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This is the inaugural issue of *History of Classical Scholarship* (HCS), a new online Open Access journal entirely devoted to the study of the scholarship on the Greek and Roman world. New editorial projects always require some justification, albeit brief, and a positive statement of their intellectual agenda — even when readers and contributors are not charged a single penny.

The history of classical scholarship is a thriving field, which has a complex and lively background, and has gained further momentum in the last few decades. Its subject matter is technically demanding, formidably diverse, inspiring and unsettling, infuriating and humbling. As we enter the third decade of the twenty-first century, it appears to us to be especially topical in at least three respects: its contents, its methods, and its perspectives.

Knowing the history of the scholarly debates on a specific problem remains the most effective way of coming to grips with its intellectual potential and historiographical significance. Understanding the genesis and development of the academic disciplines related to the study of the ancient world is essential if one is to grasp the structural rules of current research and to assess its credibility and traction. As the most authoritative practitioner of the history of classical scholarship once put it, studying the likes of Gibbon, Niebuhr or Meyer without knowing how they approached the documents on which they worked is a fruitless operation.¹

In turn, a reading of those very sources that seriously engages with what earlier scholars had to say about them is likely to achieve a greater level of depth. A full understanding of ancient documents, monuments, and ideas may only be achieved by investigating the contexts and processes surrounding their discovery, publication, interpretation, intellectual and physical reuse. This methodological approach is also vital in ensuring full access to a stratified body of knowledge (corpora, editions,

collections, digital resources etc.) and in transmitting complex research
tools to future generations of scholars.

Thirdly, studying our discipline as a topic of historical enquiry is a
necessary step towards understanding its place in the contemporary
world, and coming to terms with its implications with political practices
and discourses: with legacies of privilege and oppression, to be sure, as
well as with attempts to steep the prospect of human emancipation in the
close reading of, and engagement with, ancient sources. Any effort to de-
provincialise or decolonise the subject must build upon a factually in-
formed and interpretatively sensitive view on its historical development.

Hence this new project: we believe that *History of Classical Scholar-
ship* is the first periodical that is entirely focused on this research field,
for which we take the widest possible thematic and chronological remit.
*HCS* welcomes contributions on any aspects of the history of classical
studies, in any geographical context, from the Middle Ages to the late
twentieth century, and we are keen to host papers covering the whole
range of the discipline: from ancient history to literary studies, from epig-
ography and numismatics to iconography and archaeology, from textual
criticism to religious and linguistic studies, encompassing even ‘scho-
lastic philosophy’, as John Sandys put it in the introduction to his great
book, whose title is echoed in the name of this journal.2

We also think that important insights into the history of the discipline
may be yielded by the publication of significant items from the Nachlässe
of classical scholars, including letters and documents that shed light on
matters of historical or historiographical interest. In our ambition to
investigate and elucidate long-established intellectual traditions, we are
also hoping to challenge and deepen them. In that spirit, we look forward
to the participation of a broad and diverse base of scholars from all over
the world, and encourage the involvement of early career researchers.

Whilst classical reception does not quite fall within our brief — and is
already well served by other journals — we are open to contributions on
the engagement with the Classics in modern literatures or modern polit-
ical discourses, if they contribute to the elucidation and further under-
standing of an ancient source or historical problem: Machiavelli’s
*Discorsi*, Simone Weil’s essay on the *Iliad*, or Brecht’s *Die Geschäfte des
Herrn Julius Caesar* are valuable reminders that original insights into
classical matters are certainly not just the purview of university pro-
fessors. We hope to be able to represent the development of the discipline
in all its complexity and variety, and do justice to the ties that bind
classical scholarship with the work of other subject communities, from

modern history to law, from gender studies to sociology, from politics to oriental studies. Our enterprise is an intrinsically interdisciplinary one. And, like most people who work in our field, we have often found ourselves wondering whether Classics is a discipline at all.\(^3\) Far from being a neatly defined canon with carefully policed boundaries, classical scholarship is a wide set of interpretative practices that elude precise definition — and is all the stronger for that.

* 

This is a Diamond Open Access journal, and authors will retain copyright over their own contributions. Each issue will be freely available on the web, and each paper will be paginated and downloadable in PDF format. We shall make arrangements to include the journal in the main international indexing databases, as soon as we are eligible to do so. We are grateful to our home institutions, Ca’ Foscari University of Venice and Newcastle University, for their support, material and otherwise, to this project. We also warmly thank the colleagues who agreed to join our Editorial Board and those who have reviewed submissions to this first issue.

There is no binding word limit for contributions to \textit{HCS} and we have not set strict deadlines for the submission of papers for each individual issue, unlike what is typically the case with journals that are published in hard copy. We have decided not to impose prescriptive house editorial standards. However, submissions must be highly consistent internally, both in formatting style and referencing conventions. We expect to open the second issue of the journal early in 2020 and to upload new contributions online, as soon as a final accepted version is ready for publication. In 2020, we also plan to launch an Open Access book series, \textit{HCS Supplementary Volumes}, which will be hosted on the journal website and will include studies on aspects of the history of the discipline that require a full-scale treatment.

This opening issue conveys the aspiration to diversity that we aim to pursue all along this project. It includes papers written in four different languages, by scholars based in the US, the UK, Italy, France, Spain, Germany, and Switzerland. It covers a range of topics that goes from Conrad Peutinger’s library to scholarship in the Cold War; from nineteenth-century speculation on the Etruscans to the role of epitaphs in the work of the great polymath Pirro Ligorio and the edition of previously

unpublished lecture notes of E. R. Dodds; from the establishment of the main bibliographical tool in the discipline to a Continental reflection on Roman studies in Britain. It includes a paper on the life and career of Grace H. Macurdy and her contribution to the teaching of Classics at Vassar College, and her ties with scholars such as Lily Ross Taylor and Elizabeth H. Haight. Other pieces concentrate on specific textual issues, such as the readings of Catiline’s letter in Sallust’s *Bellum Catilinae*, or the intellectual and political background of the once influential, and now largely overlooked, works of John C. Stobart.

We hope to retain a comparable range of themes and material in the coming issues, and indeed aspire to be able to widen it further and fully do justice to the scope, diversity, and complexity of classical scholarship and its history.

Lorenzo Calvelli  
*Università Ca’ Foscari Venezia*  
lorenzoc@unive.it

Federico Santangelo  
*Newcastle University*  
federico.santangelo@newcastle.ac.uk
CONRAD PEUTINGER, READER OF INSCRIPTIONS:
A NOTE ON THE REDISCOVERY OF HIS COPY OF THE
 EPIGRAMMATA ANTIQUAE URBIS (ROME, 1521) *

— GERARD GONZÁLEZ GERMAIN —

ABSTRACT
In this paper Conrad Peutinger’s copy of the Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis
(Rome, Jacobus Mazochius, 1521) — which appeared listed in his 1523 library
catalog, but was hitherto unknown — is identified as one of the two copies kept
at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Peutinger’s marginal
annotations in the volume are described and analyzed, and the book is
contextualized within the antiquarian literature contained in his library. This
case-study sheds new light on one aspect of Peutinger’s antiquarianism, which
has so far received little attention: his role as receptor, reader and annotator
of antiquarian printed books.

KEYWORDS
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1. Conrad Peutinger and the Study of Classical Antiquity

Conrad Peutinger (1465–1547) was one of the most distinguished
scholars of German humanism, especially in the rediscovery of
classical antiquity.1 While today his name is immediately asso-
ciated with the Tabula Peutingeriana (which he neither discovered nor
published),2 during his lifetime he was acclaimed chiefly as the greatest

* The research leading to these results has received funding from the Spanish
Government (FFI2016-77723-P: “The European Influence of the Epigrammata
Antiquae Urbis (Rome 1521) on the Birth of Antiquarian Studies. Study and Edition
of the marginalia by 16th-Century Humanists”). I also benefited from a Fellowship at the
Herzog August Library in Wolfenbüttel in July–August 2018. I would like to thank
Dennis Sears from the Rare Book & Manuscript Library of the University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign for his aid and assistance. Inscriptions are identified by the
relevant Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum [hereafter, CIL] entry.

1 See recently Franz Josef Worstbrock, “Peutinger (Bei-, Peitinger), Konrad”, in id.

2 Conrad Celtis (1459–1508) discovered the Tabula Peutingeriana, and gave it to
Peutinger sometime before his death. Although Peutinger made some efforts towards
publication, he was not successful and the map remained hidden in his library until it
Gerard González Germain

antiquarian north of the Alps. He gathered an impressive collection of inscriptions, coins and other antiquities in his house in Augsburg; divulged his collection of inscriptions in what became one of the earliest printed epigraphic corpora (*Romanae vetustatis fragmenta in Augusta Vindelicorum et eius dioecesi*, Augsburg 1505; new expanded edition in *Inscriptiones vetustae Romanae et earum fragmenta in Augusta Vindelicorum et eius dioecesi*, Mainz 1520);\(^3\) wrote several antiquarian treatises (such as the *Sermones convivales de mirandis Germaniae antiquitatis* [Strasbourg 1506]\(^4\) and the unfinished *Kaiserbuch*);\(^5\) and


Conrad Peutinger, Reader of Inscriptions

became a close advisor to emperor Maximilian I.\(^6\) Thanks to his network of humanist friends and acquaintances, he became the recipient of extensive epigraphic and antiquarian documentation, both in manuscript and in print, which swelled the ranks of his magnificent library.\(^7\)

Undoubtedly, the most studied aspect of Peutinger’s antiquarianism is his 1505 edition of inscriptions from Augsburg. One facet that has received less attention, and which will be the object of this paper, is the role of Peutinger as receptor, reader and annotator of antiquarian printed books, taking his copy of the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* (ed. Giacomo Mazzocchi, Rome 1521) as a case-study.\(^8\) The location of this copy was


hitherto unknown, but I have been able to identify it as one of the two copies kept at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

2. Peutinger’s Library and the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis*

Conrad Peutinger built one of the largest private libraries in northern Europe, containing more than 6,000 titles. His determination in collecting books was matched by his efforts in developing a cataloging system. By 1515, when he drew up his first catalog, he had divided the legal section from the rest of the library (each stored in a separate room) and he had sorted both parts by book size (A for great-folios, B for folios, C for quartos) and type of binding (A for wooden-board binding, AA for vellum binding, AAA for leather binding, and so on), with a consecutive numeration for each combination; he often inscribed this shelf-mark either on the volume’s spine or on one of its edges. Since this system did not allow for an easy location of a particular book, he accompanied the catalog with subject and alphabetical indexes.


remained intact within the Peutinger family until 1718, when their last male descendant bequeathed the library to the Augsburg Jesuit College of Saint Salvator, at which point the collection was finally dispersed.10

Peutinger’s catalogs have been studied and edited in 2003–2005 by Hans-Jörg Künast and Helmut Zäh, who have identified many of his copies that passed from the Jesuits of Augsburg to other Bavarian libraries, mainly the Staats- und Stadtbibliothek Augsburg, as well as the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich, the Bibliothek des Priesterseminars St. Hieronymus in Augsburg or the Studienbibliothek in Dillingen. Other copies have turned up outside Bavaria, e.g. in Stuttgart or in Oxford.11 The most recent discoveries of books formerly owned by Peutinger come from the United States, notably the Beinecke Library and the New-York Historical Society Library.12 These identifications are greatly relevant due to Peutinger’s habit of adding annotations on the volumes, which range from marginal notabilia to proper commentaries and additions that address the books’ content. It is to be hoped that other unidentified copies from Peutinger’s library may still resurface, especially outside Germany, and particularly in the US.

This is precisely the case for Peutinger’s copy of the Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis. The book appears on his second catalog of 1523, under the shelf-mark B25 (i.e., no. 25 of the wood-bound books in folio format) and the title “Liber antiquitatum per Iacobum Mazockium impressarum”.13 From the low number of its shelf-mark, it is possible to infer that the book was already in his possession by 1523 — only two years after the book’s publication. After that, all traces of this book disappear: it is absent from the 1597 inventory, and it was not mentioned by Andrea Felix von Oefele (1706–1780), who still saw and described a good portion of Peutinger’s library in 1743.14 Similarly, Künast and Zäh could not locate the copy in their edition of Peutinger’s catalog.

10 On the history of Peutinger’s library and its catalogs, see Künast and Zäh, Die Bibliothek (see n. 7), vol. 1, pp. 12–43.
11 Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 231–232 no. 149.4 and p. 386 no. 460.2.
12 Künast, “Two Volumes” (see n. 9); Anthony Grafton, “Reading History: Conrad Peutinger and the Chronicle of Nauclerus”, in Laube and Zäh, Gesammeltes Gedächtnis (see n. 3), pp. 19–25.
13 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4021 c, f. 94r (olim 42r); on the page side, the entry is abridged as “Inscriptiones vetustae”; see Künast and Zäh, Die Bibliothek (see n. 7), vol. 1, p. 337 no. 348 [B 25]. Likewise, in the alphabetical index the book is registered as “Inscriptiones vetustae B25 infra 42 per Iacobum Mazockium” (ibid., f. 29r). This altered name is of course reminiscent of Peutinger’s own Inscriptiones vetustae Romanae et earum fragmenta in Augusta Vindelicorum et eius dioecesi, published a year before the Epigrammata.
14 See Künast and Zäh, Die Bibliothek (see n. 7), vol. 1, pp. 21 and 41–42.
The copy located at the University of Illinois bears Peutinger’s unmistakable handwriting in the margins of the volume [see Figs. 2–7].\textsuperscript{15} Unlike most of Peutinger’s books, this copy lacks his autograph ex-libris as well as the ex-libris of the Jesuits of Augsburg. And yet there can be no doubt that this was Peutinger’s personal copy, since it bears the number “25” — corresponding to its shelf-mark — written by Peutinger himself on the fore edge of the book [Fig. 1]. Its 16th-century German wooden boards may well date to Peutinger’s time.

![Fig. 1. Peutinger’s copy of the Epigrammata (see n. 15), fore edge](image)

Like a few other copies of the *Epigrammata*, this book was bound with the frontispiece incorrectly inserted between Valerius Probus’s *De notis antiquarum litterarum* and Leo X’s privilege for the publication of the *Epigrammata*. With no ex-libris or bookplate (other than that of the Library of the University of Illinois on the front pastedown), the only information about the book’s provenance comes from two modern annotations on pencil. On the gutter of the opening page of the volume (headed by Mazzocchi’s address *ad lectorem*), an annotation reads “Baldwin 6 Apr 42 Norman”; and on the bended top right corner of the front flyleaf, a similar note reads “Norman 21 May 42”. It thus appears that the library acquired the book in 1942 using a fund named after Thomas W. Baldwin (who also left an important collection of books to the University of Illinois), probably from a bookseller called Norman. Nothing else is known about the history of the volume.

\textsuperscript{15} Urbana, IL, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, IUQ01658. The copy is available online at https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiuc.5540934, last accessed 13 September 2019.
3. Peutinger’s reading of the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis*

The *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* was one of the most influential antiquarian publications of the Renaissance.\(^{16}\) Although a few epigraphic sylloges had already appeared in press by 1521, none surpassed 20 folios, whereas in the *Epigrammata* the inscriptions spanned 180 sheets. It was also the earliest printed collection of inscriptions of Rome, and the only Cinquecento publication to focus solely on the city’s epigraphy. The *Epigrammata* became, due to their exhaustivity, organization of the material, and expression of non-textual elements on the printed page, a sort of vade mecum for any humanist interested in Roman antiquities, as well as a model for later collections of inscriptions. The book’s success, however, may not have been immediate; we know of numerous readers and annotators from the middle of the century, but only a handful from the 1520s — Conrad Peutinger being of course one of them.\(^{17}\)

Peutinger’s annotations on his copy of the *Epigrammata* provide a good insight into his reading of the book. His *notabilia*, written all in a homogeneous brown ink, appear on every single page from f. 1r until the end of f. 48r, stop abruptly at that point and do not return again. These *notabilia* consist of proper and (more rarely) common names, which are written in nominative, often with the omission of the ending *-us* for the second declension. Emperors are consistently identified, with the addition of *Caes(ar)* after the name [e.g. Fig. 2]; on the few occasions where consuls are mentioned, their names are highlighted as well, with the addition of the word *coss.* (i.e. *consules*) [Fig. 3]. Proper names of private individuals, ethnic groups and cities are also regularly recorded [Figs. 4–5]. Finally, a few common names that are considered remarkable are singled out, as is the case of the chariot-related vocabulary in the funerary inscription of a charioteer (*CIL* VI 10048, f. 16v) [Fig. 3].

---

\(^{16}\) See above n. 8.

\(^{17}\) The best-known reader of this period is Antonio Lelio (who signs as *Antonius Laelius Podager*); see Bianca, “Giacomo Mazzocchi” (see n. 8). Only two (or possibly three) other Transalpine readers from the 1520s are known so far; see Gerard González Germain, “The *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* Travels North: Early Modern Owners and Annotators Beyond the Alps”, in Carbonell and González Germain, *The Epigrammata* (see n. 8), pp. 87–100 (87–89).
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Fig. 2. Peutinger's copy of the Epigrammata (see n. 15), f. 1v
Fig. 3. Peutinger’s copy of the *Epigrammata* (see n. 15), f. 16v
Besides writing these *notabilia* in the margins, Peutinger evinced his interest in particular passages of the inscriptions by drawing a manicule on three different occasions [Figs. 4–6]. In two of these cases, his attention was caught by the fact that the text of the inscriptions seemed to mention his native city, Augsburg (*Augusta Vindelicorum*) — although only one of them actually referred to it (under the form “Aug. Vindelicum”, *CIL* VI 3353, f. 29r) [Fig. 4], whereas the other abbreviated formula (“aug. vind.”, *CIL* II 370*, f. 18r) did not [Fig. 5].

The third manicule (*CIL* VI 59d*, f. 16r) [Fig. 6] is found within the so-called Donation of Tertullus, a 12th-century forgery by Peter the Deacon, who tried to attest the donation of numerous possessions in Sicily by the patrician Tertullus, father of St. Placidus, to St. Benedict. The sentence underscored states Tertullus’s duty to worship God after the many benefits he has received from Him; and could have been singled out by Peutinger for its Christian message in an essentially pagan book.

Finally, only once does Peutinger correct the text of an inscription, namely to add the missing *praenomen* of the emperor Titus, *T.* (*CIL* VI 1258, f. 1v) [Fig. 2]. The emendation may plausibly be seen to come from the list of *corrigenda* appended at the end of the book (f. aa1r), which Peutinger annotated — in order to facilitate its consultation — for the first 28 folios of the book. Although the ink used in the correction is almost identical to that in the *notabilia*, it appears this correction was made later, since Peutinger identified the emperor as Vespasian and not as Titus.

---

18 This inscription is in fact an intricate spurious will, in which the sentence “Hermeti lib. aug. vind. ma. aur. ex. [sic, instead of CX] d. da. sunt.” should probably be understood as “Hermeti lib(ero) aug(urali) vind(icta) ma(numisso) aur(ei) CX d(ono) da(ta) sunt(o)”; this is at least the interpretation provided by Georg Fabricius in his *Antiquitatis aliquot monumenta insignia ex aere, marmoribus membranisque veteribus*, Strasbourg, Blasius Fabricius, 1549, f. E1r.


20 “Ergo quia tantorum bonorum auctorem Deum nobis hec omnia concedentem, adorare, colere, venerari, nec non eius basilicas possessionibus dotare debemus”. Mazzocchi’s text reads “honorum” instead of “bonorum”.
Fig. 4. Peutinger’s copy of the Epigrammata (see n. 15), f. 29r
Fig. 5. Peutinger’s copy of the *Epigrammata* (see n. 15), f. 18r
There is a single annotation by Peutinger that clearly does not belong to the same layer as the rest of marginalia, both for its distinctive features and for the use of a different, bright reddish ink. This is indeed the only extensive annotation, and it appears not on the side, but on the top margin of the page, which contains the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* (*CIL*...
VI 930, f. 14v) [Fig. 7], the famous bronze tablet that records the grant of imperial powers to Vespasian. Interestingly, Peutinger does not mention the inscription directly, but relates it to a passage from Suetonius’s *Life of Vespasian*:

C(aius) Suetonius Tranquillus in *Vespasiano* ait: ‘Instrumentorum imperii pulcherrimum ac vetustissimum confecit, quo continebantur pene ab exordio urbis senatusconsulta, plebiscita de societate, de foedere ac privilegio cuicumque concessis’ [Suet. Vesp. 8, 5].
Suetonius here alludes to the fire on the Capitol in 69 CE, which destroyed the public archives, and Vespasian’s efforts to re-inscribe the decrees of the senate and the plebiscites by seeking copies of the lost originals. Suetonius was obviously referring to past decrees and not to the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* itself, but the passage indeed provides valuable information on the Romans’ epigraphic habit of inscribing laws on bronze tablets, and on their concern for preserving them.

The evidence gathered here allows us to conclude that Peutinger did not really use the *Epigrammata* as a source of historical and philological information, but contented himself with reading it in much the same way as he would have read a literary book: he started at the beginning and read each and every inscription, writing *notabilia* as he did so, and taking delight in the presence of his city in the inscriptions. He went over more than a quarter of the book this way, at which point he put it down, apparently without ever taking it up again. Only once, probably at a different moment, he wrote down the passage from Suetonius regarding the importance of inscribed legal texts.

4. Antiquarian and Epigraphic Literature in Peutinger’s Library

Peutinger’s copy of the *Epigrammata* can provide further evidence of his interest in inscriptions if it is framed in the context of the antiquarian section of his library. For such a task, we have relied on Künast and Zäh’s study (which includes a general survey of the presence of annotations in *Suetonius’* passage (*Vesp. 8, 5*) reads as follows: *instrumentum imperii pulcherrimum ac vetustissimum quo continebantur poene ab exordio urbis senatus consulta, plebi scita de societate et foedere ac privilegio cuicumque concessis*. Note the differences with the text cited by Peutinger, who follows exactly the text of his copy of Suetonius with Filippo Beroaldo’s commentary (Bologna, Benedetto Faelli, 1493, f. 289r), preserved at Dillingen, Studienbibliothek, XXIVa, 129; a different text appears in two other editions of Suetonius owned by Peutinger: Venice, Bernardino Rizzo, 1489, f. [i4v] (preserved at London, British Library, IB. 22631), and Basel, Johann Froben, 1518, p. 152 (preserved at Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 2º L.R. 163). The three volumes contain multiple annotations by Peutinger, but not on the passage in question. See Künast and Zäh, *Die Bibliothek* (see n. 7), vol. 1, p. 343 no. 371 [B 47]; pp. 347–348 no. 380 [B 55], and pp. 690–691 no. 716.

21 Robert A. Kaster’s edition (*Oxford Classical Texts*, 2016) of Suetonius’ passage (*Vesp. 8, 5*) reads as follows: *instrumentum imperii pulcherrimum ac vetustissimum quo continebantur poene ab exordio urbis senatus consulta, plebi scita de societate et foedere ac privilegio cuicumque concessis*. Note the differences with the text cited by Peutinger, who follows exactly the text of his copy of Suetonius with Filippo Beroaldo’s commentary (Bologna, Benedetto Faelli, 1493, f. 289r), preserved at Dillingen, Studienbibliothek, XXIVa, 129; a different text appears in two other editions of Suetonius owned by Peutinger: Venice, Bernardino Rizzo, 1489, f. [i4v] (preserved at London, British Library, IB. 22631), and Basel, Johann Froben, 1518, p. 152 (preserved at Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 2º L.R. 163). The three volumes contain multiple annotations by Peutinger, but not on the passage in question. See Künast and Zäh, *Die Bibliothek* (see n. 7), vol. 1, p. 343 no. 371 [B 47]; pp. 347–348 no. 380 [B 55], and pp. 690–691 no. 716.

the preserved copies), supplemented with our own analysis of the 1597 inventory for the books published after 1523.\(^{23}\)

Peutinger’s collection of antiquarian printed books is impressive. It contained the first edition of the list of epigraphic abbreviations that circulated under Valerius Probus’s name,\(^{24}\) which was published in Brescia in 1486;\(^{25}\) and still two later editions of the same text, which included other epigraphic material: Giovanni Bonardi’s Venetian edition of 1499 (reprinted in 1502 and again in Rome in 1509),\(^{26}\) and that of Dietrich Gresemund (Oppenheim 1510), which also contained three short antiquarian treatises by Pomponio Leto.\(^{27}\) This work became an essential tool for anyone attempting to read and understand Roman epigraphic texts.

The earliest collection of inscriptions to ever appear in print was Desiderio Spreti’s epigraphic appendix to his *De amplitudine, de vastatione et de instauratione urbis Ravennae*, published posthumously in Venice in 1489: of this book Peutinger owned not one, but two copies.\(^{28}\) He owned other historical, geographical and philological works that made

---

\(^{23}\) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4021 d, ff. 20r–58v.


\(^{25}\) Marcus Valerius Probus, *De interpretandis Romanorum litteris*, [Brescia], Bonino de’ Bonini, 1486. Currently preserved at Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 4º Ink 142. See Künast and Zäh, *Die Bibliothek* (see n. 7), vol. 1, pp. 92–93 no. 12.6 [C 12].

\(^{26}\) Marcus Valerius Probus, *De interpretandis Romanorum litteris*, Venice, Giovanni Tacuino, 1499; with reprints in Venice, Giovanni Tacuino, 1502; and Rome, Giacomo Mazzocchi, 1509. See Künast and Zäh, *Die Bibliothek* (see n. 7), vol. 1, pp. 89–90 no. 9.3 [C 9].


