывала 69 томов (считая отдельные непереплетенные тетради и подборки таких тетрадей, вложенные в переплет); туда входили книги по философии, богословию, алхимии, математике, медицине, космологии, латинской поэзии, истории, цивильному и каноническому праву. В числе прочего отмечу книгу писем Сенеки (вероятно, имеются в виду «Нравственные письма к Луцилию»), «небольшую книжку Сенеки» (*libriello chiquiello de Seneca*) неясного содержания, «старый том Терренция», два математических сочинения Боэция, «О сельском хозяйстве» Палладия (BNE MSS/13023, fol. 219v–220r).

Сам Гонсало Гарсия Гудель, уроженец Толедо, учившийся в университетах Парижа и Падуи, прежде чем стать толедским архиепископом, занимал епископские кафедры в Куэнке (1273–1275) и Бургосе (1276–1280) [Caviró Martínez 2010: 150–169]. Он был настоящим библиофилом и уже к 1273 г. обла-

¹⁴ Прозвище «Гудель» (от мосараб. *godelinus*, букв. «маленький гот») указывает на мосарабское происхождение епископа; его родословная подробно изучена Бальбиной Кавиро Мартинес [Caviró Martínez 2010: 131–150].

дал личной библиотекой, насчитывавшей не менее 40 томов (включая подборки непереплетенных тетрадей). В их числе (помимо памятников римского законодательства, трудов по богословию и философии схоластов, сочинений арабских комментаторов Аристотеля и других греческих философов) следует назвать «О сельском хозяйстве» Рутилия Палладия (IV в.), «О военном деле» Вегеция (конец IV — начало V в.), «Стратегемы» Фронтин (ок. 30–103 г.), «Заговор Катилины» («Катилинарий») и «Югуртинскую войну» Саллюстия, два сочинения Цицерона («Риторика к Гереннию» и «Об обязанностях»), «Фарсалию» Лукана, письма Плиния Младшего, «Арифметику» Боэция, латинские переводы «Арифметики» Никомаха Герасского (первая половина II в.) и трудов греческих математиков Феодосия Вифинского (ок. 160 — ок. 100 г. до н. э.) и Менелая Александрийского (ок. 70 — ок. 140 г. г.), комментарии на сочинения Евклида, неназванное произведение Платона и ряд трудов Аристотеля («Физика», «Книга о животных», некий трактат «О физике (природе?) птиц» — возможно, часть аристотелевской «Книги о животных» либо комментарий на нее Аверроэса или другого арабоязычного писателя [González Ruiz 1997: 444]) (BNE MSS/13022, fol. 185v–186r), и картина окажется достаточно полной.

К 1280 г., когда дон Гонсало Гарсия Гудель стал архиепископом Толедо, его собрание еще более пополнилось, в том числе и в своей античной части, главным образом за счет сочинений по математике и философии, общее же число книг достигло не менее 73. Не повторяя сказанного выше, ограничусь лишь несколькими замечаниями. По сравнению с перечнем 1273 г. расширился перечень сочинений Аристотеля («Физика», «Метафизика» («Первая философия»), «Этика», «Политика», «О животных», «О небе», «Риторика»). К этому ряду, возможно, следует добавить также текст «*Liber de naturalibus*», автор которого не назван. Р. Гонсалес Руис полагает, что ее название правильнее транскрибировать «*Los libros de Aristoteles de naturas en un uolumen*» и что речь идет о собрании трудов естественнонаучной тематики; помимо «Физики» (именовавшейся также «Естественная философия» — *Philosophia natural*), в эту группу входили «О небе» (или «О мироздании»), «О небесных явлениях» («Метеорология»), а также «О возникновении и уничтожении» и т. п.; по его мнению, речь идет о сохранившейся толедской рукописи Ms. 47–15, включающей сочинения «О возникновении и уничтожении», «О растениях» (приписывавшейся Аристотелю) и «О небе» [González Ruiz 1997: 430–431]. Теоретически не отвергая этой возможности, вместе с тем замечу, что предлагаемый Р. Гонсалесом Руисом вариант транскрипции едва ли можно считать корректным; полагая, что традиционная версия, принадлежащая Х. М. Мильясу Вильякресе [Millás Vallicrosa 1942: 17], является более предпочтительной. Если это так, то под «*Liber de naturalibus*» мог подразумеваться труд не самого Аристотеля, а кого-либо из его античных или средневековых комментаторов. Возможно, имеется в виду произведение «Книжица о естественных чувствах» (*Libellus de naturalibus passionibus*), приписывавшееся Аспазию (ок. 80 — ок. 150), греческому комментатору трудов основателя Ликия. Однако эта версия нуждается в проверке, осуществить которую в настоящий момент я не могу.

Возвращаясь к перечню аристотелевских сочинений в рассматриваемой описи из рукописи BNE MSS/13022, отмечу, что к старым переводам Аристотеля, по сравнению с описью 1273 г., в ряде случаев добавились новые. Наличие же в числе других книг греческого сочинения Псевдо-Дионисия Ареопа-

гита «О церковной иерархии» позволяет хотя бы теоретически предположить, что некоторые из этих новых переводов могли быть сделаны не с арабских версий, а с греческих оригиналов.

Увеличилось и число сочинений комментаторов Аристотеля, причем не только средневековых (в основном арабоязычных), но и античных; в частности, дважды упоминаются сочинения Александра Афродисийского (рубеж II–III вв.): некие «Комментарии» и трактат «О душе» — вероятно, комментарий на одноименный аристотелевский текст — Симпликия Киликийского (ок. 490–560), «О категориях», комментарий к «Категориям» Аристотеля, комментарий на аристотелевскую «Книгу о небе и мироздании» Фемистия (ок. 317 — после 388) и Прокла Диадоха (412–485). Упоминаются также неназванное сочинение Платона с комментарием Калкидия (Халкидия, IV в.), «Музыка» («Основы музыки») Боэция и неназванный текст Терпенция. Наконец, для полноты картины упомяну еще четыре анонимных сочинения по математике («*Geometria, uolumen Mathematicorum, Liber de vera Mathematica, Liber perspectiva qui incipit: “Simul rectum esse”*»), часть которых также могла быть не переводами текстов арабоязычных комментаторов, а произведениями античных авторов; то же самое можно предполагать и применительно к нескольким фигурирующим в описи анонимным «комментариям», подчас (но не всегда) обозначаемым лишь инципитами (BNE MSS/13022, fol. 163r–164r).

Выехавший из Толедо в Рим в 1298 г., дон Гонсало по прибытии был назначен по воле папы Бонифация VIII (1294–1303) епископом-кардиналом Альбано (ныне Альбано-Лациале) и вскоре после этого умер [Caviró Martínez 2010: 160]. Судьба его книжного собрания точно не известна, но часть принадлежавших ему книг несомненно осталась в Толедо: неслучайным представляется тот факт, что, хотя документ о передаче имущества бывшего архиепископа был составлен в Италии (в г. Витербо, в доме, в котором в тот момент временно проживал архиепископ), в числе свидетелей его составления находились представители толедского капитула как явно заинтересованной стороны. Имеются в виду архидьякон Гауфридо и ризничий Гомес, причем участие последнего кажется тем более показательным, что именно в подведомственной ему ризнице и хранилась библиотека капитула (BNE MSS/13022, fol. 166v).

Несмотря на то что рассмотренные выше рукописные материалы, касающиеся истории формирования книжного собрания капитула Толедского собора в эпоху Альфонсо X, не содержат прямых подтверждений присутствия в этом собрании каких-либо рукописей «Естественной истории», изготовленных по меньшей мере не позднее кодекса BNE MSS/10042 из Национальной библиотеки Испании, они вовсе не исключают такую возможность. И дело не только в том, что применительно к исследуемому периоду мы не обладаем точными каталогами библиотеки толедского капитула. Гораздо более важным кажется тот факт, что общая структура известной нам части собрания явно свидетельствует о выраженном интересе толедских архиепископов и образованных клириков из их непосредственного окружения к античным текстам с акцентом на естественнонаучные дисциплины. Этот интерес лишь отчасти мог быть удовлетворен «Этимологиями» Исидора Севильского, весьма распространенным в эпоху раннего и Высокого Средневековья энциклопедическим сочинением; «Естественная история» могла бы существенно расширить познания севильского прелата.

Для подтверждения или опровержения этой гипотезы необходимо обратиться к источникам иного рода, что и будет сделано далее.

3. Прямые и косвенные цитаты как свидетельства использования «Естественной истории» при создании «Истории Испании»

В условиях явной нечеткости информации «внешних» источников истории бытования Плиниева сочинения в Кастилии и Леоне в эпоху Альфонсо X Мудрого особое значение приобретают данные источников «внутренних», а именно — прямых (сопровождающихся четкими отсылками к «Естественной истории») и косвенных цитат в самом тексте «Истории Испании». Строго говоря, наличие первых само по себе вовсе не означало непосредственного знакомства хрониста с содержанием его источника: он мог быть известен в лучшем случае из вторых рук, а иногда — лишь по названию [Гене 2002: 132–138]. Что же касается косвенного цитирования — более или менее свободного пересказа содержания источника без указания его автора и названия, то его выявление становится еще более сложной задачей, а выводы — неочевидными: сходная по характеру информация потенциально могла быть получена из разных текстов, нередко из вторых рук. Именно поэтому указания на источники в аппарате современных критических изданий памятников средневековой историографии нуждаются в самой тщательной перепроверке.

С учетом традиции исследования источников «Истории Испании» [Solalinde et al. 1955] мною было проверено пять фрагментов ее текста, которые рассматриваются в литературе как прямые (EE 78, 105) или косвенные (EE 4, 78, 85, 105, 117) цитаты. Все перечисленные фрагменты содержатся в тексте первой редакции памятника, так называемой «Изначальной версии», составленной около 1274 г. и сохранившейся главным образом¹⁵ в кодексе Y-I-2 из Библиотеки Эскориала, происходящем непосредственно из скриптория Альфонсо X [Фернандес-Ордоньес Эрнандес 2019: 187–195]. Изложение событий в этом кодексе охватывает период от начала истории Испании до 21-го года правления короля Астурии Альфонсо II Целомудренного (ок. 765–842) включительно, а основную часть сохранившегося текста «Изначальной версии» составляет обзор римской истории, занимающий более 340 глав (EE.23–364) (до 17-го года правления западного императора Гонория включительно); далее еще в без малого ста главах (до EE 429 включительно) события римского прошлого излагаются наряду с историей варварских народов (вандалов, аланов, свевов и готов) и доводятся до падения Западной Римской империи, за которым следует рассказ об Остготском королевстве в Италии.

В каких же случаях Альфонсо X и его анонимные соавторы могли обращаться к Плинию Старшему в поисках информации о событиях римской истории? Начну с описания внешности, а также особенностей характера и поведения Юлия Цезаря как человека, военачальника и политика в главе EE 117.

¹⁵ Несколько листов оказалось в составе другого эскориальского кодекса — X-I-4 (XIII–XIV вв.), составленного из фрагментов разных рукописей между 1321 и 1344 г. королевским нотариусом Фернаном Санчесом из Вальядолида; речь идет о fol. 2r–17r [Фернандес-Ордоньес Эрнандес 2019: 215].

Принято считать [Solalinde et al. 1955: lxxxvii], что для характеристики свойственной Цезарю учености наряду с другими источниками был использован материал Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VII.27¹⁶. Детальный анализ содержания *EE* 117 показывает, однако, что главным источником для хронистов была вовсе не «Естественная история», а «Римская история» Павла Диакона (ок. 720 — ок. 799), написавшего ее в 774 г. для своей ученицы Адалгегги, дочери последнего лангобардского короля Дезидерия (756–774). В основу текста был положен «Бревиарий» позднеримского историка Евтропия, а повествование доведено до времен Юстиниана [Павлов 2018: 14–15]. Особенно хорошо это видно при анализе восхвалений военного искусства Цезаря-полководца¹⁷ и присущей ему способности к необычайно быстрому ведению записей¹⁸, где кастильский текст оказывается почти дословным переводом латинского. Что же касается «Естественной истории», то с ее текстом *EE* 117 соотносится лишь в самом общем смысле, тем более что информация, содержащаяся у Павла Диакона, делала использование Плиниева сочинения явно избыточным.

Продолжая разговор о возможном использовании «Естественной истории» в качестве источника информации о событиях римской истории, перейду от рассказа хронистов о Цезаре к их сообщениям о Помпее [Ауров и др. 2016]. Подробно этот сюжет уже был исследован мной ранее; здесь я останавлиюсь лишь на частных аспектах, связанных с тематикой настоящей статьи. В главе *EE*.78, где среди прочего говорится о триумфе, устроенном Помпеем в ознаменование его военных побед в Азии¹⁹, речь идет в том числе о животных, которых было принято вести в торжественных шествиях такого рода; в их ряду фигурирует и птица феникс. В литературе [Solalinde et al. 1955: lxxiii, lxxxi] утвердилась точка зрения, согласно которой в данном случае (как и в подобном сообщении в главе *EE* 4, где название птицы соотносится с топонимом Феникс, местом рождения «второго Геркулеса»)²⁰ в качестве источника

¹⁶ Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VII.27: «Ceteris virtutum generibus varie et multi fuere praestantes. Cato primus Porciae gentis tres summas in homine res praestitisse existimatur, ut esset optimus orator, optimus imperator, optimus senator, quae mihi omnia, etiamsi non prius, attamen clarius fulsisse in Scipione Aemiliano videntur, dempto praeterea plurimorum odio, quo Cato laboravit. itaque sit proprium Catonis quater et quadragens causam dixisse, nec quemquam saepius postulatam et semper absolutum».

¹⁷ *EE* 117. *Dell imperio de Julio Cesar et de que fayçones et de que costumbres era*. «...e daqui adelante dize en la su estoria que fue Julio Cesar uno de los meiores caualleros dell mundo; nunca fue omne que mas batallas uenciesse que ell, nin que mas matasse enemigos; cinquenta uezes ouo lides campales, et todas las uencio. Este uencio a Marcho Marcello que ouiera treynta et nueue uezes lid campal et siempre lidiara duna guisa; et todauia uenciera et nunca fuera .uencido»; cfr.: «Vir, quo nullus umquam bellis magis enituit. Eius siquidem ductu undecies centum nonaginta et duo milia hostium caesa sunt, nam quantum bellis civilibus fuderit, noluit adnotare; signis conlatis quinquagies dimicauit. M. Marcellum solus supergressus, qui triginta novem vicibus pari modo fuerat proeliatum» (Paul. *Hist. Rom.* VII.25).

¹⁸ *EE* 117: «Numqua fue ninguno que mas ayna escriuiesse que ell, ni que mas ayna leyesse»; cfr.: «Adhoc nullus celerius scripsit, nemo velocius legit, quaternas etiam epistolas simul dictavit» (Paul. *Hist. Rom.* VII.25).

¹⁹ См. выше прим. 2.

²⁰ *EE* 4: «Hercules el segundo ... fue natural duna cibdat que dixieron Fenis, e fue assi llamada porque eran tan uiciosa que tenien que no auie compannera en el mundo, assi cuemo ell aue fénix que es sola e no a compannera ninguna...». От «трех Геркулесах» см.: [Ершова 2017]. Информация о городе Фениксе как месте рождения «второго Геркулеса» заимствована из хроники Евсевия-Иеронима (Euseb.-Hieron. *Chron.* 63).

использована «Естественная история» (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* X.2). Однако детальное сопоставление ее текста²¹ с названными фрагментами «Истории Испании» не приводит к четкому выводу в силу очевидной лапидарности сообщений; для уверенного вывода необходим более пространный текст, позволяющий нагляднее проследить сходства и различия между кастильским текстом и его потенциальным латинским прототипом.

В принципе то же самое можно сказать применительно к другому фрагменту той же главы, источником которого принято считать 8-ю книгу «Естественной истории» [Solalinde et al. 1955: lxxx]. Речь идет об описании сражений с животными во время игр, устроенных в связи с триумфом Помпея, детальное сопоставление которого с сочинением Плиния действительно указывает на определенные параллели, правда, не со всей 8-й книгой, а лишь с одной ее главой. Но речь идет лишь о сходстве содержания, а не о переводе или близком к тексту переложении²². В принципе подобное использование источника было допустимо: в конце концов никто не обязывал хронистов цитировать дословно. Однако в главе *EE* 78 это цитирование сопровождается показательной фактической ошибкой: местом игр необоснованно назван театр, а не амфитеатр — оговорка, непростительная даже для средневекового писателя, знакомого с «Этимологиями» Исидора Севильского, четко различающего разные виды зрелищ и места их проведения²³, и уж тем более маловероятная для человека, непосредственно знакомого с текстом Плиния.

Далее, в главе *EE* 85 сообщается о возвращении Помпея в Рим после завоевания и окончательного покорения Азии и присвоения ему титула императора: «...alli le llamaron emperador primeramente». Это замечание при желании можно, конечно, связать с 7-й главой «Естественной истории» (...totiens imperator ante quam miles — Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VII.26), как это принято в литературе [Solalinde et al. 1955: lxxxii]. Однако гораздо логичнее выглядит связь с другим источником — тем, о котором говорят сами хронисты, а именно с хроникой Евсевия-Иеронима (*EE* 85: «E assi cuemo cuenta Eusebio en su estoria»): «Pompeius imperator appellatus» (Euseb.-Hieron. *Chron.* 236). Очевидно, что в последнем случае мы видим почти дословное совпадение с кастильским текстом, тогда как в случае сочинения Плиния это явно не так, что делает указание на него как на источник рассмотренного фрагмента явно избыточным.

²¹ См. выше прим. 2.

²² *EE* 78: «E tod esto fazien por onra et por nobleza del sennorio et de la cibdat de Roma et de los sennores della. E pora estas animalias brauas tener et guardar et lidiar las alli, et uenir y la yente a ueer lo, fizieron los principes de Roma un corral grand redondo a que llamauan en latin teatro; e aquellogar era assi fecho: que auie dentro a derredor muchas camaras a bouada et departidas pora cada una daquellas animalias o estidiessen apartadas segund sus naturas, e tod el teatro a derredor fecho a gradas por o estidiessen los omnes quando querien fazer iuegos con ellas en sus fiestas, o quando tomauan por sennores a sos principes o los querien onrrar»; cfr.: «[Elephantes] Romae iuncti primum subiere currum Pompei Magni Africano triumpho, quod prius India victa triumphante Libero patre memoratur. Procihus negat potuisse Pompei triumpho iunctos egredi porta. Germanici Caesaris munere gladiatorio quosdam etiam inconditos meatus edidere saltantium modo. Vulgare erat per auras arma iacere non auferentibus ventis atque inter se gladiatorios congressus edere aut iasciuenti pyrriche concludere» (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VIII.2).

²³ Isid. *Etym.* XVIII.52.1: «Amphitheatrum locus est spectaculi, ubi pugnant gladiatores».

Следующий пример имеет существенные отличия от всех рассмотренных выше примеров уже потому, что прямое указание на «Естественную историю» как источник соответствующего сообщения вынесено в название соответствующей главы (EE 105) — «О похвале, расточаемой Плинием Помпею Великому»²⁴. В основной же части главы исследователями выявлено четыре более или менее очевидные аллюзии на сочинение Плиния, что совсем немало, если учесть ограниченный объем этой части кастильского текста [Solalinde et al. 1955: lxxxv]. В первом случае речь идет о высокой оценке факта завоевания Помпеем для Римской державы огромных земель на Востоке, что, по мнению хронистов, приравнивало его деяния к свершениям Александра Македонского, Геракла и даже легендарного Либеры-отца²⁵. Во втором — перечисляются завоевания Помпея на Западе (Сицилия, Африка, испанские земли и др.), упоминаются взятые укрепления и одержанные победы²⁶. Третья аллюзия связана с восхвалением побед Помпея над пиратами; здесь сходство латинского и кастильского текстов прослеживается в наименьшей степени, хотя очевидно, что речь идет об одном и том же факте²⁷. Наконец, в четвертом случае возможный латинский оригинал содержит текст надписи, о которой упоминается в кастильском тексте²⁸.

Во всех четырех случаях сама по себе связь латинского и кастильского текстов не вызывает сомнений. Настораживает, однако, одна ошибка: дело в том,

²⁴ EE 105. *De la alabanza que cuenta Plinio de Ponpeyo el Grand.*

²⁵ EE 105: «Et tanto puio a seer omne de grand guisa et tantos fizo de buenos fechos et grauados, que diz que si las batallas que el uencio et todos los sos grandes fechos et las sus noblezas contasse omne, que non solamiente las lides et las conquistas del grand Alexandre, mas aun las de Hercules et del princep Libero padre que conquirio a Asia et fue sennor della, non serien mayores nin mas que fueron las daquel Ponpeyo el Grand»; cfr.: «Verum ad decus imperii Romani, non solum ad viri unius, pertinet victoriarum Pompei Magni titulos omnes triumphosque hoc in loco nuncupari, aequato non modo Alexandri Magni rerum fulgore, sed etiam Herculis prope ac Liberi patris» (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VII.26.95).

²⁶ EE 105: «Ca el cobro el regno de Sezilla que auie perdido Roma, et gano a Affrica et las metio so el poder de los romanos, lo que numqua fiziera otro princep ante del; desi uino a las Espannas, et lidio con los espannoles et uenciolos; et tomo y por fuerça ocho cientos et setaenta et VI entre uillas et castiellos grandes, et conquirio la tierra et las yentes, et ayunto daquela uez las Espannas all imperio romano. Et esto fue de las Alpes fasta las postremeras tierras de occident...»; cfr.: «Igitur Sicilia recuperata, unde primum Sullanus in rei publicae causa exoriens auspicatus est, Africa vero tota subacta et in dicionem redacta Magnique nomine in spoliis inde capto, eques Romanus, id quod antea nemo, curru triumphali reuectus et statim ad solis occasum transgressus, excitatis in Pyrenaeo tropaeis, oppida DCCCLXXVI ab Alpibus ad fines Hispaniae ulterioris in dicionem redacta victoriae suae adscripsit...» (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VII.26.96).

²⁷ EE 105: «Et desbarato los cossarios que robauan los puertos et las tierras et tenien presos todos los mares»; cfr.: «Postea ad tota maria et deinde solis ortus missus hos retulit patriae titulos more sacris certaminibus vincentium — neque enim ipsi coronantur, sed patrias suas coronant; hos ergo honores urbi tribuit in delubro Minervae...» (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VII.26.97).

²⁸ EE 105: «...Et tod esto dexo ell en escripto»; cfr.: «...quod ex manubiis dicabat: CN-POMPEIVS MAGNVS IMPERATOR BELLO XXX ANNORVM CONFECTO FVSVS FVGATIS OCCISIS IN DEDITIONEM ACCEPTIS HOMINVM CENTIENS VICIENS SEMEL LXXXIII DEPRESSIS AVT CAPTIS NAVIBVS DCCCXLVI OPPIDIS CASTELLIS MDXXXVIII IN FIDEM RECEPTIS TERRIS A MAEOTIS AD RVBRVM MARE SVBACTIS VOTVM MERITO MINERVAE» (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* VII.26.97).

что сведения, положенные в основу материала главы, содержатся в 26-й главе 7-й книги «Естественной истории». Между тем в самом начале рассматриваемой главы «Истории Испании» хронисты, повторяя указание на источник, приводят не только имя автора используемого в качестве источника сочинения, но и точный номер книги и — явно ошибочный! — номер главы: «Плиний сообщает о природных качествах и достоинствах людей в 28-й главе седьмой книги “Естественной истории” и говорит о причине рассказать о благородных деяниях Помпея и Цезаря...»²⁹. И это при том, что в средневековых рукописях «Естественной истории» (и рассмотренный выше мадридский кодекс BNE. MSS / 10042 не является исключением из правил) в обязательном порядке обозначались номера не только книг (как правило, в верхней части листа, над основным текстом, в середине), но и глав, включая и 26-ю главу 7-й книги³⁰.

Чем могла быть вызвана эта ошибка? Опиской, сбоем технического характера, невнимательностью? Может быть. Тем более что некоторые рукописи вместо XXVIII (см.: RBME Y-I-2, fol. 52r) дают XXVII (именно последняя версия отражена в издании Р. Менендеса Пидалья [Menéndez Pidal 1955: 82]), что как будто свидетельствует об определенных сомнениях переписчиков в правильности обозначения. Показательно, однако, что ни одно из этих разночтений не дает верной информации, не говоря уже о том, что ни одна рукопись по своему характеру не может быть приравнена к RBME Y-I-2 — оригиналу, происходящему непосредственно из королевского скриптория, по меньшей мере часть которого была составлена при непосредственном присутствии Альфонсо X.

Если же все сказанное в этом разделе свести воедино, обнаруживается такое количество несоответствий, что сомнений не остается: «Мудрый король» и его соавторы были знакомы с «Естественной историей» Плиния Старшего лишь из вторых рук, хотя осознавали значение этого памятника и стремились создать у читателя впечатление своего знакомства с его содержанием³¹.

* * *

Строго говоря, в таком подходе не было ничего беспрецедентного. Точно так же как с Плинием, создатели «Истории Испании» обращались и с некоторыми другими римскими писателями, в частности, с «Жизнью двенадцати цезарей» Светония. Рукописей этого автора (в отличие, например, от хорошо известного в Кастилии и Леоне Саллюстия) в исследуемый период было крайне немного. Показательно отсутствие этого сочинения даже в таком масштабном книжном собрании, как толедское. И хотя имя Светония было несомненно знакомо хронистам, а его сочинение воспринималось как крайне авторитетное, тем не менее все цитаты из его текста (даже сопровождающиеся прямыми отсылками к «Жизни двенадцати цезарей») на самом деле были почерпнуты из «Зеркала истории» знаменитого французского писателя Винсента из Бове

²⁹ EE 105: «Plinio fabla de las naturas et de las noblezas de los omnes en el XXVIII capitulo del seteno libro de la *Natural Estoria*, et dize sobre razon de alabar los nobles fechos de Ponpeyo el Grand et de Julio Cesar...».

³⁰ См., например: BNE MSS / 10042, fol. 52v.

³¹ Строго говоря, этот вывод можно полностью распространить и на «Всеобщую историю» Альфонсо X, создававшуюся в том же скриптории, что и «История Испании» [Ершова 2019: 151–152].

(ок. 1184–1264). Внимательное сопоставление соответствующих мест хроники и латинского оригинала Светониевых жизнеописаний не оставляет в этом сомнений³².

Следует подчеркнуть, что описанное обращение к источнику было характерно далеко не только скрипторию Альфонсо X. Например, такими же принципами руководствовался известный историк того времени брат Хуан Хиль (ок. 1241 — ок. 1318), образованный францисканец из Саморы, младший современник «Мудрого короля», безусловно знавший его лично, но, насколько известно, не участвовавший в работе над «Историей Испании». Около 1282 г. он написал фундаментальный труд «О чудесах Испании», само название которого перекидается с названием хроники, составленной под руководством Альфонсо X. Более того, в ряду кастильских и леонских хронистов XIII в. главными образцами для саморца стали хроники Родриго Хименеса де Рада и Луки Туйского (ум. в 1249 г.), являвшиеся важным источником и «национальной» хроники Альфонсо X.

Брат Хуан Хиль трижды прямо цитирует «Естественную историю», указывая имя римского писателя, и все три случая представляют собой явные фальсификации. При этом два раза цитируется то самое необоснованно связываемое с «Естественной историей» сообщение о городах Карпентании, которое уже рассматривалось выше применительно к хронике Родриго Толедского; отсюда же его несомненно списал и брат Хуан Хиль, таким образом подарив новую жизнь псевдоцитате, столь же уверенно, как у его предшественника, снабженной ссылкой на Плиния Старшего³³. В другом случае абсолютно вымышленное сообщение об испанском происхождении Аристотеля, заимствованное из «Всемирной истории» Луки Туйского, было для большей убедительности дополнено псевдоссылкой на автора «Естественной истории»³⁴.

³² EE 117: «E segund cuenta en el primer libro en que fabla de los doze Cesares, era Julio Cesaralto de cuerpo, e era blanco de color en todos los miembros del cuerpo, e auie ta boca unpoco mas ancha de quanto conuinie, e era bienandante en ueuir siempre muy sano, sinon tanto que a las uezes falleciel a soora el coraçon. Et auie por costumbre de se espatar entre suennos muchas uezes» (etc.). Cfr.: «Hic fuisse traditur excelsa statura, colore candido membris, ore paulo pleniore, nigris vegetisque oculis, valetudine prospera nisi quod repente animo linqui, aut etiam per sompnum exerceri solebat» (Vinc. Belov. *Spec. Histor.* VII.38); «Fuisse traditur excelsa statura, colore candido, teretibus membris, ore paulo pleniore, nigris vegetisque oculis, valitudine prospera, nisi quod tempore extremo repente animo linqui atque etiam per somnum exterreri solebat» (Suet. *Div. Iul.* 45). См. также: EE 119 (cfr.: Vinc. Belov. *Spec. Histor.* VII.41; Suet. *Div. Iul.* 81); EE 120 (cfr.: Vinc. Belov. *Spec. Histor.* VII.41–42; Suet. *Div. Iul.* 81–84) etc.

³³ *De praec. Hisp.* I.1: «Et habet Celtiberia Carpentanam provinciam que in se quatuor habet opida, scilicet: Aucam, Calagurram, Tirasonam et Auripam, que post Cesaraugusta, ab Augusto Cesaare, fuit dicta, et ius romanorum principum occupavit. Que tamen, sicut referunt Plinius, et Sisebutus, ad Cartaginenses provinciam pertinebat»; cfr.: Rod. *Hist. Goth.* I.3.34 (текст см. в прим. 6). См. также: *De praec. Hisp.* VIII.7.

³⁴ *De praec. Hisp.* VII.1: «De Hispania siquidem fuit Aristoteles, Philosophorum perfectio et consummation, secundum Plinium et secundum Lucam Tudensem Episcopum, in Coronicis suis in capitulo de Ataxerse, dicto Asuero». Cfr.: «Antiquitate preterea philosophorum fulget Yspania, eo quod genuit Aristotelem summum philosophum...» (Luc. *Chron. Mundi*, Prefatio (De excellentia Hispaniae) 2.80–90). Показательно и то, что автор сознательно запутал читателя, указав неверное место в своем источнике: у Луки рассказ о царе Артаксерксе помещен в другом месте (Luc. *Chron. Mundi* I.75.10).

Можно было бы закончить эту статью пассажем о наивности и необразованности средневековых историописателей в духе историков-позитивистов второй половины XIX — начала XX столетия, если бы не одно «но» — поразительное богатство собраний античных авторов и комментариев к ним там, где вы вовсе не ожидаете его обнаружить. Не только в Толедо с его глубокими традициями переводов арабских версий сочинений греческих философов и комментариев к ним, но и далеко от церковной столицы полуострова применительно к XII–XIII вв. отмечается явный интерес к античному прошлому, следствием которого становилось пополнение соборных библиотек книгами римских писателей — как христианских, так и языческих, — а также всякого рода средневековыми сводами сообщений об античном прошлом.

Приведу лишь два примера, представляющиеся мне достаточно показательными. Так, книжное собрание ризницы собора Успения Девы Марии в г. Бурго-де-Осма (в современной провинции Сория), судя по данным описи конца XIII в., включало некую «Троянскую историю» («Ystoria troiana»), небольшую (*chiquello*) книжицу с характерным инципитом «Socrates», «Граматику» Доната, три разных издания «Арифметики» Боэция [Rojo Orcajo 1929b: 659–663]. К ним следует добавить еще два кодекса, не упомянутые в описи. Первый из них, ныне обозначаемый как Ms. 7 (XII в.), среди прочего включает сочинения Цицерона «О нахождении материала» («De inventione rhetorica») и его же «Сон Сципиона» с комментариями Макробия [Ibid.: 706–707]. Еще один кодекс, Ms. 126 (XIII в.), наряду с другими сочинениями содержит так называемую «Историю о разрушении Трои» «Дарета Фригийского в переводе Корнелия Непота» (на самом деле текст был сочинен в V или VI в.) [Ibid.: 222].

Библиотека леонского собора Св. Марии (Santa María de la Regla), которая ныне включает всего 40 кодексов IX–XVIII вв., представляет собой лишь малую часть средневекового собрания. Тем не менее даже в ее составе есть целый ряд книг, обращающих на себя внимание. Назову кодекс X в., содержащий палимпсест «Римского закона вестготов» (Ms. 15), а также разрозненные фрагменты рукописей XII в., в числе которых выдержки из сочинения Салюстия («Катилинарий»), вторая книга «Сатир» Горация, фрагмент «Андрии» Терренция, часть трактата об арифметике [Beer, Díaz Jiménez 1888: 16–18, 42–43].

Приведенный перечень в полной мере определяет тот интеллектуальный климат, в котором только и мог зародиться живой интерес к «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего, основанный на понимании важности этого памятника. Стремление к прямому, неопосредованному знакомству с Плиниевым сочинением не могло реализоваться в конкретных условиях Кастилии и Леона XIII в. — эпохи Альфонсо X Мудрого. Но оно стало реальностью уже во второй трети следующего, XIV столетия, свидетельством чему стал быстрый рост числа рукописей «Естественной истории» в испанских собраниях. Эти кодексы, изготовленные в Италии, несли с собой дух начинающегося итальянского Возрождения, вскоре радикально изменивший состав соборных библиотек.

Однако эта тема составляет предмет уже совсем другого исследования.