\(^{28}\) Desiderius Spretus, *De amplitudine, de vastatione et de instauratione urbis Ravennae*, Venice, Matteo Codecà, 1489. See Künast and Zäh, *Die Bibliothek* (see n. 7), vol. 1, p. 127 no. 42.3 [C 42] and pp. 242–243 no. 169.1 [C 167].
ample use of epigraphic sources, such as Ermolao Barbaro’s *Castigationes* (Rome 1492–93),29 Pomponio Leto’s *Romanae historiae compendium* (Venice 1499),30 Flavio Biondo’s *Roma instaurata* and *Italia illustrata* (Venice 1503),31 or Raffaele Maffei’s *Commentarii urbani* (Rome 1506).32

Peutinger owned practically all the topographic and archaeological treatises on ancient Rome published in the first two decades of the 16th century. These included the Pseudo-Publius Victor’s *De regionibus urbis Romae* (a version of the *Curiosum urbis Romae regionum XIV* interpolated by Pomponio Leto);33 Leto’s *De Romanae urbis vetustate* (a text that had circulated in manuscript form under the title *Excerpta a Pomponio dum inter ambulandum cuidam domino ultramontano reliquias ac ruinas Urbi ostenderet*, followed again by his *De regionibus*);34 Mazzocchi’s edition of the *Menologium rusticum Vallense* (Rome

---


1509), Francesco Albertini’s *Opusculum de mirabilibus novae et veteris urbis Romae* (Rome 1510), and Andrea Fulvio’s *Antiquaria urbis* (Rome 1513). Given the time spent coordinating with Hans Burgkmair for the creation of a series of woodcut portraits of the Roman emperors to accompany his *Kaiserbuch*, it is hardly surprising to discover that he owned a copy of Andrea Fulvio’s *Illustrium imagines* (Rome 1517), more intriguing is the fact that this title is missing from his autograph catalog, and appears only in the 1597 inventory, which opens up the possibility that it was acquired after 1523.

The inventory of 1597 also lists a copy of the epigraphic collections regarding the cities of Mainz and Augsburg published by Johann Schöffer in 1520: Johann Huttich’s *Collectanea antiquitatum* and Peutinger’s *Inscriptiones vetustae*, respectively. The next antiquarian treatise that we encounter after the publication of the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* is Fabio Calvo’s *Antiquae urbis Romae cum regionibus simulachrum*

---

35 [Calendarium Romanum], Rome, Giacomo Mazzocchi, 1509. Currently preserved at Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 4º Gs 36. See Künast and Zäh, *Die Bibliothek* (see n. 7), vol. 1, p. 268 no. 211.2 [CC 24].

36 Franciscus Albertinus, *Opusculum de mirabilibus novae et veteris urbis Romae*, Rome, Giacomo Mazzocchi, 1510. Currently preserved at Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 4º Gs 36. See Künast and Zäh, *Die Bibliothek* (see n. 7), vol. 1, p. 268 no. 211.1 [CC 24].

37 Andreas Fulvius, *Antiquaria urbis*, Rome, Giacomo Mazzocchi, 1513. Currently preserved at Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 4º Gs 36. See Künast and Zäh, *Die Bibliothek* (see n. 7), vol. 1, p. 268 no. 211.3 [CC 24].


39 [Andreas Fulvius], *Illustrium imagines*, Rome, Giacomo Mazzocchi, 1517. The copy now at Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, Bio 3762, bears on its front pastedown the modern indication “prov.: Konrad Peutinger”; it is not annotated and has no ex-libris apart from the stamp of the former Königliche Kreis- und Stadtbibliothek Augsburg on its frontispiece; the book is bound together with another title of a similar topic, but which does not appear in any of Peutinger’s inventories, namely Johannes Huttich, *Imperatorum Romanorum libellus una cum imaginibus ad vivam effigiem expressus*, Strasbourg, Wolfgang Köpfel, 1525.

40 See Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4021 d, f. 55r, where it is entered three times, under no. 19 ("Illustrium imagines"), no. 23 ("Imagines illustrium"), and no. 38 ("Illustrium imagines").

41 Johannes Huttich, *Collectanea antiquitatum in urbe atque agro Moguntino repertorum*, Mainz, Johann Schöffer, Mainz 1520. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4021 d, f. 34r no. 27.

42 Chonradus Peutinger, *Inscriptiones vetustae Romanae et earum fragmenta in Augusta Vindelicorum et eius dioecesi*, Mainz, Johann Schöffer, Mainz 1520. See Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4021 d, f. 34v no. 41.
Conrad Peutinger, Reader of Inscriptions

Peutinger also owned the two most remarkable antiquarian books that appeared in the following decade: Petrus Apianus and Bartholomaeus Amantius’s *Inscriptiones sacrosanctae vetustatis* (Ingolstadt 1534) and Bartolomeo Marliani’s *Antiquae Romae topographia* (Rome 1534). After that, the only book worth mentioning is the posthumous edition of Iohannes Cuspinianus’s *De Caesaribus atque Imperatoribus Romanis* (Strasbourg 1540), which contained a portrait of each emperor and included a few inscriptions.

The overall impression is that the antiquarian section of the library is truly exhaustive until the 1520s, when we find the first noticeable omissions, such as Mazzocchi’s compendium *De Roma prisca et nova varii auctores* (Rome 1523), and, especially, Andrea Fulvio’s *Antiquitates Urbis* (Rome 1527). Furthermore, judging from Peutinger’s located copies, earlier editions appear to have been annotated more intensely: Peutinger copied an inscription from Augsburg in the first edition of Probus’s list of abbreviations, Barbaro’s *Castigationes* are thoroughly annotated and were used as a source for getting inscriptions, and his now-lost copy of Leto’s *Compendium* contained numerous epigraphic

---


44 Petrus Apianus and Bartholomaeus Amantius, *Inscriptiones sacrosanctae vetustatis, non illae quidem romanae, sed totius fere orbis*, Ingolstadt, Peter Apian, 1534. See Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4021 d, f. 38r no. 67 (according to the inventory, it was bound together with Joachim Vadianus, *Epitome trium terrae partium, Asiae, Africae et Europae compendiariam locorum descriptionem continens*, Zurich, Christoph Froschauer, 1534).

45 Bartholomeus Marliani, *Antiquae Romae topographia libri septem*, Rome, Antonio Blado, 1534. See Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4021 d, f. 51v no. 76 (the title on the inventory coincides with that of the Roman edition, and not the Lyon edition of the same year).

46 Iohannes Cuspinianus, *De Caesaribus atque Imperatoribus Romanis*, [Strasbourg], [Kraft Müller], 1540. See Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4021 d, f. 34r no. 23.

47 For an example of an inscription from Tarragona, featuring in the earliest phase of Peutinger’s *Kaiserbuch* and coming specifically from Barbaro’s *Castigationes*, see González Germain, “Una aproximación” (see n. 7), p. 131.
and numismatic texts added in the margins. On the other hand, Albertini’s *Opusculum* and Mazzocchi’s *Epigrammata* contain mostly *notabilia*, and Fulvio’s *Antiquaria urbis* has no annotations.

5. Peutinger’s Interest in Inscriptions: The Evidence of His Library

The rapid survey presented here allows us to put forward some points on Peutinger as a reader of inscriptions, which a future analysis of his marginalia within all his extant antiquarian books (both in manuscript and in print) might confirm and develop. First of all, it is fairly safe to assume that his interest in inscriptions (and antiquities in general) began early on — probably during his student years in Italy (1482–1488) and his encounter with Pomponio Leto, as is often assumed — and continued throughout his entire life, as his later book acquisitions show.

On the other hand, we can identify at least two consecutive phases in the way he read antiquarian and epigraphic treatises: in the first one, he took a very active role, exhaustively collecting antiquarian books (sometimes even acquiring various editions of the same text) and profusely annotating them. In the second phase, he continued to acquire antiquarian literature, but now rather as a curious reader, mostly limiting himself to writing notabilia and not hesitating to drop a book after a while. His copy of the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* is exemplary of this second phase: he read it line by line, stopped after a quarter of the book, and only one annotation goes beyond the simple *notabilia*.

It is not by chance that Peutinger’s more active role as an antiquarian reader — which can be dated approximately to the final years of the fifteenth century and the first decade of the sixteenth century — corresponds with the preparation of his own antiquarian works. The *Kaiserbuch* was begun not much after 1500, and its last phase is dated around 1514–1516. His two more properly antiquarian works — i.e. the *Romanae vetustatis fragmenta* and the *Sermones convivales* — were published in 1505 and 1506 respectively. And, finally, two letters written in 1510–1511 included inscriptions as a source for the names of the Roman emperors: one was addressed to Dietrich Reysacher, and the other was

---

48 According to Andrea Felix von Oeefele’s description; see Künast and Zäh, *Die Bibliothek* (see n. 7), vol. 1, p. 140.
49 See e.g. West, “Conrad Peutinger” (see n. 38), p. 64.
50 See Posselt, “Das Kaiserbuch” (see n. 5).
51 This letter (signed in Augsburg on November 14, 1510) is preserved in two copies: Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Hist. 2º 248, ff. 12r–23v; and Munich,
Conrad Peutinger prepared together with his wife Margarete Welser and addressed to her brother Christoph Welser.\(^{52}\)

Just as Peutinger’s more active involvement as a reader of inscriptions coincides with the full duration of his unfinished *Kaiserbuch* project, the inception of this book appears to be linked with Peutinger’s reading of one particular work: Pomponio Leto’s *Romanae historiae compendium*. There, his former teacher shed light on the history and onomastics of late antique emperors, using the evidence provided by inscriptions and coins to that end — much in the same way as Peutinger did a few years afterwards; Peutinger explicitly mentioned Leto’s treatise in his letter to Christoph Welser,\(^{53}\) and his own annotated copy of the *Compendium* may have served as the very first layer of the *Kaiserbuch*\(^{54}\).

Peutinger’s special interest in the emperors’ onomastics continued years after he had abandoned his *Kaiserbuch* project: the most recent antiquarian book in his library appears to be Cuspinianus’s *De Caesariibus*. And, as we have seen, in his copy of the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* Peutinger persisted in highlighting the names of Roman emperors, just as we find in his earlier manuscript epigraphic collections.\(^{55}\) In fact, Mazzocchi’s assemblage of the monumental inscriptions at the beginning of the *Epigrammata* may well have been one of, if not the main, reason why Peutinger lost interest in the book, once the emperors stopped featuring in the inscriptions.

Gerard González Germain  
*Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*  
gerardgggermain@gmail.com

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4029, ff. 231v–243v. There is only one partial edition that does not include the epigraphic part: see Erich König, *Konrad Peutingers Briefwechsel*, Munich 1923, pp. 125–126 no. 77.


\(^{53}\) Zäh, “Konrad Peutinger” (see n. 52), pp. 457–458.

\(^{54}\) See above n. 48.

\(^{55}\) See e.g. González Germain, “Una aproximación” (see n. 7), p. 134.
L’ÉPITAPHE COMME « EXEMPLUM VIRTUTIS »
DANS LES MACROBIES DES « ANTICHI EROI ET HUOMINI ILLUSTRI » DE PIRRO LIGORIO (1512 C.–1583)
— GINETTE VAGENHEIM —

ABSTRACT
Dans son traité sur les hommes illustres de l’Antiquité, Pirro Ligorio consacre le troisième livre aux personnes ayant vécu longtemps (macrobies) ; commençant par les peuples légendaires, comme les Éthiopiens, l’antiquaire poursuit son enquête en explorant la vie de personnages mythiques et de héros du passé cités chez des auteurs tels qu’Hérodote, Plutarque, Valère Maxime et Pline l’Ancien, mais aussi celle de personnages contemporains et de nombreuses femmes. Après avoir exposé les raisons de son intérêt pour ces macrobies, Ligorio offre à certaines de ces figures une sorte de « nouvelle vie » à travers un procédé très personnel que je décris dans cet article.

In his treatise on illustrious men from Antiquity, Pirro Ligorio devotes the third volume to the people who lived a long life (macrobii). After an opening section devoted to legendary populations, like the Ethiopians, Ligorio continues his account with mythical and heroic figures quoted in classical authors like Herodotus, Valerius Maximus, Pliny the Elder, and Plutarch, as well as contemporary characters and a number of women. After setting out the reasons for his interest in these figures, Ligorio offers them a new lease of life through a very distinctive process, which is analysed in this article.
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Acciò che per lo mezzo d’essi [epitaphi] trapassano li buoni esempi nella posterità come vivi tra viventi.

Le thème des personnages illustres de l’Antiquité est l’un des fils conducteurs de l’encyclopédie du monde antique de Pirro Ligorio (1512 c.–1583) intitulée « Le Antichità romane », que ce soit à travers l’étude des monnaies1, celle des tombes monumentales des

grandes familles romaines\textsuperscript{2} ou de leurs inscriptions\textsuperscript{3} ; cependant, c’est dans ses trois livres consacrés spécifiquement aux hommes illustres que Ligorio recueille, pour la première fois, l’ensemble des notices littéraires et archéologiques à leur sujet. Le premier des trois livres, intitulé « Libro XLIII […] dell’effigie d’alcuni antichi heroi et huomini illustri », a été abondamment étudié\textsuperscript{4} ; les deux autres étaient inconnus jusqu’à leur publication au sein de la collection de l’*Edizione nazionale delle opere di Pirro Ligorio*\textsuperscript{5} ; dans cet article, j’examinerai le « Libro XLV […] nel quale si contiene di quelli che hanno vissuto lungo tempo », c’est-à-dire le livre consacré aux personnages remarquables en raison de leur longévité ; il s’agit d’un thème que Ligorio avait déjà abordé, selon son habitude, lors de la première rédaction de ses « Antichità romane », sous le titre « uomini e donne di lunga vita », comme on le verra plus loin\textsuperscript{6} ; on trouve dans le Libro XLV des figures telles que Platon ou encore Hippocrate, déjà évoqués dans le livre précédent en raison de leur célébrité, mais également de nouveaux personnages comme Tite-Live ; cependant, l’aspect le plus original de ce livre est son statut inattendu de « recueils d’inscriptions » que Ligorio évoque dans la préface, comme nous le verrons, après ce bref rappel des étapes principales de sa vie ainsi que du contenu du « Libro XLIII […] dell’effigie d’alcuni antichi heroi et huomini illustri ».

1. **Biographie**

Ligorio est sans aucun doute l’une des figures les plus fascinantes de la Renaissance, notamment par la place qu’il a cherché à occuper, tant bien que mal, entre le monde des érudits et celui des antiquaires et par l’œuvre immense qu’il nous a léguée dans tous les domaines de l’antiquité\textsuperscript{7}. Arrivé


\textsuperscript{6} Le texte est publié par Silvia Orlandi (2008) p. 3–12.

Ginette Vagenheim

...de Naples vers 1545 comme peintre (« pittore napolitano »), il abandonne rapidement ce métier pour se consacrer aux investigations des antiquités romaines qu’il recueille dans une œuvre en plusieurs volumes, restée longtemps manuscrite, et intitulée « Le Antichità romane ». Celle-ci forme une encyclopédie monumentale du monde antique illustrée de dessins, composée de vingt-cinq livres sur les monnaies grecques et romaines, cinq livres sur les inscriptions, trois livres, cités plus haut, sur les vies d’hommes illustres, et de dessins de statuettes, gemmes, sarcophages, monuments funéraires, arcs, plans de temples et d’autres monuments antiques présents à Rome et dans le reste de l’Italie. À la même date, Ligorio entre au service du cardinal Hippolyte II d’Este, alors gouverneur de Tivoli, pour une durée de six ans ; il commence les fouilles à la Villa d’Hadrien ainsi que la construction de la Villa d’Este ; à cette époque, il s’occupe aussi de la décoration d’autres villas romaines dont il orne les jardins de statues antiques et d’autres monuments découverts au cours de ses fouilles. En 1549, Ligorio entre au Vatican et publie certains de ses travaux, notamment ses cartes topographiques de la Rome antique, un traité sur les théâtres et les cirques, une reconstitution des thermes de Dioclétien et Maximien, celle de la volière de Varron (« Aviarium Varronis ») et ses illustrations des fables d’Ésope. En 1555, l’antiquaire entre au service du pape Paul IV comme architecte au Vatican. Il y fait de nombreux travaux, parmi lesquels la nouvelle cour du Belvédère et la réalisation du magnifique « Casino » de Pie IV, commencé sous le pontificat précédent. Cependant, sa fonction la plus importante est celle d’architecte de Saint-Pierre, qu’il occupe en 1564 à la mort de Michel-Ange. On lui doit aussi le projet de la tombe de Paul IV conservée à Santa


L’épitaphe comme « exemplum virtutis »

Maria sopra Minerva. En 1567, sous Pie V, Ligorio tombe en disgrâce et quitte Rome deux ans plus tard pour la cour de Ferrare, après avoir vendu au cardinal Alexandre Farnèse, sous la pression d’érudits comme Fulvio Orsini et Onofrio Panvinio, les dix volumes de ses Antiquités romaines conservés aujourd’hui à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Naples ; ces derniers exploiteront abondamment les livres de Ligorio, notamment ses dessins : grand nombre de planches publiées en 1600 dans les deux livres De ludis circensibus, sous le nom d’Onofrio Panvinio, furent réalisées à partir de dessins de monnaies conservés dans les Antichità romane de Ligorio et de planches aujourd’hui perdues12. Avant de rejoindre sa dernière retraite, l’antiquaire fit une halte à Tivoli, où il acheva ses travaux à la Villa d’Hadrien et à la Villa d’Este. À Ferrare, Ligorio se mit au service du neveu du cardinal d’Este, le duc Alphonse II, dont il organisa la bibliothèque et les collections d’antiquités (« La libraria ed antichario ») ; comme architecte, il participa notamment à la reconstruction du château d’Este après le tremblement de terre de 1570 dont il nous a transmis un récit complet13. Il mit aussi ses talents d’architecte au service des Gonzague dans la ville voisine de Mantoue. À la cour d’Este, il participa aussi à la scénographie des fameux tournois de Ferrare (« cavallerie ferraresi ») et rédigea une nouvelle version en trente volumes de ses Antichità romane, dont une partie sous forme d’un dictionnaire alphabétique, conservés aujourd’hui aux Archives d’État de Turin.

Même si Ligorio est le seul rédacteur des Antichità romane, certaines parties furent composées en étroite collaboration avec les érudits les plus éminents de l’époque, qui formaient le « cercle » du Cardinal Alexandre


D’autres parties de l’œuvre ligorienne sont personnelles et méritaient d’être davantage étudiées, comme ses enquêtes sur les comètes, les tremblements de terre déjà citées, ou encore sur les aqueducs qui éclairent un épisode encore méconnu de la genèse des sciences techniques à la fin de la Renaissance. Quant aux rubriques de son dictionnaire, elles consistent le plus souvent en une compilation, parfois maladroite, des travaux d’érudits, comme j’ai pu le montrer pour son livre sur les navires anciens, entièrement fondé sur le traité De re nautica libellus de Gregorio Lilio Giraldi (1540) ; une telle méthode explique le


sens des paroles de l’érudit espagnol Antonio Agustín, qui déclarait à son interlocuteur des *Dialogues sur les médailles*, que son ami Ligorio avait réussi à rédiger plus de quarante livres sur les médailles et sur d’autres antiquités sans connaître le latin, et que pour ce faire, il avait exploité les ouvrages de ses contemporains, donnant ainsi à ses lecteurs l’impression d’avoir lu tous les auteurs grecs et latins. C’est pourtant une autre critique qui causa à Ligorio le plus grand tort, formulée, entre autres, par le même Agustín qui mettait en garde les membres du cercle Farnèse contre les falsifications épigraphiques de Ligorio. Malgré ces critiques, au-

---

20 Agustín Antonio (1744) *Diálogos de medallas inscripciones y otras antigüedades*, Madrid : en la oficina de Joseph Francisco Martínez Abad (traduction espagnole) p. 131–132 : « Pyrrho Ligori napolitano conocido myo gran antiquario y pintor, el qual sin saber latin ha escrito mas de quarenta libros de medallas y edificios y de otras cosas [...] quien lee sus libros pensara que han visto todos los libros latinos e griegos que hai escritos. Ayudanse del trabajo de otros, y con debuxar bien con el pinzel, hazen otro tanto con la pluma ». « Mon ami Pirro Ligorio, grand antiquaire et peintre, qui sans connaître le latin a écrit plus de quarante livres de médailles et d’édifices et d’autres choses [...], ceux qui lisent leurs ouvrages [sicl. des antiquaires] penseront qu’ils ont vu tous les livres latins et grecs qui ont été écrits. Ils utilisent le travail des autres et finissent par se servir de leur plume aussi bien que de leur pinceau ». Sur la concurrence entre les érudits et les antiquaires, voir Ferrary (1996) p. 38.

jord'hui plus nuancées, il est deux éléments qui firent toujours l'unanimité dans l'œuvre de Ligorio : sa plume talentueuse, louée par le même Agustín, et sa connaissance directe des antiquités, inlassablement scrutées et recopiées sur le terrain et qui lui permit, mieux que quiconque, de faire renaitre devant nos yeux l’image de la Rome antique.

2. « Libro XLIII [...] dell’effigie d’alcuni antichi heroi et huomini illustri »

Tout comme André Thévet, dans l’épître au lecteur des Vrais pourtraits des hommes illustres de 158422, Ligorio rappelle dans la préface de son « Libro XLIII » dédié aux hommes illustres de l’antiquité, la raison pour laquelle les Anciens gardaient chez eux les portraits de leurs ancêtres — motif rendu célèbre par les préfaces de Salluste :

Fu per antico costume, come per una cosa necessaria e virtuosa, tenere i retratti di suoi antecessori, sendo lor(o) fatti degni di qualche egregia opera, acciò che quella inclita virtù già non mai per alcun tempo si smenticasse, e come cosa che ricordassero in ogni luogo, l’alta virtù di quelli [...] [e] vedendo l’effigie rinovavano le virtù in quelli et le stampavano nell’ani d’essi viventi23.

Ligorio nous explique ensuite qu’il a trouvé ces portraits lors de ses pérégrinations incessantes et épuisantes dans les ruines de Rome et sur les terrains de fouilles et qu’il les a ensuite recueillis dans son livre. Son but est de préserver leur mémoire et leur identité, notamment pour les portraits qui furent transportés loin de Rome ou qui furent trafiqués dans le but de changer leur identité ; enfin, l’antiquaire souhaitait aussi protéger le fruit de son travail que certains n’avaient pas hésité à piller et à publier sous leur nom, comme on le verra plus loin :

Così dunque noi, avendo tali memorie ritrovate pellegrinando le reliquie antiche, non con poca fatica et contrasto di fortuna per forza l’havemo compilate con estrema fatica et di tante cose sperse et trasportate da questo e da quell’altro fuori di Roma et da esse alienate


23 Libro XLIII, f. 1r et p. 3 dans l’édition citée.
et parte, la ingordiggia d’alcuno havendole traffugate et ammascarate per appropriarle a loro disegni n’havemo fatta una diligente inquisizione; acciò che, coloro i quali emulando ogni mia opera sono corsi a stampare et porre le cose in altro modo che elleno non sono, si trovino secondo la loro invidia buggiardi [...] e questo havemo voluto dire sanamente [...] per havertire a coloro che non possano intendere il vero non albergando in Roma [...] et per quelli che non possono invenire nella verità, per lì quali semo sforzati a mostrarle nei luoghi loro, dove egliano hanno presa una effigie per un’altra et si dirà qual sia la vera et quale no24.

Avant de conclure sa préface, Ligorio récapitule les catégories des hommes illustres dont il sera question dans son livre et qui figurent déjà dans son titre :

Libro XLIII di Pyrrho Ligorio, patritio napolitano e cittadino romano, delle antichità nel quale si contiene dell’effigie d’alcuni antichi heroi et huomini illustri di philosophi, d’oratori, de poeti, di historici, de geographi et delli gran capitani et delli primi inventor dell’arti che giovano ai mortali »25.

Il y ajoute les médecins, qui sont pourtant déjà inclus dans la dernière des sept catégories varroniennes d’hommes illustres, celle des « primi inventor dell’arti che giovano ai mortali », ainsi que les dieux et les déesses, en réalité une seule déesse, Vénus (fig. 1)26, et une trentaine d’hommes et femmes illustres d’époque romaine27 : les poètes Cinna, Térence, Caecilius Statius, Horace, Asinius Pollion, Perse ; les consuls Valerius Poplicola, Minicius Cippus, Caius Claudius Néron, Caton le Censeur, les historiens Cornutus, les Dionisi ; les orateurs Cicéron, Aristide de Smyrne, les philosophes Oppien, Sénèque, les deux sophistes Favorinus, Polémon de Smyrne, Dias d’Éphèse, les sophistes Philostrates, Maior Maiorinus, le grammairien Mettius Epaphroditus, le médecin Diodotus, la mime Eucharis, l’augure Attus Navius et deux figures de la chrétienté, Saint Pierre et Grégoire de Naziance. On y trouve un contemporain de Ligorio, le poète de Modène, Francesco Maria Molza28.

24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid., f. 18.
27 Pour plus de détails, voir l’introduction de Venetucci Palma, Beatrice (2005) Pirro Ligorio... , p. XII.
28 Vagenheim, Ginette (2017) « Antiquari e letterati nell’Accademia degli Sdegnati : il sodalizio di Pirro Ligorio e Francesco Maria Molza » dans Intrecci virtuosi. Letterati,
et enfin un héros, Hercule (fig. 2)\textsuperscript{29}, auquel Ligorio consacre la notice la plus longue de tout le traité ; il s’agissait probablement de rendre hommage à Hercule d’Este, le grand-père du duc Alphonse, dédicataire du livre\textsuperscript{30}.

Dans son introduction du Libro XLIII, Beatrice Palma Venetucci commence par évoquer sa structure, plus aboutie que les deux livres suivants, qui sont des sortes d’appendices\textsuperscript{31} ; cependant même le Libro XLIV est inachevé, comme le révèlent de nombreux indices dont la pagination et la discordance entre l’index du livre et son contenu ; elle indique ensuite le mode de répartition, sur plus de 200 feuillets\textsuperscript{32}, des portraits d’hommes et femmes illustres dont Ligorio précise qu’ils se présentaient tantôt sous forme de statues entières (« facevano memoria o con imagini tutte intere », fig. 3)\textsuperscript{33} tantôt sous forme d’effigies montés sur un fût, en « hermès » (« quelle che solo le effigie aveano, et il resto tutto d’una pietra quadrata della umana altezza », fig. 1)\textsuperscript{34} ; dans de rares cas, on constate que le fût est acéphale ou présente une ébauche de portrait comme dans celui du roi Agésilas (fig. 4)\textsuperscript{35} ; Ligorio les présente sans suivre un ordre rigoureux, sauf pour les philosophes (ff. 48–60) ; il évoque parfois le même personnage à divers endroits de son traité, comme Ménandre (f. 12) dont il parle la seconde fois avec Eros (f. 32)\textsuperscript{36}.