Литература

- Ауров 2017 — Ауров О. В. Власть, Церковь и текст в Испании до 1000 года // Теология и политика: Власть, Церковь и текст в королевствах вестготов (V — начало VIII в.): Исследования и переводы / Ред.-сост. О. В. Ауров; Общ. ред. О. В. Ауров, Е. С. Марей. М.: Изд. дом «Дело» РАНХиГС, 2017. С. 183–266.
- Ауров 2019 — Ауров О. В. Альфонсо X Мудрый, его эпоха и его «История Испании» // История Испании, которую составил благороднейший король дон Альфонсо, сын благороднейшего короля дон Фернандо и королевы доньи Беатрис = *Estoria de Espanna que fizo el muy noble rey don Alfonso fijo del noble rey don Fernando et de la reyna donna Beatriz*: Комментированный перевод по транскрипции средневекового текста, осуществленный Рамоном Менендесом Пидалем («Первая всеобщая хроника Испании») / [Под общ. ред. О. В. Аунова (сост., отв. ред.) и др.]. СПб.: Наука, 2019. С. 31–94.
- Ауров и др. 2016 — Ауров О. В., Марей Е. С., Копылов И. А. «...Mas cumplido príncip de bondat que en mundo oio...»: Помпей Великий глазами средневекового хрониста // Шаги / Steps. Т. 2. № 2–3. С. 317–348.
- Гене 2002 — Гене Б. История и историческая культура средневекового Запада / Пер. с фр. М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2002.
- Ершова 2017 — Ершова И. В. «О трех Геркулесах, существовавших в этом мире»: античный герой в средневековых испанских хрониках // Диалог со временем. № 59. 2017. С. 231–245.
- Ершова 2019 — Ершова И. В. «История Испании» как литературный памятник // История Испании, которую составил благороднейший король дон Альфонсо, сын благороднейшего короля дон Фернандо и королевы доньи Беатрис = *Estoria de Espanna que fizo el muy noble rey don Alfonso fijo del noble rey don Fernando et de la reyna donna Beatriz*: Комментированный перевод по транскрипции средневекового текста, осуществленный Рамоном Менендесом Пидалем («Первая всеобщая хроника Испании») / [Под общ. ред. О. В. Аунова (сост., отв. ред.) и др.]. СПб.: Наука, 2019. С. 148–166.
- Павлов 2018 — Павлов А. А. Павел Диакон и его эпитама «О значении слов» // Павел Диакон. Эпитама сочинения Секста Помпея Феста «О значении слов» / Пер., вступ. ст., коммент. А. А. Павлова. СПб.: Центр гуманитарных инициатив, 2018. С. 12–36.
- Фернандес-Ордоньес Эрнандес 2019 — Фернандес-Ордоньес Эрнандес И. «История Испании»: история текста и рукописная традиция / Пер. с исп. // История Испании, которую составил благороднейший король дон Альфонсо, сын благороднейшего короля дон Фернандо и королевы доньи Беатрис = *Estoria de Espanna que fizo el muy noble rey don Alfonso fijo del noble rey don Fernando et de la reyna donna Beatriz*: Комментированный перевод по транскрипции средневекового текста, осуществленный Рамоном Менендесом Пидалем («Первая всеобщая хроника Испании») / [Под общ. ред. О. В. Аунова (сост., отв. ред.) и др.]. СПб.: Наука, 2019. С. 177–248.
- Aguilera y Gamboa 1908 — [Aguilera y Gamboa E. de] Discursos leídos ante la Real Academia de la Historia: en la recepción pública del Sr. D. Enrique de Aguilera y Gamboa, marqués de Cerralbo, en 31 de Mayo de 1908. Madrid: “Sucesores de Rivadeneyra”, impresores de la Real Casa, 1908.
- Beer, Díaz Jiménez 1888 — Beer R., Díaz Jiménez J. E. Noticias bibliográficas y Catálogo de los códices de la Santa Iglesia Catedral de León. León: Establecimiento tipográfico de Mariano Garzo, 1888.
- Beneyto Pérez 1986 — Beneyto Pérez J. El cardenal Albornoz: hombre de iglesia y de estado en Castilla y en Italia. Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1986.
- Bonilla Martínez, Delgado Romero 2014 — Bonilla Martínez E., Delgado Romero M. Biblioteca virtual Scriptorium Isidori Hispalensis. Ponencia en el Congreso “Diócesis y Abadía”, Alcalá la Real, 25-10-2014 // Scriptorium Isidori Hispalensis. Publicaciones del

- Grupo de Trabajo. URL: <http://www.scriptoriumisidorihispalensis.org/pdfs/Congreso%20Alcala/Biblioteca%20virtual%20Scriptorium%20Isidori%20Hispalensis.pdf>.
- Caviró Martínez 2010 — *Caviró Martínez B.* El linaje y las armas del arzobispo toledano Gonzalo Pétrez “Gudiel” (1280–1299) // *Toletum. Boletín de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes y Ciencias Históricas de Toledo*. Núm. 57. 2010. P. 131–169.
- Crespo López 2015 — *Crespo López M.* Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada: Vida, obra y bibliografía. Madrid: Fundación Ignacio Larramendi, 2015.
- Cros Gutiérrez 2018 — *Cros Gutiérrez A.* Gil de Albornoz, mecenas de las artes, un cardenal en contexto // *DOMUS HISPANICA*. El Real Colegio de España y el cardenal Gil de Albornoz en la Historia del Arte / Ed. por M. Parada López de Corselas. Bologna: Bononia University Press, 2018. P. 17–42.
- Domínguez Bordona 1933 — *Domínguez Bordona J.* Manuscritos con pinturas: notas para un inventario de los conservados en colecciones públicas y particulares de España. Vol. 1. Avila; Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1933.
- Doody 2010 — *Doody A.* Pliny’s encyclopedia: The reception of Natural History. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010.
- Falque 2003 — *Falque E.* Lucas de Túy y Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada: el uso de las fuentes // *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiéval*. N° 26. 2003. P. 151–161.
- Fernández Valverde 1987 — *Fernández Valverde J.* Fuentes // *Roderici Ximenii de Rada Opera omnia*. Pars. I: Historia de rebus Hispaniae sive Historia Gothica / Cura et studio J. Fernández Valverde. Turnholti: Brepols, 1987. (Corpus christianorum. Continuatio mediaevalis; 72a). P. xxviii–xli.
- Fernández Valverde 1989 — *Fernández Valverde J.* Introducción // Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada. Historia de los hechos de España / Introducción, traducción, notas y índices de J. Fernández Valverde. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1989. P. 13–52.
- Ferrer i Mallol 2002 — *Ferrer i Mallol M. T.* Estudio histórico // Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda. Obras completas. Vol. 5: Historia de los hechos del Cardenal Gil de Albornoz / Por J. Costas Rodríguez, A. Moreno Hernández, L. Carrasco Reija, M. Trascasas Casares. Pozoblanco: Ayuntamiento de Pozoblanco, 2002. P. vii–lviii.
- González Ruiz 1973 — *González Ruiz R.* La Biblioteca capitular de Toledo en el s. XIV // *Toletum. Boletín de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes y Ciencias Históricas de Toledo*. Núm. 6. 1973. P. 29–56.
- González Ruiz 1997 — *González Ruiz R.* Hombres y libros de Toledo (1086–1300). Madrid: Fundación Ramón Areces, 1997.
- Guirardel 2007 — *Guirardel S. J.-M.* *L’Histoire gothica* de Rodrigue Jimenez de Rada (1243): écriture et discours: Thèse ... Docteur de l’Université de Toulouse II. 2007.
- Haenel 1830 — *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum, qui in bibliothecis Galliae, Helvetiae, Belgii, Britanniae M., Hispaniae, Lusitaniae asservantur* / Ed. G. Haenel. Lipsiae: Sumtibus I. C. Hinrichs, 1830.
- Hernández Aparicio 2000 — *Hernández Aparicio P.* Inventario general de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional. Vol. 14: 9501 a 10200. Madrid: Biblioteca Nacional de España, 2000.
- Lomax 1977 — *Lomax D. W.* Rodrigo Jimenez de Rada como historiador // *Actas del Quinto Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas, celebrado en Bordeaux del 2 al 8 de septiembre de 1974*. [Vol.] 1 / Publ. bajo la dir. de M. Chevalier et al. Bordeaux: Instituto de estudios ibéricos y iberoamericanos; Universidad Bordeaux III, 1977. P. 587–592.
- Menéndez Pidal 1955 — *Primera Crónica General de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289* / Publ. por R. Menéndez Pidal con colabor. de A. G. Solalinde, M. Muñoz Cortés y J. Gómez Pérez. Vol. 1. Madrid: Gredos, 1955.
- Millás Vallicrosa 1942 — *Millás Vallicrosa J. M.* Las traducciones orientales en los manuscritos de la Biblioteca Catedral de Toledo. Madrid: CSIC, 1942.

- Nieto Soria 2002 — *Nieto Soria J. M.* La época medieval: Iglesia y cultura. Madrid: Istmo, 2002.
- Pérez de Guzmán 1926 — *Pérez de Guzmán L.* Un inventario del siglo XIV de la Catedral de Toledo (La Biblia de San Luis) // *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*. T. 89. 1926. P. 373–419.
- Reeve 2006 — *Reeve M. D.* Manuscripts of Pliny's Natural History in Spain // *Exemplaria Classica: Revista de Filología Clásica = Journal of Classical Philology*. Núm. 10. 2006. P. 151–186.
- Reeve 2011 — *Reeve M. D.* The *Vita Plinii* // *Pliny the Elder: Themes and contexts* / Ed. by R. R. Gibson, R. Morello. Leiden: Brill, 2011. P. 207–222.
- Reynolds 1983 — *Reynolds L. D.* The Elder Pliny // *Texts and transmissions: A survey of the Latin Classics* / Ed. by L. D. Reynolds. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983. P. 307–316.
- Rizzi 2018 — *Rizzi A.* Editing and translating Pliny in Renaissance Italy: Agency, collaboration and visibility // *Renaissanceforum: Tidsskrift for renaissanceforskning = Journal of Renaissance Studies*. Vol. 14. P. 2018. 117–138.
- Rodríguez Lajusticia 2019 — *Rodríguez Lajusticia F. S.* La relación de Jaime I de Aragón con sus hijos en los registros de cancillería (1257–1276). Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico. Exma. Diputación de Zaragoza, 2019.
- Rojo Orcajo 1929a — *Roco Orcajo T.* Catálogo descriptivo de los códices que se conservan en la Santa Iglesia Catedral de Burgo de Osma // *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*. T. 94. 1929. P. 655–792. T. 95. 1929. 152–314.
- Rojo Orcajo 1929b — *Rojo Orcajo T.* La Biblioteca del Arzobispo don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada y los manuscritos del monasterio de Santa María de Huerta // *Revista Eclesiástica*. Núm. 3. 1929. P. 196–219.
- Rubio Fernández 1984 — *Rubio Fernández L.* Catálogo de manuscritos clásicos latinos existentes en España. Madrid: Editorial de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1984.
- Sánchez-Prieto Borja 2001 — *Sánchez-Prieto Borja P.* Introducción // *Alfonso X el Sabio. General Estoria*. T. 1: Génesis. 2001. Madrid: Biblioteca Castro; Fundación José Antonio de Castro, 2001. P. xxvi–lxxx.
- Sandys 1921 — *Sandys J. E.* A history of Classical scholarship. Vol. 1: From the Sixth century B. C. to the end of the Middle Ages. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1921.
- Solalinde et al. 1955 — *Solalinde A. G., Muñoz Cortés M., Gómez Pérez J.* Fuentes de cada capítulo en particular // *Primera Crónica General de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289* / Publ. por R. Menéndez Pidal con colabor. de A. G. Solalinde, M. Muñoz Cortés, J. Gómez Pérez. Vol. 2. Madrid: Gredos, 1955. P. lxxiii–ccviii.
- Ward 2003 — *Ward A.* Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada: auteur et acteur en Castille à la fin du XIII^e siècle // *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*. N° 26. 2003. P. 283–294.

Сокращения

Неопубликованные источники

Национальная библиотека Испании (Мадрид)

- BNE MSS/10042 — [Plinio Secundo, Cayo] *Naturalis Historia*. Signatura: BNE MSS/10042 (olim BCT Cajón 47, núm. 11) [s. XII–XIII].
- BNE MSS/13022 — Documentos de la Iglesia y prelados de Toledo. Signatura: BNE MSS/13022 [s. XVIII].
- BNE MSS/13023 — Documentos de la Iglesia y prelados de Toledo. Signatura: BNE MSS/13023 [s. XVIII].
- BNE MSS/13471 — *Inventarium librorum librariae ecclesiae Toletane repertorium*. Signatura: BNE MSS/13471 (olim BCT, Cajón 41, núm. 44) [a. 1455].

- BNE MSS/13596 — Inventarium librorum libraria alme ecclesie Toletane repertorium. Signatura: BNE MSS/13596 (olim BCT, Cajón 41, núm. 43) [a. 1455].
- BNE MSS/13630 — Inventarios de los libros de la biblioteca de la Santa Iglesia de Toledo. Signatura: BNE MSS/13630 (olim BCT, Cajón 41, núm. 46) [a. 1601–1700].

Королевская библиотека монастыря Св. Лаврентия (Эскориал)

- RBME Q-I-4 — C. Plinii Secundi naturalis historiae libri II-XXXVII. Signatura: RBME Q-I-4 [s. XIV].
- RBME R-I-5 — C. Plinii Secundi naturalis historiae libri II-XXXVII. Signatura: RBME R-I-5 [s. XIV].
- RBME Y-I-2 — Alfonso X, Rey de Castilla (1221–1284). Estoria de España. Signatura: Y-I-2 [s. XIII].

Национальный исторический архив (Мадрид)

- AHN Codices, 987B — Liber privilegiorum Ecclesie Toletane [I]. Signatura: CODICES, 987B (Secc.: Códices y Colecciones) (olim BCT Cajón 42, núm. 23) [s. XII–XIV].

Национальная библиотека Франции (Париж)

- Paris. B.N. Lat. 6797 — C. Plinii Secundi historiae naturalis libri triginta septem: trigesimus septimus manu recentiore suppletus est. Cote: BnF Latin 6797 [a. 1201–1300].

Библиотека Лауренциана (Милан)

- BML Plut. 82.1 — Plinii Pars Prima. Plinii Secundi Novocomensis Natularis Historiae Libri XXXII. Coll. Plutei. Segnatura: Plut. 82.1 [a. 1201–1300].

Ватиканская библиотека

- Vat. Lat. 1953 — Plinius Secundus, Gaius, Naturalis Historiae lib. I–XXXVII sec. XV in. Segnatura: Vat. Lat. 1953 [a. 1401–1425].

Опубликованные источники

- De praec. Hisp.* — Fray Juan Gil de Zamora (*O. F. M.*). De preconiiis Hispanie / Ed. M. de Castro y Castro. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid; Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, 1955.
- EE* — Estoria de Espanna. In: Primera Crónica General de España / Ed. por R. Menéndez Pidal con un estudio actualizador de D. Catalán: 2 vols. Madrid: Seminario Menéndez Pidal; Gredos, 1977. (Fuentes cronísticas de la historia de España; 1).
- Euseb.-Hieron. *Chron.* — Die Chronik des Hieronimus = Hieronymi Chronicon / Hrsg. R. Helm. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 2012.
- Isid. *Etym.* — San Isidoro de Sevilla. Etimologías: Edición bilingüe / Preparada por J. Oroz Reta y M.-A. Marcos Casquero: 2 vols. Madrid: Biblioteca de autores cristianos, 1993.
- Luc. *Chron. Mundi* — *Lucae Tudensis*. Chronicon Mundi / Ed. E. Falque // *Lucae Tudensis Opera Omnia*. T. 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003. (*Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Medieevalis*; 74).
- Paul. *Hist. Rom.* — Pauli Historia Romana in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae historicis recusa. Berolini: Apud Weidmannos, 1879.
- Plin. *Nat. Hist.* — *Pliny. Natural History*. With an English translation: 10 Vols. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard Univ. Press; William Heinemann Ltd, 1961 (Vol. 2), 1967 (Vol. 3).

- Rod. Hist. — *Roderici Ximenii de Rada*. Historia de rebus Hispaniae sive Historia Gothica / Cura et studio J. Fernández Valverde. Turnholti: Brepols, 1987. (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis; 72).
- Suet. Div. Iul. — Suetoni Tranquillii Vita Diui Iuli // Suetonius with an English translation by J. C. Rolfe, PhD. Vol. 1: C. Suetonius Tranquilli De vitis Caesarum. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1979. P. 1–119.
- Vinc. Belov. Spec. Histor. — Vincentius Bellovacensis. Speculum Historiale (Texte du Ms. Douai B.M. 797) // Accueil — Site du laboratoire ATILF. URL: <http://atilf.atilf.fr/bichard>.

Прочие сокращения

- a. — anno, año, année.
- AHN Clero — Archivo Histórico Nacional. Sección Clero.
- BML Plut. — Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (Firenze). Pluteo.
- BNE — Biblioteca Nacional de España (Madrid).
- Catálogo RBME — Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Catálogo digital. URL: <http://rbmecat.patrimonionacional.es>.
- cfr. — conferor.
- fol. — folium, folii.
- olim — ранее (в описаниях рукописей при обозначении прежних шифров).
- Paris. B.N. — Bibliothèque National de France (Paris).
- r — retro.
- RBME — Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial.
- s. — saeculum, siglo, secolo, siècle.
- v — verso.
- Vat. — Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.

References

- Aguilera y Gamboa, E. de (1908). *Discursos leídos ante la Real Academia de la Historia: en la recepción pública del Sr. D. Enrique de Aguilera y Gamboa, marqués de Cerralbo, en 31 de Mayo de 1908*. Madrid: “Sucesores de Rivadeneyra”, impresores de la Real Casa. (In Spanish).
- Aurov, O. V. (2017). Vlast', Tserkov' i tekst v Ispanii do 1000 goda: Teologiya i politika [Power, Church and text in Spain before the year 1000: Theology and politics]. In O. V. Aurov, E. S. Marey (Eds.). *Vlast', Tserkov' i tekst v korolevstvakh vestgotov (V — nachalo VIII v.): Issledovaniia i perevody* [Power, Church and text in the Visigoth kingdoms (5th — beginning of the 8th century): Studies and translations], 183–266. Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom “Delo” RANHiGS. (In Russian).
- Aurov, O. V. (2019). Alfonso X Mudryi, ego epokha i ego “Istoriia Ispanii” [Alfonso X the Wise and his “History of Spain”]. In O. V. Aurov et al. (Eds.). *Istoriia Ispanii, kotoruiu sostavil blagorodneshii korol' don Al'fonso, syn blagorodneshego korolia dona Fernando i korolevy don'i Beatriz = Estoria de Espanna que fizo el muy noble rey don Alfonso fijo del noble rey don Fernando et de la reyna donna Beatriz: Kommentirovannyi perevod po transkripsii srednevekovogo teksta, osushchestvlennyi Ramonom Menendesom Pidalem (“Pervaiia vseobshchaia khronika Ispanii”)* [History of Spain, composed by the most honorable king don Alfonso, son of the most honorable king don Fernando and the queen donna Beatriz: Commented translation on the transcription of the medieval text, made by Ramon Menéndez Pidal (“First General Chronicle of Spain”)] (Vol. 1), 31–94. St. Petersburg: Nauka. (In Russian).

- Aurov, O. V., Marey, E. S., Kopylov, I. A. (2016). "...Mas complido princep de bondat que en mundo ouo...": Pompei Velikii glazami srednekovogo khronista ["...Mas complido princep de bondat que en mundo ouo...": Pompey the Great as seen by a medieval chronicler]. *Shagi/Steps*, 2(2–3), 317–348. (In Russian).
- Beer, R., Díaz Jiménez, J. E. (1888). *Noticias bibliográficas y Catálogo de los códices de la Santa Iglesia Catedral de León*. León: Establecimiento tipográfico de Mariano Garzo. (In Spanish).
- Beneyto Pérez, J. (1986). *El cardenal Albornoz: hombre de iglesia y de estado en Castilla y en Italia*. Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española. (In Spanish).
- Bonilla Martínez, E., Delgado Romero, M. (2014). Biblioteca virtual Scriptorium Isidori Hispalensis. Ponencia en el Congreso "Diócesis y Abadía", Alcalá la Real, 25-10-2014. *Scriptorium Isidori Hispalensis. Publicaciones del Grupo de Trabajo*. Retrieved from <http://www.scriptoriumisidorihipalensis.org/pdfs/Congreso%20Alcala/Biblioteca%20virtual%20Scriptorium%20Isidori%20Hispalensis.pdf>. (In Spanish).
- Caviró Martínez, B. (2010). El linaje y las armas del arzobispo toledano Gonzalo Pétrez "Gudiel" (1280–1299). *Toletum. Boletín de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes y Ciencias Históricas de Toledo*, 57, 131–169 (In Spanish).
- Crespo López, M. (2015). *Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada: Vida, obra y bibliografía*. Madrid: Fundación Ignacio Larramendi. (In Spanish).
- Cros Gutiérrez, A. (2018). Gil de Albornoz, mecenas de las artes, un cardenal en contexto. In M. Parada López de Corselas (Ed.). *DOMUS HISPANICA. El Real Colegio de España y el cardenal Gil de Albornoz en la Historia del Arte*, 17–42. Bologna: Bononia Univ. Press. (In Spanish).
- Domínguez Bordona, J. (1933). *Manuscritos con pinturas: notas para un inventario de los conservados en colecciones públicas y particulares de España* (Vol. 1). Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos. (In Spanish).
- Doody, A. (2010). *Pliny's encyclopedia: The reception of Natural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Ershova, I. V. (2017). "O trekh Gerkulesakh, sushchestvovavshikh v etom mire": antichnyi geroi v srednekovykh ispanskikh khronikakh ["On the three Hercules who existed in this world of ours": The classical hero in medieval Spanish chronicles]. *Dialog so vremenem* [Dialogue with time], 59, 231–245. (In Russian).
- Ershova, I. V. (2019). "Istoriia Ispanii" kak literaturnyi pamiatnik [History of Spain as a literary monument]. In O. V. Aurov et al. (Eds.). *Istoriia Ispanii, kotoruiu sostavil blagorodneishii korol' don Al'fonso, syn blagorodneishego korolia dona Fernando i korolevy don'i Beatris = Estoria de Espanna que fizo el muy noble rey don Alfonso fijo del noble rey don Fernando et de la reyna donna Beatriz: Kommentirovannyi perevod po transkripsii srednekovogo teksta, osushchestvlennyi Ramonom Menendesom Pidalem* ("Pervaia vseobshchaia khronika Ispanii") [History of Spain, composed by the most honorable king don Alfonso, son of the most honorable king don Fernando and the queen donna Beatriz: Commented translation on the transcription of the medieval text, made by Ramon Menéndez Pidal ("First General Chronicle of Spain")] (Vol. 1), 148–166. St. Petersburg: Nauka. (In Russian).
- Falque, E. (2003). Lucas de Túy y Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada: el uso de las fuentes. *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26, 151–161 (In Spanish).
- Fernández-Ordoñez Hernández, I. (2019). "Istoriia Ispanii": istoriia teksta i rukopisnaia traditsiia ["History of Spain": History of the text and manuscript tradition]. In O. V. Aurov et al. (Eds.). *Istoriia Ispanii, kotoruiu sostavil blagorodneishii korol' don Al'fonso, syn blagorodneishego korolia dona Fernando i korolevy don'i Beatris = Estoria de Espanna que fizo el muy noble rey don Alfonso fijo del noble rey don Fernando et de la reyna donna Beatriz: Kommentirovannyi perevod po transkripsii srednekovogo teksta, osushchestvlennyi Ramonom Menendesom Pidalem* ("Pervaia vseobshchaia khronika Ispanii") [History of Spain, composed by the most honorable king don Alfonso, son of the most honorable king don Fernando and the queen donna Beatriz: Commented

- translation on the transcription of the medieval text, made by Ramon Menéndez Pidal ("First General Chronicle of Spain")] (Vol. 1), 177–248. St. Petersburg: Nauka. (In Russian).
- Fernández Valverde, J. (1987). Fuentes. In J. Fernández Valverde. (Ed.). *Roderici Ximenii de Rada Opera omnia. Pars. I: Historia de rebus Hispaniae sive Historia Gothica*, xxviii–xli. Turnhout: Brepols. (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis; 72a). (In Spanish).
- Fernández Valverde, J. (1989). Introducción. In J. Fernández Valverde (Ed.). *Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada. Historia de los hechos de España*, 13–52. Madrid: Alianza Editorial. (In Spanish).
- Ferrer i Mallol, M. T. (2002). Estudio histórico. In J. Costas Rodríguez, et al. (Eds.). *Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda. Obras completas*, (Vol. 5) *Historia de los hechos del Cardenal Gil de Albornoz*, vii–lviii. Pozoblanco: Ayuntamiento de Pozoblanco. (In Spanish).
- González Ruiz, R. (1973). La Biblioteca capitular de Toledo en el s. XIV. *Toletum. Boletín de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes y Ciencias Históricas de Toledo*, 6, 29–56. (In Spanish).
- González Ruiz, R. (1997). *Hombres y libros de Toledo (1086–1300)*. Madrid: Fundación Ramón Areces. (In Spanish).
- Guenée, B. (2002). *Istoriia i istoricheskaia kul'tura srednevekovogo Zapada* [Trans. from Guenée, B. (1980). *Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident Médiéval*. Paris: Aubier Montaigne]. Moscow: lazyki slavianskoi kul'tury. (In Russian).
- Guirardel, S. J.-M. (2007). *L'Historia gothica de Rodrigue Jimenez de Rada (1243): écriture et discours* (Doctoral Thesis, University of Toulouse II). (In French).
- Haenel, G. (Ed.) (1830). *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum, qui in bibliothecis Galliae, Helvetiae, Belgii, Britanniae M., Hispaniae, Lusitaniae asservantur*. Lipsiae: Sumtibus I. C. Hinrichs. (In Latin).
- Hernández Aparicio, P. (2000). *Inventario general de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional. Vol. 14: 9501 a 10200*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nacional de España. (In Spanish).
- Lomax, D. W. (1977). Rodrigo Jimenez de Rada como historiador. In M. Chevalier et al. (Eds.). *Actas del Quinto Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas, celebrado en Bordeaux del 2 al 8 de septiembre de 1974* (Vol. 1), 587–592. Bordeaux: Instituto de estudios ibéricos y iberoamericanos; Universidad Bordeaux III. (In Spanish).
- Menéndez Pidal, R. (Ed.) (1955). *Primera Crónica General de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289* (Vol. 1). Madrid: Gredos. (In Spanish).
- Millás Vallicrosa, J. M. (1942). *Las traducciones orientales en los manuscritos de la Biblioteca Catedral de Toledo*. Madrid: CSIC. (In Spanish).
- Nieto Soria, J. M. (2002). *La época medieval: Iglesia y cultura*. Madrid: Istmo. (In Spanish).
- Pavlov, A. A. (2018). Pavel Diakon i ego epitoma "O znachenii slov" [Paul the Deacon and his epitome "On the meaning of the words"]. In A. A. Pavlov (Ed., Trans., Comment.). *Pavel Diakon. Epitoma sochineniia Seksta Pompeia Festa "O znachenii slov"* [Paul the Deacon. Epitome of the opus *On meaning of the words* by Sextus Pompeius Festus], 12–36. St. Petersburg: Tsentr gumanitarnykh initsiativ. (In Russian).
- Pérez de Guzman, L. (1926). Un inventario del siglo XIV de la Catedral de Toledo (La Biblia de San Luis). *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 89, 373–419. (In Spanish).
- Reeve, M. D. (2006). Manuscripts of Pliny's Natural History in Spain. *Exemplaria Classica: Revista de Filología Clásica = Journal of Classical Philology*, 10, 151–186.
- Reeve, M. D. (2011). The *Vita Plinii*. In R. R. Gibson, R. Morello (Eds.). *Pliny the Elder: Themes and contexts*, 207–222. Leiden: Brill.
- Reynolds, L. D. (Ed.) (1983). The Elder Pliny. In L. R. Reynolds (Eds.). *Texts and transmissions: A survey of the Latin Classics*, 307–316. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rizzi, A. (2018). Editing and translating Pliny in Renaissance Italy: Agency, collaboration and visibility. *Renaissanceforum: Tidsskrift for renaissanceforskning = Journal of Renaissance Studies*, 14, 117–138. (In Italian).

- Rodríguez Lajusticia, F. S. (2019). *La relación de Jaime I de Aragón con sus hijos en los registros de cancellería (1257–1276)*. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico. Exma. Diputación de Zaragoza. (In Spanish).
- Rojo Orcajo, T. (1929a). Catálogo descriptivo de los códices que se conservan en la Santa Iglesia Catedral de Burgo de Osma. *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 94, 655–792, 95, 152–314. (In Spanish).
- Rojo Orcajo, T. (1929b). La Biblioteca del Arzobispo don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada y los manuscritos del monasterio de Santa María de Huerta. *Revista Eclesiástica*, 3, 196–219 (In Spanish).
- Rubio Fernández, L. (1984). *Catálogo de manuscritos clásicos latinos existentes en España*. Madrid: Editorial de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1984. (In Spanish).
- Sánchez-Prieto Borja, P. (2001). Introducción. In *Alfonso X el Sabio. General Estoria* (Vol. 1) *Génesis*, xxvi–lxxx. Madrid: Biblioteca Castro. Fundación José Antonio de Castro. (In Spanish).
- Sandys, J. E. (1921). *A history of classical scholarship* (Vol. 1) *From the sixth century B. C. to the end of the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Solalinde, A. G., Muñoz Cortés, M., Gómez Pérez, J. (1955). Fuentes de cada capítulo en particular. In E. Menéndez Pidal. *Primera Crónica General de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289* (Vol. 2), lxxiii–ccviii. Madrid: Gredos. (In Spanish).
- Ward, A. (2003). Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada: auteur et acteur en Castille à la fin du XIII^e siècle. *Cahiers de linguistique et de civilisation hispaniques médiévales*, 26, 283–294. (In French).

* * *

Информация об авторе

Олег Валентинович Аулов

кандидат исторических наук
доцент, ведущий научный сотрудник,
Лаборатория античной культуры,
Школа актуальных гуманитарных
исследований, Российская академия
народного хозяйства и государственной
службы при Президенте РФ
заведующий кафедрой всеобщей
истории, Институт общественных
наук, Российская академия народного
хозяйства и государственной службы при
Президенте РФ
Россия, 119571, Москва, пр-т
Вернадского, 82
Тел.: +7 (499) 956-96-47
✉ olegaurov1@yandex.ru

Information about the author

Oleg V. Aurov

Cand. Sci. (History)
Assistant Professor, Leading Researcher,
Laboratory for Classical Culture,
School for Advanced Studies in the
Humanities,
The Russian Presidential Academy
of National Economy and Public
Administration
Head of the World History Department,
School of Public Policy, The Russian
Presidential Academy of National Economy
and Public Administration
Russia, 119571, Moscow, Prospekt
Vernadskogo, 82
Tel.: +7 (499) 956-96-47
✉ olegaurov1@yandex.ru

R. J. A. Talbert

✉ talbert@email.unc.edu

Университет Северной Каролины в Чапел-Хилле
(США, Чапел-Хилл)

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF PLINY'S GEOGRAPHICAL BOOKS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Аннотация. Цель статьи — рассказать о предпринятом ее автором совместно с коллегой проекте, направленном на пересмотр и замену давно устаревшего перевода на английский язык географических книг «Естественной истории» Плиния Старшего в серии «Loeb Classical Library» (1940). Обсуждаются проблемы определения целевой читательской аудитории нового перевода (в отношении не владеющих латынью, объем (книги III–VI и предваряющая их II книга о строении космоса вкупе с последующими географическими пассажами в книгах VII–XXXVII), привлекаемые издания (серии «Budé» выборочно и «Tusculum» полностью), необходимость соблюдения баланса между точностью и удобочитаемостью перевода. Большое значение уделяется выразительным средствам языка для передачи топонимов и этнонимов наряду с надлежащей передачей особенностей языка Плиния, особенно его сокращенного стиля *staccato*, со списками, в которых отсутствуют глаголы, и с пространными предложениями. В статье также идет речь о дополнительных разделах издания — о примечаниях, сопровождающем текст географической карте обитаемого мира (цифровой) и комментарии.

Ключевые слова: Центр картографии античного мира, география, Г. Рэкхэм, перевод с латинского на английский, «Естественная история», Loeb Classical Library, Плиний Старший, Римская империя

Для цитирования: Talbert R. J. A. An English translation of Pliny's geographical books for the 21st century // Шаги/Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 214–228. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-214-228.

*Статья поступила в редакцию 17 сентября 2019 г.
Принято к печати 9 октября 2019 г.*

R. J. A. Talbert

✉ talbert@email.unc.edu

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
(USA, Chapel Hill)

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF PLINY'S GEOGRAPHICAL BOOKS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Abstract. The author's aim, in collaboration with a colleague, is to supersede the standard English translation of Pliny the Elder's geographical books in the *Natural History*, one produced for the Loeb Classical Library around 1940, but with clear limitations (explained here) and long outdated. The article discusses the challenges of determining the intended audience for the new translation (broad, without knowledge of Latin), the scope (Books 3–6, preceded by 2 on the universe and its elements, followed by notable geographical passages in 7–37), the editions of the Latin text to follow (Budé where available, otherwise Sammlung Tusculum), and the need to balance accuracy with readability. Close attention is paid to effective means of handling toponyms and ethnonyms, as well as to appropriate replication of Pliny's style, especially its staccato shorthand, with lists lacking verbs, as well as loose rambling sentences. How far the descriptive terms in Pliny's Latin can, and should, be consistently translated by the same English word gains attention. The matter of aids — notes and an accompanying map (seamless, digital) — is also addressed; a commentary separate from the translation is planned, to be contributed by a further colleague.

Keywords: Ancient World Mapping Center, geography, Harris Rackham, Latin-English translation, *Natural History*, Loeb Classical Library, Pliny the Elder, Roman empire

To cite this article: Talbert, R. J. A. (2020). An English translation of Pliny's geographical books for the 21st century. *Shagi/Steps*, 6(1), 214–228. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-214-228.

Received September 17, 2019

Accepted October 9, 2019

The project in progress discussed here stems from a perception that Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis Historia* has untapped potential to advance understanding of ancient geographical knowledge and thought; an English translation could usefully assist that purpose. The project's initial impetus and its design relate primarily, therefore, to the geography in the work's opening books rather than to a preoccupation with its author himself.

For many years past there has been widespread recognition that the sole usable English translation of Pliny's geographical books — made for the Loeb Classical Library over eighty years ago (see further below) — is long overdue for replacement.¹ My former pupil and Ancient World Mapping Center director Brian Turner, now associate professor of history at Portland State University, Oregon, first resolved to meet this need. At the outset he consulted me, and I agreed to help. But as this informal help continued, he then insisted that I become his full partner. I consented, on the two conditions that he should have the final say on any disputed issues, and that his name should precede mine on the title-page of the book we now have a contract to publish with Cambridge University Press.²

Devoted admirers of Pliny might interject that Turner and I should be reprimanded for separating the geographical books from the rest of the *Natural History* and then limiting our translation to them. To be sure, the objection has merit. Even so, it may be considered utopian in character as well as impractical, given the exceptional length of the work and the great diversity of its aspects.³ Moreover, we readily acknowledge the need to keep in mind Pliny's own conception of the work as a single whole, as well as the important fact that its different parts do inter-relate rather than remaining merely self-contained. This is particularly the case with the geographical books, because they come first. They lay the foundation for the treatments of peoples, animals, plants and minerals that will follow. Notably, for example, in Book 7 on the human animal (immediately *after* the geographical books) Pliny expands on the character and lifestyle of Scythian cannibals, northern Arimaspi and numerous extraordinary peoples on all three continents first mentioned in Books 3 to 6.

What books should our translation cover? Books 3 to 6 without question, but we think it essential to include Book 2 also (on the universe and its elements). Throughout, at the appropriate points, we shall insert the subject headings listed in Book 1, and we shall also reproduce its listing of each book's sources. In a substantial appendix we mean to translate notable 'geographical' passages that occur in later books of the *Natural History*. The draft list of such passages in the Appendix below is no more than a provisional selection, but it serves to demonstrate our thinking as well as to underscore our concern to recognize that Books 2 to 6 form an integral part of a much larger whole in which geography continues to feature constantly.

¹ In personal communication Graham Shipley has mentioned to me that when he approached the Loeb Classical Library editors in the late 1990s with a proposal to revise its translation of these books, no interest was shown.

² My thanks to Brian Turner for commenting on a draft of this article and confirming that it reflects our joint thinking to date; any error is mine alone.

³ The choice to focus on just one aspect of Pliny's work is of course far from novel: note the length of the section "Subject Areas in the *Natural History*" in [Doody 2015].

Which editor's Latin text should we translate, or should we prepare our own edition? To address the second question first, without hesitation we resolved not to prepare our own edition. This would be an unavoidably herculean task, given (on the one hand) the mass of manuscripts and their difficulties, not to mention our lack of qualifications for editing texts, and (on the other hand) the fact that satisfactory editions are already available. Admittedly, no single editor since Carl Mayhoff for Teubner in 1906 has published a text of Books 2 to 6 in their entirety. But today there are volumes in the (French) Budé series for all but the latter two-thirds of Book 5 and the first and third quarters of Book 6. Our decision, therefore, has been to translate the Budé text where there is one — all of it published since 1980, except for Book 2 which dates to 1950: see Table 1.⁴ Otherwise we turn to the (German) *Sammlung Tusculum* text; everything we need from this series was published in the 1990s. By this means we leave decisions about textual matters to experts alone.⁵ We also divide and number the sections of text as in Budé and *Tusculum* only, while noting in our Introduction that some older editions divided and numbered differently.