D’autres personnages sont dessinés à trois reprises (Hercule)\textsuperscript{37} voire cinq fois comme Sappho (fig. 5)\textsuperscript{38}. Dans certains cas, Ligorio a suivi l’ordre topographique comme pour les portraits découverts au Forum romain (Valerius Publicola, Caton, Claudius Néron et Attus Navius ; Alcibiade, Polystrate, Léonidas et Hannibal)\textsuperscript{39}. De nombreux portraits furent également découverts à Tivoli où Ligorio dirigea les fouilles pour le compte d’Hippolyte II d’Este à partir des années 1550 et d’autres à


\textsuperscript{29} Libro XLIII, f. 439.

\textsuperscript{30} C’est ce que pense Venetucci Palma, Beatrice (2005). \textit{Pirro Ligorio}..., p. XII.

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Ibid.}, p. IX.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Ibid.}, p. XI.

\textsuperscript{33} Le portrait de Marcus Mettius Epaphroditus, f. 94.

\textsuperscript{34} Le portrait de Vénus, f. 18.

\textsuperscript{35} Le portrait d’Agésilas, f. 39.

\textsuperscript{36} Venetucci Palma, Beatrice (2005) Pirro Ligorio..., p. X.

\textsuperscript{37} Voir Libro XLIII, f. 434r et f. 435r.

\textsuperscript{38} Les portraits de Sappho, \textit{ibid.}, f. 340, pour le troisième également et f. 340v pour le dernier.

\textsuperscript{39} Venetucci Palma, Beatrice (2005) \textit{Pirro Ligorio}..., p. XI.
Montecassino (Villa de Varron), à Palestrina et à Ostie, entre autres\footnote{Ibid., p. XVII.}. Ligorio connaissait bien les collections romaines d’antiquités, comme celle d’Orsini d’où sont tirés les portraits d’Homère, Ménandre, Solon, Sophocle, Callisthène, Aratos, Perse, Sappho, Eucharis, Cicéron, Pittacus, Théocrite et Philémon\footnote{Ibid.}. Il utilise également son édition des \textit{Imagines et elogia virorum illustrium} pour les portraits de Platon, Héraclite, Aristote, etc.)\footnote{Ibid., p. XXIV. Voir Ursinus, Fulvius (1570) \textit{Imagines et Elogia Virorum illustrium}. Romae : Antonius Lafrery.}. L’antiquaire cite également les collections d’Hippolyte d’Este, des cardinaux Pio da Carpi, Jean du Bellay, Achille Maffei, de l’évêque Girolamo Garimberto, qui possédait un portrait d’Aristote orné d’un bonnet dans sa « libraria et studio in Roma, infra molti ritratti et imagini di principi et di huomini sapienti di laude degni »\footnote{Ibid., p. XIX.}. Certains portraits étaient connus grâce aux monnaies conservées dans les collections de particuliers, comme l’antiquaire Antonio Conteschi, que Ligorio appelle « Antonietto delle medaglie » ou « Antonietto antiquario » ; d’autres étaient connus à travers d’autres objets précieux ; c’est ainsi que Ligorio nous révèle avoir formé le portrait d’Aristote sur la base du camée Carafa et sur la pierre de jaspe qui se trouvait chez « Paolo Lucchesi, banchiere alla Traspontina » ; celui de Pittacus à partir d’une cornaline « ligata in oro da Antonietto antiquario in vendita » (fig. 6)\footnote{Portrait f. 540.} ou celui du poète comique Callisthène sur la base d’un bas-relief avec masques comiques et tragiques, découvert sur l’Esquilin et conservé dans la collection Orsini\footnote{Ibid., p. XXIV et Libro XLIII, f. 341r.}. Il s’agissait parfois de faux antiques dont les auteurs étaient connus ; c’est le cas de l’antiquaire de Parme, Marmita, qui « fece un cameo con testa di Socrate molto bella »\footnote{Ibid., p. XXIV.} ou Alessandro Cesari, appelé « il Greco », qui fit de nombreux portraits, parmi lesquels « quello che passò tutti fu la testa di Focione ateniese che è miracolosa et il più bello cameo che si possa vedere »\footnote{Ibid., p. XXIV.}. Ligorio cite encore le portrait d’Alcibiade réalisé par un certain Calvino sur la base d’une monnaie antique tandis que d’autres portraits circulaient sous forme de monnaies modernes, comme le Sappho ; l’un des exemplaires fut réalisé pour Annibal Caro par un orfèvre du nom de « Mario » , comme il nous révèle dans une lettre du 7 octobre 1564 (fig. 7) : « E se potessi avere quella
Sappho che mi faceste d’oro grande con quel cufiotto in testa e con quel polpo per traverso fatemela d’oro, perche m’è stata forza rendere gli originali di tutte quelle che mi contrafaceste e se non volete d’ora fatemela d’oro, avvertendo che sia di lega appunto, o d’or, o d’argento che sia perché altramente non riesco al peso »48. Ce désir de combler les lacunes dans le domaine de la numismatique s’étendait aussi aux portraits, ce qui explique l’exploitation de toutes les sources possibles pour y remédier, notamment les sources littéraires ; c’est ainsi que certains personnages ne sont connus qu’à travers Suidas, comme Antippus ou Alcydamas49 ; les sources les plus courantes sont Valère Maxime, Plutarque, Varron, déjà cité, Flavius Josèphe et Saint Jérôme50. Certaines lacunes étaient dues à la destruction des portraits de la part des « cavatori » qui firent disparaître ceux de Themistius « tutti guasti dall’incendio ricevuto [...] dalla barbarica crudeltà che pria li gettò a terra e le conculcò sotto le rovine e sotto il fuoco; e li moderni poscia ne hanno conseguentemente fatto altre opere che non sono degne d’essere nominate »51. Ligorio dut parfois se contenter de restitutions modernes, comme pour le portrait de Tite-Live ou la statue médiévale de saint-Pierre, conservée dans la basilique homonyme, que Ligorio décrit comme antique (« trovandosi fra le antiche memorie degli christiani, comne si vede nella sua antica imagine di bronzo, nella sua chiesa di Roma », fig. 8)52.

Comme antiquaire à la cour de Ferrare, Ligorio fut chargé de constituer le musée et la bibliothèque d’Alphonse II qu’il décida d’orner de portraits d’hommes illustres comme nous l’apprend Orsini, dans une lettre au cardinal Alexandre Farnèse (1571) : « Il signor Duca di Ferrara, per disegno di Pirro, mette insieme la sua libraria di scritti a mano, fatta dai libri del Manuzio, del Stazio et altri, e sopra i pilastri che portano gli armari, mette teste antiche di filosofi e letterati »53. On trouve en outre en marge d’un dessin de Ligorio représentant les « libraria e antichario » déjà mentionnés, les noms de Solon, Thalès, Hippocrate, qui sont représentés dans le Libro, mais aussi de personnages moins connus comme le grammairien Dydime ou l’orateur Samios. On sait également que depuis Ferrare, Ligorio avait demandé à l’agent du duc à Rome, Alessandro dei Grandi, de lui procurer dix-huit bustes de philosophes dont huit sont mentionnés dans la lettre qu’un autre agent, Evangelista

48 Ibid., p. XXVI.
49 Ibid., p. XXVII.
50 Ibid., p. XXVII–XXVIII.
51 Ibid., p. XXX.
52 Portrait de Saint-Pierre, f. 61.
Baroni, adresse à Ligorio pour visa : il s’agit, entre autres, des portraits de Posidonius, Carnéade, Euripide, Marc-Aurèle, Socrate, Homère, Platon, Zénon, qui disparurent au cours d’un naufrage et dont seuls quelques-uns furent récupérés en 1950 à Porto Corsini, dont les deux Miltiade aujourd’hui au Musée de Ravenne. L’intérêt de Ligorio pour les hommes illustres de l’antiquité se manifeste non seulement dans toute son œuvre mais dura aussi toute sa vie. Les résultats de ses investigations furent conservés dans le vaste répertoire de notices numismatiques, épigraphiques, archéologiques et littéraires que forment ses Antichità romane et plus précisément dans ses trois Libri consacrés aux hommes illustres.

3. « Libro XLV delle antichità, nel quale si contiene quelli che hanno vissuto lungo tempo »

Comme l’indique le titre, le Libro XLV est consacré aux personnages ayant vécu longtemps, autrement dit aux « macrobies » dont la structure révèle qu’il s’agissait d’une version provisoire :

Havendo dunque noi scritto di molte et varie cose dell’antichità delle più eccellenti [figure] et havendo tra esse ricollelente infinite memorie scritte nell’epitaffii, che sono tituli che restano dopo la morte invece dei sepulti corpi, acciò che per lo mezzo d’essi trapassano li buoni esempi nella posterità come vivi tra viventi, rendendo conto di coloro ai quali è piaciuto farsi intendere per ammonire gli huomini a dilettrarsi delle cose che fa l’huomo buono, morto o vivo, mi è parso convenevole cosa di compilare insieme tutti quegli che con retto vivere et con dolci precetti, con faticose arti, hanno voluto dolcemente parlare et significare quanto sia utile cosa all’humana vita l’essere sobrio et prudente et contenente et paciente nelle humane occorrenze et quanto se ne retrahe utile et longa vita per due vie: l’una perché vivendosi naturalmente con parcità, s’allungano gli anni, se alleggeriscono i morbi; l’altra, tenendovi appresso la via dell’arti et delle opere buone con la cura della gloria, si vince la morte per fama immortale. Et pertanto, parendo cosa utile et dilettevole narratione, havemo raccolti insieme tutti quelli che da ottanta anni in suso hanno vissuto senza dignità tale che sia meritevole alle loro fatiche, acciò che per essi si veda chiaramente come la modestia et temperantia del vivere et di quella dell’aere et per la generosità della natura, si puote allongare la vita et pervenire a una sana vecchiezza et far men grave la decrepita. Perciò che, per lo mezzo della buona et forte natura, si possa trasportare

54 Portraits de Miltiade, ff. 56–57.
tunt’oltre la vita che facci longo spatio, prendendo per esempio la
destinestria dell’antichi, i quali, temperantemente havendo vissuto,
hanno menata la vecchiezza più agile et più giocondo et allegra, et con
la conseguentia delle virtù, si sono fatti di nome immortal et come
amici della philia, figliola delle Muse, hanno superato la morte55.

Le premier chapitre est consacré aux populations vivant longtemps et
s’ouvre sur la vie des légendaires Éthiopiens ; suivent celles des « Indi,
Macrobi, Cyrrnii, Gymnetas [sic], Mandrori, Epii », puis des individus
isolés (« Dandone, Matusalem, Cephalo, Tithone ») que Ligorio a
trouvées dans les textes d’Hérodot, Plutarque, Lucien, Valère Maxime et
Pline l’Ancien.

Le deuxième chapitre intitulé « Delle openioni se si può vivere lungo
tempo et della divisione dell’anno » concerne notamment les calendriers
anciens, parmi lesquels ceux des Égyptiens, Hébreux et Grecs, ainsi que
le débat, au cœur de la problématique du livre, fondé sur le texte de Pline,
relatif à la possibilité de vivre longtemps, notamment en Italie ; à ce
propos, Ligorio cite, dans un des rares passages autobiographiques de son
œuvre, les inscriptions funéraires qu’il a vues dans l’église de San
Salvatore in Lauro et qui appartiennent à des personnes qui périrent au
cours d’un même automne rigoureux ; certaines sont d’origine modeste ;
l’une d’elles est une femme de sa famille qui vécut 107 ans et la dernière
épitaphe concerne le médecin de Volterra Francesco Lettino, qui serait
mort à 114 ans, à qui Ligorio dédia les trois traités des livres XLVII et
XLVIII de ses Antichità romane56 :

Ma noi a di nostri, havemo veduto Antonino ricamatore in San Salvator
del Lauro sepulto, di anni cento dieci passati. Un certo Antonio
alchimista di cento tredici anni; una nostra parente di anni centosette;
un’altra dei Capiscucchi di anni cento sei; un Francesco Le ttino medico
di anni cento quattordici. Tutti ad un medesimo tempo vivevano, et un
asprissimo inverno, poco oltre all’autunno, le portò via57.

55 Libro XLV, f. 546r et p. 240 dans l’édition.
56 « Libro XLVII [...] nel quale si tratta del significato del dracone, dedicato al
Signor Francesco Lottino Volaterrano A.S.C. », « Libro XLVIII [...] nel quale si
ragiona del dracone, al Signor Magnifico Signor Francesco Lottino dedicato ». « Il
tertio trattato della natura del gallo et del basilisco scritto per Pyrrho Ligorio al
medesimo Signor Francesco Lottino ».
57 Libro XLIII, f. 547v.
Plus loin dans le même chapitre, avec le sens de la polémique qu'on lui connaît, Ligorio remet en cause les propos de l'astronome Luca Guarico selon lesquels la durée de la vie des hommes dépendrait des planètes :

Io sono certissimo che a dì nostri, Luca Guarico fu stimato per grande astrologo in far giudizio; et noi l’abbiamo viste tutte le sue cose essere state al rovescio che egli ha detto.


Les poètes sont encore cités dans le chapitre suivant « Dei romani poeti et d’altro grado (Marco Terentio, Livio Druso, Marco Valerio Corvino, Appio Claudio Cieco, Quincto Caecilio Metello, Quinctio Fabio Maximo, Marco Perpenna, Lucio Volumnio Saturnino, Asinio Polllione, Lucretio, Ennio »), qui

60 On retrouve la même organisation que dans le cod. XIII.B.8 cité à la note 6, où Ligorio annonce qu’il va commencer « dagli re esterni nati fuori d’Italia et poscia degli altri di più bassa condicione » (voir Orlandi (2008), p. 3).
62 Ibid. p. 262–263, n. 42.
précède un chapitre intitulé « degli altri esterni (Amilcare, Mezentio, Methrocole) », qui à son tour précède celui des philosophes « dei philosopi (Platone, Aristotele, Aristippo, Epimenide Gnossio, Hegesia, Themistocle, Solone, Cleanthe, Anaxagora, Demade, Gorgia, Xenophilò, Anacarse, Pitagora, Democrito, Carneade, Athenodoro Sandoni, Xenophon, Crates, Phicione, Xenocrate, Antipatro, Zamonide, Panetio, Pittaco, Zenone, Cleanthes di Zenonide, Aristone, Crisippo, Quinto Caecilio Olympionico, Seleuco, Posidonio) ».


65 Libro XLV, f. 221r et p. 286–287 dans l’édition.
66 De même, dans le cod. XIII.B.8, après la liste des rois mythiques ayant vécu longtemps, Ligorio cite les catégories suivantes : « de principi nati in Italia di longha età ; dei philosophi che hanno vissuto longo tempo ; degli historici di lunghia vita ; degli oratori di lungho tempo vissuti ; dei poeti che hanno vissuto longo tempo; degli grammatici di lunghia vita ; degli huomini nobili latini ; delle donne di lungha età vissute et altri huomini ; degli huonini sancti che sono stati di longa vita ». Voir Orlandi (2008) p. 3 et suivants.
4. **Les inscriptions des personnes ayant eu une longue vie (macrobies)**

Dans la préface au Libro XLV, Ligorio indique avoir recueilli de nombreuses inscriptions d'hommes et femmes de l'antiquité ayant vécu longtemps et qu'il souhaite publier pour faire œuvre utile et agréable ; en effet, il s'agit de montrer les deux voies qui ont permis à ces personnes d'atteindre un grand âge ; la première est celle de la modération et la seconde est la voie des arts et des bonnes actions qui rendent les hommes immortels.

4.1. **« Dei philosophi »**

Dans la catégorie consacrée aux philosophes, Ligorio cite le nom de *Quintus Caecilius Olympicus* qui vécut 91 ans, 8 mois et 2 jours ; il souligne qu'aucune information ne nous est parvenue sur ce personnage en raison de la perte des textes anciens et que notre seule source de connaissance est son monument funéraire en marbre, découvert en morceaux (« *la quale era assai fragmentata* ») près du Mausolée des *Caecilii* ; Ligorio représente pourtant un monument intact dont il décrit en outre soit les éléments de décoration, une gorgone encadrée de deux papillons (fig. 9) :

Philosopho stoico [che] visse novantuno anno et mesi otto et giorni duoi del quale non havemo altra notitia per la perdita dell’antichi scrittori, et tanto ne sapemo quanto ci ha mostrato l’ara di marmo trovata nella via Appia, non guari lontano dal monumento dei Caecilii, la quale era assai fragmentata. In essa si vede la imagine della gorgona et pare che gli volano a destra e a sinistra due farfalle con festoni di frutti che secondo noi imaginiamo quel stoico ci da ad intendere una certa cosa che ammunicse gli huomini a vivere con prudentia, se basta tanto anchora alla vita dei mortali, sendo debole et frivola in ogni momento. Conciò sia cosa che, per la faccia della gorgona si rappresenti il terrore, lo spavento et la virtù che muove et rimuove et scancella et cangia et produce et leva et da in questa vita et muta et mai essa muore, come non muore l’alta providentia che è immortale. Et par che facci quell’effetto che fa un supremo capitano che par che nel petto porti la virtù o gorgona et che di lontano et da presso percuote et adduca horrore et paura come imaginato per vincitore. La quale virtù par che vogli far conoscere agli huomini che nel tempo che si vive si debba attendere a cose immortalì perché quelle si vive et si gode i frutti della virtù et tutto il resto e niente et simile alle cose transitorie et alle frivole farfalle. Perciò che usisi quanto si voglia sottilezza nel vivere, non si
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arriva a tanta prudenza che abbasti a penetrare il profondo et alto concetto et nulla cosa giova la prudenza humana, se non all’acquistare le virtù: et tutto l’altro è vanità, speranze caduche, come sono caduche le farfalle et la superbia copia dei fiori. Et perciò è miglior partito attendere alle virtù che vincono il terrore della morte et così si lasciano et si godono ancho i frutti mentre si sta nelle cose terrene. Imperocché solo l’alta sapienza di chi ha creato le cose è sempre quella che vive e prove67.

Comme on pouvait s’y attendre, le nom du philosophe et son inscription sont des inventions de Ligorio (CIL VI 1463*), comme, du reste, la totalité des personnages et des épitaphes qui suivent68.

4.2. « Di medici et d’altr’arti »

Dans cette nouvelle catégorie, Ligorio nous donne l’inscription funéraire de deux médecins et d’un sexvīr : Lysistrate (CIL VI 1621*), Lucius Aelius Moschilus (CIL VI 1035*) et Polymaque (CIL XI 464*).


4.3 « Di rhetori »

Parmi les rhéteurs se trouvent un médecin au service de la gens Ulpia, nommé Aglaus (CIL XIV 160*) et un grammairien, de nom d’Agis (CIL VI 2407*) :

Aglao liberto della fameglia Ulpia, medico, visse ottantanove anni, secondo il suo epitaphio trovato nella via Appia presso Albano: M.VLPIO M. LIB. AGLAO. MEDICO VIX ANN. XCIX. VLPIA LATANVSA LIBERTA PATRONO S. F. EX TEST.
Agis liberto della fameglia Mucia, grammatico, visse anni ottanta otto e mezzo. Fu sepolto nella via Ianicolense presso la chiesa di San Pancrario dove fu trovata la intitolatione della sua sepultura: L. MVCIO L. L. AGI GRAMMATICO DE VICO FORTVNATO VIXIT ANN LXXXVIII. MEN VI. P. MVCIVS FEROCIANVS LIBERTVS F. CVR70.

4.4 « Dei rhetori o oratori »

Dans ce nouveau chapitre consacré aux rhéteurs, Ligorio nous procure l’inscription d’un nommé Potamon, cité par Lucien ;

Anchor egli non incelebre rhetore, nel vero laudatissimo, lasciò di vivere nell’ottanta anni, come vuole Luciano. Costui visse come a Tiberio Claudio Potamone, libero di Tiberio Claudio et procuratore de li clienti di esso imperadore, secondo l’epitaphio trovato nella via Decia Salaria in questo senso; TI. CLAVDIO. TI. AVG. LIBERTO POTAMONE/ PROCVRAT. CLIENT. AVGVSTI.N./ VIXIT. ANN. XC. MENS III. DIEB. XVII/ TI. CLAVDIVS. TI. AVG. LIB HIERONYMUS/ HER. FAC. CVR (CIL VI 1641*)71.

Titus Tuscinius, préfet du prétoire, y trouve également une place ainsi que son inscription dessinée sans aucun ornement (CIL XIV 156a*, fig. 10) :

Tito Tuscino, praefetto pretorio, visse anni ottantacinque, secondo mostra questo epitaphio trovato nella Via Appia presso Albano della cui fameglia fu Tuscino oratore72.

70 Ibid., p. 283–284.
71 Ibid., p. 285.
72 Ibid., p. 285.
À la fin du paragraphe, réfléchissant sur le grand nombre d’épitaphes anciennes mentionnant des hommes âgés, Ligorio nous révèle son opinion — quelque peu déroutante — sur la rareté de macrobies parmi ses contemporains dont la cause serait l’opulence ou le trop grand nombre de naissance rapprochées :

Si trovano nell’epitaphi molti che hanno passato alli ottanta anni dell’antichità, ma tra la vita dei moderni sono rarissimi et forsi viene dal vivere troppo opulentemente et lautamente, o pure perché fanno figlioli troppo per tempo.\textsuperscript{73}

4.5 « Di grammatici »

Le grammarien Marcus Pompilius Fortunatus eut une sépulture sur la Via Appia (CIL 2566\textsuperscript{*}) :

Fu grammatico in Roma, lo quale fu di gente libertina deli Pompili et fu sepulto nella Via Appia, et visse anni settantanove et mesi tre, secondo accusa la intitulatione della sua sepulture a di nostri trovata in una tabola di marmo: M. POMPILI M. L. FORTVNATI/ GRAM. VIX. AN. LXXIX. M. III/ M. POMPILIVS. M. L. AGATHANGELVS/ OLL. DED. I\textsuperscript{74}.

L’inscription de Maius Acilius Severianus fut trouvée sur la Via Labicana et conservée dans la collection du cardinal Pio da Carpi, bien connue pour ses faux (CIL VI 1000\textsuperscript{*})\textsuperscript{75} :

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 288.

L'épitaphe comme « exemplum virtutis »

Maio Acilio Severiano della tribu Quirina, grammatico latino, visse ottanta otto, secondo dice il suo titolo della sepulture trovato nella Via Lavicana et raccolto dal cardinal Carpi, in questo senso: M. ACILI. M. F. QVIR/ SEVERIANO. GRAMAT./ LATIN. CVRAT. VICI/ LORETI. MIN/ VIX. ANNIS LXXXVIII/ MANIA. ACILIA. HER/ EX. TEST. F. C./ MAXIMO II ET AELIANO.COS/ KAL. IVN76.

Ligorio consacre ensuite une longue notice au célèbre grammairien Hygin dont il cite les fonctions de préfet de la bibliothèque palatine grecque et latine (CIL VI 2082*) et dont l’inscription indique qu’il aurait vécu 89 ans :


Le dernier grammairien dont Ligorio cite l’inscription est Sextus Pompeius Daphnis. Il dit avoir déjà transmis son épitaphe dans le livre consacré aux antiquités de la ville de Rome ; il précise aussi que cette inscription se trouve dans la collection Carpi (CIL VI 940*)78 :

78 Dans le cod.XIII.B.8, Ligorio cite un autre grammairien dont l’inscription est publiée pour la première fois par Orlandi (2008, p. 7): « Havemo trovato in uno monimento anticho nell’imporio al mare di Cere, città disfatta di Thoscani, un certo L. Annio Virio grammatico, che ha visso novantasette anni; le parole che sono nel marmo sono queste: L. ANNIO VIRIO L. F. PALATINA ET L. VIRIO ANNIANO GRAMMATICO FRATRI PIISSIMO ANNIA RUFINA HER FEC. ».
Fu liberto di Sexto, lo quale morì nell’estremo della sua decrepita, secondo dice Crescenzo bibliothecario, di cui era memoria infra li scritti di alcune intitulationi nella Via Appia, dentro la porta di San Sebastiano deli liberti di Sexto Pompeio, ove era il titolo della sepoltura di due donne fatto da esso grammatico, la quale inscrizione havemo posta nella dittione della città di Roma et qui l’epitaphio ch’èbbe l’illustrissimo cardinale Pio da Carpi, lo quale serve a due persone. In questa forma appunto fa testimonio di colui che dedicò le urne sepulchrali; SEXT POMPEIVS/ SEX L DAPHNIS/ GRAM/ CHLOE POMPEIAE/ APPI. OPST./ ATIA79.

4.6 « Degli huomini delle romane colonie italiane »

Parmi les colonies romaines, Parme compte une femme plus que centenaire du nom de Caia Cusinia Vargunteia (CIL VI 2158*) :

Visse anni centododici, secondo si trova in uno epitaphio trovato nella via Appia di questo tenore: DIIS MANIBVS SACRVM CVSINIAE VARGVNTIEAEE FELICISSIMAE FEMINAE VIXIT ANN. CXII DIEB VIII VARGVNTIEA IOCVNDA ET C. VARGVNTIEIVS PAETVS HER. EX. T. F. CVR80.