One of the anonymous evaluators of our project proposal to the Cambridge University Press urged emphatically that we should follow Mayhoff's text because it — unlike the ones we favor (as yet anyway) — is available free online and so can be consulted more conveniently. But to us, this argument does not give sufficient cause to set aside all the work done on the text during the past century and more (since 1906), and thereby in effect to devalue the expertise of specialists such as Jehan Desanges, who has edited the first part of Book 5 and the final part of Book 6 (both on Africa) for the Budé series. Both this series and the *Sammlung Tusculum* are well known and readily available in research libraries; we do not intend to reproduce the Latin texts of either.

The matter of which Latin text to follow links with the equally fundamental issue of who we mean to be translating for. Our aim, we have resolved, should be to present a scholarly translation, but at the same time a readable one, accessible to a broad audience that knows Latin barely, if at all, and so has minimal concern to examine any edition of the Latin text. In these respects our approach differs very distinctly from that of Harris Rackham (1868–1944), a member of the University of Cambridge Faculty of Classics,⁶ who produced what has remained the standard English translation of Pliny's geographical books (and many more) ever since it was published in two volumes of the Loeb Classical Library around 1940,⁷ conforming to the regular format for the series — Latin text on each lefthand page, and English translation of it on the corresponding righthand. In a curt Prefatory Note to the volume for Books 3 to 7 (1942), however, Rackham unapologetically warns his readers that “this translation is designed to afford assistance to the student of the Latin text; it is not primarily intended to supply the English reader with a substitute

⁴ Observe our use of the volume dated 2004 for Book 3. It in fact incorporates considerable revision and enlargement (with new pagination) of the 1998 edition, although not presented thus by Budé and in consequence easily assumed to be no more than a reprint of that edition.

⁵ All Budé texts are presented with an apparatus criticus; *Sammlung Tusculum* volumes record editors' variant readings in an extensive appendix.

⁶ Obituary in *The Times* March 21st 1944.

⁷ Books 1–2 (1938), 3–7 (1942), also 8–11 (1940), and posthumously 12–16 (1945), 17–19 (1950), 33–35 (1952) (see [Rackham et al. 1938–1963]).

for the Latin.”⁸ This Note summarizes a slightly fuller statement about his approach as a translator that forms the Preface (p. v) to the volume for Books 8 to 11 published two years earlier: here he maintains that, because the translation is to be printed facing the original text, its purpose should be “to assist the reader of the original to understand its meaning.”⁹

Rackham’s translation of Books 2 to 6 has proven long-lasting, but really by default, because a replacement in English has yet to appear. The lack of one for this important text has become all the more frustrating when such a wealth of new English translations of Greek and Latin geographical works has appeared during the past 20 years. In the circumstances it is a further disappointment that Rackham evidently showed minimal concern for how his translation of Pliny’s geographical books might be framed to last. I say this with particular reference to his practice in one prominent respect vital for these books: the rendering of place-names. If Rackham did in fact formulate methodical principles by which to render the names of places and also of peoples (as any translator of Pliny should), he never explains them; instead he proceeds with a surprising and unfortunate degree of inconsistency. His practice seems more puzzling still in the light of his warning that he did *not* intend to supply a substitute for Pliny’s Latin.

In this event, his logical course would surely be to reproduce a name just as Pliny records it in Latin, even when the place or feature is identifiable and its current equivalent modern name readily established. In fact Rackham duly does just this in the case of Lixus and the others underlined in the following specimen passage (5.9, as presented in both Latin and English by him):

Ad flumen Anatum CCCXCVI, ab eo Lixum CCV Agrippa, Lixum a Gaditano freto CXII abesse; inde sinum qui vocetur Sagigi, oppidum in promunturio Mulelacha, flumina Sububum et Salat, portum Rutubis a Lixo CCXXIV, inde promunturium Solis, portum Rhysaddir, Gaetulorum Autoteles, flumen Quosenum, gentes Velatitos et Masatos, flumen Masathat, flumen Darat, in quo crocodilos gigni.

Agrippa says that to the river Anatis is a distance of 496 miles, and from the Anatis to Lixus 205 miles; that Lixus is 112 miles from the **Straits of Gibraltar** and that then come the gulf called Sagigi Bay, the town on Cape Mulelacha, the rivers **Sebou** and **Sallee**, the port of **Mazagan** 224 miles from Lixus, then **Capo Blanco**, the port of **Safi**, the Gaetulian *Free State*, the river **Tensift**, the Velatiti and Masati tribes, the river **Mogador**, and the river **Sous**, in which crocodiles are found.

This prudent choice of retaining what is in the Latin eliminates the risk to be incurred by substituting the modern current name instead; sooner or later there may be some change to it, rendering the translation increasingly out of date and hard to comprehend. Even so, in other instances (set in bold type here) Rackham

⁸ A more restrictive purpose in fact than that articulated by James Loeb when he initiated the series in 1912. The Note has been dropped from reprints issued after 1969.

⁹ This 1940 Preface is reprinted (p. vi) in the volume for Books 12 to 16 (1945). The first volume to appear (1938) begins with a concise Introduction, but this makes no reference to the character of the translation.

opts for exactly that alternative: he dispenses with Pliny's name and substitutes a contemporary one of the post-World War I period. By now, up to a century later, predictably enough this is often a name superseded decades ago, so that today's readers are liable to find its use variously disorienting, quaint, or offensive for its association with a rejected colonial past. To create further bafflement, the choices that Rackham makes between use of a name's ancient form or its equivalent in his day seem merely random. Thus he could just as well have substituted a modern name for ancient Lixus (Larache, say) but for whatever reason he did not, and equally he could have retained ancient Rhysaddir instead of substituting modern Safi.

In other instances still — again at random, it seems — Rackham chooses to set aside Pliny's form of the name and to use instead an English translation of its meaning in Greek or Latin. Here he could have done this for promunturium Solis ("Sun's cape"), though he preferred to substitute its modern name Capo Blanco. But the "Gaetulian Autoteles" are rendered as the "Gaetulian Free State" (set in italic type here),¹⁰ and elsewhere Hierasycaminos is rendered as Holy Mulberry (6.184), Zeugma as Bridgetown,¹¹ and so on.

To add to the sense of confusion, Rackham acts to mislead his readers by the way in which he translates a sentence eight sections later (5.17), where Pliny names the Autoteles again and then refers back to them with the pronoun *horum*:

Gaetulae nunc tenent gentes, Baniurae multoque validissimi Autoteles et horum pars quondam Nesimi, qui avolsi his propriam fecere gentem versi ad Aethiopas.

Rackham translates:

The country is now occupied by the Gaetulian tribes, the Baniurae and the Free State, by far the most powerful of them all, and the Nesimi, who were formerly a section of the Autoteles, but have split off from them and formed a separate tribe of their own in the direction of the Aethiopians.

So here Rackham in the first instance renders Autoteles (consistently) as the Free State. But then at once, when he considers it necessary to specify the name of this people again in order to clarify *horum* in Pliny's compressed Latin, he opts instead for Pliny's own Autoteles without any indication that these are in fact the Free State just mentioned rather than an entirely different people, as readers of this English translation would reasonably infer; only a painstaking check of the Latin could correct that impression.¹²

The manifestly unsatisfactory nature of Rackham's practice has convinced us that, so far as seems practical, our translation should methodically retain the form of each name in Pliny's Latin. We do so even when Pliny names an *oppidum* or the

¹⁰ It may be relevant to recall that the Republic of Ireland was officially named the Irish Free State between 1922 and 1937.

¹¹ 5.67, 86, 90; 6.119, 120, 126. But Rackham retains Pliny's Zeugma in his translation of 34.150.

¹² Rackham's predilection for mixing ancient and modern names produces an especially bizarre effect in his translation (5.37) of the African peoples and towns whose names and images were featured in the triumph of Cornelius Balbus (19 BCE).

like by its ethnic adjective rather than by its toponym: so in 5.29, for example, we translate Simittuensian and Uchitanian rather than converting to Simittu and Uchi.¹³ If within a list Pliny should vary his usage between ethnic adjective and toponym — as in 5.29 with Canophicum — we reflect the variation. By the qualification “practical” I mean that we do not abandon our concern for readability and for modern English usage, although we still expect readers to recognize that Pliny’s world in the distant past must inevitably appear unfamiliar in multiple respects. Accordingly, for a limited number of frequently used names we have opted to use the common anglicized forms rather than Pliny’s Latin ones: for example, Rome instead of Roma, Egypt instead of Aegyptus, Nile instead of Nilus. Pliny’s Aethiopia, however, we retain as a repeated reminder to readers that the part of Africa Pliny has in mind when he uses this name is by no means equivalent to modern Ethiopia.

In plenty of other instances, however, where the Latin name-form may not sound instantly familiar but still can hardly be a source of confusion, we have resisted the temptation to anglicize. Hence we keep, for example, Alpes, Danuvius, Europa, Gallia, Hispania, Italia, Euxinus and Pontus, although for this last pair we do add in square brackets after the name’s first appearance “= Black Sea.” Where the name of a physical feature is a noun such as *mare* or *oceanus* and adjective, we favor using the latter’s common anglicized form if there is one: so, for example, Atlantic ocean instead of Atlanticus, Caspian sea instead of Caspium, Aegean instead of Aegaeum, Egyptian instead of Aegyptiacum, Indian instead of Indicum. By the same token we readily anglicize Latin ethnic forms if there is a common English equivalent: so, for example, Amazons instead of Amazones, Greeks instead of Graeci, Indians instead of Indi, Macedonians instead of Macedones, Numidians instead of Numidae, Romans instead of Romani.¹⁴ We acknowledge that in all our choices of whether to anglicize a name or not there is an element of subjectivity, but this is unavoidable; rather, the goal should be to strike a practical balance between retaining Pliny’s usage and making the translation readable.

We strive to avoid repeating a name where Pliny uses only, say, a pronoun or adjective to refer to it again. In some instances, of course, the name simply has to be repeated for the sake of achieving clarity in English, and we then enclose it in square brackets to signify that it does not recur at that point in the Latin. So we handle *horum* as follows in the compressed sentence quoted earlier (5.17):

Gaetulae nunc tenent gentes, Baniurae multoque validissimi Autoteles et horum pars quondam Nesimi, qui avolsi his propriam fecere gentem versi ad Aethiopas.

Nowadays Gaetolian peoples dominate, Baniurae and Autoteles (by far the most powerful) and Nesimi, who were once a sub-group of theirs [Autoteles] but split from them to become a people in their own right located in the Ethiopians’ direction.

¹³ However, if the location of the community is known, it is to be named with its toponym on the map in preparation (see further below), not its ethnic adjective.

¹⁴ In addition, where readers of English are likely to find use of *v* rather than *u* more familiar, we opt for that choice: so, for example, Arverni instead of Aruerni, Ubii instead of Vbii. When unsure, we follow the choice made by *Barrington Atlas*. We also normally follow its choice where the Latin text is liable to create confusion with variant spellings of a name (Rhodos/Rhodus and many others).

Similarly, we use square brackets to identify any other words that must be introduced to make Pliny's Latin meaningful beyond routine minimal additions that a readable translation into English calls for.

Another practice we have adopted stems from concern to present most effectively the long lists of features, peoples and places that Pliny offers. Rackham, with ample justification, presents them for the most part in a normal way for English prose — using “the” frequently, and also “of”, as in “Straits of ...”, “port of ...”:

Agrippa says that to the river Anatis is a distance of 496 miles, and from the Anatis to Lixus 205 miles; that Lixus is 112 miles from the Straits of Gibraltar and that then come the gulf called Sagigi Bay, the town on Cape Mulelacha, the rivers Sebou and Sallee, the port of Mazagan 224 miles from Lixus, then Capo Blanco, the port of Safi, the Gaetulian Free State, the river Tensift, the Velatiti and Masati tribes, the river Mogador, and the river Sous, in which crocodiles are found.

However, we have concluded that such repeated use of “the”, “of” and the like is unnecessary in this context, and that their omission (for the most part) permits better replication of Pliny's staccato shorthand with its frequent lack of a verb. So we translate this passage in leaner fashion as follows (from the Budé Latin, which marks lacunas at the start):

.... as far as Anatis river <...> 496 <...>. Agrippa says that Lixus is 205 from it, and that Lixus is 112 from the Gaditanian strait. Then the bay called Sagigi, a town on cape Mulelacha, Sububus and Sala rivers, Rutubis harbor 224 from Lixus, then Sol's cape, Rhysaddir harbor, Gaetulian Autoteles, Quosenum river, Selatiti and Masathi peoples, Masath river, Darat river in which crocodiles are born.

In Rackham's translation “miles” occurs four times, because he automatically follows each distance figure with the unit; but in no instance here does Pliny's Latin state it, and we see no merit in adding it in instances like these where the unit is beyond all doubt. We never convert Roman miles, or any of the other units of measurement stated by Pliny, into a modern equivalent; instead, our book's front matter includes an explanatory note about such conversions and the difficulties they pose. Likewise, we just translate Pliny's directional indicators — *adversus*, *ante*, *contra*, *infra*, *sub*, *super*, etc — literally, without substituting a compass direction.

Observe that we do not capitalize the initial letter of physical-feature nouns such as cape, strait, etc. This practice is indeed contrary to regular English usage and may act to disconcert some readers at first, especially in the cases of, say, an ocean, sea or mountain. Even so, no obstacle is introduced to comprehension of Pliny's material, and the practice curbs the number of capitalized words in a text already teeming with them. Observe, too, that we do not convert Pliny's long list beginning “Then the bay called Sagigi” into a normal sentence by introducing a main verb, as Rackham does unnecessarily; we simply leave it as a list. Nor do we insert “and” before the mention of the last name, as Rackham does in accordance with regular English usage, but again unnecessarily in our view. We also do not retain Rackham's repetition of the river-name Anatis, but refer back to it only with a pronoun, as Pliny does; what “it” refers to here in our translation can hardly give readers any doubt.

There can be no avoiding the delicate perennial problem for translators of whether a Latin word used by their author should always be rendered as the same English word. In tackling Pliny, we have again sought to strike a balance. In some instances we find no sound reason to maintain consistency: for example, *nobilis* can as well be translated, say, “outstanding” or “splendid” (depending on the context), *clarissimus* as “very well known” or “famous”. This said, we are concerned not to translate such adjectives either in a distinctly more muted way than Pliny does, or in an even more effusive way.

More generally, too, we reject going to the extreme adopted by Tony Woodman in his painstaking, but provocative, translation (2004) of the *Annals* of Tacitus — a great stylist of course, quite unlike Pliny — where he was determined to translate a Latin word with always the same English word. This was a heroic effort on his part that produced some curious choices, such as “dene” for *saltus*. To be sure, he admitted defeat in some instances [Woodman 2004: xxiv], and we share his conviction with reference to readers: “... it is positively valuable to be reminded constantly that ancient Rome was an alien world” [Ibid.: xxvi]. Even so, we heed the verdict of Barbara Levick in her thoughtful review, which declared Woodman’s approach to be unduly rigid; hence her summing-up: “This is a book that is useful to have and an irritation to read.” [Levick 2005: 28].

Common ethnic and geographical terms used throughout by Pliny pose a problem for his translators in that for the most part there seems no knowing how far each represents a deliberately precise choice on his part. For certain, he does evidently treat *desertum/deserta* (“desert”) and *solitudo/solitudines* (“wilderness”) as the same.¹⁵ However, is he consciously differentiating when, for example, he uses *litus* in some contexts and *ora* in others, or may these two Latin terms be also considered interchangeable? Turner and I cannot say, but since a pair of alternates in common English use is ready to hand, our view is that we may as well differentiate between *litus* always to be translated “shore”, and *ora* “coast” likewise. By contrast, when the same issue arises with regard to *amnis, flumen, fluvius*, again any differentiation that Pliny may have in mind eludes us, as do also three acceptable alternate words in English; so without more ado we just translate all three as “river.” Terms that Pliny does seem to use with at least some degree of deliberation (even if the basis for his choices remains obscure), and that we are able to translate consistently with the same word, include *castellum* “fortress”, *civitas* “state”, *gens* “people”, *iugum* “range”, *locus* “place”, *oppidum* “town”, *populus* “community”, *portus* “harbor”, *sinus* “bay”, *urbs* “city.” This said, allowance must also be made for the fact that general Latin usage for a term may itself rule out such consistency: *mundus*, for example, in Pliny as in other Latin authors can signify either “universe” or “world”.¹⁶

At the same time, even when consistent translation of a term can be achieved, we recognize that occasional exceptions should be accommodated nonetheless. In the specific case of *Persicus sinus*, for example, “bay” jars in modern English, because its term “Persian gulf” for this well-known body of open water is standard usage. In a different instance, when *gens/gentes* is translated as “people”, this choice creates difficulty if Pliny also speaks of *natio/nationes* in the same context (as he does occasionally), because the translation “nation” may well encourage readers to

¹⁵ Cf. 6.73, 77.

¹⁶ Cf. *sidus, vapor*.

conceive that term in misleadingly modern terms (just as “race” for *gens* is to be avoided for the same reason). When this problem arises in 6.14–15, for instance, we have chosen “tribes” for *nationes*, albeit with reluctance, because this word too has its undesirable connotations (Sammlung Tusculum Latin text, my italics):

deinde multis nominibus Heniochorum *gentes*.