4.7 « Di Aminterno nelli Sabini »

Après avoir évoqué les Sybilles, Ligorio revient à la catégorie des colonies romaines dont Aminterno d’où sont originaires des personnes ayant eu une macrobie. Dans ce cas, Ligorio cite leurs noms mais ne reproduit pas ici leur inscription ; il s’agit d’un soldat vétéran nommé Quintius Avidius Saecula (CIL IX 389*) et d’une certaine Caia Nerulana dont Ligorio avait déjà donné les inscriptions dans son livre sur les antiquités de cette ville (CIL IX 394*) :

Quintio Avidio Saecula amintermense sabino, veteranò soldato, visse ottanta otto et mesi nove et hore sette. Et nella medesima citta Aminterno, visse novanta duoi una certa Caia Nerulana Sabina donna felicissima et piissima, sepolta dai suoi figlioli com’è detto nella dittione della citta di Aminterno81.

80 Ibid., p. 293.
81 Ibid., p. 295.
4.8 « Delle Vergini vestali »

Dans ce chapitre consacré aux vestales ayant eu une longue vie, Ligorio reproduit leurs quatre inscriptions dans un cadre dénué de toute décoration, précisant qu’il les vit dans cet état (fig. 11):

Cloelia Torquata, vergine vestale in Roma, visse nel tempio custode anni centosette, com’è notato nel suo epitaphio trovato nella Via Lavicana dentro di Roma (CIL VI 1676*).

Tuccia Claelia Torquata visse anni centoquattro, custode del tempio antistite, la quale fu sepulta nella Via Latina dove fu trovata la sua memoria che vivente di centoquattro anni, fece testamento (CIL VI 2869*).

Aurelia Sufena Torquata visse anni centocinque, custode del tempio di Vesta, la quale fu sepulta nella Ianicolen se dentro la citta (CIL VI 1410*)

Iunia Caecilia, vergine vestale visse anni centoquindecì secondo mostrava l’epitaphio trovato nella via Appia la quale memoria siccome l’havemo vedute così l’havemo copiate presso il luogo dove i cavatori et rovinatori dell’antichita l’hanno scoperte82.

Ligorio ajoute que les statues des vestales furent découvertes en même temps que ces inscriptions et qu’elles furent portées au Vatican où elles furent placées « nella fabbrica del lymphaeo in Vaticano nel boschetto del sacro palazzo apostolico » :

Le imagini di due di esse sono state poste nella fabbrica del lymphaeo in Vaticano nel boschetto del sacro palazzo apostolico [CIL VI 2158*]83.

Le « lymphaeo » désigne le Casino que Ligorio réalisa dans les jardins du Vatican (« ne havemo avuto la cura del disegno et del fabricarlo e dell’ornarlo »), sous les pontificats de Paul IV et Pie IV et qu’il évoque — non sans une douleur toujours vive —, dans cette rare page de son autobiographie ; il y souligne également la différence de culture entre Paul IV, qui considérait ces statues comme des témoins du passé, et Pie V qui fit enlever toutes les statues antiques dont Ligorio avait orné l’édifice y compris celles des Vestales, signifiant ainsi symboliquement à l’antiquaire son congé :

82 Ibid. Il semble que Ligorio n’ait pas forgé d’inscription à cette vestale, comme c’est le cas dans le cod.XIII.B.8, à propos d’une certaine Claudia : « Havemo letto, in una dedicatione trovata nella Via Sacra a Roma, d’una Claudia vergine vestale, la quale essendo vissuta castamente nel sacerdorio de la dea ottantasette anni, gli fu dedicata dopo la morte la statua » (Orlandi 2008, p. 9).

Le due statue poste nel Vaticano nella facciata del Casinò nel boschetto del sacro palazzo, delle quali come del luogo ne havemo avuto la cura del disegno et del fabricarlo e dell’ornarlo, ove sendo locate esse figure dell’antiche vergini vestali, per comandamento di Papa Pio quarto, le quali accettò volentieri per mostrarle per antico esempio agli huomini curiosi che amano di vedere le cose passate. Ma papa Pio Quinto per suo volere n’ha spogliato ogno ornamento delle antiche opere.

4.9 « Di quelli che passarono l’anno cento »

Parmi les personnes ayant vécu plus de cent ans se trouvent une certaine Almaeonide de Bâle dont le nom remonterait à la plus haute antiquité (CIL VI 1111*), un certain Titus Flavius, masseur dans les thermes de Titus (CIL VI 1886*), le chevalier romain Trebonius Geminus (CIL VI 2855*) et un autre militaire nommé Marcus Tibilius Matutinus (CIL VI 2832*):


Nous avons dit que dans la version antérieure de ses « Antichità romane », Ligorio avait traité du sujet des macrobies et des catégories que nous venons d’examiner ; cependant, on y trouve une référence à un athlète qui n’est pas mentionné dans le Libro XLV et qu’il nous a semblé opportun d’ajouter ici : il s’agit d’Olympionicus, originaire de Crotone, mort à 103 ans et qui aurait servi dans la 3e Légion Parthique :


quarta cosa da notare. Laterano, dice Leone Augusto nell’opera delle cose bellice, era colui il quale havea cura del lato del campo, acciò che stesse unito et difeso. L’epitaffio a questi di fu cavato tra gli altri dalla medesima rovina di un sepolcro nella Via Lavicana, al terzo miglio, di sasso tivertino e molto consumato, con li caratteri tinti di minio minerale, appunto della forma disegnato86.

Tout comme le Libro XLIII, le livre sur les macrobies a pour but de conserver la mémoire des hommes et femmes ayant vécu longtemps, à la fois en raison d’une hygiène de vie saine, d’une conduite morale exemplaire et du culte des arts. Alors que dans le Libro XLIII Ligorio s’inscrivait dans la tradition du genre littéraire, en évoquant les hommes et les femmes illustres à travers les textes, les inscriptions et les statues et en reconstituant leur portrait perdu à l’aide de ces mêmes sources mais aussi d’autres sources iconographiques, notamment les monnaies et les gemmes, dans le Libro XLV, dépourvu de portraits, Ligorio a souhaité en outre compléter la liste traditionnelle des macrobies, comme celles des personnages bibliques ou des rois et peuples légendaires, en y ajoutant de son propre crû des nouveaux personnages, non moins crédibles qu’un Nestor ou Bellérophon. Pour légitimer sa démarche, Ligorio déclarait s’inscrire dans la lignée des auteurs grecs qui n’avaient pas mis en doute l’existence de personnages pourtant « fabuleux »87. C’est pourquoi il s’était employé à reconstituer l’identité de ces hommes et femmes illustres, vestales, philosophes, médecins et autres artistes, orateurs, grammairiens mais aussi simples mortels, à travers des « portraits » épigraphiques fondés sur sa connaissance extraordinaire du formulaire épigraphique ainsi que de l’histoire et la topographie romaines, afin qu’ils puissent servir d’« exempla virtutis » à la postérité.

Ginette Vagenheim
Université de Rouen
ginette.vagenheim@univ-rouen.fr

87 C’est ce qu’il déclare au début de son exposé relatif aux macrobies, dans la première version de ses « Antichità romane » rédigée à Rome (1535–1568), dans le chapitre consacré aux « uomini e donne di lunga vita […]. Anchora che molti siano favolosi, non da meno i Greci l’hanno commemorati et creduti haver loro tali tempi vissuti » : Orlandi (2008) p. 3.
Fig. 1. Libro XLIII, f. 18r. Portrait de Vénus.
Fig. 2. Libro XLIII, f. 439r. Portrait d’Hercule.
Fig. 3. Libro XLIII, f. 94r. Portrait d’Epaphroditus.
Fig. 4. Libro XLIII, f. 39r. Buste d’Agésilas.
Fig. 5. Libro XLIII, f. 340r. Portraits de Sappho.
Fig. 6. Libro XLIII, f. 540r. Portrait de Pittacus.
Fig. 7. Libro XLIII, f. 341r. Portrait de Sappho.
Fig. 8. Libro XLIII, f. 61r. Portrait de saint Pierre.
L’épitaphe comme « exemplum virtutis »

Fig. 9. Libro XLIII, f. 565r. Monument funéraire d’Olympionicus (CIL VI 1463*).
Fig. 10. Libro XLIII, f. 573v. Épitaphe du préfet du prétoire Titus Tuscinius (CIL VI XIV 156a*).

Fig. 11. Libro XLIII, f. 580r. Epitaphes de vestales (CIL VI 1676*, 2869*, 1410*, inédite (?)).
GLI ETRUSCHI NELLA CULTURA POPOLARE ITALIANA DEL XIX SECOLO.
LE INDAGINI DI CHARLES G. LELAND
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ABSTRACT

Charles Godfrey Leland was an American polymath, active during the second half of the 19th century: a journalist, writer, poet, and student of folklore and popular traditions. This article focuses on the latter aspect of his work. Leland wrote two books and several articles in which he asserted to have found traces of ancient Etruscan religion still alive in the Italian countryside, notably in Tuscany. This paper seeks to assess the degree of reliability and significance of Leland's work against the backdrop of the debates on the role of Etruscans in Italian 19th century popular culture.
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Il 1891 fu un anno importante per la storia degli studi sul Folklore. In quell’anno Londra ospitò il secondo International Folklore Congress,1 un evento che ebbe ampia risonanza nei giorni dell’epoca.2

* Condivido il mio interesse per Leland con Maurizio Harari, con il quale ho potuto avere conversazioni come al solito preziose. Ma una nota di ringraziamento non basta certo a riconoscere il valore di una frequentazione ormai quasi trentennale.

1 Il Congresso si tenne dal 1 al 5 ottobre 1891 presso la Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, Piccadilly. Gli atti furono pubblicati l’anno seguente (Jacobs–Nutt 1892), con tanto di scuse da parte degli editori per il ritardo (p. xxiii).

Al convegno erano presenti pressoché tutti gli studiosi di rilievo: tra gli altri vi erano Edward B. Tylor, Edwin S. Hartland, Emmanuel Cosquin, Andrew Lang, G.L. Gomme. In apertura dei lavori i due organizzatori, Joseph Jacobs e Alfred Nutt, ricordavano che il precedente congresso, tenutosi a Parigi nel 1889, si era chiuso col voto che i convegni di Folklore diventassero appuntamento fisso, e che la successiva riunione si tenesse a Londra. Questo voto era stato affidato a Mr Charles Leland, che aveva accettato l’incarico di portarlo alla neonata Folk-lore Society e di prendere le opportune iniziative per l’organizzazione dell’evento; incarico che Mr Leland, sempre stando a quanto ricordato dagli organizzatori, aveva svolto in maniera egregia. Lo stesso Leland, peraltro, prendeva parte al congresso londinese in maniera attiva non solo a livello organizzativo, come Vice-Chairman del comitato organizzatore, ma anche sul piano scientifico, attraverso commenti alle relazioni, documentati dagli atti congressuali, e con un suo paper che fu definito «the most sensational of those laid before the Congress».

Eppure, se andiamo a scorrere le storie della ricerca folklorica, non troveremo il nome di questo personaggio che aveva avuto un ruolo così importante nell’evento.

Chi era dunque questo signor Leland?

1. «Heaven knows what else»

*Typical American.* Così un anonimo giornalista del New York Times titolava un pezzo del 20 maggio 1894 dedicato alla fresca pubblicazione delle *Memoirs* di Charles Godfrey Leland: «the book is an arsenal of interesting anecdotes; no one, especially no American, can afford to neglect this biography of a typical globe-roaming American». Nell’articolo, che suona quasi come un ‘cocodrillo’ anticipato, si legge questa presentazione del personaggio: «Mr. Leland has been journalist, art writer, theatrical and musical critic, archaeologist, folklorist, volunteer in the civil war, a Pennsylvania prospector for oil, an amateur philologist, student of gypsy tongues — and heaven knows what else». E il cielo sa cos’altro. Particolarmente indicativo dell’ampiezza dei suoi interessi è il catalogo delle sue pubblicazioni, edito da Joseph Jackson a più riprese negli anni

---

3 «One high point of this first phase was the Society’s hosting of the International Folk-Lore Congress of 1891»: Simpson–Roud 2000, p. 128
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'20 del '900 e poi raccolto in volume, e tuttavia incompleto. Per riannodare le fila di questa storia, cominciamo dall’inizio.


La ricca eredità paterna gli permette una vita quasi da bohémien e piena di viaggi. Dopo i primi studi linguistic — compreso il latino — e filosofici a Princeton (dove si laurea con un anno di ritardo a causa di una sospensione per aver sobillato i suoi compagni di studi nel 1842), si trasferisce ad Heidelberg e poi a Monaco di Baviera. A Parigi, a suo dire, prende parte alla rivoluzione del ’48. In questo periodo fa la spola tra Vecchio e Nuovo Continente. Nei soggiorni americani muove i primi passi nel mondo dell’editoria, collaborando con alcune riviste; sul Bulletin di Philadelphia si segnala per le prese di posizione contro la

---


6 Elizabeth Robins (1855–1936) è una figura di scrittrice ed intellettuale (tra l’altro antesignana dei moderni food blogger) che merita approfondimenti che in questa sede ovviamente sono impossibili. Mi limito a rinviare al recente Morse Jones 2015.


8 Cfr. Parry 1933, p. 151: Leland «not even once called himself a Bohemian, but undoubtedly lived like one». Lo stesso Leland nelle sue memorie (p. 235) teneva a marcare le differenze con i bohémien americani (cfr. anche Stovall 1974, p. 223).

9 Suo docente di latino fu James Waddel Alexander (1804–1859), teologo noto come traduttore di inni e salmi da greco e latino in inglese.

10 È lo stesso Leland a ricordare l’episodio in maniera divertita in una lettera conservata presso la Charles Godfrey Leland Collection della Princeton University Library.

11 Qui, oltre ad entrare in contatto con Friedrich Creuzer (che nei suoi Memoirs diventa Creutzer!), segue corsi di cinese con Karl Friedrich Neumann, ma anche di chimica e scienze con Leopold Gmelin (Leland 1893b, pp. 156–157).

12 A Monaco segue corsi di Estetica con Friedrich Thiersch e frequenta i celebri musei (Leland 1893b, pp. 157–158).
schiavitù. Durante questo periodo si dedica anche alla produzione poetica, che più tardi darà come esito la raccolta *Hans Breitmann Ballads*, che riscuote un certo successo. Il lato poetico del Nostro si esprime anche in una importante traduzione dell’opera di Heine, che sarà apprezzata da Walt Whitman.


Nel 1888 si stabilisce a Firenze, dove rimarrà pressoché ininterrottamente fino alla morte; questo soggiorno costituisce una importante svolta nella sua vita. La Firenze di fine ‘800 era città particolarmente accogliente per il pubblico anglosassone, come vedremo meglio più avanti; e vedremo anche come il nostro personaggio fosse entrato in diretto contatto con i più importanti esponenti della cultura non solo fiorentina, come Domenico Comparetti ed altri. A questo periodo risalgono le *Legends of Florence* (1895–1896) e *The Unpublished Legends of Virgil* (1899). Ma a Firenze, soprattutto, Leland conosce un’ambigua donna, il cui vero nome rimane un mistero (su cui torneremo più avanti):

---


Leland la ricorda come «Maddalena», ma in altri documenti è ricordata come Margherita; anche il cognome oscilla tra diverse forme: Talenti, Taluti, Tanuti. ¹⁸ Ad ogni modo, Maddalena lavora per strada come cartomante ed indovina, e rivela a Leland di essere una strega, appartenente ad una famiglia di streghe. Iniziano così le sue ricerche sulle tradizioni magico-religiose, e la raccolta di materiale folklorico come filastrocche ed incantesimi, in base ai quali Leland ritiene di essersi imbattuto in culti e riti pagani, romani ma anche etruschi, sopravvissuti come un fiume sotterraneo a secoli di cristianesimo in una zona compresa tra Toscana e Romagna. Il frutto delle ricerche sulla stregoneria è principalmente *Etruscan Roman Remains in Popular Tradition* (1892), volume anticipato l’anno precedente dall’intervento presentato al già ricordato Convegno Internazionale di Folklore di Londra; del 1893 è un breve intervento sul primo fascicolo della *Rivista delle tradizioni popolari italiane*.

Ancora da Maddalena ottiene un manoscritto da cui trae quello che forse è il suo libro più famoso: *Aradia or the Gospel of the Witches*, pubblicato nel 1899. Quest’opera sarebbe la testimonianza di un antico culto stregonesco incentrato sulla figura di Aradia, figlia di Diana, di cui il testo racconta la storia e raccoglie rituali ed incantesimi.

L’interesse per questi argomenti non viene meno fino alla morte, che lo coglie a Firenze il 20 marzo 1903. Le sue ceneri sono ora conservate a Philadelphia.

Una valutazione della affidabilità dei lavori di Leland per l’antichistica è difficile. Proverò in questo contributo a focalizzare l’attenzione su un certo numero di questioni. Innanzitutto, sarà utile fornire un assaggio delle ‘scoperte’ che Leland riteneva di aver compiuto, concentrando l’attenzione sui due lavori più importanti per l’etruscologia, ovvero i *Remains* ed *Aradia*. Procederemo poi ad esplorare meglio l’universo in cui Leland si formò e si trovò ad operare, muovendoci tra Stati Uniti, Inghilterra ed Italia, seguendo le tracce anche oltre la sua biografia, fino ad arrivare agli sviluppi più recenti. Infine, si proverà ad inquadrare il tema della presenza etrusca nella cultura popolare della seconda metà del XIX secolo, per esplorare possibili riscontri a (o possibili equivoci su) questa mole di materiale lasciataci dall’infaticabile americano.

¹⁸ La variante «Zaleni», che pure ogni tanto viene riportata, non sembra invece attendibile.
2. Aradia, ovvero «quello che ci si sarebbe aspettati»

Partiamo in qualche modo dalla fine, ovvero da *Aradia or the Gospel of the Witches*, l’opera a cui Leland deve la notorietà che ancora oggi ha, e per la quale si può dire che l’interesse non sia mai venuto meno.\(^{19}\)

Si tratta di un testo complesso, nelle sue vicende esteriori e nella sua formazione, che conosciamo ora meglio grazie ad un lavoro accurato fatto da uno dei pochi studiosi seri che se ne siano interessati, ovvero Robert Mathiesen, che ha potuto lavorare sulla mole di carte ed appunti conservati presso diversi archivi e biblioteche, su tutte quella della Historical Society of Pennsylvania.\(^{20}\) Il personaggio chiave, come abbiamo già accennato, è la misteriosa donna conosciuta a Firenze nel 1886. Quando Leland conosce ‘Maddalena’ e comincia a raccogliere la documentazione folklorica, viene a sapere dell’esistenza di un importante manoscritto.\(^{21}\)

Dopo qualche tempo, il 1 gennaio 1897, riesce finalmente ad avere da Maddalena una copia, scritta dalla donna, del favoloso testo, il cui originale Leland stesso ricorda di non essere mai riuscito a vedere, anche perché da quel momento non rivede più la sua informatrice.

Aradia è una sorta di anti-Vangelo. La protagonista è la figlia della dea Diana e di Lucifero, venuta sulla Terra per insegnare ai poveri e agli oppressi la stregoneria come mezzo di resistenza sociale: una sorta di Anticristo in versione femminile. Aradia avrebbe dunque insegnato una serie di incantesimi, invocazioni e rituali, presentati in uno stile che riecheggia quello dei Vangeli ma in maniera capovolta. Già Leland aveva operato il collegamento tra Aradia e la figura di Erodiade o *Herodias*, che, come è noto, insieme a Diana fu uno dei simboli della religiosità popolare medievale, in quanto considerata la regina della ‘caccia selvaggia’: questo ruolo è attestato per Diana già nel X secolo da Reginone, abate di Prüm, che probabilmente riportava materiale dal precedente *Canone Episcopi*, mentre la coppia Diana-Herodias fa la sua comparsa un secolo dopo in

---


Burcardo di Worms.\textsuperscript{22} Se Diana è una delle poche divinità pagane ricordate nei Vangeli (Atti 19, 23–41),\textsuperscript{23} Erodiade era ritenuta dai Padri della Chiesa una delle figure più ‘diaboliche’ della Bibbia, rea di aver preteso la testa di Giovanni Battista. La diffusione della leggenda di Herodias e Diana è estremamente ampia anche dal punto di vista geografico: dalla Romania\textsuperscript{24} alla Sardegna,\textsuperscript{25} oltre a diversi paesi nordici, in cui si incrocia con altre figure del folklore germanico come Holda e Perchta.\textsuperscript{26} Non è da escludere che il nome Aradia, mai attestato in questa forma prima di Leland, fosse in qualche modo derivato da una crasi tra le due figure: Hera-Diana; oppure dall’unione di Hera e –dia. È stata anche proposta una derivazione dal nome etrusco di Ariadne, attestato come Ariathia (su uno specchio da Civita Castellana), Areatha (su uno specchio chiusino) o Aratha (su uno specchio da Bolsena),\textsuperscript{27} e va notato che quest’ultimo in particolare era esposto proprio a Firenze.\textsuperscript{28} Ma non sono mancate anche proposte di derivazione da una radice celtica airidh, che indicherebbe il pascolo ma anche in senso figurato il concetto di «valore, merito».\textsuperscript{29} Non sarebbe strana una identificazione di Arianna con una divinità ‘anticristiana’ e legata a pratiche stregonesche: si potrà ricordare infatti che l’Ariadne divina in ambito minoico era la Grande Dea, signora del Labirinto, se è corretta l’interpretazione di Kerényi.\textsuperscript{30} D’altro canto, nel caso si ipotizzasse una etruscità piuttosto che celticità originaria, sarebbe arduo spiegare la sua diffusione in un ambito geografico così ampio.

La figura di Aradia ha attirato l’attenzione di studiosi di storia sociale e religiosa, oltre che di appassionati di occultismo e di religioni underground. Il giudizio più illuminante su questo lavoro è di J.B.\textsuperscript{22} Su tutta la questione, tra gli innumerevoli rimandi, ricordo Cohn 1975; Russell 1980, pp. 42–52; Ginzburg 1995, pp. 65–98.

\textsuperscript{23} Hutton 1999, p. 143.

\textsuperscript{24} Eliade 1976: Irodioada o Arada.

\textsuperscript{25} Magliocco 2009.

\textsuperscript{26} Come Herodias è menzionata all’inizio del II atto del Parsifal di Wagner.


\textsuperscript{28} Etruskische Spiegel V 110–111.

\textsuperscript{29} J. e S. Farrar, cit. in Menegoni 1999, p. XIV.

\textsuperscript{30} Cfr. il capitolo dedicato ad Ariadne in Kerényi 1976. Arianna in ambito minoico era indicata anche come Aridela, «la oltremodo chiara» (Hesych. s.v.).
Russell, che notava con acutezza: «Aradia is not what one would expect of a surviving witch cult; it is very much what one would expect from a late-nineteenth-century scholar attempting [...] to discover such cult».\(^{31}\)

Analoghi il giudizio del Rose, che non escludeva la possibilità di una sopravvivenza di idee paganeggianti legate alle eresie, anche se ciò escluderebbe una particolare antichità del materiale: «The whole work reads much more as if one of its authors was consciously seeking to establish that the witch-cult was a cult of this particular nature, and grafted material calculated to prove it on to an existing straightforward book of incantations».\(^{32}\)

Le edizioni americane più recenti, in particolare, hanno avuto come obiettivo quello di tentare di recuperare il testo originale italiano attraverso il testo riportato da Leland, che è in un italiano piuttosto incerto, e che di conseguenza egli aveva tradotto con frequenti sviste e fraintendimenti. Questo lavoro è stato compiuto non a caso da studiosi italo-americani: dapprima Mario Pazzaglini,\(^ {33} \) e più di recente Patricia Della-Piana, che si presenta come «spiritual poet» e «practicing strega (Italian witch)».\(^ {34} \) L’edizione curata da Pazzaglini è importante per diversi aspetti, tra i quali aver sottolineato che il testo italiano pubblicato da Leland è in più punti eccessivamente scorretto: «odd if he was copying the actual text».\(^ {35} \) Per una analisi dettagliata della vicenda testuale si può utilmente rimandare all’analisi di Mathiesen: basti ricordare che il controllo dei fogli di lavoro mostra chiaramente che in realtà Leland non si limitò a tradurre in inglese un testo che aveva ricevuto, ma riscrisse, rielaborò, aggiunse.\(^ {36} \) In effetti, lo stesso Leland più volte sottolinea la sua personale rielaborazione del materiale ricevuto, anche se non riesce a render conto al lettore di quali parti risalgano al manoscritto e quali siano dovute al suo intervento. La conclusione del lavoro filologico di Mathiesen è che Aradia è una «compilation made by Leland from a number of written texts and oral materials collected mostly (or entirely) from just one very unusual Italian informant, whom he named Maddalena».\(^ {37} \) Di più: il testo pubblicato riflette le idee di Leland, innestate in qualche

\(^{31}\) Russell 1980, pp. 151–152.

\(^{32}\) Rose 1962, p. 218.

\(^{33}\) Pazzaglini 1998.

\(^{34}\) Della-Piana 2009 (pubblicato on demand).


\(^{36}\) Mathiesen 1998, p. 35.

modo su materiale presumibilmente inventato da una eccezionale figura di «strong-minded woman from Florence».38

In definitiva, la parte che interessa dal punto di vista antichistico sta in quel materiale che finisce nel calderone insieme ad idee di riscatto sociale, di religiosità antagonista, ed anche di vago femminismo ante litteram che formano il fenomeno-Aradia. Da questo punto di vista specifico, Aradia poco o nulla aggiunge al materiale che già era raccolto nel precedente e ben più ampio lavoro, Etruscan Roman Remains: è su questo che converrà dunque concentrare le nostre attenzioni.

3. Folletti e filastrocche, un tanto al chilo

Che genere di materiale venne raccolto in Etruscan Roman Remains? Uno degli esempi migliori riguarda una filastrocca, o incantesimo, che a suo dire i contadini delle zone tra Toscana e Romagna utilizzavano per assicurarsi un buon raccolto di uva. Questa filastrocca recita così: «Faflon Faflon Faflon / a voi mi raccomando / Che l’uva nella mia vigna / è molto scarsa / a voi mi raccomando / che mi fate avere / buona vendemmia / Faflon Faflon Faflon / a voi mi raccomando / che il vino nella mia cantina / è molto buono / [...]». Lo stesso Leland, provvisto di nozioni di base di etruscologia, aveva facilmente operato il collegamento tra il folletto Faflon e la divinità etrusca Fufluns, Dioniso; e non può sfuggire la coincidenza che questo folletto sia legato al vino proprio come il semiomonimo dio antico. Così il folletto Tigna, il cui attributo è la folgore, è facilmente ricollegabile a Tinia, Zeus-Giove; Teramo a Turms, l’Hermes etrusco; Turanna, bella fata che aiuta gli amanti, non può non ricordare Turan, l’Afrodite etrusca; e così via. Da questo e da numerosi altri esempi simili, Leland aveva dedotto che molte divinità e figure semidivine dell’antica cultura etrusca erano sopravvissute nel corso dei secoli, ‘declassate’ da divinità a folletti e spiriti, e che il loro culto era ancora presente in aree non raggiunte dalla civiltà urbana come le campagne dell’Appennino toscano-romagnolo, in una società cristianizzata, ma solo in superficie. «La vecchia religione», come la chiamano i suoi informatori, è «more than a sorcery and less than a faith».

Quanto è attendibile questo materiale? I dubbi sono numerosi. Non può non saltare all’occhio la frequente excusatio di avere difficoltà ad intendere completamente la lingua italiana, anzi quel misto di italiano e

39 Leland 1892, p. 2.
dialetto con cui i suoi informatori si esprimevano.40 Quando leggiamo le trascrizioni fatte da Leland nelle sue opere, ci accorgiamo che vi sono frequenti travisamenti ed imprecisioni. Ma questo è solo uno dei punti che destano perplessità nel metodo di raccolta dei dati. Per avere informazioni, Leland leggeva più volte agli informatori liste di nomi di divinità etrusche,41 e chiedeva di cercare riscontri promettendo in cambio soldi o regali; dopo qualche giorno queste persone si presentavano con strambe filastrocche contenenti qualche nome di divinità etrusche, attingendo a volte anche da opere celebri, come quelle di Dante ed Ariosto.42 Dubbi sul materiale raccolto li ebbe egli stesso, come risulta dai suoi ricordi; parte delle tradizioni e dei canti che gli vennero riferiti poteva essere dovuto al fatto che si era sparsa la voce che un americano eccentrico regalava tabacco, rhum e soldi in cambio di strane storie. Leland si difese osservando che ben difficilmente una vecchia contadina tosco-emiliana avrebbe avuto la cultura necessaria per costruire una falsa storia basandosi su teonimi etruschi.43 Ma su questo punto torneremo più avanti.

Per cercare di fare chiarezza su questo aspetto, è importante ritornare alla misteriosa ‘Maddalena’ cui abbiamo già fatto cenno, ricordando che il mistero avvolge prima di tutto il suo vero nome. I documenti più rilevanti per tentare di sciogliere l’enigma sono pochi. Ci sono gli atti del Congresso londinese, ed in particolare l’esposizione di oggetti connessi al folklore (su cui torneremo più avanti): in quell’occasione Leland espone alcuni oggetti che gli sarebbero stati consegnati da Maddalena Taluti.44 C’è una preziosa lettera scrittagli dalla donna, che si firma Maddalena Talenti, che è presumibile ritenere il vero nome della donna.45 Una conferma viene da un documento ritrovato da Alberto Menarini, autorevole studioso di linguistica, che era entrato in possesso di tre volumetti di epoche diverse sulle ‘lingue furbesche’ appartenuti proprio a

---

40 «A somewhat archaic or simple form of Bolognese, in which there are many rough and strange words, most unlike Italian»: Leland 1892b, p. 185.
41 Ad es. Leland 1892, p. 5: «I have read [agli informatori] many times lists of the names of Roman deities...». Va notato tra l’altro che la forma Faflon potrebbe rispondere proprio alla lettura con pronuncia inglese del nome Fufluns.
42 «On one occasion I was given as a great find [...] some poetry which I soon found consisted of about one hundred and fifty lines from Ariosto»: Leland 1892, pp. 155–156.
43 «The women from whom they were derived could absolutely have no more invented them than they could have invented the flying-machine of the future» (!): Leland 1892, p. 9. Cfr. su questo punto Wellard 1973, p. 98.
44 Jacobs–Nutt 1892, p. 454.
Leland. Tra i numerosi appunti contenuti in questi libretti, ve n’è uno in cui si legge «Communicated by Maddalena Talenti 1896», indicazione che assume particolare importanza proprio in quanto appunto personale e non destinato a pubblicazioni: non si vede motivo per cui l’Americano avrebbe dovuto usare un nome falso per la sua informatrice su un appunto. Per quanto riguarda poi l’attendibilità di questa donna, una parola forse non decisiva ma quantomeno indicativa può essere aggiunta sulla scorta di un brano poco noto di Leland, in cui vi è una descrizione piuttosto impietosa della sua ‘informatrice’:

She is ever impecunious, and when reduced to living on air, like the wolves of François Villon, waylays me in the road, when a few francs change owner, and a promise is passed that traditional folk-lore shall be collected and written, as an equivalent. Then my agent goes about, among old women, into Florentine slums, and out into peasant homes, and anon delivers to me sheets of note-paper on which, in very pronounced Tuscan, is written a tale or two [...]. When I lately met my collector, she was, by her own account, going full speed to utter ruin [...]. She had been cited to be fined by the police, her landlord had warned her for a month’s arrears, all her clothes were in pawn, — she had in the world only a cent, and that was counterfeit. Result — five francs surrendered, and a week after sundry writings received.

Acquistare quasi ‘al peso’ («as an equivalent») materiale folklorico da una donna in condizioni molto critiche non è evidentemente un buon indizio di genuinità.

In definitiva, è difficile non concordare con l’anonimo recensore che nel 1901, pur nell’ambito di una discussione complessivamente positiva, notava: «Enthusiasm, Mr. Leland has in plenty, literary taste, and the art of interesting; but he lacks method».

---

46 Menarini 1948, p. 96.
47 Questi elementi mettono in secondo piano il ricordo Roma Lister, folklorista ed amica di Leland, che nelle sue memorie ricorda di averlo accompagnato qualche volta a fare domande agli informatori a Firenze e parla del ruolo preminente di una certa Margherita (Lister 1926, pp. 123–124): questo nome potrebbe essere frutto di una memoria imprecisa della Lister, oppure potrebbe essere stato il nome d’arte della donna.
48 Leland 1893c, p. 229.
49 In Folklore 11, No. 3, 1900, p. 309.
4. Per un bilancio su Leland: «si dia al fuoco la sua opera»?

Ho già avuto modo altrove di tracciare un pur incompleto bilancio dei giudizi critici sull’opera di Leland.\(^{50}\) Basti qui ricordare soprattutto l’aspra contesa che oppose negli anni ’20 del XX secolo due importanti studiosi come Raffaele Pettazzoni (1883–1959) e Raffaele Corso (1883–1965). Se il primo, pur esprimendo cautela ed alcuni dubbi, considerava con interesse il materiale raccolto da Leland,\(^{51}\) il secondo replicò duramente al collega scrivendo: «Si dia al fuoco la sua [di Leland] opera, per il decoro della scienza italiana!».\(^{52}\) Pettazzoni rispose alle accuse difendendo la sua posizione; ma non è il caso di entrare nel merito della polemica.\(^{53}\) Le valutazioni riprendono poi a partire dagli anni ’60, in concomitanza con la riedizione dei *Remains*: si può dire in generale che lo scetticismo prevale sull’accettazione.

È evidente che si tratta di una figura molto complessa: un fervido ed eclettico «indagatore di subculture»,\(^{54}\) con una pericolosa tendenza a confondere il materiale raccolto con proprie aggiunte personali (cosa che emerge peraltro anche dallo studio della sua produzione in altri settori)\(^{55}\) e ad esercitare pressioni sui suoi informatori. Tra le due ipotesi proposte in passato, che egli avesse inventato tutto o che fosse stato raggirato con abilità, una terza soluzione può essere avanzata: che egli, lungi dall’essere stato ingannato o dall’aver voluto ingannare i suoi lettori, avesse in qualche modo ingannato se stesso. La sua particolare sensibilità, la sua vantata propensione ad immedesimarsi in una cultura, specie nei suoi livelli folklorici, lo avrebbe condotto a chiedere ai suoi informatori riscontri a idee che già fermentavano nella sua vasta immaginazione, ed a suggerire involontariamente nomi, funzioni, connessioni che in realtà erano nella sua testa.\(^{56}\) In qualche modo, come già

\(^{50}\) Di Fazio 2003 e 2008.

\(^{51}\) Pettazzoni 1928, pp. 223–224; l’interesse fu peraltro ribadito anche nella prestigiosa sede del I Congresso Internazionale di Etruscologia (Firenze–Bologna 1928), nel quale Pettazzoni presiedeva la sessione dedicata alla religione.

\(^{52}\) Corso 1929.


\(^{54}\) Di Fazio 2003; cfr. anche Harari 1989, p. 244.

\(^{55}\) Parkhill 1997.

osservato da un recensore negli anni ’60, «he insisted, all too often, on exhibiting himself rather than a subject more interesting than he».

Dunque dovremmo seguire l’indicazione del Corso, e dare fuoco alla sua opera? In realtà, nel materiale raccolto paiono effettivamente conservati frammenti culturali in alcuni casi sorprendenti, come un centone di versi danteschi che Maddalena gli spaccia come antico, ed un poemetto pseudo-magico consistente di 150 versi di Ariosto. L’*Orlando Furioso* era una di quelle opere che nel corso del Rinascimento erano penetrate nella cultura popolare tramite recite orali: Montaigne nel suo viaggio in Italia del 1581 ricorda di aver conosciuto (proprio in Toscana) contadini analfabeti che lo conoscevano a memoria. Questi ed altri indizi ci suggeriscono che gli informatori attingessero effettivamente ad una cultura popolare tutt’altro che priva di interesse. E che qualche frammento di consuetudini antiche fosse rimasto impigliato in qualche modo nella rete della cultura popolare, è una traccia che credo valga la pena di seguire. Ma c’è anche un’altra considerazione.

In un celebre film del 1983, *Zelig*, Woody Allen racconta la storia di Leonard Zelig, personaggio affetto da una strana malattia che ne trasforma i tratti psicosomatici a seconda dell’ambiente che gli sta intorno. Con un musicista jazz di colore diventa musicista jazz e di colore, con dei campioni di baseball diventa campione di baseball, obeso con gli obesi, indiano con gli indiani. Zelig sembra un po’ ricordare il caso di Leland: nei campi rom era preso per un gitano, nei convegni di folklore per un folklorista, per un giornalista tra i giornalisti; a contatto con sedicenti streghe era diventato quasi più strega di loro, fino a confezionare un vero e proprio Vangelo delle streghe. Questo effetto-Zelig ha un’interessante implicazione: seguendo le tracce del nostro personaggio si finisce per addentrarsi nelle vicende di storia culturale degli Stati Uniti e dell’Europa del suo tempo, in un continuo intreccio di livelli ‘alto’ e ‘basso’. Leland ebbe infatti non solo una notevole mobilità, ma anche una eccezionale propensione ad entrare in contatto diretto con l’élite intellettuale di quei decenni come con le classi più popolari, trattando con la stessa disin-volta con un Edward B. Tylor o un Comparetti e con i Rom dell’Europa classici nel folklore moderno: il materiale usato a mo’ di esempio ha una base documentale molto più solida di quello raccolto da Leland.

57 Simeone 1964, p. 360.
60 Si veda la ripresa del tema-Zelig in Lanza 1997, p. 126.
centrale o i contadini dell'Italia centrale. È questo il percorso che cercheremo di seguire nei prossimi paragrafi. Quello che non può sfuggire infatti è che stiamo parlando di un protagonista, pur se a suo modo, della vita culturale del suo tempo. È questo un aspetto che merita di essere approfondito su diversi piani: i precedenti, il ‘brodo di coltura’ per così dire; la realtà a lui contemporanea; e quelli che sembrano essere stati fenomeni che in qualche modo hanno tratto spunto ed ispirazione dalla sua attività.

5. Vivere in un racconto di Hawthorne

Per inquadrare i precedenti, occorre tornare a quel New England che lo aveva visto nascere, e in cui l’interesse per magia, tradizioni e racconti popolari aveva trovato terreno fertile almeno dagli inizi del XIX secolo. Un filone di questi interessi è quello che riguarda la cultura indiana, che emerge nella letteratura americana già dai suoi inizi, come probabile compensazione per l’opera di distruzione dei nativi sul piano storico; ma più in generale è evidente, in un Paese ancora in via di formazione, l’interesse per le tradizioni locali, indigene o importate. Giusto per citare qualche esempio più vicino al momento che ci interessa, sono del 1831 le Legends of New England di J.G. Whittier, che scopriva nuovi filoni narrativi nelle tradizioni orali indiane; del 1855 è The Song of Hiawatha di H.W. Longfellow, che si basa su materiali storici, anche se il risultato travisava le intenzioni. Ma ancor più diretti dovettero essere gli influssi derivanti da quegli autori noti sotto l’etichetta di ‘trascendentalisti’: Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau e Amos Bronson Alcott (padre di Luisa May di Piccole Donne). Leland conobbe personalmente Emerson, ed Alcott fu suo schoolmaster nei primi anni di scuola a

62 Matthiessen 1941, p. 204.
64 Su questi cfr. il vecchio ma basilare Matthiessen 1941, che ha coniato la felice definizione di “American Renaissance” riferita in particolare a Hawthorne, Whitman e Melville; più di recente, le radici esoteriche dell’American Renaissance (rosacroccianesimo, teosofia, teorie di Swedenborg etc.) sono state messe in luce da Versluis 2001, che però purtroppo non prende in considerazione Leland.
65 Leland 1893b, p. 246, in cui sono ricordate le cene del sabato con Emerson e con Oliver W. Holmes, un altro esponente di spicco della cultura americana, appartenente ad una delle famiglie più di lunga tradizione del New England, i cosiddetti ‘Brahmins’ (termine coniato proprio da Holmes), nonché membro del cosiddetto ‘Dante Club’, ovvero quel gruppo di intellettuali americani che si cimentarono nell’impresa della
Sono numerose le pagine soprattutto dell’Emerson di *Nature* (1834) e degli *Essays* (1841–44) nelle quali riecheggiano assonanze con lo stile ispirato di Leland, ma una analisi puntuale ci porterebbe troppo lontano. Non fu esente da questa moda anche il puritano Nathaniel Hawthorne, tra i cui primi cimenti letterari vi erano *Seven Tales of My Native Land* (1828–30); ma anche alcuni dei racconti più tardi sono basati su leggende indiane, oltre che su atmosfere esoteriche e magiche. Si pensi al cap. XXIV di *The Blithedale Romance* (1852), in cui i frequentatori di una sorta di moderna Arcadia mettono in scena una mascherata zeppa di riferimenti stregoneschi, compreso un vero e proprio sabba infernale, in pagine che offrono diverse consonanze con i temi cari a Leland. E va ricordato che sempre Hawthorne esplorò nei suoi lavori anche il filone ‘italiano’, in particolare in *The Marble Faun* (1860), frutto di un tour del 1858 in cui aveva fatto ovviamente tappa anche a Firenze. Sarebbe dunque interessante sapere a quale di questi lavori pensava Leland quando, rievocando la sua giovinezza, scriveva «I seem to have lived in a legend by Hawthorne». Ben difficilmente, del resto, Hawthorne sarebbe rimasto indifferente al fascino della magia, essendo nativo di quella Salem, Massachusetts, che

traduzione della *Commedia* in inglese (pubblicata nel 1867); cfr. anche Leland 1891, p. 80, e Leland 1892, p. 48.


70 «Among them was an Indian chief, with blanket, feathers, and war-paint, and uplifted tomahawk; and near him, looking fit to be his woodland bride, the goddess Diana, with the crescent on her head, and attended by our big lazy dog, in lack of any fleeter hound»; «A bright-complexioned, dark-haired, vivacious little gypsy, with a red shawl over her head, went from one group to another, telling fortunes by palmistry; and Moll Pitcher, the renowned old witch of Lynn, broomstick in hand, showed herself prominently in the midst, as if announcing all these apparitions to be the offspring of her necromantic art»; «So they joined hands in a circle, whirling round so swiftly, so madly, and so merrily, in time and tune with the Satanic music, that their separate incongruities were blended all together, and they became a kind of entanglement that went nigh to turn one’s brain with merely looking at it». Questo lavoro di Hawthorne è frutto delle frequentazioni con i ‘Trascendentalisti’.

71 Matthiessen 1941, *passim*.

72 Leland 1893b, p. 6.
Poco più di un secolo prima era stato teatro del più feroce episodio di caccia alle streghe verificatosi nella storia americana. Proprio la presenza nel New England di credenze in fatto di stregoneria, indubbiamente influenzate dalla madrepatria Inghilterra, può essere una chiave di lettura per inquadrare i precoci interessi di Leland ed altri nei confronti di questi argomenti.

Sarà poi soprattutto dopo la guerra civile che si produrrà una letteratura attenta al folklore e alle leggende locali, evidente tra gli altri in W.D. Howells (1837–1920), nel più celebre Mark Twain (1835–1910), ed in molti altri autori e studiosi. Questo interesse sfocia progressivamente nella fondazione della American Folklore Society e di altre imprese dall’intento sistematico, come la Smithsonian Institution che a partire dal 1879 ampliava i suoi interessi all’etnologia americana. Anche senza cercare derivazioni ed influenze dirette, appare chiaro che vi era un clima decisamente favorevole all’osservazione di fatti folklorici, leggendari, popolari: clima del quale il recettivo Leland non poteva non essere partecipe.

6. Dalla cipolla di Tylor ai neopagani

Se questa è in qualche modo l’humus nella quale Leland cresce, non meno importante si rivela l’ambito in cui si troverà immerso in Europa. In particolare, gli ultimi decenni del XIX secolo ed i primi del XX furono ricchi di significative novità sul piano delle ricerche sul folklore e le tradizioni popolari un po’ in tutta Europa. Anche l’Italia, sulla spinta dell’Unità, cominciava a fornire studiosi importanti alla ricerca delle tradizioni popolari: su tutti spicca la figura di Giuseppe Pitré, decano degli studi di folklore italiano, ma anche Costantino Nigra, Domenico Compagnetti, Angelo De Gubernatis. Ma è indubbio che l’epicentro di questa


75 Dello stesso tenore appare un singolare intreccio tra biografia e letteratura riportato nelle sue memorie, laddove egli ricorda che un suo antenato, «a High German Doctor», era considerato un mago; Leland era anzi convinto che questo antenato fosse quell’ «High German Doctor» che compare nel racconto di Washington Irving Sleepy Hollow (Leland 1893b, p. 28).

76 Cfr. per una panoramica Zolla 1969.

nuova ventata di studi fosse l’Inghilterra vittoriana, probabilmente (come è stato acutamente osservato) anche in virtù delle imprese coloniali che portarono la civilizzata Inghilterra a contatto con realtà molto diverse.\textsuperscript{78} In questa temperie il nostro si trovò a suo agio, tanto da essere, secondo Dorson, «The American who penetrated deepest into the English folklore movement, and into the Victorian world of letters and culture».\textsuperscript{79} La scuola antropologica anglosassone si innestava sulle teorie evoluzioniste di Darwin, sviluppando l’idea che le società e le culture compiono percorsi simili a quelli degli organismi biologici.\textsuperscript{80} L’opera di Leland va dunque allineata su un asse cruciale, che parte da Edward B. Tylor, prosegue con James G. Frazer, e termina con Margaret A. Murray.\textsuperscript{81}

Tylor (1832–1917) fu forse il primo ad elaborare in termini antropologici il concetto di survival nel suo importante saggio del 1874, \textit{Primitive Culture}.\textsuperscript{82} Tradizioni e credenze apparentemente irrazionali si rivelavano, nella proposta tyloriana, relitti di antiche pratiche che in origine avevano una loro razionalità. Il confronto con Tylor è utile sotto diversi aspetti. Da un lato, è evidente che nello studioso inglese vi era uno spessore scientifico di altro tipo, e l’influenza che il suo lavoro ebbe nella storia degli studi sta a dimostrarlo. D’altro canto, lo stesso Tylor è la dimostrazione che la ricerca antropologica in quegli anni procedeva anche con qualche bizzarria. Per questo dobbiamo tornare a quel secondo \textit{International Folk-Lore Congress} tenuto a Londra nel 1891, che fu fortemente segnato proprio dalla relazione di Tylor.\textsuperscript{83} A margine dell’evento era stata organizzata una \textit{Exhibition of Objects Connected with Folk-Lore}: qui Tylor aveva esposto una cipolla che aveva personalmente recuperato a Rockwell Green, nel Somerset. L’ortaggio era infilzato da bastoncini e recava un’etichetta col nome di un calzolaio del posto: un chiaro esempio di maledizione, che lo studioso presentò ai colleghi come dimostrazione che le pratiche magiche in Inghilterra non solo avevano una tradizione molto antica, ma erano ancora largamente praticate.\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{78} «Un tedesco poteva ben tenere il suo sguardo rivolto alle religioni ariane così come un latino poteva tenerlo rivolto alle civiltà classiche; non un inglese, al quale si aprivano, invece, nuovi orizzonti, a mano a mano che nelle sue colonie veniva a contatto con una massa di popoli non ariani e in gran parte primitivi» (Cocchiara 2004, p. 356)

\textsuperscript{79} Dorson 1972, p. 261.

\textsuperscript{80} Cirese 1973, pp. 43–44.

\textsuperscript{81} Ackerman 1991.

\textsuperscript{82} Nell’ampia bibliografia mi limito a rimandare a Stocking 1987.

\textsuperscript{83} Dorson 1972, p. 266.


Le teorie di Tylor furono riprese e portate alla massima diffusione da uno tra i più noti ed influenti antropologi, Sir James George Frazer (1854–1941).86 È grazie a lui che le idee del survival e le teorie sui rapporti mito-rituale ebbero enorme risonanza anche fuori dall’ambito degli studi (si pensi solo all’influenza su un’opera come la Waste Land di T.S. Eliot).87 La prima edizione del monumentale Golden Bough è del 1890, ed ebbe diverse edizioni ampliate;88 ma né in questo né in altri lavori di Frazer, a quanto ho potuto appurare, è mai ricordato Leland, a conferma del fatto che i colleghi dovevano trovarlo un personaggio bizzarro, magari brillante, ma pur sempre un irregolare, in qualche modo anti-academico.

Arriviamo infine a M.A. Murray (1863–1963), di cui per certi versi il Nostro può essere considerato precursore. La Murray fu figura molto interessante e molto prolifica, anche grazie anche ad una vita lunghissima.89 Non sono i suoi lavori egittologici che le garantirono fama, ma i due saggi sulla caccia alle streghe nel corso dei secoli: come è noto, in questi due lavori la Murray sosteneva che i perseguitati fossero in realtà adepti di antichi culti pagani sopravvissuti nel tempo.90 Le analogie tra questa idea e la ‘scoperta’ di Leland sono abbastanza evidenti, anche se la Murray non cita mai il suo ‘collega’ americano; e non è detto che ne avesse

85 «As Belle [la moglie] says, she can’t turn over a shirt without having a fetish roll out» (Pennell 1906, II, p. 352).
86 Ackerman 1987.
89 La sua autobiografia è assai ironicamente intitolata My First Hundred Years (1963).
letto i lavori.\textsuperscript{91} Un confronto puntuale tra i testi manca; si può però ipotizzare che la studiosa inglese avesse ricevuto solo uno spunto dai lavori di Leland, per poi sviluppare le sue indagini in altre direzioni. D’altro canto, l’idea che accomuna i due, ovvero la sopravvivenza di interi sistemi religiosi ‘alternativi’ a quelli ufficiali, era nell’aria già da tempo. Per chiarire questo aspetto è necessario fare un passo indietro a riconsiderare il ‘crepuscolo’ dell’epoca della caccia alle streghe.

Nel corso del XVIII secolo il punto di svolta, ancora carico di contraddizioni, è fornito dalla pubblicazione del volume di Girolamo Tartarotti, \textit{Il Congresso notturno delle lammie} (1749), e dalle polemiche che si accesero in conseguenza. Ma mentre gli intellettuali discutevano, i roghi continuavano, anche se in misura minore rispetto ai secoli precedenti.\textsuperscript{92} È col XIX secolo, in un’atmosfera post-illuminista, che il fenomeno ufficialmente viene meno (tranne alcuni sporadici episodi), e può iniziare una vera riflessione con ambizioni di analisi storica e sociale. Nei primi decenni del secolo comincia a farsi largo l’idea che le persone accusate e perseguite come adoratori del diavolo nei secoli della caccia alle streghe fossero in realtà adepti di religioni precristiane. Già nel 1828 Karl Ernst Jarcke, professore a Berlino, aveva avanzato questa ipotesi, ripresa poco dopo, nel 1839, da un altro tedesco, Franz Josef Mone.\textsuperscript{93} Ma soprattutto, l’idea è alla base di tanti scritti di un influente autore, Jules Michelet. Nelle sue pagine si respira quella stessa atmosfera di ‘alterità’ rispetto all’ordine, creata dall’occulta persistenza degli dei, che pervade molte pagine di Leland.\textsuperscript{94} In particolare è indicativo il primo capitolo del principale lavoro di Michelet, da cui vale la pena riportare qualche ampio brano:

Certains auteurs nous assurent que, peu de temps avant la victoire du christianisme, une voix mystérieuse courait sur les rives de la mer Égée, disant : «Le grand Pan est mort.» [...] S’agissait-il simplement de la fin de l’ancien Culte, de sa défaite, de l’éclipse des vieilles formes religieuses ? Point du tout. [...]Cette aristocratie de l’Olympe, en sa décadence, n’avait nullement entraîné la foule des dieux indigènes, la

\textsuperscript{91} Secondo Clifton (1998, pp. 70–72) vi sono alcuni motivi per pensare che la Murray non conoscesse il suo predecessore americano.