V regio Colica et *gentes*, Achaeorum *gentes*,
ceterae eodem tractu *gentes*

15. Subicitur Ponti regio Colica, in qua iuga Caucasi ad Ripaeos montes torquentur, ut dictum est, altero latere in Euxinum et Maeotium devexa, altero in Caspium et Hyrcanium mare. reliqua litora ferae *nationes* tenent Melanchlaeni, Coraxi

Then Heniochian peoples (*gentes*) with their many names.

V Colica Region and Peoples (*gentes*). Achaean
Peoples (*gentes*). Other Peoples (*gentes*) in the
Same Region

15. Colica region lies below Pontus where the Caucasus range veers towards the Ripaeian mountains (as already mentioned [5.98]), one side sloping toward Euxinus and Maeotis, the other to the Caspian and Hyrcanian seas. The rest of the shoreline is occupied by the savage Melanchlaeni and Coraxi tribes (*nationes*)

In showing respect for Pliny's prose, we try to preserve his sentences where possible. We do this even at the risk of taxing our readers, who will often have to remain alert to the punctuation if they are to comprehend the annotated lists satisfactorily, as in this typical instance (3.32, Budé Latin text):

In ora regio Sordonum intusque Consuaranorum, flumina Tecum, Vernodubrum, oppida Illiberis, magnae quondam urbis tenue vestigium, Ruscino Latinorum, flumen Atax e Pyrenaeo Rubrensem permeans lacum, Narbo Martius Decumanorum colonia XII p. a mari distans, flumina Araris, Liria.

On the coast the Sordones' region and inland that of the Consuarani, Tecum and Vernodubrum rivers, towns Illiberis (mere vestige of a once-great city) and Ruscino Latinorum, Atax river flowing from Pyrenaeus through lake Rubrensis, Narbo Martius a colony of the Tenth legion 12 miles from the sea, Araris and Liria rivers.

However, there are passages where Pliny rambles so breathlessly that, for comprehensible translation into English, we find it essential to introduce a break or two into an interminable sentence. In this challenging instance in Book 4, where we introduce two breaks, observe that even Budé's Latin places a semi-colon after *Rhoxolani* in 80:

80. Ab eo in plenum quidem omnes Scytharum sunt gentes, variae tamen litori adposita tenuere, alias Getae, Daci Romanis dicti, alias Sarmatae, Graecis Sauromatae, eorumque Hamaxobii aut Aorsi, alias Scythae degeneres et a servis orti aut Trogodytae, mox Alani et Rhoxolani; superiora autem inter Danuvium et Hercynium saltum usque ad Pannonica hiberna Carnunti Germanorumque ibi confinium, campos et plana Iazyges Sarmatae, montes vero et saltus pulsi ab iis Daci ad Pathissum amnem, 81. a Maro, sive Duria est a Suebis regnoque Vanniano dirimens eos, aversa Basternae tenent aliiue inde Germani.

80. From this point all the peoples are generally Scythian, although different groups have occupied coastal areas, in one instance Getae (called Daci by Romans), in another Sarmatae (called Sauromatae by Greeks) and those of them called Hamaxobii or Aorsi, in another Inferior Scythians (including ones of slave origin) or Trogodytae, and then Alani and Rhoxolani. In the uplands between the Danuvius and Hercynian forest as far as the Pannonian winter-quarters at Carnuntum and the German borderland there, Sarmatian Iazyges occupy the plains and lowland, while Daci — expelled from there by them — occupy the mountains and forests up to Pathissus river.

81. From the Marus (or if it is the Duria separating [the Daci] from the Suebi and Vannius' kingdom) Basternae hold the opposite side and thereafter other Germans.

Observe here our deliberate placement of phrases within parentheses and dashes to encapsulate what would otherwise be separated by commas. Also note our separation of one section from the next with a line left blank, a layout that we see as invaluable assistance to the reader's comprehension. By its very nature Pliny's text is dense, and the Loeb Classical Library's space-saving format does little to relieve its rebarbative character: only the start of some sections is accompanied by a slight line-indentation, and the marking of section numbers beside the Latin text is not repeated beside the translation.

* * *

A discussion of plans for a translation of Pliny's geographical books would be incomplete without consideration of two aids that must surely accompany it: notes and maps. Turner's initial intention was to provide concise footnotes on the modest scale that Frank Romer, for example, did in his 1998 translation of Pomponius Mela's *Description of the World*. As Romer explains: "The notes to the translation are motivated by items that stand out in Mela's narrative. These notes include cross-references within Mela's text, references to other ancient writers, selected bibliography, and other useful information that suits his miscellany" [Romer 1998: ix].

However, in due course we learned that Duane Roller was investigating prospects for achieving with Pliny's geographical books what he already had with Strabo's *Geography*: a complete translation of its 17 books published by Cambridge University Press in 2014, followed in 2018 by a historical and topographical *Guide* over 1,000 pages in length from the same Press [Roller 2014; 2018]. It emerged

from discussions that Roller would welcome the opportunity to prepare a similar *Guide* to Pliny's geographical books on the basis of the translation that Turner and I were making, without needing to make his own. Turner and I were agreeable, and Cambridge University Press has committed to publishing first our translation and then later, when ready, Roller's *Guide*.

For our translation, the notable consequence is that the already modest scale of notes envisaged becomes further reduced. Certainly, we still mean to supply cross-references to other passages in the *Natural History*, as well as the years of consular dates, brief explanation of technical terms like *conventus*, and so forth. Everything else in need of comment, however, we now leave to Roller's *Guide* — with regret, naturally, that inquiring readers will be temporarily ill-served during the unavoidable interval between the appearance of the translation and that of the *Guide*.

As to a map or maps, with 21st century digital cartography at our disposal and data from the *Barrington Atlas* and its *Map-by-Map Directory*, today we are empowered to transform the quality of what was offered when printed paper was the only possible format and cartography for antiquity remained in disarray. Notably, of the latest three Budé volumes, the fourth quarter of Book 6 (2008) does include a grayscale foldout map with inset, but neither Book 3 (2004) nor Book 4 (2015) has any map. Sammlung Tusculum offers some (small, grayscale) for Books 3, 4 and 5, though none for Book 6. For us, by contrast, there is already an instructive model in the color digital map made by the Ancient World Mapping Center to accompany Roller's translation of Strabo.¹⁷

Consequently, the Ancient World Mapping Center¹⁸ is preparing a matching digital map for Pliny's geographical books. Like the one for Strabo, it extends seamlessly all the way from the British Isles to India, using the Center's *Map Tiles* as its base and conforming in style to the Center's mapmaking tool *Antiquity-A-La-Carte*. The map is georeferenced, and the modern physical landscape is returned — so far as can be achieved — to how it is likely to have been in antiquity. Users can pan and zoom as they wish. The scale at which the map may be displayed is of course variable, with a zoom possible up to about 1:50,000. All features, peoples and places mentioned by Pliny that can be located are to be marked, following his form and spelling of the name.

The marking of each name on the map offers a link to the relevant "Pleiades" project entry,¹⁹ where fuller information — including the modern equivalent name, if any, and bibliography — may be found. Where applicable, the map is also to indicate a community's official Roman status as specified by Pliny (colony, with Latin rights, ally, tax-exempt, free, tribute-paying), as well as to outline the approximate extent of Roman provinces, *conventus* districts, and the Augustan regions of Italy. Each type of data is entered on a separate layer which users of the map can introduce or remove as they wish. Distances may also be calculated on the map.

* * *

As is only to be expected, this paper has focused on aspects of translating Pliny that are especially important for achieving a sound, lasting English version

¹⁷ Accessible gratis: awmc.unc.edu/applications/Strabo.

¹⁸ awmc.unc.edu/wordpress.

¹⁹ pleiades.stoa.org.

of the geographical books for the 21st century, one that strives to balance accuracy with readability. Even so, our translation cannot always flow smoothly. Yet should readers express dissatisfaction on that score, the appropriate response must be that this limitation merely reflects Pliny's material and his manner of presenting it; our translation has not rendered these books harder to comprehend. The temptation to adapt and supplement the translation further is one that we have resisted. Fortunately, Pliny is not an author who requires these efforts in the way that another (anonymous) one I have translated does.²⁰ This mid-4th century work *Expositio Totius Mundi et Gentium*,²¹ mercifully short, is written in Latin so execrable, with syntax so opaque (no doubt worsened by copyists' slips), that the need repeatedly arises for the translation to become a conjectural reconstruction of what may be meant; otherwise the translator will deliver unsatisfying gibberish. As a result, readers of a translation are offered prose more meaningful and more readable than the Latin original. Pliny is often hard to comprehend, but he is seldom so mystifying that his translators are called upon to resort to such uncomfortable speculation.

APPENDIX

Notable Geographical Passages in *Natural History* Books 7 to 37

7.95–99	Extent of Pompey's conquests
7.191–206	Inventions: Who made them, and where
8.225–229	Localization of animal species
9.44–46 and 49–53	Tunny-fish
10.74–79	Migration and localization of birds
10.132–135	Unusual birds
12.51–57 and 63–65	Frankincense and its export to the Mediterranean
12.82–84	Arabia and the value of Rome's eastern imports from beyond the empire
12.107–109	Gums and mosses
14.59–76	Vineyards and the quality of their wines
16.2–6	Germania, with and without woodland
16.159–162	Reeds and bamboo for arrows
16.238–240	Trees of great age in Graecia and Asia Minor
18.210–217	Difficulties of forecasting the seasons
19.2–15	Flax: Importance, cultivation, processing
27.1–3	Roman peace permits worldwide transport and use of plants
31.5–6 and 9–30	Whereabouts and nature of waters, healing and deadly
32.15–19 and 21	Remarkable fish; coral
37.30–46	Amber
37.201–205	Conclusion, with highest praise for Italia

²⁰ For [Shipley (forthcoming)].

²¹ Attributed to Iunior Philosophus by *FGrHist* V.2023.

Table 1: The Latin Editions

Book, Sections	Budé	Sammlung Tusculum
2	Beaujeu, J. (1950). <i>Pline L'Ancien. Histoire Naturelle. Livre II</i> . Paris: Belles Lettres.	
3	Zehnacker, H. (2004). <i>Pline L'Ancien. Histoire Naturelle. Livre III</i> . Paris: Belles Lettres.	
4	Zehnacker, H., Silberman, A. (2015). <i>Pline L'Ancien. Histoire Naturelle. Livre IV</i> . Paris: Belles Lettres.	
5, 1–46	Desanges, J. (1980). <i>Pline L'Ancien. Histoire Naturelle. Livre V, 1–46 (L'Afrique du Nord)</i> . Paris: Belles Lettres.	
5, 47–151		Winkler, G., König, R. (1993). <i>C. Plinius Secundus d. Ä., Naturkunde. Lateinisch-deutsch. Buch V</i> . München: Artemis & Winkler.
6, 1–45		Brodersen, K. (1996). <i>C. Plinius Secundus d. Ä., Naturkunde. Lateinisch-deutsch. Buch VI</i> . München: Artemis & Winkler.
6, 46–106	André, J., Filliozat, J. (1980). <i>Pline L'Ancien. Histoire Naturelle. Livre VI 2e partie (L'Asie centrale et orientale, l'Inde)</i> . Paris: Belles Lettres.	
6, 107–162		Brodersen, K. (1996). <i>C. Plinius Secundus d. Ä., Naturkunde. Buch VI</i> . München: Artemis & Winkler.
6, 163–220	Desanges, J. (2008). <i>Pline L'Ancien. Histoire Naturelle. Livre VI. 4e partie. (L'Asie africaine sauf l'Égypte, les dimensions et les climats du monde habité)</i> . Paris: Belles Lettres.	

References

- Doody, A. (2015). Pliny the Elder. In R. Scodel (Ed.). *Oxford Bibliographies Online: Classics*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195389661/obo-9780195389661-0194.xml>.
- Levick, B. (2005, February 11). Review of Woodman 2004. *The Times Literary Supplement*, 28.

- Rackham, H., et al. (Trans.) (1938–1963). *Pliny. Natural History* [10 Vols.]. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press. (The Loeb Classical Library). Vol. 1: Praefatio, Libri I–II. H. Rackham (Trans.) (1938). Vol. 2: Libri III–VII. H. Rackham (Trans.) (1942). Vol. 3: Libri VIII–XI. H. Rackham (Trans.) (1940). Vol. 4: Libri XII–XVI. H. Rackham (Trans.) (1945). Vol. 5: Libri XVII–XIX. H. Rackham (Trans.) (1950). Vol. 6: Libri XX–XXIII. W. H. S. Jones (Trans.) (1951). Vol. 7: Libri XXIV–XXVII. W. H. S. Jones (Trans.) (1956). Vol. 8: Libri XXVIII–XXXII. W. H. S. Jones (Trans.) (1963). Vol. 9: Libri XXXIII–XXXV. H. Rackham (Trans.) (1952). Vol. 10: Libri XXXVI–XXXVII. D. E. Eichholz (Trans.) (1962).
- Roller, D. W. (2014). *The Geography of Strabo: An English translation with introduction and notes*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Roller, D. W. (2018). *A historical and topographical guide to the Geography of Strabo*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Romer, F. E. (1998). *Pomponius Mela's Description of the World*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- Shipley, G. (Ed.) (forthcoming). *Selected Greek geographers*.
- Woodman, A. J. (Ed., Trans.) (2004). *Tacitus: The Annals*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

* * *

Информация об авторе

Ричард Дж. А. Талберт

PhD

*профессор, исторический факультет,
Университет Северной Каролины в
Чапел-Хилле*

NC 27599-3195 USA

Тел.: +1 (919) 962-3942

✉ talbert@email.unc.edu

Information about the author

Richard J. A. Talbert

PhD (Cambridge University)

*Professor, Department of History,
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
NC 27599-3195 USA*

Tel.: +1 (919) 962-3942

✉ talbert@email.unc.edu

А. А. Сабашникова^а

ORCID: 0000-0002-1490-3791
✉ asabashnikova@hse.ru

Я. С. Линкова^а

ORCID: 0000-0003-3950-7426
✉ yalinkova@hse.ru

^а *Национальный исследовательский университет
«Высшая школа экономики»
(Россия, Москва)*

ЛИТЕРАТУРА О ПОВСЕДНЕВНОСТИ И ПОВСЕДНЕВНОСТЬ В ЛИТЕРАТУРЕ (ОБЗОР КНИГ В. А. МИЛЬЧИНОЙ)

Обзор книг:

- *Мильчина В.* Париж в 1814–1848 годах: повседневная жизнь. — М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2013. — 944 с.: ил. — (Культура повседневности).
- *Французы, нарисованные ими самими. Парижанки / Сост., вступ. ст. и ред. пер. В. Мильчиной.* — М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2014. — 832 с.: ил. — (Культура повседневности).
- *Сцены частной и общественной жизни животных: этюды современных нравов / Пер. с фр., вступ. ст. и коммент. В. Мильчиной.* — М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2015. — 656 с.: ил. — (Культура повседневности).
- *Мильчина В.* Имена парижских улиц: путеводитель по названиям. — М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2016. — 320 с. — (Культура повседневности).
- *Мильчина В.* Парижане о себе и о своем городе: «Париж, или Книга Ста и одного» (1831–1834). — М.: Изд. дом «Дело» РАНХиГС, 2019. — 696 с.

Благодарности. В работе использованы результаты проекта «Литературный процесс в контексте интеллектуальной истории», выполненного в рамках Программы фундаментальных исследований НИУ ВШЭ в 2019 г.

Для цитирования: Сабашникова А. А., Линкова Я. С. Литература о повседневности и повседневность в литературе (обзор книг В. А. Мильчиной) // Шаги / Steps. Т. 6. № 1. 2020. С. 229–242. DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-229-242.

*Обзор поступил в редакцию 5 ноября 2019 г.
Принято к печати 20 ноября 2019 г.*

A. A. Sabashnikova^a

ORCID: 0000-0002-1490-3791
✉ asabashnikova@hse.ru

Ya. S. Linkova^a

ORCID: 0000-0003-3950-7426
✉ yalinkova@hse.ru

^a National Research University Higher School of Economics
(Russia, Moscow)

LITERATURE ABOUT EVERYDAY LIFE AND EVERYDAY LIFE IN LITERATURE (A REVIEW OF BOOKS BY V. A. MILCHINA)

A review of:

- Milchina, V. (2013). *Parizh v 1814–1848 godakh: povsednevnaia zhizn'* [Paris in 1814–1848: Everyday life]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. 944 p., ill. (Kul'tura povsednevnosti). (In Russian).
- Milchina, V. (Ed., Trans., Intro.) (2014). *Frantsuzy, narisovannye imi samimi. Parizhanki* [Frenchmen painted by themselves. Parisian women]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. 832 p., ill. (Kul'tura povsednevnosti). (In Russian).
- Milchina, V. (Ed., Trans., Intro, Comment.) (2015). *Stseny chastnoi i obshchestvennoi zhizni zhivotnykh* [Life of animals: Private and public scenes]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. 656 p., ill. (Kul'tura povsednevnosti). (In Russian).
- Milchina, V. (2016). *Imena parizhskikh ulits: putevoditel' po nazvaniyam* [Names of Parisian streets: Street names guide]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. 320 p. (Kul'tura povsednevnosti). (In Russian).
- Milchina, V. (2019). *Parizhane o sebe i o svoem gorode: "Parizh, ili Kniga Sta i odnogo" (1831–1834)* [Parisians about themselves and their city: Paris, or *The Book of Hundred and One* (1831–1834)]. Moscow: Izdatel'skii dom "Delo" RANKhIGS. 696 p. (In Russian).

Acknowledgements. This work is an output of a research project implemented as part of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University) in 2019.

To cite this review: Sabashnikova, A. A., Linkova, Ya. S. (2020). Literature about everyday life and everyday life in literature (A review of books by V. A. Milchina). *Shagi/Steps*, 6(1), 229–242. (In Russian). DOI: 10.22394/2412-9410-2020-6-1-229-242.