\textsuperscript{94} La diretta conoscenza del lavoro di Michelet non è pressoché mai esplicitata da Leland, a parte un cursorio accenno in Leland 1892, p. 98 e Leland 1899, p. 102, in entrambi i casi in associazione con Georg Conrad Horst, autore di una \textit{Dämonomagie} (Frankfurt a.M. 1818) e di \textit{Zauber-bibliothek: Oder, von Zauberei, Theurgie und Mantik, Zauberern, Hexen, und Hexenprocessen} (Mainz 1821).

L’idea di sopravvivenze di conveittolico stregonesche sarà poi sviluppata in maniera ancora più estensiva dalla Murray; dai cui lavori parte però un altro filo, di diversa tessitura rispetto a quello antropologico: i suoi libri sui \textit{witch-cults} sono infatti importanti per lo sviluppo del fenomeno del cosiddetto ‘neopaganesimo’ nel XX secolo. Di questo movimento Leland è considerato un precursore, in particolare per il culto di Wicca, un movimento neopagano ancora oggi discretamente attivo, soprattutto negli Stati Uniti, e che ha avuto il suo ‘guru’ in Gerald Gardner.\textsuperscript{96} Non è il caso di entrare nei dettagli, che possono comunque risultare interessanti sul piano culturale, talvolta anche vicini al grottesco.\textsuperscript{97}


\textsuperscript{97} Vale però la pena richiamare una coincidenza. In uno dei teatri dei delitti del ‘Mostro di Firenze’, a Monte Morello, vicino Sesto Fiorentino, vennero rinvenuti alcuni strani circoli di pietre: «costruzioni circolari, tutte di diametro di 90 cm perfetti […], tutte aperte nel senso che la circonferenza era in tutte interrotta per un tratto di 10/15 cm. La costruzione appariva accurata nel senso che le pietre utilizzate per la loro costruzione erano tutte di medie/piccole dimensioni incastrate tra loro come se fosse un mosaico» (Giuttari 2006, p. 290). La descrizione corrisponde ad uno dei rituali presenti in una delle opere di neopaganesimo, il cosiddetto Moon Altar (Grimassi 2003, pp. 207–208). La pista esoterica è stata effettivamente presa in considerazione nell’ambito delle indagini.
7. «Célèbre and illustrissimo»


Leland aveva particolare interesse per un pregevole specchio prenestino con raffigurazione di Losna tra i Dioscuri: un pezzo celebre, che era stato rinvenuto a Palestrina nel XVIII secolo insieme alla ancor più celebre Cista Ficoroni. Aveva dunque chiesto a Maddalena informazioni su Losna, e la donna gli aveva risposto che era la dea del Sole e della Luna, e gli aveva riportato una storia relativa ad incesti tra fratello e sorella. Basandosi sulle riproduzioni riportate in diversi libri Leland aveva provato a disegnare tre o quattro copie dello specchio, ma con esito poco soddisfacente, tanto che l’editore Unwin le aveva rifiutate. Triste per l’intoppo, esce di casa e va in giro per Firenze; entra in un negozio di

98 Si vedano le belle foto raccolte in Sframeli 2007.
99 La copia che ho consultato alla *British School at Rome* era appartenuta a Thomas Ashby.
101 Romualdi 2000.
103 Leland 1892, pp. 90–94.
104 Bordenache Battaglia-Emiliozzi 1990, p. 211; cfr. *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 1, s.v. Amykos (G. Beckel), n. 2 (pp. 738–742).
antiquariato, e trova lo specchio vero e proprio, che ovviamente acquista, riuscendo finalmente ad ottenere un calco fedele. Come interpretare la vicenda? Inutile ricordare che l’originale è tuttora ben custodito al Museo di Villa Giulia, dove si trova dal 1913 (prima si trovava al Kircheriano, dalla metà del ’700). Va peraltro ricordato che un altro esemplare è conservato a Madrid, museo nazionale;\footnote{Blàzquez 1960, p. 145: il pezzo è parte di una collezione formatasi nel XIX secolo con materiale acquistato in Italia.} ma è a Madrid dal 1840 circa, e già Hübner\footnote{Hübner 1862, p. 190. Più di recente si veda la disamina di Martelli 2007, p. 359.} lo aveva riconosciuto come falso, anche perché è speculare rispetto a quello romano. È chiaro che trattandosi di uno specchio celebre, e riportato in diversi libri (Gerhard, Corssen), si prestava ad essere riprodotto da falsari. La vicenda è comunque indicativa del carattere del personaggio, e solleva diversi dubbi in merito ai suoi rapporti con gli ambienti antiquari fiorentini.

modo un anticipatore dei tempi.111 Queste iniziative, insieme al più volte ricordato ruolo nell’organizzazione dell’International Folk-Lore Congress, lasciano intendere che, se non sul piano scientifico, almeno su quello organizzativo il contributo di Leland alla storia del folklore fu di rilievo.

Sul primo numero della Rivista di Tradizioni Popolari Italiane venne pubblicato un contributo di Leland, ed anche una recensione di De Gubernatis al volume Etruscan Roman Remains. La recensione era sostanzialmente favorevole, tranne qualche critica nel merito di alcune proposte; ma De Gubernatis si augurava che il volume venisse giudicato anche da un etruscologo, nello specifico Luigi Adriano Milani (1854–1914), allievo e genero del Comparetti, che in quegli anni era responsabile del Museo Archeologico di Firenze. Milani però declinò l’invito, e suggerì a Leland di rivolgersi piuttosto a Ernesto Schiaparelli, che era direttore del Museo Egizio di Firenze.112

Il terzo personaggio, forse il più importante, era il romano Domenico Comparetti (1835–1927), senatore, docente dell’ateneo fiorentino e all’epoca una delle massime autorità accademiche italiane. Leland lo ringrazia con deferenza nella sua prima opera ‘fiorentina’, ed è probabilmente nella sterminata biblioteca del senatore che ebbe modo di consultare numerosi testi fondamentali di cui si avvale per le sue scorribande culturali. Oltre a conoscere e citare spesso e volentieri George Dennis e la Hamilton Gray, Leland conosce infatti il trattato di K.O. Müller, Die Sprache der Etrusker di S.P. Corssen, Gottheiten der Etrusker di E. Gerhard, A.N. de Vergeres, ma anche Inghirami, Lanzi, Gori; più in generale, si avvale delle opere di Friedrich, Lenormant, Creuzer, Preller. Tutte opere consultabili nella formidabile biblioteca di casa Comparetti,113 che rappresenta un polo importante per le ricerche di Leland, come da lui stesso ricordato: «Florence appears to be one of the most abundant fields for Folk-lore which I have ever examined, and Prof. Dom. Comparetti of this city possesses one of the best Folk-lore libraries in Europe».114


112 Così si legge in una lettera di Milani a Leland del 1887, conservata presso la Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze. A quanto mi consta, neppure Schiaparelli raccolse l’invito.


114 Leland 1887, p. 259.
Ma non sarà nella bottega di un antiquario come Bardini, né nel salotto di Comparetti, che potremo cercare le tracce del materiale raccolto da Leland. È altrove che le nostre attenzioni dovranno rivolgersi, dal momento che questo materiale proveniva da contadini e da streghe di campagna.

8. La ‘Romagna Toscana’

Sarà utile dunque soffermarsi sulla ‘Romagna Toscana’: così era detta la zona di confine tra le due regioni, a nord del Mugello, che storicamente appartenne a Firenze almeno dal XIV secolo, fin quando non fu aggregata alla provincia di Forlì nel 1923. Questa zona rimase per secoli sostanzialmente isolata, parecchio arretrata, e preda di un endemico banditismo. Tra le (poche) località menzionate da Leland vi sono Forlì, Rocca San Casciano, Civitella Romagna e soprattutto Premilcuore, località in cui già Gamurrini aveva segnalato un «sepolcro etrusco con vasi e bronzi, scheletri, armi e utensili, tazza con iscrizione». Conosciamo fortunatamente numerose opere di raccolta di tradizioni popolari romagnole, risalenti a diverse epoche, tra cui diversi proprio degli ultimi decenni del XIX secolo: rinviando per commenti ed esempi ad altri miei precedenti lavori, mi limito a ricordare che in queste raccolte si trovano abbondanti tracce di un cristianesimo superstizioso tipico delle campagne italiane non solo del XIX secolo, in cui le streghe non mancano, ma sembrano ben diverse dalle custodi della ‘vecchia religione’ di Leland; nulla si trova che possa invece essere ricondotto addirittura ad uno strato ‘etrusco’.

D’altro canto, uno sguardo alle tradizioni folkloriche ed alle raccolte di racconti romagnoli potrà facilmente mostrare che nel materiale raccolto da Leland si trovano diversi echi del patrimonio popolare di quella zona, come ad esempio l’importanza dei folletti: in particolare il folletto dispettoso dal cappello rosso, il mazapégul, che è comune non solo alla Romagna ma ad un’area molto più ampia che comprende le isole britanniche (il Redcap che compare anche nei romanzi di Harry Potter). Sia i folletti che le fate dell’area romagnola sembrano condividere caratteri

116 La scheda su Premilcuore fa parte del formidabile archivio di notizie raccolto da Gian Francesco Gamurrini, ed è citata in Nieri 1931, p. 507.
da un lato con i loro omologhi britannici, il che è stato collegato ad una comune matrice celtica,\textsuperscript{119} dall’altro con una tradizione classica; ma questo percorso ci porterebbe lontano dal nostro interesse.

Va però soprattutto sottolineato che nello svolgere le sue indagini Leland rimaneva comodamente a Firenze. Non è dato sapere anzi se in realtà abbia mai messo piede nella ‘Romagna Toscana’. Le località citate sono poche, ed il quadro geografico con cui si apre il suo \textit{Remains} è molto pittoresco, ma anche molto di maniera. Nulla insomma ci fa pensare che il Nostro sia andato direttamente nei luoghi di cui parla;\textsuperscript{120} va anche considerato che in quegli anni era non più giovane ed afflitto da vari acciacchi, dei quali si lamentava spesso con la nipote. Ancora una volta, l’immagine di alacre ricercatore necessita di essere ridimensionata. Torniamo dunque a Firenze.

\section*{9. Gli Etruschi nella cultura popolare toscana}

E qui si arriva ad un punto chiave della nostra ricerca. Infatti conosciamo piuttosto bene la storia dell’interesse verso gli Etruschi da parte della cultura accademica europea, ma anche la storia del fascino che questo popolo esercitò su viaggiatori e artisti nel corso dei secoli. Sappiamo che diversi artisti del Medioevo e del Rinascimento italiano si ispirarono più o meno direttamente ad opere di arte etrusca per i loro lavori.\textsuperscript{121} In età rinascimentale, il mito etrusco in Toscana acquisterà anche importanti valenze politiche: Cosimo de’ Medici si poneva ai suoi contemporanei come novello Porsenna.\textsuperscript{122} Sappiamo inoltre bene quanto i resti etruschi incuriosissero i numerosi protagonisti del \textit{Grand Tour}, fino ad arrivare alla luminosa figura di George Dennis. Insomma, la storia dell’interesse verso gli Etruschi da parte di studiosi, viaggiatori ed in generale del pubblico colto è stata più volte studiata ed esplorata.\textsuperscript{123}

\begin{itemize}
\item[119] Baldini 1988, p. 191.
\item[120] Nell’\textit{Introduzione} a Leland 1892 è esplicitamente ricordato che alcuni informatori prendevano tempo per scrivere lettere ai loro amici residenti nella zona romagnola (p. 5); più avanti lo stesso ricorda materiale che «...was obtained in Rocca Casciano for me» (p. 22).
\item[121] Si pensi alle suggestive ipotesi di influenze iconografiche etrusche su artisti quali Ghiberti: Cherici 2006. Per altri esempi di continuità iconografiche cfr. Hall 1996.
\item[122] Cipriani 1980; cfr. anche Thoden van Velzen 1999.
\item[123] Mi limito a citare da ultime le raccolte di saggi in Haack 2015, Della Fina 2017 e Swaddling 2018.
\end{itemize}
Resta ancora invece da indagare la storia di questo interesse presso le classi popolari.\textsuperscript{124} Sarà però utile raccogliere qualche ‘spigolatura’ al proposito.

Gli autori dell’inchiesta \textit{I libri più letti del popolo italiano}, del 1903, erano costretti a confessare di non aver potuto tenere in conto i «fogli volanti, opuscoletti popolari, sacri e profani, canzonette ecc. che formano purtroppo la sola lettura di una grande percentuale del popolo italiano».\textsuperscript{125} È noto che uno dei principali veicoli di diffusione di cultura nell’Italia moderna furono i numerosi almanacchi e lunari, che avevano l’obiettivo principale di fornire informazioni di vario genere, utili in particolare per le attività agricole, ma non solo. Il fenomeno della diffusione di questi fascicoli è ben studiato proprio per la Toscana dei secoli XVIII e XIX.\textsuperscript{126} Un pur cursorio esame degli articoli contenuti negli almanacchi e lunari diffusi nella Toscana del XIX secolo restituisce effettivamente l’impressione che l’interesse per le antichità locali fosse tutt’altro che estraneo: di fianco a pezzi dedicati ad argomenti i più vari, come i \textit{Cenni sulla cultura del trifoglio pratese} o un bizzarro \textit{Astuzie per non pagare all’osteria},\textsuperscript{127} si leggevano anche un \textit{Racconto sull’antico tempio di Giove},\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Ritrovamenti di oggetti di antichità},\textsuperscript{129} e diversi contributi dedicati alle vicende storiche di Firenze e della Toscana. È facile insomma che attraverso questi almanacchi, che erano molto diffusi anche tra i ceti più popolari, si diffondessero anche nozioni spicchiole di cultura e di storia; ma una più precisa valutazione dell’elemento etrusco richiederà un esame più specifico.

Un altro settore di indagine, in qualche modo parallelo a quello degli almanacchi e lunari, è quello dei testi scolastici, per i quali ancora una volta la Toscana si offre fortunatamente come punto di osservazione privilegiato. In generale l’editoria italiana della seconda metà dell’Ottocento trova proprio in questa regione alcuni tra gli esempi più importanti: basti ricordare i nomi di Le Monnier e Bemporad. Se la maggior parte dei volumi pubblicati da queste case editrici aveva diffusione principalmente negli ambienti più colti, non va sottovalutato il fenomeno dei testi scolastici, che ovviamente avevano una circolazione diversa, e che proprio gli

\textsuperscript{124} Qualche interessante elemento in Thoden van Velzen 1999.
\textsuperscript{125} Cfr. Pivato 1986, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Lunario per l’anno bisestile}, 1832 (in Solari 1989, p. 177 n. 350).
\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Almanacco universale per l’anno 1821} (in Solari 1989, p. 80 n. 174).
\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Calendario casentinese per l’anno 1840} (in Solari 1989, pp. 90–91 n. 193).
stessi editori affidavano a nomi di assoluto valore scelti spesso tra i
docenti dell’Università di Firenze.\textsuperscript{130} È ancora da fare una indagine su
come gli Etruschi venissero raccontati nei testi scolastici.\textsuperscript{131}

Ma tra i volumi destinati agli intellettuali e quelli per le scuole,
l’editoria dell’epoca contava pure numerosi titoli rivolti a classi popolari;
in questa produzione spiccano spesso veri e propri poligrafi, come Cesare
Causa, autore di centinaia di commedie, racconti e saggi dal taglio divulgativo.
Tra le commedie in particolare assumono interesse quelle che
hanno come protagonista la maschera fiorentina, Stenterello. E tra queste
commedie alcuni titoli non possono non catturare l’attenzione, come il
caso dell’opera \textit{Stenterello burlato da una giovane, perseguitato da una
vecchia e tormentato dalle supposte streghe}, pubblicato dalla Salani nel
1884.\textsuperscript{132}

In definitiva, se negli ultimi decenni del XIX secolo un membro dei
ceti medi fiorentini avesse voluto creare qualche storia dal sapore etrusco,
avrebbe avuto sotto mano tutto sommato agevolmente materiale ed
informazioni spicchiole su cui costruire. Questo è un dato che credo vada
tenuto in conto. Ma non ci esime dall’affrontare, giunti alla fine di questa
rassegna, la questione centrale: è possibile che nel corso dei secoli in
alcune zone dell’Italia centrale si fossero conservati frammenti di antiche
tradizioni più o meno religiose, sopravvissuti a livello di superstizioni, di
leggende, di elementi favolistici?

\subsection*{10. Survival?}

Sopravvivenze di forme di paganesimo in età postclassica sono state più
volte evidenziate dalla ricerca storica.\textsuperscript{133} A proposito di etruschi e folk-
lore, mi limiterò a richiamare qualche esempio. Una vera e propria
miniera di elementi popolari è ovviamente la novellistica italiana del
Trecento; in quest’ambito, altrettanto ovviamente, l’attenzione maggiore
va al \textit{Decameron} di Boccaccio. Nella Prima novella della Settima giornata
si racconta di Monna Tessa, moglie di Gianni Lotteringhi, la quale,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{130} Sull’editoria toscana della seconda metà del XIX secolo cfr. i saggi raccolti in
Porciani 1983.
\item \textsuperscript{131} Per un’analisi sui manuali contemporanei si veda di recente Micozzi 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{132} Ma del Causa si ricordano anche altri lavori interessanti come \textit{Le streghe di
Benevento, con Stenterello medico per combinazione}, edito sempre da Salani nel 1874.
In particolare sull’attività dell’editore Salani cfr. Faccioli 1983.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Cfr. di recente la messa a punto di Montanari 2001, con riferimenti ai lavori di
Angelo Brelich ed Ernesto de Martino. Per altre indicazioni rinvio a Di Fazio 2008 e
Ermacora 2013. Riflessioni molto interessanti sul \textit{survival} come oggetto suggestivo e
inquietante in Bettini 2009, pp. 332–335.
\end{itemize}
durante le assenze del marito, ‘riceve’ un amante. Il segnale convenuto per indicare l’assenza del marito è la direzione in cui sarebbe stato rivolto il teschio di un asino montato su un palo sul limite di una vigna accanto alla casa di Monna Tessa. Questa consuetudine dei contadini toscani, ma anche umbri, di collocare il teschio di un asino su un palo a protezione della vigna è nota e ben documentata a livello folklorico ancora durante il XIX secolo.\textsuperscript{134} Ed è in qualche modo sorprendente ricordare che Columella, l’agronomo romano vissuto nel I secolo d.C., ci dice che gli Etruschi erano soliti collocare la testa di un asino sul confine dei campi per proteggerli dai fulmini di Giove (X, 344–347).

Nello stesso ambito possiamo collocare la superstizione raccolta da alcuni folkloristi italiani agli inizi del XX secolo tra Romagna, Toscana ed alto Lazio, secondo cui chi avesse spostato le pietre di confine tra poderi, al momento della morte sarebbe rimasto in agonia finché non gli fosse stata posta una pietra sotto la testa.\textsuperscript{135} La sacralità delle pietre di confine era già ben presente nella cultura etrusca: basti pensare alla ben nota ‘profezia di Vegoia’, in cui la ninfa etrusca Vegoia rivela ad Arrunte Veltimmo che vi saranno punizioni per chi si appropria di terre altrui mediante lo spostamento delle pietre di confine.\textsuperscript{136} Anche in questo caso, la continuità è sorprendente; ed anche in questo caso, essa coinvolge aspetti della vita che più direttamente coinvolgono la sfera agraria. Ma inoltre, trattandosi di credenze e regole legate alla terra ed alla sua gestione, è facile pensare che si prestassero ad essere tramandate nel corso dei secoli.

Un altro interessante aspetto riguarda il frequente rinvenimento in tombe etrusche di punte di freccia in selce o ossidiana, databili ad età preistoriche. Sappiamo che in epoca classica questi frammenti erano interpretati come prodotti della conflagrazione di fulmini, e detti appunto \textit{keraunia} o \textit{ceraunia}. Anche in questo caso, conosciamo ampiamente l’uso di tali oggetti come amuleti; ancora nel XIX secolo questo uso era frequente tra i contadini in Toscana, Umbria e Marche.\textsuperscript{137}

Un lavoro di setaccio degli atti dei processi per stregoneria costituirebbe un altro punto interessante per capire se è possibile che un culto pagano possa essere sopravvissuto nei secoli. Si scoprirebbe ad esempio che a metà del ‘500 la ‘strega’ Antonia, che operava tra Firenze e Siena,
invocava Diana in termini dal sapore ‘Aradiano’: «Stella Diana, stella mattutina, io ti scongiuro assieme con il diavolo [...]».  

Non è dunque da escludere che una opera sistematica, e condotta con enorme cautela, di analisi del materiale folklorico raccolto sul campo oppure confluito nella letteratura italiana nel corso dei secoli possa permetterci di individuare alcune ‘anomalie’ che ci restituiscono informazioni su usi e tradizioni risalenti alla cultura pre-cristiana, proprio come le manifestazioni artistiche ed architettoniche in Toscana a volte paiono conservare traccia di iconografie etrusche. Una ricognizione del patrimonio folklorico raccolto nella letteratura popolare potrebbe riservare qualche sorpresa.

Quello che invece andrebbe discusso è la possibilità che a sopravvivere nel corso dei secoli fosse un intero sistema religioso, con una sua organicità e coerenza, quale al Nostro sembrò poter riconoscere. Ma evidentemente questo è un argomento che esula dalle possibilità di chi scrive, e dai propositi del presente scritto.

Massimiliano Di Fazio  
*Università di Pavia*  
massimiliano.difazio@unipv.it

---

139 Cito ad esempio il recente lavoro di Cherubini 2010, che dedica interessanti pagine agli elementi di continuità delle caratteristiche delle streghe del mondo antico (pp. 30–34).  
140 È però importante che queste ricognizioni, che finora sono state condotte perlopiù da storici della letteratura, vengano fatte con l’occhio dell’etruscologo o più in generale dell’antichista. Per esempio la novella del Sercambi (XLIII, I) in cui un tal Scipione si getta volontariamente in una voragine piena di fuoco per salvare Roma, non attinge ad un sostrato celtico né ha a che fare con l’importanza del cavallo nelle culture nordiche, come proposto da Montesano 2000, p. 103, ma è probabilmente frutto della lettura della storia di Marco Curzio che si getta nel lacus che da lui prenderà nome, narrata da Livio (VII, 6).
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THE LEGACY OF THE DRUNKEN DUCHESS: 
GRACE HARRIET MACURDY, BARBARA McMANUS AND 
CLASSICS AT VASSAR COLLEGE, 1893–1946

— JUDITH P. HALLETT —

ABSTRACT

This paper builds on a monumental biography published by the Ohio State University Press in 2017: The Drunken Duchess of Vassar: Grace Harriet Macurdy, Pioneering Feminist Scholar, by the late Barbara McManus. Macurdy (1866–1946), who came from a family without social, economic and educational advantages, joined the Classics faculty at the all-female Vassar College in 1893 after receiving BA and MA degrees from Harvard University’s Radcliffe Annex. Following a year studying in Berlin, she received her PhD from Columbia in 1903, and immediately established herself as an internationally renowned Greek scholar, ultimately publishing two groundbreaking books on ancient women’s history. I will contextualize Macurdy’s life and work by looking at evidence beyond the purview of McManus’ book about two of Macurdy’s equally illustrious Classics colleagues, who taught with her at Vassar prior to her retirement in 1937 — Elizabeth Hazelton Haight (1872–1964) and Lily Ross Taylor (1886–1969).
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1. Grace H. Macurdy’s Legacy

My essay and the research it represents build on a monumental work of biographical scholarship published by the Ohio State University Press in 2017: The Drunken Duchess of Vassar: Grace Harriet Macurdy, Pioneering Feminist Scholar, by Barbara McManus.¹ Macurdy, who lived from 1866 through 1946, taught Classics at the then all-female Vassar College for 44 years, from 1893 through 1937. McManus, born four years before Macurdy’s death, in 1942, taught

¹ McManus (2017). See also Hallett (2016a) 213 and (2018a) and the review by Pounder (2017).
The Legacy of the Drunken Duchess

Classics at the all-female College of New Rochelle, her own undergraduate alma mater, from 1967 to 2001. She died on June 19, 2015, shortly after finishing her labors on this book.¹

Three months before her death, immediately upon submitting the manuscript to the Press, aware that she would not be able to see it through publication, Barbara McManus had entrusted the British classicist Christopher Stray and me with the privilege of bringing the book to completion. Since then, I have also enthusiastically embraced the challenge of continuing McManus’ research about Macurdy, and about the study of classical languages, literatures and cultures at Vassar and other U.S. women’s colleges from the 1890s, when Macurdy joined the Vassar faculty, until the 1940s, when Macurdy died, a period extending over fifty years. One, but far from the only, reason for my embrace of this challenge is that the two distinguished scholars who refereed the manuscript suggested further lines of inquiry that McManus’ manuscript did not pursue: perhaps because of its singular biographical focus on one, fascinating, individual.

Macurdy grew up outside of Boston in the working-class suburb of Watertown, in a family without social, economic and educational advantages. She suffered from deafness from the time she was in her early fifties; she assumed responsibility for raising the three motherless offspring of her sister soon after becoming deaf. Nevertheless, after earning her BA in 1888 and taking a series of graduate courses in Classics at Harvard’s Radcliffe Annex, studying for a year in Berlin in 1899–1900, and receiving her PhD in 1903 at Columbia University in New York City (in a mere two years, while teaching full-time at Vassar), Macurdy established herself as an internationally renowned Greek scholar. Her publications included two groundbreaking books on ancient women’s history, both published by the Johns Hopkins University Press: *Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria*

² See Taylor and Haight (1915) on Vassar College before and during Macurdy’s time there. According to its *Wikipedia* entry (2019), the college was “the second degree-granting institution of higher education for women in the United States, one of the historic Seven Sisters, and one of the first elite female colleges in the US.” Located in Poughkeepsie, New York, 84 miles north of New York City, it remained all female until going coeducational in 1969. For Macurdy’s years at Vassar, see McManus (2016) 201–211 and (2017) 34–225 as well as Pomeroy (2019). For McManus’s years studying as an undergraduate (1960–1964) and then teaching (1967–2001) at the all-female College of New Rochelle, 69 miles to the south of Vassar in Westchester County, see Hallett (2016a) and McManus (2017) x–xiii (by Hallett and Stray) as well as Brown–Hallett–Marsilio–Raia (2016) and (2019).
One of the two scholars who refereed *The Drunken Duchess* was Elizabeth Carney of Clemson University, who has published widely on Hellenistic queens. A graduate of another woman’s college, Smith, she is also the mother of a Vassar alumna. The other was Donald Lateiner of Ohio Wesleyan University, father of a Vassar alumnus, whose scholarly specializations include ancient prose fiction: an area of literary research pioneered by Macurdy’s Latinist colleague at Vassar, Elizabeth Hazelton Haight, herself an 1894 Vassar graduate. Both Carney and Lateiner were eager to see Macurdy’s career and scholarship situated in a larger social and historical context, ideally through close comparisons between her career and those of other contemporary female classicists, both at Vassar and elsewhere. My paper will contextualize Macurdy’s work in this very way, by looking at some evidence beyond the purview of McManus’ book about two of Macurdy’s Vassar Classics colleagues, Haight and Lily Ross Taylor, and indeed about Macurdy herself.4

---

3 See McManus (2017), as well as the book’s back cover; see also Hallett (2016a) and (2018a).

4 Both Lateiner and Carney are quoted on the back cover of *The Drunken Duchess*, with the former stating: “McManus has delivered a pioneering study of an American Classicist and feminist academic,” and the latter, “Macurdy’s life is fascinating, and McManus has recovered an amazing collection of primary sources about it.” For Lateiner, see his *Prabook* entry (2019); for Carney, see her Clemson faculty biography (2019). The back cover also contains the following summary of the book:

In this biography, Barbara McManus recovers the intriguing life story of Grace Harriet Macurdy (1866–1946), Professor of Greek at Vassar College and the first woman classicist to focus her scholarship on the lives of ancient Greco-Roman women. Fondly known as “The Drunken Duchess,” although she never drank alcohol, Macurdy came from a poor family with no social, economic, or educational advantages. Moreover she struggled with disability for decades after becoming almost totally deaf in her early fifties. Yet [after receiving a BA from Harvard’s Radcliffe Annex in 1888, winning a fellowship to study in Berlin, and, while teaching full-time at Vassar, earning a PhD from Columbia (where she also taught for several summers) in 1903] she became an internationally known Greek scholar with a long list of publications and close friends as renowned as [the British Greek scholar] Gilbert Murray and [the British poet laureate] John Masefield.

Through Macurdy’s eyes and experiences, McManus’ biography also examines significant issues and developments from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century, such as the opening of higher education to women, the erosion of gender and class barriers in the profession, the delicate balancing
Macurdy’s Vassar Classics colleague of greatest socio-historical interest is certainly Haight. Born in 1872, she received a PhD in Classics from Cornell, then taught at Vassar from 1902 through 1942, serving as Chair of the Latin Department after attaining the rank of Full Professor in 1923. Like Macurdy, she published prolifically, in the areas of Greek and Latin poetry as well as in ancient prose fiction. Lily Ross Taylor, perhaps the most esteemed American female classicist of the twentieth century, deserves a closer look in this context too. Upon receiving her PhD from Bryn Mawr College in 1912, she joined the Vassar faculty, where she taught until 1927 before returning to Bryn Mawr, initially as Professor and Chair of Latin, later becoming Dean of the Graduate School.

During the First World War, Taylor left Vassar to become the first woman appointed as Fellow at the newly consolidated American Academy in Rome, arriving in October 1917. But she spent most of her fellowship year (1917–1918) in Padua as an American Red Cross hospital inspector. During her second Fellowship year (1918–1919), Taylor spent nine months in war work, especially as part of the American Red Cross Commission to the Balkans, including five months in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and only three at the Academy. She concluded her war work in September 1919, and was in residence at the Academy in 1919–1920 until late August, and then again for three months in fall 1921. Over a decade later, during the 1934–1935 academic year, while on sabbatical act between personal and professional life required of women, the marginalized role of women’s colleges in academic politics, and changes in the discipline and profession of Classics in response to the emerging role of women and new social conditions.

Geffcken (2018), my undergraduate Classics teacher at Wellesley College, who was born in 1927 and has been associated with the American Academy in Rome for 65 years, called my attention to another Vassar Latinist on whom she has herself done research: Elizabeth Hatch Palmer. A Wellesley graduate, Palmer spent 1912 at the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, lived at the Pensione Girardet where most women classicists resided at that time, became a friend of the archaeologist Esther Van Deman, and collected ancient coins for teaching. Geffcken reported a recent conversation with the granddaughter of the Pensione Girardet’s owner that afforded her the opportunity to examine an album of photos and a summary about guests. Haight figures prominently in both, along with Macurdy and Taylor (from her year as an ASCSR student in 1909–1910). These records offer valuable information for future researchers on these American women classicists.

Geffcken also mentioned Ethel Brewster as “another Latinist in that Vassar scene, who also had Rome ties, agreed with Taylor that the department needed to do more than translation, and moved on to Swarthmore.”

5 For Haight, see Lateiner (1996–1997) and (2019) as well as her Wikipedia (2019a) and Vassar College Encyclopedia entries (2019b).
from Bryn Mawr, Taylor came back to the American Academy in Rome, as “Acting” Professor-in-charge of its School of Classical Studies; upon retiring in 1952, she was appointed “Official” Professor in charge at the same program, holding that post through 1955. Both Haight and Taylor also served as the second and third female presidents of the national professional organization of classicists, the American Philological Association, in 1934 and 1942 respectively.

To be sure, McManus’ book devotes some attention to Haight, largely in connection with Macurdy’s attempts to support Haight’s promotion to Full Professor in 1922. Yet McManus does not give Haight’s academic achievements, among them thirteen books, much scrutiny or credit. Indeed, she quotes Macurdy’s recommendation of Haight for promotion, comparing Haight’s work unfavorably to that of Taylor and deeming the latter “distinguished.” As for Taylor herself, McManus quotes, very

6 For Taylor, see Brennan (2018) and Broughton (2019).
7 As McManus (2017) 61–98, notes, Abby Leach, who hired and then cruelly persecuted Macurdy at Vassar, was the first female president of the American Philological Association in 1900. Of special interest in this context are 95 (“[Leach] did not pursue a formal program of study leading to a doctorate but rather studied informally at the University of Leipzig and also attended some lectures of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve at Johns Hopkins University”) and 97–98 (“Leach was strikingly different from the small number of men who controlled the APA offices — not so much because she was a woman, but rather because, unlike these eminent scholars, she had never published a single article nor delivered a paper at a classics conference until she gave her APA presidential address. She was the ‘prodigy’ of William Watson Goodwin, the Harvard Greek professor whom she had persuaded to give her private tuition. Goodwin had twice served as APA president ... To Goodwin and others, Abby Leach was a fine figurehead, an imposing and attractive woman who was a skilled classical linguist but posed no threat to male hegemony in the association.”). See also Hallett (2019) on the female presidents of the APA who succeeded Haight and Taylor. Two of them, Cornelia Catlin Coulter (1948) and Inez Scott Ryberg (1962), also taught at Vassar.
8 McManus (2017) 120–121. Macurdy to Vassar President Henry Noble MacCracken on the promotion of Haight to full professor, January 7, 1922:

I have known Miss Haight well, though not intimately, for many years: Her good points are so conspicuous that it is hardly necessary to set them down. She is a teacher whose enthusiasm and genuine love for her subject infect her classes, so that the “gospel” of the classics is spread through her. She is, in an entirely good sense of the word, a propagandist for her subject. That, in a sense, is her greatest gift and I know that no member of the two departments would deny her pre-eminence over all the rest of us in that line ... She is distinguished for “executive ability” and you know still better than I her
briefly, from Taylor’s 1939 review of Macurdy’s *Vassal Queens*. So, too, citing from her own 1997 book on *Classics and Feminism*, and its analysis of Taylor’s professional “image,” McManus also compares Taylor to Macurdy, judging Macurdy to have achieved international professional stature as “a woman and a scholar,” whereas “the womanhood of ... Taylor ... was ignored in her achievement of scholarly status as an ‘honorary male’.”

Yet McManus does not say anything else about Taylor or her research, other than to note that Taylor, along with Macurdy and a few other female classicists who taught at women’s colleges, served on the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens from 1925 through 1929. Indeed, three other female classicists with whom Macurdy enjoyed close relationships occupy more space in the book than does Taylor. Two were Macurdy’s former Vassar students who later became Vassar colleagues (as well as a mutually devoted lesbian couple at the center of a fabled foursome): Ida Carleton Thallon Hill and achievements in that way during the War. Her administration of the Department of Latin this year has been tactful and successful. In all our dealings I have found her fair and eager for the best good of both departments.

You know her indefatigable industry and the quality of her writing. I shall be untruthful if I said that I believe her to be distinguished in the line of pure research — as for example, Professor Lily Taylor is distinguished. She has been too busy with other things for that and probably too the quality of her mind is not that, fine as her mental equipment is. I speak perhaps with too great frankness here, but it is in no spirit of derogation. I do not hold that pure research is, with the brief time allowed for it, a *sine qua non* for the full professorship in most of our American colleges. Miss Haight would be a very great loss to the Department of Latin if she should resign because of a failure to receive promotion. I very sincerely second the request of my friends in the Latin Department that she be given the rank of full professor for the next year.

---

9 McManus (2017) 205 n. 45: “The reviews of *Vassal-Queens* were again positive, with most praise given to the collection of difficult-to-find information: ‘No one has ever before brought together the available evidence for all the vassal queens of Rome’” (citing Taylor (1939)).

10 McManus (2017) 246 n. 59: “Most significantly, [Macurdy] earned this distinction as ‘a woman and a scholar’ in such a way that neither side of the equation diminished the other, as happened with two other outstanding female classicists of the era. In the case of her early role model, Jane Ellen Harrison, gender was accentuated at the expense of recognition as a ‘sound scholar,’ while the womanhood of Macurdy’s younger colleague Lily Ross Taylor was ignored in her achievement of scholarly status as an honorary male.” For more information about Lily Ross Taylor, see McManus (1997) 32–35. See also Appendix 1 below.
Elizabeth Denny Pierce Blegen. The third was Macurdy’s lifelong friend, the British-born Gertrude Mary Hirst, who taught at Barnard College from 1901 through 1943. Three years Macurdy’s junior, Hirst obtained her PhD from Columbia in 1901, two years before Macurdy earned hers. Still, McManus does not provide much information on Macurdy’s female classicist contemporaries other than Hirst, even Macurdy’s fellow Hellenist on the ASCSA Managing Committee Julia Caverno, who joined the Smith faculty in 1893, the same year that Macurdy arrived at Vassar. Or, for that matter, even Cornelia Catlin Coulter, who taught at Vassar from 1916 through 1925, before taking a post at Mount Holyoke College. In my epilogue to McManus’ book I attempted to contextualize Macurdy’s life and career by comparing her to another contemporary female classicist who did not teach at Vassar: Edith Hamilton. A year Macurdy’s junior, Hamilton, like Macurdy, had studied Classics as an undergraduate at another women’s college, Bryn Mawr; pursued graduate work, also at


14 On Coulter (1885–1960), see McManus (2017) 98 and 120 as well as Quinn (2019). McManus observes on 98 that Coulter gave two papers at the American Philological Association meetings from 1910–1918 (Macurdy presented eight, as well as having four papers “read by title”). On 120, McManus also observes:

Although Grace herself had been barred from teaching advanced courses for many years, she expressed regret in this report that she had been unable to give her new Greek instructor Cornelia Catlin Coulter any advanced courses because she did not want to put too much of a burden on her during her first year in the department. However, Coulter would have nine hours of advanced elective work and no elementary courses in the following year: “This will give her opportunity to immerse herself in Greek literature under favorable circumstances.” Grace repeatedly wrote to President MacCracken praising Coulter’s work and recommending a higher salary and promotion to assistant professor. Later she did everything in her power to foster Coulter’s career, even when it meant losing her to Mount Holyoke. In fact, Grace privately asked Mount Holyoke’s president Mary Woolley, to make sure that Coulter did not “burden herself so heavily that she will have no time for research and publication.”
Bryn Mawr, that included a year’s study abroad in Germany; and concentrated mostly on the ancient Greeks in her writings. Hamilton, however, did not complete her doctorate. For twenty-six years she made her living as the headmistress of the Bryn Mawr School, a private all-girls’ secondary institution in Baltimore with an exclusively college preparatory curriculum; she never taught at the college level and only taught an Advanced Latin course (never any Greek) on the secondary level.

Most significant, Edith Hamilton wrote best-selling books, such as *The Greek Way* and *Mythology*, for commercial publishers, rather than the serious, responsibly researched scholarship to which Macurdy dedicated her life and self. My epilogue contrasted not only Macurdy, but also Barbara McManus herself, with Hamilton on these grounds. Both Macurdy and McManus helped redefine the category of professional classical scholar to include women, from modest as well as more privileged backgrounds, who taught at undergraduate liberal arts institutions, spoke authoritatively in their own voices and focused their research on the lives of ancient women. Their scholarly undertakings, although less heralded than the popularizing writings of Hamilton and aimed at a more specialized audience, have helped endow the study of the classical world with its staying power.15

2. Haight, Taylor, and Mussolini’s Italy

But my topic in this essay is, again, what scholars have been uncovering about Macurdy’s Vassar Classics colleagues Haight and Taylor as well as about other female classicists, most of whom did not teach at Vassar during Macurdy’s lifetime. This research not only furthers understanding of Macurdy’s distinctive academic career but also illuminates how the field of Classics, and the role accorded to women and other previously underrepresented groups therein, underwent major transformations

15 Hallett in McManus (2017) 248–250; on Hamilton (1867–1963), see also Hallett (2016b). By crediting both Macurdy and McManus with helping to redefine the category of professional classical scholar, I do not mean to diminish the scholarly accomplishments of other women classicists in the twentieth century, but to emphasize that these two female classicists differed from many of these colleagues in that they did not teach in departments that awarded the PhD, and that they published major research on the lives of ancient women. For Hamilton’s shortcomings as a scholar, and virtues as a popular writer, see Lateiner (2018), who discusses Hamilton’s missed reference and mis-understanding of Ps-Xen.’s *Political Regime of the Athenians*, a.k.a. the “Old Oligarch”; her (and esteemed British classical scholar Gilbert Murray’s) failure to understand the rhetoric of a Delphic inscription and a passage in Dionysios of Halikarnassos; and the reasons for Edith Hamilton’s awesome celebrity and why we ought not begrudge it.
over the course of the twentieth century. I am greatly in the debt of my
colleague T. Corey Brennan of Rutgers University, and a paper he de-
ivered at a conference in April 2018, for documenting connections
between Haight and Taylor nearly a decade after Taylor had left Vassar.16
My paper seeks to link these connections to Macurdy’s life, and to Classics
at Vassar at the end of and beyond Macurdy’s lifetime.

Of immense importance is the report Taylor submitted in her capacity
as the Acting Professor in Charge of the School for Classical Studies,
American Academy in Rome to the AAR Trustees, for the 1934 through
1935 academic year, in which she chronicles an intellectually ambitious
and diverse program of lectures and excursions, research and publica-
tions.17 Addressed to “Gentlemen,” it mentions by name seven women
(including Taylor herself) as well as over a dozen men: this may have been
the first time that Taylor had ever assumed academic and administrative
responsibilities in a co-educational environment.18 Observing that “visits
of American scholars have been less frequent than usual this year,” Taylor
spotlights those visitors, chief among them “Professor E.H. Haight, Chair
of the Advisory Council, [who] spent May and June in Rome.” Taylor
relates that Haight delivered the sole lecture given at the Academy that
year, on “Prose Fiction in the Augustan Age: Seneca’s Controversiae.” In
chapter 11 of The Drunken Duchess, McManus furnishes further infor-
mation on Haight’s activities in Rome at this time, stating: “In 1935, when
Haight was on sabbatical leave in Italy, she prevailed upon Vassar’s
president [MacCracken] to request for her an audience with [the Italian
dictator Benito] Mussolini so she could present several volumes from

16 Brennan (2018); see also Broughton (2019).
17 See Appendix 2 for the full text of the letter, with necessary annotation.
18 As Geffcken (2018) has observed, the circumstances at the AAR in 1934–35
created special difficulties for Taylor:

Director [Gorham] Stevens (a great friend of Taylor’s) had been terminated
by the Trustees in 1932. [He was replaced by an incompetent] architect from
New York, connected with the firm of McKim, Mead and White, whose direct-
orship was such a disaster that by 1934–35 he seem[ed] pretty absent — the
Trustees more or less made him disappear. Another Director (Chester
Aldrich, a very good choice) arrived in 1935 ... 1934–35 was a sort of inter-
regnum, over which [Taylor reportedly] presided magnificently. The second
problem is that the Depression meant no money. The Classical School had
always been dirt poor. One lecture was probably all that was possible. Stevens
had had about 14 or 15 lectures a year, but now paying stipends to lecturers
was not possible. Aldrich turned this situation around, probably using his own
money to pay guest lecturers.
Vassar in honor of the bimillenaries of [the Roman poets] Horace and Augustus. All the books were related to Italy except *Hellenistic Queens*, which Grace reluctantly agreed to include in the donation."

McManus proceeds to quote from Haight’s “effusive account of her June 4 audience to MacCracken,” including Haight’s statement “I was deeply impressed with the honor of having the *Capo del Governo* in these troubled days lay aside all affairs of state and journey with me back to the ancient Italy which he knows well.” Macurdy’s discomfort about Haight’s admiration of Mussolini went well beyond mere reluctance, as McManus documents by quoting from Macurdy’s own correspondence, in the same month, June 1935, with the British classicist Gilbert Murray. Macurdy lamented: “The world is so full of horrors now — fascists and despotists and other terrible things ... [Gertrude] Hirst often says to me that she and I will never visit Germany again, for Hitler will probably outlast our time and we cannot bring ourselves to go while he remains. And Mussolini is cleverer, but just as bad, worse perhaps for not being such an unmitigated fool as Hitler.”

Macurdy’s negative view of Mussolini, even before Italy instituted its anti-Semitic racial laws in 1938, would seem to accord with that of Lily Ross Taylor. Taylor, however, was at that time living and working in

19 McManus (2017) 228. Macurdy’s reluctance stemmed from her political opposition to Mussolini, but she felt obligated to be supportive of Haight. Correspondence from Haight to Vassar President MacCracken (1880–1970) in the Vassar College Archives from spring 1935 includes requests for a special letter of introduction to Mussolini with a gold seal, as well as detailed descriptions of her activities while in Rome, written from the Pension Girardet. As Geffcken (2018) observes, “although Haight gave [the 1935] lecture at the AAR, she always lived at the Girardet. In 1934–35 she was not a member of the AAR community.”

The *Vassar College Encyclopedia* entry on Haight (2019b) describes her 1935 visit to Rome as well: “In 1935, Haight once again ventured to Greece and Italy, and this time, received a grand reception from both the King and Queen as well as Il Duce Benito Mussolini. She met Mussolini at Renaissance Hall of the Palazzo Venezia and presented him with books about Italy written by the Vassar faculty. She talked to Il Duce extensively, focusing on recent archeological discoveries and the government’s plan for continued archaeological work. Haight was impressed by his dynamic personality and powers of concentration that she believed to be ‘part of the secret of his achievement.’” (AAVC) She also purchased many antiquities for the Classics Museum.

20 McManus (2017) 228. As Geffcken has commented, however, “In evaluating people’s reaction to Fascism, we tend not to remember that the vast majority of Americans, especially classicists, were pro-Mussolini for a long time. Miss Haight is fairly typical. Few went as far as Van Deman in enthusiasm. But many flocked to Piazza Venezia to applaud the Duce when he appeared. They loved his excavations and his emphasis on the Augustan period. It validated their own choice of field. The dissenters or skeptics did exist, but it was really only the Ethiopian War that began to change people.”
Mussolini’s Rome and required to keep the American Academy in the
good graces of the Italian government. Indeed, on February 22, 1933, the
year before Taylor assumed her position as “acting” Professor-in-Charge,
the Academy hosted a visit by Mussolini himself. She could not speak out
or up, even in her correspondence: the fascist censorship checked the
contents of private letters. Brennan’s paper on Taylor poses a basic
question: “how did this great Romanist process the sweeping changes
that Italy endured under Mussolini, that extended to the interpretation
and presentation of the ancient Roman past, and encompassed a massive
intervention in the fabric of the city of Rome itself?”

Brennan immediately acknowledges that Taylor’s published works on
Roman studies, even those from after World War Two, offer little, as they
only mention Mussolini twice and in passing. But he adduces several
previously unknown sources about her reactions to Mussolini, among
them lectures from 1941 and thereafter, and 21 detailed monthly reports
on contemporary Italian politics that she wrote for the American
magazine *Current History* from November 1923 through July 1925: the
very years when the “Fascists, at first a minority government, established
themselves as the dominant party in Italy, and when Mussolini firmly
established himself as dictator.” Brennan characterizes Taylor’s reports
as “describing vividly yet passionately a whole series of pivotal events,”
limiting her [disapproval] to “editorial gestures such as referring to the
title ‘Duce’ in quotation marks … though sharpening her tone after [the
1924 kidnapping and murder of [Mussolini’s rival] Matteotti.” He also,
and plausibly, conjectures that Taylor handed over the task of writing these
reports to her Vassar History department colleague Eloise Ellery because
Taylor’s Bryn Mawr mentor Tenney Frank, Professor-in-Charge at the
AAR from 1922 through 1925, had been her informant, and he returned
to the US to teach at Johns Hopkins in the summer of 1925. She had
relied heavily on the information he conveyed, but once he departed from
Italy he was no longer a first-hand source.

Brennan further observes that it was in the mid-1930s, when a single
party totally dominated the Italian state, that Taylor turned her research
focus from ruler-cult to the nature of party politics in ancient Rome. He

21 For Mussolini’s visit to the Academy, see the following You Tube video, accom-
panied by T. Corey Brennan’s notes: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5V550mj
“The AAR had long had a ‘keep a distance from local politics’ policy — so instructed by
the President in NY for years (the AAR archaeologists did work with the Fascist
archaeologists). The Girardet family was Waldensian, Swiss Protestant — and the
Fascist government seemed to leave them alone.”

asserts that she chose her words carefully while residing in Italy, but after returning to Bryn Mawr was less guarded, remarking in a 1941 lecture, “Having lived under Mussolini and read Mein Kampf and watched the rise of Hitler, I think I understand Caesar better ... I am planning to devote my summer to the making of a dictator.” The following year she reflected in a lecture, “The rise of a dictator to power has a peculiar fascination ... The career of Caesar has attracted less attention [than that of Napoleon] ... because the modern Caesar, strutting in the Palazzo Venezia before the bust of the great dictator, has made such a poor showing ...”23 According to Brennan, around 1944, Taylor hinted that

23 See also Taylor (1942), her presidential address on Caesar and the Roman nobility, prepared for the meeting of the American Philological Association in Cincinnati, which was cancelled on account of the demands of the war. The opening paragraph merits quotation in full:

For the generation which has read Mein Kampf and has seen Hitler’s ruthless execution of the designs for domination and world conquest of which he provided a blue print long in advance, the rise of a dictator to power has a peculiar fascination. Hence the great revival of interest in the career of Napoleon who as a foreigner in the land of his adoption shows in his swift course of conquest remarkable parallels with Hitler. The career of Caesar has attracted less attention first because the modern Caesar, strutting in the Palazzo Venezia before the bust of the great dictator, has made such a poor showing that the prestige of his prototype is in a sense lowered, and second because Caesar’s empire, most of it already conquered by his predecessors, did not, like Napoleon’s, fall apart after Caesar’s death but has endured for several hundred years. A study of Caesar does not give us the hope of liberation that we can secure from rereading, as many of us have since Hitler’s invasion of Russia, the story of Napoleon’s failure in the vivid pages of War and Peace.

Wiseman (2002) has observed that The Roman Revolution, written by the distinguished Roman historian Sir Ronald Syme, was “clearly influenced by the rise of Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler (the book was published the week after the invasion of Poland in September 1939). Syme kept his eye clearly fixed on Machtpolitik: ‘... One thing was clear. Monarchy was already there and would subsist, whatever principle was invoked in the struggle, whatever name the victor chose to give to his rule, because it was for monarchy that the rival Caesarians contended.’ When Syme used the word ‘party,’ it was with all the overtones of Europe in the 1930s. Power for its own sake was the subject.” Wiseman continues: “Less overwhelming, but also influential in its way, was Lily Ross Taylor’s Party Politics in the Age of Caesar (1949) ... her analogy for Roman politics was the American system of party conventions in a Presidential election year, when the Republican and Democratic hopefuls relied on their personalities for success and kept quiet about political issues.” Taylor, however, seems to have been more explicit than Syme about the similarities between Caesar and Mussolini, and about the relevance of Hitler and indeed Napoleon, to contemporaries interested in studying
Mussolini’s racial laws of 1938 had signaled “an unforgiveable break for her”; after the war ended, Brennan asserts, Taylor spoke more harshly still. Her 1957 lecture titled “On Scholarship and Nationalism” “explicitly spells out her chief objections to what Mussolini and Fascism had inflicted on Rome and Italy of the past and present.”