Received November 5, 2019

Accepted November 20, 2019

© A. A. SABASHNIKOVA, YA. S. LINKOVA

Появившиеся за последние два десятилетия в разных издательствах книжные серии, посвященные повседневности («Живая история. Повседневная жизнь человечества» в «Молодой гвардии» и «Культура повседневности» в «Новом литературном обозрении») свидетельствуют о том, что история повседневности перестает быть лишь одним из направлений современной исторической науки и привлекает широкого читателя. Неизменный интерес вызывает и одноименная передача на радиостанции «Говорит Москва», запущенная в эфир по инициативе издательства «Новое литературное обозрение».

Просветительскую роль серии «Культура повседневности» невозможно не оценить. Действительно, каждая публикация, как сказано на сайте издательства, — «это введение в широкий оборот уникальных материалов современных исследований, переосмысление традиций нашей ежедневной жизни в культурном контексте»¹.

Среди изданий серии — переводы трудов западных ученых, посвященные самым разнообразным явлениям повседневности, истории идей или антропологии. Не претендуя на перечисление всего, назовем навскидку несколько изданий последних лет: пятитомная история частной жизни Филиппа Арьеса и Жоржа Дюби [Арьес, Дюби 2014–2017], охватывающая историю Запада от античности до XX в., или трехтомная «История тела» под редакцией Алена Корбена, Жан-Жака Куртина и Жоржа Вигарелло [Корбен и др. 2012–2016].

Помимо коллективных монографий, печатаются и книги отдельных исследователей, западных и отечественных. Это может быть скрупулезный труд, посвященный дендизму, где история возникновения и бытования этого явления подается в контексте истории моды, литературы, гендерных вопросов, эстетики и т. д., с привлечением огромного изобразительного материала и исчерпывающим списком научной литературы и источников, как в случае книги О. Б. Вайнштейн [2005]. Или исследование, за десять лет выдержавшее четыре издания, посвященное истории меланхолии, где за описанием чувств проступают история общества и его стереотипы. Книга Карен Юханнисон «История меланхолии» основана на огромном фактическом материале с привлечением медицинских трактатов, литературных персонажей и кинофильмов [Юханнисон 2011].

Разнообразие названий книг, выходящих в серии «Культура повседневности», — от истории левшей [Бертран 2016] до пассажиров «колбасного поезда» [Лебина 2019] — подтверждает, что повседневность становится своеобразным перекрестком, на котором сходятся интересы представителей многих областей гуманитарного знания, а популярность этих изданий у читателя — как подготовленного, так и массового — показывает, что интерес к частной жизни, быту и материальной культуре становится новой формой постижения прошлого. Современное «повседневноведение» все больше склоняется к междисциплинарности и существует на стыке социологии, психологии, антропологии, культурологии, истории и литературы.

В книгах В. А. Мильчиной, опубликованных в серии «Культура повседневности», мы видим воплощение подобной междисциплинарности, которое

¹ https://www.nlobooks.ru/books/kultura_povsednevnosti.

выражено, как будет показано ниже, самым неожиданным образом. Каждая из этих книг имеет свою документальную основу, отличается своим принципом построения, ориентирована на определенную читательскую аудиторию, но в то же время все они объединены общей темой — Париж первой половины XIX в. — и образуют единый цикл, дающий исчерпывающую картину парижской повседневности.

Первая из «парижских» книг В. А. Мильчиной, **«Париж в 1814–1848 годах: повседневная жизнь»** (2013), в целом задумана и построена так же, как большинство подобных книг этого и других издательств. За небольшим предисловием следуют 27 глав, посвященных самым разным аспектам парижской жизни, а затем двухстраничное заключение, где кратко говорится о грядущих событиях 1848 г., которые положили конец интересующей автора эпохе. Завершают книгу хронология основных событий парижской жизни избранного периода, обширная библиография, список топонимов, список периодических изданий и список иллюстраций. Сами иллюстрации — на каждую главу по несколько гравюр, в том числе известных художников, — раскиданы по тексту книги.

Свое обращение к читателю автор начинает с утверждения: «Эта книга — не научное исследование, а плод чтения разных книг — научных и не очень» (2013, с. 5). Далее объясняется, что научные книги обеспечивают историческую точность, а мемуары, дневники, нравоописательные очерки создают «эффект присутствия», позволяют сделать текст живым и интересным.

Эту авторскую характеристику издания хотелось бы расширить и дополнить. Да, легкий, увлекательный, изящный рассказ В. А. Мильчиной о Париже, разумеется, «не научен», в особенности если понимать под «научностью» академический педантизм и сухость изложения. Однако предложенные вниманию читателя без малого 900 страниц — это лишь верхушка айсберга, подводная часть которого сугубо научна и включает в себя кропотливую работу серьезного исследователя над невероятным количеством текстов того времени, среди которых не только исторические документы, свидетельства очевидцев, публицистика и другие традиционные источники нравоописаний, но и обширный пласт художественной литературы. Авторский текст необычайно органично вбирает в себя множество цитат, порой весьма пространных, но никогда не нарушающих общий строй повествования. Мы слышим голоса известных писателей и безвестных журналистов, французов и иностранцев (по большей части русских, побывавших в эти годы в Париже), но их вкрапление никоим образом не создает стилистического диссонанса; увлеченный сюжетом читатель «глотает» все подряд и смакует пикантные подробности, не спотыкаясь о кавычки.

И тут возникает вопрос, что собой представляет этот увлеченный читатель, кому адресована книга. Однозначно ответить на него нельзя, и в этом, пожалуй, одна из основных особенностей не только этой, но и — еще в большей степени — последующих книг Мильчиной о парижской повседневности. Очевидно, что каждому, кто заинтересуется названием, интересно узнать, как жили, работали, общались и развлекались парижане в эпоху Реставрации и Июльской монархии. Причем в случае, если читатель недостаточно подкован в истории и имеет смутное представление о том, что происходило во Франции

в первой половине XIX в., ни малейшего дискомфорта он не испытывает: первые, «политические» главы книги ненавязчиво заполняют возможные пробелы, рисуя общую историческую картину. И никакой снисходительности, никакого снижения тона; автор находит такой своеобразный ракурс представления событий, что для кого-то они преломляются по-новому, а для кого-то впервые раскрываются во всей своей увлекательной последовательности. В то же время историк литературы или повседневности, историк идей или моды сможет найти для себя фактический материал, необходимую основу для собственных исследований. Примеры, почерпнутые из книг В. А. Мильчиной, всегда придают фактурность и живость лекционным курсам преподавателей. Прошлое начинает играть неожиданными красками, оживает, становится близким и понятным.

Разумеется, некоторые из читателей возмущаются за книгу из любви к Парижу — и тут, помимо массы интересных сведений об истории отдельных мест (мало кто знает, например, что Пале-Руаяль в эпоху Реставрации был пристанищем продажной любви), помимо любопытнейших иллюстраций (чего стоит один лишь проект Ж.-А. Алавуана — слон на площади Бастилии), бросается в глаза одно неожиданное решение: названия улиц и площадей, традиционно передающиеся по-русски транскрипцией, В. А. Мильчина переводит. Во избежание путаницы в конце приводится список топонимов, где восстанавливается соответствие перевода и оригинального названия. Благодаря этому смелому решению упоминающимся в тексте названиям возвращается семантическая связь с той самой повседневностью, которой посвящена книга. Все-таки Кожевненная набережная, Болотная улица или мост Менял создают куда более уютную городскую среду, чем ничего не говорящие русскому уху французские названия. Тот же принцип ляжет в основу книги **«Имена парижских улиц»** (2016), которую можно рассматривать как справочное подспорье ко всей парижской серии и, разумеется, шире — как неоценимый справочник для историков, переводчиков и всех интересующихся Парижем.

Есть, однако, среди интересующихся парижской повседневностью и такие, кто — осознанно или нет — воспринимает французскую историю, Париж и парижан прежде всего через призму французской литературы. Кто-то просто читает романы, кто-то изучает и анализирует их как филолог, но все находят в книгах Мильчиной особый, тончайшим образом проработанный пласт, неизменно удовлетворяющий порой весьма прихотливое любопытство. В «Париже в 1814–1848 годах» эта литературная составляющая только намечена, впоследствии она разрастется настолько, что изменит саму структуру книги. Дело в том, что многие парижские реалии, и в первую очередь человеческие типы, неизменно связаны в нашем сознании с соответствующими реалиями и типами из художественной литературы. Стоит сказать «парижский мальчишка», как неминуемо в памяти всплывет Гаврош. Естественно, об этом сказано и в книге, а заодно, как бы невзначай, приведена вся литературная история слова «гамен» и самого литературного типа, возникшего, как выясняется, задолго до «Отверженных» (1862). Другой пример — «женщины без имени» («женщины легкого поведения», «дамы полусвета», «куртизанки», «лоретки...»), именованию которых — а следовательно, бытованию соответствующих слов в текстах — посвящены увлекательнейшие страницы из главы «Парижанки». Или

такая деталь: оказывается, прежде чем украсить корсаж Маргариты Готье, камелия слыла «фешенебельным» цветком и красовалась в петлице некоего денди-журналиста, прозванного за это «кавалером с камелиями».

С одной стороны, перед нами детали повседневности, отсылающие к литературным образам, а с другой — совершенно неожиданный и исчерпывающий комментарий к литературному тексту.

Следующая книга о парижской повседневности под названием **«Французы, нарисованные ими самими. Парижанки»** (2014) выходит в той же серии «Нового литературного обозрения» годом позже, и имени В. А. Мильчиной на сей раз на обложке нет. В данном случае формально она выступает только как составитель, автор вступительной статьи и редактор переводов, а также как переводчик введения Жюль Жанена. Остальное — плод коллективного творчества, и в этом как раз заключается своеобразие всего издательского проекта.

Книга представляет собой публикацию избранных очерков из восьмитомного сборника, выпущенного в Париже в начале 1840-х годов стараниями издателя Леона Кюрмера. Верная своей парижской теме, В. А. Мильчина ограничивается «столичными» томами, а желание выстроить собственный сюжет и придать русскому изданию цельность и завершенность побуждает ее обратиться к «женским» очеркам, отсюда вторая часть названия — «Парижанки». Как и в оригинальном издании, каждый очерк открывает «тип», т. е. гравюра, изображающая фигуру в полный рост. Об истории издания Кюрмера, о личности издателя, его предшественниках и последователях, о жанровых особенностях сборника, о принципах его построения, об иллюстрациях и иллюстраторах подробно рассказано во вступительной статье; сведения об авторах можно найти в конце книги.

Но главная отличительная черта данного издания — это его переводчики. Вся работа над текстом книги велась в переводческом семинаре Веры Мильчиной, открытом в Институте высших гуманитарных исследований РГГУ по инициативе и под покровительством французского Национального центра книги и лично Елены Бальзамо² в 2012 г. Сведения о переводчиках, помещенные в конце книги, сообщают, что все участники семинара — люди очень молодые и что для большинства из них это первая серьезная переводческая работа. Как именно была организована работа в этой творческой лаборатории, рассказано во вступительной статье. Мы же не можем не подивиться результату: 800 страниц разных авторов XIX в. в переводе 27 начинающих переводчиков читаются на одном дыхании, так что ничто не коробит, не мешает, вообще не напоминает, что текст переводной. Перед нами богатый, красивый, правильный русский язык, следующий классическим правилам синтаксической и лексической сочетаемости, не допускающий каких бы то ни было анахронизмов, но при этом совершенно свободный от искусственной архаизации, естественный и выразительный. Что так умеет переводить В. А. Мильчина, знают многие. Но чтобы так могли переводить дебютанты, их надо не просто

² Елена (Орловская) Бальзамо — эссеист, переводчик, доктор филологических наук. Преподаватель Практической школы высших исследований (при Сорбонне), почетный доктор университета Умео (Швеция), действительный член Королевской академии Густава-Адольфа, член-корреспондент шведской Королевской академии исторических наук и изящной словесности.

научить — их надо заинтересовать, влюбить в материал, развить языковое чутье, сформировать навыки работы со справочными изданиями, расширить их фоновые знания, приучить во всем сомневаться и все проверять — да мало ли что еще довелось узнать за два года тем молодым дарованиям, кому посчастливилось заниматься в семинаре Веры Аркадьевны!

Итак, перед нами четыре десятка очерков, описывающие самых разных обитателей французской столицы, от герцогинь и светских львиц до скромных цветочниц и гризеток. Расположены они в том же порядке, что и в оригинале, т. е. без всякой видимой логики, «в живописном беспорядке». О характере очерков, об их содержании и литературных особенностях исчерпывающе сказано во вступительной статье, нас же интересует прежде всего способ подачи материала, поэтому несколько слов следует сказать о комментариях. Их в книге два вида: постраничные примечания — для имен и реалий, упомянутых однократно, и помещенный за текстом «Список имен, топонимов и культурно-исторических реалий» — для тех, что повторяются в разных очерках. Все они, если верить вступительной статье, — «плод общего творчества» участников семинара (учитывая высочайший научный уровень комментариев, верится с трудом).

Затекстовый комментарий в целом носит более общий характер и содержит сведения о более или менее известных исторических деятелях, мифологических персонажах, а также топонимах. Правда, и здесь встречаются порой любопытнейшие пояснения чисто бытовых деталей: например, о чем могла свидетельствовать растительность на лице и какой формы бороду в какие годы носила свободомышлящая молодежь.

Но настоящий клад ценнейших сведений обо всем на свете — это постраничные примечания. Как и следует ожидать, в них комментируются имена собственные, аллюзии на библейские и литературные тексты и, разумеется, реалии. Именно объяснение реалий, т. е. явлений повседневности, которым посвящена книга, разрастается порой в весьма пространный текст, удачно дополняющий очерк, но при этом увлекательный сам по себе. Это может быть генеалогия денди или рассказ о моде на магнетизм и гомеопатию, литературная предыстория имени или правила королевской лотереи. Порой для объяснения какой-нибудь загадочной детали приводятся даже фрагменты других текстов, так что в результате об искусстве кутаться в шаль нам рассказывает русский путешественник, писатель и переводчик XIX в. В. М. Строев. Особое внимание уделяют комментаторы словам и их употреблению — эту черту мы уже отмечали в первой книге Мильчиной. Так, название «женщина хорошего тона» влечет за собой не только подробное толкование французского *comme il faut*, но и рассказ о традиции русских переводов этого выражения с примерами из классики. Узнаем мы и о том, когда во французском языке появилось слово «спорт», о ком и о чем можно было сказать «фешенебельный» и чем французские «светские львы» отличались от английских.

Получается, что комментарии как бы выполняют две функции: с одной стороны, как всякие примечания, они поясняют потенциально непонятное, приближают текст к читателю, облегчают чтение, а с другой — действуют параллельно основному тексту, дополняя, расширяя, углубляя представления читателя в рамках заинтересовавшей его темы.

Еще год спустя в той же серии «Культура повседневности» вышла третья парижская книга — **«Сцены частной и общественной жизни животных. Этюды современных нравов»** (2015), где В. А. Мильчина выступает в качестве переводчика и автора вступительной статьи и комментариев. Опять перед нами нравоописательный сборник XIX в., причем на сей раз опубликованный по-русски почти целиком (23 очерка из 30), — но сборник весьма своеобразный. Во-первых, это плод совместного творчества издателя и составителя П.-Ж. Этцеля и знаменитого рисовальщика Гранвиля — и русская книга включает все полосные иллюстрации, бережно сохраняя общий замысел издания. Во-вторых, это не просто сборник разрозненных очерков разных авторов, но цельное литературное произведение с единым сюжетом. И, наконец, самое главное: как следует из названия, картина нравов XIX в. дана в опосредованной форме, через образы животных.

Прежде всего сам сборник Этцеля и Гранвиля — это остроумный, увлекательный текст, иллюстрированный изысканными и веселыми гравюрами. Читать очерки превосходных авторов в блистательном переводе В. А. Мильчиной и разглядывать картинки — несомненное удовольствие для любого читателя. Перевод здесь особенно важен, так как комический эффект зачастую достигается в результате языковой игры: обыгрываются переносные значения «зоологической» лексики, раскладываются фразеологизмы, реализуются метафоры. Виртуозно владея словом, Мильчина находит самые разные способы передать или компенсировать приемы оригинала, так что текст читается легко и непринужденно и все остроумие сохраняется.

Как и в «Парижанках», разнообразные пояснения к тексту пыливый читатель найдет в постраничных комментариях. Учитывая зооморфный характер сборника, здесь они, пожалуй, играют еще более важную роль. Прежде всего в тексте великое множество скрытых цитат и реминисценций, а упустить, что медведь цитирует Гомера или заяц — Шекспира, было бы обидно. Кроме того, многие примечания отсылают к предыстории образа того или иного животного — научной, псевдонаучной и литературной. И, разумеется, огромный пласт политического подтекста без комментариев мог бы ускользнуть от читателя, не дав ему насладиться веселой пародией. Однако как и в предыдущей книге, Мильчина в постраничных комментариях редко ограничивается самым необходимым. Так, поясняя со ссылкой на «Естественную историю» Бюффона, почему и с каких пор зайца избрали в барабанщики, она не может не рассказать заодно анекдот о дрессированном зайце несчастного сына Людовика XVI.

Значительная часть примечаний носит «литературный» характер, и они вкуче со вступительной статьей делают это издание не просто публикацией малоизвестного нравоописательного текста, но тончайшим исследованием литературной жизни во Франции 1830–1840-х годов. Так, к заголовку каждого очерка дается комментарий, связанный с его автором, причем сведения общего характера — годы жизни, чем известен и т. п. — сопровождают только малоизвестные имена, в случае же знаменитых писателей примечание содержит рассказ о взаимоотношениях автора с издателем, о возможных перекилках с другими, более известными его произведениями, о связанных с очерком любопытных фактах биографии автора, о его участии в других подобных изданиях и множество иных интересных деталей. В результате набирается ценнейший

материал, связанный уже не столько с бытом и нравами, сколько с самим писателем и его участием в литературном отражении повседневности. Прибавим к этому отсылки к перекличке текстов как внутри сборника, так и с другими текстами нравоописательного характера, а также сопоставление вариантов одного и того же рассказа в разных изданиях сборника, и получим ценнейший научный аппарат, совершенно уникальный, поскольку во Франции ни одно издание «Сцен» примечаний не удостоилось.

Исчерпывающая характеристика сборника Этцеля — Гранвиля как издательского проекта и литературного произведения дана во вступительной статье В. А. Мильчиной, где книга рассматривается в контексте целой традиции визуального и словесного изображения людей в зверином облики, а также сопоставляется с другими нравоописательными сборниками, в частности, с «Французами, нарисованными ими самими». Читателю, знакомому с «Парижанками», в особенности если он не поленился прочитать предисловие, несомненно, будет интересно узнать о том, как Этцель вознамерился соперничать с удачливым издателем «Французов», и сопоставить перекликающиеся гравюры на фронтисписах обоих сборников.

Но, пожалуй, самое тонкое наблюдение автора — это то, что она уловила перекличку «звериного» сборника с романтическими настроениями эпохи. Как убедительно продемонстрировано в статье, каждый мохнатый или пернатый герой в своем автобиографическом рассказе оказывается не больше не меньше в ситуации героя европейского романтизма, и в итоге «зоологическая метафора призвана показать иллюзорность политических утопий и романтических порывов» (2015, с. 42). Таким образом, автор не только выявляет нравоописательную составляющую публикуемых сборников, но и рассматривает их в контексте «большой литературы» — как особый жанр, чутко реагирующий на основополагающие умонастроения эпохи.

Последняя (на данный момент) книга парижской серии называется «**Парижане о себе и своем городе: “Париж, или Книга Ста и одного” (1831–1834)**» (2019). Снова выборочная публикация нравоописательных очерков из многолетнего коллективного сборника 1930-х годов (кстати, не раз упомянутого в предисловиях и примечаниях к предыдущим книгам), иллюстрированная гравюрами и снабженная подробными и содержательными комментариями, однако структура книги, да и сам тип издания на сей раз иные. Если «Парижанки» и «Сцены...» — это прежде всего публикация текстов XIX в. с научным аппаратом, в том числе вступительной статьей, то теперь перед нами полновесная научная монография, сопровождаемая переводом 15 очерков из 15-томного сборника, которому она посвящена.

Выше мы уже затрагивали вопрос, кому адресованы книги В. А. Мильчиной, и обратили внимание на то, что при всей своей занимательности они всегда имели чем порадовать самого взыскательного знатока истории и словесности. В последнем издании научность возобладала над популярностью — а занимательность все же осталась в неизменном виде, и у любознательного, но не сильно искушенного читателя по-прежнему остается возможность насладиться пикантными подробностями парижского быта, обращаясь по мере надобности к постраничным примечаниям, к сведениям об авторах, открывающим каждый очерк, а при желании и к основному тексту исследования.

Ведь в каком бы жанре ни писала В. А. Мильчина — научном или популярном, — легкость ее пера, изящество слога, бережное отношение к материалу, остроумие, проникающее в самый что ни на есть научный дискурс, — иными словами, ее неповторимый тонкий исследовательский почерк делает любой ее текст увлекательным для любого читателя.

Исследование открывается небольшим предисловием, где критически рассматриваются существующие в современной науке определения того пласта литературы, к которому относится «Книга Ста и одного». Перечислив все достоинства утвердившегося термина Вальтера Беньямина «панорамическая литература», автор уделяет внимание и предложенным его оппонентами определениям «калейдоскопическая», «социографическая» литература; рассматривает даже русский «физиологический очерк», но тут же убедительно демонстрирует, что ни одно из определений не охватывает всей полноты явления, и тактично уходит от терминологической точности, остановившись на нейтральном «парижеописании».

Глава, посвященная издателю Ладвока, сама по себе необычайно занимательна, и читатель, интересующийся парижской повседневностью, найдет в ней еще один портрет, который прекрасно дополняет галерею образов, описанных в самом сборнике. Опираясь на множество документов, обильно цитируя современников, Мильчина увлекательно рассказывает биографию ловкого и амбициозного предпринимателя, а заодно знакомит читателя с издательским производством того времени и вписывает деятельность своего героя в исторический и культурный контекст эпохи.

Всестороннему анализу сборника «Париж, или Книга Ста и одного» посвящена третья, самая большая глава, и тут перед читателем раскрывается во всей своей полноте целый пласт литературы, составить представление о котором до этого у него просто не было возможности. Хотя полностью в книгу включены лишь 15 очерков из 256, благодаря классификациям, описаниям, сопоставлениям и пространным цитатам, всегда привлекаемым по делу и читающимся на одном дыхании, начинаешь ощущать себя причастным колоритному миру исторического Парижа, где сама В. А. Мильчина, кажется, чувствует себя как дома.

Что же касается контекста, то сколь бы скромно автор ни уверял, что вовсе не претендует на всеохватность, материал привлекается колоссальный, и это далеко не только коллективные сборники 1830–1840-х годов о Париже (про них читатель узнает все), но и более ранние тексты, посвященные Парижу, нравам или человеческим типам. Столь широкий фон служит автору как для определения основных тенденций развития «парижеописания» до и после «Книги Ста и одного», так и для выявления уникальных черт самого сборника. В этом направлении Мильчиной сделаны удивительно тонкие и совершенно оригинальные наблюдения, об одном из которых хочется сказать подробнее.

Одной из отличительных черт замысла Ладвока, как показывает автор, еще его современники считали принципиальную установку издателя на соединение под одной обложкой совершенно разных по возрасту, положению, политическим взглядам и эстетическим установкам авторов. Однако все это многоголосие не приводит к конфликтам и ссорам, столь частым в чрезвычайно политизированной Франции 1830-х годов, и в этом исследовательница видит

«новую инкарнацию салонной общежительности» (2019, с. 161). Доказательство этой мысли виртуозно: от краткой характеристики салонов XVIII в. — к «мифу о салоне», перешедшему в век XIX, потом об отражении этого мифа в пяти очерках «Книги...» с блестящей демонстрацией того, как ее автор описывает идеальный салон, не понимая и не одобряя его в силу своей принадлежности другому поколению; и наконец вывод, что сама конструкция сборника, предполагающая мирное сосуществование диаметрально противоположно настроенных авторов, выстроена по модели идеального салона: «Ладвока создал аналог мифологизированного салона, приютив людей противоположных взглядов под одной обложкой» (2009, с. 207).

Однако контекстом для «Книги Ста и одного» служит не только литература о парижской повседневности. В главе, посвященной жанровой природе сборника, В. А. Мильчина сопоставляет тексты сборника и с газетными публикациями нравоописательного характера, и с беллетристикой того времени, наглядно и убедительно показывая, как под одной обложкой уживаются не только элементы самых разных жанров, но и противоположные тенденции развития очерка парижских нравов. Примеры сюжетов из разных томов 15-томника демонстрируют, что текст, начатый как «парижеописательный» очерк, мутирует иной раз в «неистовую» новеллу, притчу и водевиль. По утверждению автора, это идет вразрез с общей эволюцией «парижеописания», которое после «Книги Ста и одного» всячески стремилось от беллетризации, наоборот, освободиться.

В ракурсе того, что сказано на 300 страницах последней книги, все написанное В. А. Мильчиной ранее приобретает неожиданное звучание. Если первая книга просто повествует о частной жизни, а вторая и третья предлагают выборочные публикации сборников о парижской повседневности с обширным комментарием, то последняя книга представляет собой уже самостоятельное исследование целого пласта нравоописательной литературы. Автор не только анализирует сам текст, но и воссоздает всю историю его бытования в определенный период французской истории, посвящая читателя в тонкости издательского дела и уделяя особое внимание адресату подобных текстов и их рецепции.

Соединяя разрозненные нити, Мильчина сплетает в один изящный узор пикантные детали парижского быта, их литературное описание, любопытные подробности из жизни бытописателей, рождение, становление и процветание бытоописательных изданий, их переключку с другими литературными и нелитературными текстами и восторженное восприятие их современниками. Публикуемые тексты, ныне практически забытые, пользовались в свое время невероятной популярностью у обывателя XIX в. — не того, который увлечен высокими романтическими идеалами, а именно типичного среднестатистического читателя, которому нравилось узнавать себя, окружающих, свой город, среду, нравы. Каждый элемент этого узора представляет собой нечто обыденное, происходящее изо дня в день, размеренное течение жизни, которое современнику приносит радость узнавания, а исследователю наших дней, будь то историк, социолог, антрополог, филолог или культуролог, дает возможность подойти к постижению прошлого с позиций современной гуманитарной науки, т. е. через изучение частных явлений выйти на определение общих исторических тенденций.

Но есть у парижской серии и другая особенность, подсказанная во многом самим материалом. Ведь Париж, как уже говорилось выше, — это не просто город, для многих искушенных читателей — это также (если не в первую очередь) литературный текст. Об этом Мильчина никогда не забывает, и в каждой из книг неизменно присутствует некий литературный сюжет. Где-то примечание, призванное прояснить ту или иную реалию, разрастается до литературного комментария, отсылающего к хорошо известному произведению или герою, так что читатель испытывает интеллектуальное наслаждение от неожиданно нового нюанса в том, что казалось хорошо знакомым. Где-то литературная фигура первой величины — например, Бальзак — предстает перед читателем в непривычном окружении более скромных собратьев по перу, что заставляет по-новому взглянуть и на самого писателя, и на литературную жизнь того времени. И наконец, весь этот бытоописательный пласт постоянно рассматривается в контексте ведущих литературных тенденций, прежде всего романтизма. Справедливо утверждая, что это течение с его культом оригинальности не распространялось на всю литературу того времени, а бытописание с его установкой на типичное развивалось самостоятельно, автор тончайшим образом прослеживает, как некоторые романтические коллизии все же проникают в саму ткань текстов, напрямую с романтизмом никак не связанных.

Иными словами, парижская повседневность под пером В. А. Мильчиной — это богатый материал для представителей разных областей гуманитарного знания, а для искушенного ценителя словесности — это еще и возможность выйти за рамки проторенных дорог в изучении литературного процесса, познакомиться с малоизученным пластом литературы «второго плана», а зачастую открыть для себя нечто новое в прославленных шедеврах и пересмотреть устоявшиеся общие места, мифы, стереотипы.

Обращение к литературе в рамках культуры повседневности не ново. Новое, что в центре исследования — сама литература.

Литература

- Арьес, Дюби 2014–2019 — История частной жизни: [В 5 т.] / Под общ. ред. Ф. Арьеса, Ж. Дюби. Т. 1: От Римской империи до начала второго тысячелетия; под ред. П. Вейна / П. Вейн и др.; Под ред. В. Михайлина; Пер. с фр. Т. Пятницыной, Г. Беляевой. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2014. Т. 2: Европа от феодализма до Ренессанса; под ред. Ж. Доби / Д. Бартелеми и др.; Пер. с фр. Е. Решетниковой, П. Каштанова. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2015. Т. 3: От Ренессанса до эпохи Просвещения; под ред. Р. Шартье / Ф. Арьес и др.; Пер. с фр. М. Неклюдовой, О. Панайотти. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2016. Т. 4: От Великой французской революции до I Мировой войны; под ред. М. Перро / А. Корбен и др.; Пер. с фр. О. Панайотти. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2018. Т. 5: От I Мировой войны до конца XX века; Под ред. А. Про, Ж. Венсана / С. Боди-Жандро и др.; Пер. с фр. О. Панайотти. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2019.
- Бертран 2016 — *Бертран П.-М.* Зеркальные люди: История левшей / Пер. с фр. К. Щербиню. 2-е изд. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2016.
- Вайнштейн 2005 — *Вайнштейн О.* Денди: мода, литература, стиль жизни. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2005.

- Корбен и др. 2012–2016 — История тела: В 3 т. / Под ред. А. Корбена, Ж.-Ж. Куртина, Ж. Вигарелло; Пер. с фр. М. Неклюдовой, А. Стоговой. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2012–2016.
- Лебина 2019 — Лебина Н. Пассажиры колбасного поезда. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2019.
- Юханнисон 2011 — Юханнисон К. История меланхолии: о страхе, скуке и чувствительности в прежние времена и теперь / Пер. со швед. И. Матыциной. М.: Нов. лит. обозрение, 2011.

References

- Ar'ès, F; Diubi, Zh. (Eds.) (2015–2019). *Istoriia chastnoi zhizni* [Trans. from Ariès, P., Duby, G. (1999). *Histoire de la vie privée*, (Vol. 1) *De l'Empire romain à l'an mil*, (Vol. 2) *De l'Europe féodale à la Renaissance*, (Vol. 3) *De la Renaissance au Lumières*, (Vol. 4) *De la Révolution à la Grande Guerre*, (Vol. 5) *De la Première Guerre mondiale à nos jours*. Paris: Seuil]. T. Piatnitsyna, G. Beliaeva, E. Reshetnikova, P. Kashtanov, M. Nekliudova, O. Panaiotti (Trans.). Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. (In Russian).
- Bertran, P.-M. (2016). *Zerkal'nye liudi: Istoriia levshei* [Trans. from Bertrand, P. M. (2001). *Histoire des gauchets. Des gens à l'envers*. Paris: Imago]. K. Shcherbino (Trans.). Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. (In Russian).
- Iukhannisson, K. (2011). *Istoriia melankholii: o strakhe, skuke i chuvstvitel'nosti v prezhnii vremena i teper'* [Trans. from Johannisson, K. (2009). *Melankoliska rum. Om ångest, leda och sårbarhet i förfluten tid och nutid*. Stockholm: Albert Bonniers förlag]. I. Matytsina (Trans.). Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. (In Russian).
- Korben, A., Kurtin, Zh.-Zh., Vigarell, Zh. (Eds.) (2012–2016). *Istoriia tela* [Trans. from Corbin, A., Courtine, J.-J., Vigarello, G. (2011) *Histoire du corps*. Paris, Seuil] (3 Vols.). M. Nekliudova, A. Stogova (Trans.). Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. (In Russian).
- Lebina, N. (2019). *Passazhiry kolbasnogo poezda* ['Sausage train' passengers]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. (In Russian).
- Vainshtein, O. (2005). *Dendi: moda, literatura, stil' zhizni* [The dandy: Fashion, literature and lifestyle]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. (In Russian).

* * *

Информация об авторах

Анна Ароновна Сабашникова
кандидат филологических наук
старший преподаватель,
Департамент истории и теории
литературы,
факультет гуманитарных наук,
Национальный исследовательский
университет «Высшая школа экономики»
Россия; 105066, Москва,
ул. Старая Басманная, д. 21/4, стр. 1
Тел.: +7 (495) 772-95-90 *22820
✉ asabashnikova@hse.ru

Information about the authors

Anna A. Sabashnikova
Cand. Sci. (Philology)
Senior Lecturer, Department of Literary
History and Theory, National Research
University
Higher School of Economics
Russia, 105066, Moscow, Staraya
Basmannaya Str., 21/4, Bld. 1
Tel. + 7 (495) 772-95-90 *22820
✉ asabashnikova@hse.ru

Яна Сергеевна Линкова

*кандидат филологических наук
доцент, Департамент истории
и теории литературы, факультет
гуманитарных наук,
Национальный исследовательский
университет «Высшая школа экономики»
Россия; 105066, Москва,
ул. Старая Басманная, д. 21/4, стр. 1
Тел.: +7 (495) 772-95-90 *22902
✉ yalinkova@hse.ru*

Yana S. Linkova

*Cand. Sci. (Philology)
Associate Professor, Department of Literary
History and Theory, National Research
University Higher School of Economics
Russia, 105066, Moscow, Staraya
Basmannaya Str., 21/4, Bld. 1
Tel. + 7 (495) 772-95-90 *22902
✉ yalinkova@hse.ru*

ВЫШЛА НОВАЯ КНИГА

Русская авантюра: идентичности, проекты, репрезентации: Коллект. моногр. / Под ред. М. С. Неклюдовой, Е. П. Шумиловой. — М.: Изд. дом «Дело» РАНХиГС, 2019. — 432 с.

Авантюризм как культурное явление принял свою классическую форму в XVIII в., и именно этот период служит точкой отсчета для всех исследований на эту тему. Но и в более ранней, и в более поздней истории встречаются фигуры и события, которые невозможно описать, не прибегая к таким понятиям, как авантюрист или авантюра. Нередко они связаны с Россией — страной радикальных социальных и политических экспериментов, которые, с одной стороны, притягивали людей предприимчивых, с другой — отталкивали несогласных, порой побуждая их затевать собственные отчаянные предприятия. Сборник «Русская авантюра» представляет несколько эпизодов этой двойной истории притяжения и отталкивания, однако основная задача его авторов состояла в определении границ того, что мы называем «авантюризмом». Достаточно ли человеку строить безумные планы и сознательно идти на риск, чтобы считаться авантюристом? Тогда в эту категорию попадет большинство первооткрывателей и реформаторов. Или авантюра — это всегда несостоявшийся проект?

В основу книги легли материалы конференции «Русская авантюра», проводившейся 21–23 сентября 2017 г. Школой актуальных гуманитарных исследований РАНХиГС.

Научный журнал
Academic journal

Шаги / Steps
Shagi / Steps

Т. 6. № 1. 2020

Основан в мае 2015 г.

ISSN 2412-9410

Учредитель издания: Российская академия народного хозяйства
и государственной службы при Президенте РФ

Свидетельство о регистрации СМИ: ПИ № ФС77–61736 от 07.05.2015,
выдано Роскомнадзором

При перепечатке ссылка на журнал обязательна.

Подписано в печать 20.03.2020

Формат 70×100/16

Объем 18 а. л.

Тираж 500 экз. (1-й завод — 200 экз.)

Отпечатано в типографии РАНХиГС