It must not, therefore, have been easy for Taylor to offer sympathy and support for her colleague Haight’s homage to Mussolini: especially in view of the activities Taylor had organized, the scholars of whom she was “in charge” at the AAR, and how she chose to present both to those overseeing and concerned with the research profile and productivity of the AAR Classical School. For example, Taylor’s report mentions an Academy visit to Hadrian’s Villa led by Karl Lehmann-Hartleben. A German ancient art historian whose Jewish parents had converted to Christianity in the 1880s, he was nonetheless expelled by the Nazis from his professorship at Münster in 1933 and sought refuge in Italy. Fortunately, an appointment to a full professorship at New York University’s Institute of Fine Arts in 1935 made it possible for him and his family to emigrate to the US. His equally if not more accomplished older sister Eva Lehmann Fiesel, an Etruscologist removed from her post at the University of Munich, had also fled to Italy in 1933, along with her teenage daughter Ruth. The two Fiesels, however, had already arrived in the US by the fall of 1934: Professor Edgar H. Sturtevant of the Yale Linguistics Department had temporarily rescued Eva by hiring her as his research assistant, unable to offer her more stable employment since Yale did not appoint women to its faculty. But upon Taylor’s return to the US, Bryn Mawr College managed to obtain funds — from the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars, the Rockefeller Foundation, and a group of Eva’s Yale colleagues — to underwrite a two-year visiting associate professorship for her, beginning in the fall of 1936.25

Tragically, Eva Fiesel died of liver cancer before the end of the 1936–37 academic year. At the urging of Sturtevant, however, Bryn Mawr

Julius Caesar as a dictator — in writing in her APA presidential address, at the height of World War II. By way of contrast, the names of Mussolini and Hitler do not appear in Syme’s The Roman Revolution. Nor do the words “fascism,” “fascist” or “totalitarianism.” Syme’s pupil Erich Gruen, moreover, recalls (pers. comm.) that “Syme always insisted (whether disingenuously or not) that the writing of The Roman Revolution was not motivated at all by events or persons in contemporary Europe.”

24 Brennan (2018). Geffcken (2018) recalls that Taylor “said that her work on religion (cults of Ostia and Etruria etc.) led to Ruler cult, and ruler cult naturally led to politics”; Brennan (2018) offers a complex and nuanced interpretation of how her research interests evolved.

25 For Lehmann and Fiesel, see Hallett (2018b).
managed to transfer the money pledged to underwrite Eva’s faculty position to the education of her daughter, first at the Baldwin School and then at Bryn Mawr College, from which Ruth graduated in 1942. There Ruth majored in Classics and studied with Taylor, whom she always praised as her favorite professor in alumnae questionnaires. While she did not complete her doctoral work in Classics at Johns Hopkins, she made an indelible mark on the field of secondary school Latin teaching, first at the Bryn Mawr School in Baltimore (which she and her life partner Ann Merriam played a key role in integrating) and later in Philadelphia at Friends Central and Baldwin, serving the latter as head of its middle school.26

More important, Taylor’s report highlights in detail the accomplishments of the Fellows in Classical Studies and Archaeology. She relates that one of the first-year Fellows, Richmond Lattimore, had resigned at the end of his first year, having “practically completed his book on ... Greek and Roman Sepulchral Inscriptions,” to accept an assistant professorship of Greek at Bryn Mawr College, thereby becoming Taylor’s colleague.27 The endeavors of two other fellows, Meyer Reinhold and Naphtali Lewis, command much more attention. Of Reinhold, noting that he had published two brief articles and a review in the Classical Weekly, completed a paper on the great fortunes of the Augustan Age, and had in progress a study of Augustus’ relations with client princes, she states “The Academy has felt great pride in the many enthusiastic reviews which his [Columbia University] dissertation on Marcus Agrippa has received.” Of Lewis, she announces that he has written two papers accepted by the Études de Papyrologie, and has in preparation two other studies, one on Roman coins and the other on Greek papyri in Cairo. Taylor goes on to relate that both Lewis and Reinhold represented the Academy at the International Papyrological Conference (Florence, 28 April–2 May 1935), and accords Lewis’ other travels particularly close attention, including his

26 Hallett (2018b). See also Gray (2018); a younger protégée of Taylor’s at Bryn Mawr College, Gray is the daughter of Annemarie Bettmann Holborn, a Berlin-trained classical philologist who tutored Ruth Fiesel in Latin after she and her mother arrived in New Haven.

27 See Lang (2019) for Lattimore (1906–1984). Geffcken (2018) speculates: “I suspect that [Taylor] was furious with Lattimore for resigning the second year of his Fellowship ... That was also the year that [he and his wife Alice] got to know one another and then married. Alice had graduated from Wellesley in 1934 and went to the AAR as a student.”
four months’ absence, with the consent of the Academy authorities, working with the French Archaeological Institute in Egypt. 28

Two decades later Lewis and Reinhold, by then teaching at Brooklyn College, would collaborate on a major project of incalculable value to undergraduate courses on Ancient History and Classics in translation, a two-volume sourcebook on Roman civilization. 29 But what I find significant is the pride imbuing Taylor’s detailed descriptions, in 1935, of these two young, male, Jewish scholars, whom she presumably chose to represent the AAR at a prestigious European scholarly conference elsewhere in Italy, soon after Hitler’s rise to power. It merits emphasis, too, that prior to 1934, the School of Classical Studies of the AAR, which merged with the AAR in 1913, had previously awarded fellowships to only two Jews, nearly two decades apart, in the field of Classics and Archaeology: Elias Avery Lowe in 1911; and Taylor’s own Bryn Mawr PhD student Irene A. Rosenzweig in 1930.

Lowe, who emigrated to New York from Moscow as a thirteen-year old in 1892, and graduated from Cornell ten years later, had received his PhD from Munich in 1908. He evidently remained in Europe doing research until taking up his AAR Fellowship, and was hired at Oxford in 1915, only returning to the US in 1936 as one of the first professors at Princeton’s Institute for Advanced Study. 30 By way of contrast, Rosenzweig, who came from Pine Bluff, Arkansas, returned to the US and received her PhD following her year at the AAR, but never obtained a college teaching position. For many years she taught Latin at Madeira, a private secondary school for girls outside Washington, DC, where she also tutored family members of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. 31 But such were the barriers to Jews, even those with promising research records, in the field of college-level Classics teaching prior to the arrival of Jewish scholars fleeing Nazi Germany in the 1930s. And, as McManus’ book and Eva Fiesel’s story both illustrate, college-level positions for women were


29 Lewis and Reinhold (1990); initially published in 1951 and 1955, it is characterized by Bagnall (2019) as “sweeping and voluminous.”


31 For Rosenzweig, see “Irene Rosenzweig (1903–1977)” (2016); Gefcken (2018) writes “I knew her. She was a great friend of [Howard University Classics professor] Virginia Callahan. Do you know that she wanted a college job? She always seemed to me greatly wrapped up in her Madeira teaching. She was independently wealthy (left a wonderful legacy to the AAR), very chic — she dressed very well. Enjoyed Washington, concerts, lectures etc. Lively talker in a kind of wacky way.”
few and almost exclusively at a handful of women’s colleges. Significantly, one of the archaeological sites which Taylor reports having visited (although apparently not with either Lewis or Reinhold) was the Tuscan city of Pitigliano, an ancient Etruscan town later known as Italy’s little Jerusalem for its synagogue and historical Jewish community.\textsuperscript{32}

How did Haight reconcile her ardent support of Mussolini with Taylor’s efforts to make Jewish scholars feel included and valued? Especially after both returned to the US, where Bryn Mawr, which appointed Taylor its Graduate Dean in 1942, made generous efforts to welcome, acculturate and fund several Jewish scholars and students: not only Eva and Ruth Fiesel, but also Fiesel’s pupil in both Germany and Italy, Gabriele Schoepflich Hoenigswald, and Vera Lachmann, a Berlin Jewish classicist, who had fled the Nazis in fall 1939, and taught German at Vassar through 1941.\textsuperscript{33} The Vassar Memorial Minute written by Haight’s Classics colleagues Theodore Erck, Myrtle Soles Erck and Inez Scott Ryberg soon after her death in 1964 highlights Haight’s efforts at Vassar to help German refugee scholars, many but not all of them Jewish, find positions in the US, remarking: “In the mid-thirties, when scholars were fleeing Hitler’s Germany, Miss Haight was chiefly instrumental in organizing a program of visiting scholars, which brought to Vassar a series of distinguished professors as guests, free to give open lectures and to meet with advanced classes and student organizations. Many of these were enabled through their visit to Vassar to secure appointments in American colleges and universities.”\textsuperscript{34} From all appearances, Haight was following Taylor’s example.

3. Renata von Scheliha’s Failed Move to Vassar
As I have related, the classicist Vera Lachmann, who fled Hitler’s Germany in 1939, benefited from one such appointment at Vassar through 1941, in the Department of German (although later, at Bryn Mawr, Lachmann taught Classics courses, as she did at Brooklyn College, where

\textsuperscript{32} For Pitigliano, see Celata (1995), Poggioli (2014) and Paioletti (2014).
\textsuperscript{33} For Lachmann (1904–1985) and Hoenigswald (1912–2001), see Hallett (2018b); see also Miller (2014) on Lachmann.
\textsuperscript{34} Erck–Erck–Ryberg (1964); Theodore Erck (1907–1980) and his wife Myrtle Soles Erck (1922–1993) taught at Vassar through 1971. For Ryberg (1901–1980), see Bacon (2019). The Vassar College Archives contain much valuable material on Haight’s efforts to help such German refugee scholars as the philosopher Richard Kroner (1884–1972), father of the University of Michigan classicist Gerda Seligson (1909–2002), and the art historian Otto Brendel (1901–1973), which makes her opposition to the hiring of Renata von Scheliha, discussed below, all the more surprising.
she found a permanent post after the end of the war). A possibility for at least a temporary appointment in the Vassar Greek Department itself occurred in those years, owing to the sudden death of Greek professor Philip Davis in February 1940. As McManus relates, quoting Department Chair Theodore Erck, Macurdy, three years post-retirement, “came to the rescue at once with her great knowledge and experience for the remainder of the semester.”35 A year later, in the spring of 1941, Haight was informed about the possibility of hiring a non-Jewish German female classicist, Renata von Scheliha. Like Vera Lachmann — whose escape from Germany von Scheliha had facilitated — von Scheliha was a lesbian, desperate to escape the Nazis. Though von Scheliha came recommended by several eminent scholars in the US and UK, Haight decided to consult Werner Jaeger, formerly professor of Greek at Berlin, who had left Germany, first for the University of Chicago and then Harvard, after the Nazis rose to power. Jaeger was not Jewish, but his second wife, decades his junior, came from a Jewish family.36

Jaeger’s response to Haight, among his papers at Harvard’s Houghton Library, dated June 18, 1941, opens with a reference to Macurdy herself, although he misspells her name as “McCurdy”:37 “I was delighted to hear from you since I have a very pleasant memory of our associations at Vassar College and the afternoon which I spent with you and Miss McCurdy. I hope you are both well and enjoy your work.” He continues,

I am glad to give you the little bit of information about Dr. Renata von Scheliha which I have. I do not know her personally and as long as I taught at the University of Berlin (end of summer 1936) she certainly did not have any relationship to the Classical Department of that University. If she had any such relations to that Department later I have no way of knowing. However I am a little doubtful about that because she is not a classical scholar of the type which we used to select for the position of assistant in the pro-seminar or as Privatdozent of Classical Philology. This does not mean that I want to belittle her work but her essay on Dion of Syracuse as well as her translations of the Author on the Sublime show more literary than erudite ambitions. She seems to be a person of cultivated aesthetic taste but I do know now [sic] whether she likes to do the hard work of the scholar. She certainly has a good

35 McManus (2017) 234. For Davis (1901–1940), husband of the illustrious theatrical producer, director, playwright and author Hallie Flanagan Davis (1889–1969), see Haight (1940).


37 Jaeger (1941); also discussed in Hallett (2018b).
philological education and even though I did not examine the two publications mentioned above very carefully I take it that they are done with the necessary philological accuracy. I had the impression which may be wrong that her ideas were somewhat influenced by the aesthetic and cultural ideology of the powerful intellectual circle of Stefan George, deceased German poet. There was a review of her little book on Dion by an American writer in the *Classical Weekly* if my memory is correct some years ago which might interest you.

Very truly yours,
Werner Jaeger

Inasmuch as von Scheliha had letters of reference from scholars familiar with her work and its quality, it is not clear why Haight consulted Jaeger for his assessment of von Scheliha’s suitability for this position. Haight’s June 1941 letter soliciting Jaeger’s assessment survives in Jaeger’s Harvard archive, and merits quoting in full:

My dear Professor Jaeger: I trust you will remember me as one of your hostesses when you came to lecture at Vassar on the invitation of Professor [Moritz] Geiger (1880–1937, Vassar Professor of Philosophy who fled Nazi Germany in 1933) under the auspices of the Departments of Greek and Latin. I write to beg from you some confidential information about a German woman, Dr. Renata von Scheliha. Friends of Dr. von Scheliha are making a great effort to bring her to this country from Switzerland where she is living at present and it was suggested by a foundation that we should take her as a research assistant at Vassar. I have therefore read her curriculum vitae with her letters of recommendation and have noticed that she taught at the university of Berlin. As you are the only one in this country from Berlin whom I know personally I am writing to ask if you would tell me your opinion of Dr. von Scheliha’s scholarship, her teaching ability and her personality. I should like to know what rank she had in the University of Berlin. I trust this is not asking too great a favor of you.

There is no vacancy in the Department of Greek and Latin at present and it seems to us impossible to take a mature woman as a research assistant who is not working in any of the fields in which we are engaged. But since some pressure has been brought to bear upon us I

---

38 Haight (1941); also discussed in Hallett (2018b). In light of materials discovered in the Vassar College Library on September 13 and 14, 2018, Hallett’s discussion needs major revision.
wish to get as full particulars as possible about Dr. von Scheliha. With sincere regards and many good wishes, I am very truly yours,

Elizabeth Hazelton Haight,
Professor of Latin and Chair of the Department.

Yet Haight’s letter raises more questions than it answers. For one thing, even though she seeks Jaeger’s opinion of von Scheliha’s scholarship, teaching ability and personality, Haight does not mention the possibility of her teaching there, merely working as a research assistant. So, too, she claims to be under pressure to consider appointing her, and asserts outright that “it seems to us impossible to take a mature woman as a research assistant who is not working in any of the fields in which we are engaged.” What is more, Haight tells Jaeger that she has read von Scheliha’s curriculum vitae and letters of recommendation, and has noticed that she taught at the University of Berlin. The CV, which is found in the correspondence files of Vassar President Henry Noble MacCracken, therefore repays close scrutiny. It states:

Name: Scheliha, Renata von
Date of Birth: 1901
Nationality: German
Family: Single
Field: Classical archaeology and philology
Academic Posts Held:
   1933–1938, Privatdozent, University of Berlin
   1934–1936 Lecturer, Lessing Hochschule, Berlin
Publications and Other Achievements:
   Die Wassergrenze im Altertum Breslau 1930
   Die Platonische Staatsgrundung in Sicilien [sic]
   Patroklos
   Diss-Leipzig 1934
   Ueber das Erhabene
   Critical Edition of Longinus; also a translation, Berlin 1938
Languages: English, German, French, Greek, Latin
References: Professors Macurdy, Kantorowicz, Lachmann,
   Bergstraesser, Schultz, Morwitz, Kempner
Present Address: Basel, Switzerland
Additional Remarks: Strongly anti-Nazi; gave up posts 1937, when asked to make a pro-Nazi declaration.

The document seems to have been written by von Scheliha’s close friend Lachmann, who was then teaching in the Vassar German Department. At
least it closely resembles the text of a letter Lachmann sent the previous year, on August 29, 1940, to Alvin Johnson, the Director of the New School for Social Research in New York City, which was apparently also shared with President MacCracken, since it, too, was found in his correspondence files.39

39 Lachmann (1940), sent from the Westville, Connecticut home of Professor H. Wiegand of Yale University, whose daughter Erika was a close friend of Lachmann’s. The text reads:

Miss von Scheliha, of German nationality, born in 1901 in Silesia from an officer’s family, studied Sanskrit and Greek in Breslau and Berlin. I know of her publications: “Die Wassergrenze im Altertum,” ed. in Historische untersuchungen” 1931, M.S.H Marcus, Breslau, and Lion [sic] “Die platonische [sic] Staatsgruendung in Sizilien,” ed. in “Das Erbe der Alten,” 1934, Dieterich Leipzig, and I know that she just now finished a very important book, called “Patroklos.” She gave courses in Greek language at the University of Berlin, and lectured during several years at “Lessing-Hochschule,” Berlin, f.i. about Greek tragedy. When the Nazi regime began she retired entirely from public work, being strongly opposed to the government and, besides her research work, devoted herself entirely to the assistance of her Jewish friends. So, I got acquainted with her and saw how she risked her life and safety again and again to get people free from concentration camps, to facilitate the emigration of her friends. It seemed a miracle to me that nothing happened to her. Finally she could not stand a life in Germany any longer, as she felt herself guilty of what happened sharing the privileges of an Aryan. From a trip to Switzerland last year she did not come back, though she never emigrated regularly and is since living in Basel without means or labor permission. Recently her friends wrote to me that, as Switzerland is almost becoming an axis power, she is in real danger and has to flee as soon as possible. Professor Albert Bergstraesser, Claremont University — California; Professor Ernst Morwitz, Duke University; Professor Cecil Bowra, Oxford would gladly testify to her first class scholarly work, Renata von Scheliha has never belonged to any political party. Her family tradition was conservative, she never sympathized with communism. Her only decided political point of view is the opposition against the National socialism. She is single and has no parents. Her English is good. I remember that one of her ancestors came from Britain. May I add that there was nobody during these hard years who made us keep up courage like her, that she is the most wonderful pure and strong character I ever saw in my life, that her creative intuition of the ancient world seems to me of the utmost importance? I would be very grateful if you would allow me to come to New York and see you. Any day and time would suit me.

Very sincerely yours,

[SIGNED] Vera Lachmann,
German Department, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Several details demand our attention. First, that von Scheliha’s stated field, Classical Archaeology and Philology, were in fact the branches of the discipline in which the Vassar Department was engaged, represented prominently by the work of Davis and Macurdy. Second, that von Scheliha’s anti-Nazi stance, and her loss of her teaching positions in 1937 rather than swear allegiance to the Nazi regime, are mentioned: such information should have made it clear to Haight that — as Lachmann remarks in her letter to Johnson — von Scheliha had put her own life at risk. And third, that the first of von Scheliha’s references listed is Professor Macurdy. Macurdy’s letter, sent to Alvin Johnson of the New School as well, dated to October 17, 1940, bears quoting in full:

I write you now at the request of Miss Vera Lachmann of this college to state my very high opinion of two books by Miss Renata von Scheliha which I have examined. I have read Dion, Die Platonische Staatsgründung in Sizilien, with great pleasure and profit. It is a fine and scholarly study of a fascinating character, and Miss von Scheliha’s interpretation of the aim and spirit of Dion is of great interest and importance.

Because the books have to be returned to Yale very soon I have not been able to read Die Wassergrenze in Alterthum as thoroughly as I could wish. I have found it a valuable and significant study of an important religious, geographical and political subject.

Miss von Scheliha is evidently both a scholar and a thinker. You will doubtless have appreciations of her work more valuable than mine, but I am very glad to add my testimony to what you already have of her.

Sincerely yours,

[SIGNED] Grace H, Macurdy

---

40 Neither the cv nor the letter, however, says anything about von Scheliha’s brother Rudolf (1897–1942), a German diplomat based in Poland. A Soviet spy who used his connections to help Poles and Jews flee abroad, he was sentenced to death by hanging on December 14, 1942, and executed in Ploetzensee Prison. For Rudolf von Scheliha, see his Wikipedia entry (2009). As Donald Lateiner has called to my attention, Renata von Scheliha’s correspondence from 1930–1967 has been published by Frommel (2002) and merits study.

41 Macurdy (1940); the letters from von Scheliha’s other references are worth quoting, too, since they offer high praise for her scholarship and spotlight her principled activities on behalf of Jewish friends. Bergstraesser, for example, states “Miss von Scheliha is of rare quality in both character and condition. She combines accuracy and intimate knowledge of her subject with a vital interest in the philosophical and generally human implications of classical writings ... Seldom in recent years I met [sic] a person who like she [sic] even in moments of danger kept up without fear her relations to Jewish friends and watched over her own integrity of opinion.”
Whatever Haight’s reasons for writing Jaeger, and disregarding the testimony of her devoted and learned colleague Macurdy in favor of his remarks, I view Jaeger’s letter, which torpedoed von Scheliha’s chance for this position, and for emigration to the US at this time, with chill and alarm.\footnote{Donald Lateiner and others have suggested to me that Jaeger was the most important German classicist Haight knew, and Haight was seeking to elicit a negative assessment of von Scheliha’s work from him.} Escaping from Germany was a matter of life or death for von Scheliha. Had not a wealthy Jewish female friend and fellow member of the Stefan George Circle arranged for her to flee to Switzerland, the Nazis might well have executed her, as they did her own brother, although he served in the highest ranks of Hitler’s government, for aiding the escape of Jews such as Lachmann. Why Jaeger even felt it appropriate to assert that von Scheliha had no relationship to the Berlin Classics Department when he left for the US in 1936, and to distinguish her from suitable appointees there, is mystifying: she was merely a Privatdozent, of low academic rank.\footnote{Either Lachmann or Jaeger is misrepresenting von Scheliha’s academic position at the University of Berlin; whether or not the non-Jewish von Scheliha worked as a Privatdozent there, in the years immediately after the university fired its Jewish faculty members after Hitler came to power, is of far less consequence than her solid academic background and the high assessment of her scholarly attainments by esteemed scholars in her area of research.} As for her work on Dion of Syracuse, a 166-page book (not little, much less an essay) published in 1934, Jaeger’s vague allusion to “a review by an American writer in Classical Weekly” fails to mention its assessment in 1935 by Reginald Hackforth in the British journal The Classical Review. Hackforth, who became Laurence Professor of Ancient Philosophy at Cambridge in 1939, disagrees with its interpretation of “Plato’s experiment in practical politics.” Yet he praises its “clear and vigorous style, orderly arrangement and complete mastery of the facts,” saying that “the narrative parts of the book … are excellent,” and “the final chapter interesting.”\footnote{Hackforth (1935).}

What is more, the reference to the circle of Stefan George, whose own homoerotic leanings were well known, but not openly discussed in polite German intellectual circles, can be interpreted as a homophobic aspersion.\footnote{For George (1868–1933), see Norton (2002). Complicating Jaeger’s possible antipathy to George’s homoerotic leanings, and to von Scheliha as a lesbian herself, is his apparent failure to realize that Haight had homoerotic leanings herself. See Hallett (2019) on Haight’s (unrequited) attraction to her student, the bisexual poet Edna St. Vincent Millay. Donald Lateiner has suggested (pers. comm.) that Haight did not want another lesbian in the department, perhaps fearing competition or scandal or both.} Von Scheliha’s academic credentials, confirmed less than a decade
later with the award of a Guggenheim Fellowship, certainly qualified her for a temporary post as a research assistant at Vassar. Not only did she, in Jaeger’s words, have a “good philological education” and produce publications that even on his cursory examination evinced “the necessary philological accuracy.” Like her fellow German refugee female classicists, she had much to offer the Vassar Classics department in return for, literally, her life.

***

To conclude. After the death of Grace Harriet Macurdy in 1946, the field of Classics underwent important changes, demographic and intellectual. Owing to the increased presence of Jews who had fled Nazi-occupied Europe on the faculties of US Classics departments, more Classicists of Jewish background came to occupy college-level teaching positions in the field: in departments which offered the PhD degree; and in liberal arts colleges, including women’s colleges. 46 McManus’ chapter about Macurdy’s experiences on the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens during the 1920s does not mention any Jewish members. But since then several Jews have served in that capacity, as well as on the Board of Trustees (among them my Wellesley College undergraduate mentor Mary Lefkowitz), and as directors of academic programs. Some come from humble backgrounds like Macurdy’s, and were the first in their families to attend college. 47

Barbara McManus herself, it warrants emphasis, was born a Roman Catholic and taught, as she had studied while an undergraduate, at a Catholic women’s college. Another of my own undergraduate mentors, Barbara McCarthy, was the first American-born Roman Catholic hired at Wellesley, in 1929, and subject to special, arguably bigoted, scrutiny in her first years there. 48 To the best of my knowledge, only one of the scholars Taylor mentions in her report on the AAR in the mid-thirties, Fellow George Siefert, later to teach at The Catholic University of America, was a Roman Catholic, even at a program in Italy within sight of the Vatican itself. Roman Catholics, like Jews, have increased their representation and visibility in the college teaching ranks of classicists outside Catholic institutions. Macurdy’s family, Scots-Irish Protestants, had changed the spelling of their name from McCurdy to Macurdy when

46 See, for example, Hallett (2019).
emigrating from Canada to the US, because of the prejudices against Irish Catholics in the Boston area where they settled; Macurdy would have been amused to have been mistaken for a Catholic nun when I presented a paper about her at the 2017 meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, held that particular year in Canada. 49

Macurdy’s influence on the Classics profession of course looms largest on the intellectual front, in the inclusion of women and gender, as important subjects of research and teaching. Taylor did not seem to have been remotely interested in studying women and gender. Haight’s interest was limited to the representation of women in literary texts; she did not explore historical realities to the extent that Macurdy did in her final two books. 50 Right before her death, Barbara McManus was delighted to learn that the Society for Classical Studies had finally adopted “women and gender” in both Greece and Rome as official categories of scholarly specialization, after years of impassioned lobbying on her part. What we now call the intersectionalities between Jewish and Catholic classicists on the one hand, and research on women and gender in classical antiquity on the other, is, like that of Macurdy’s female classicist contemporaries, a topic demanding further investigation as well, and a challenge I hope others will take up along with me. 51

Judith P. Hallett

*University of Maryland*

jeph@umd.edu

---

49 McManus (2017) 15: “the new spelling would proclaim them as Scotch Protestants rather than Irish Catholics.”

50 Haight (1922), however, includes an entire chapter on women in ancient and present-day Italy.

51 My thanks to Dean Ross of the Vassar College Library, for providing me with access to Archives Files 3.53–3.55 (Annual reports of the Vassar College Greek Department 1889–1914); other assorted folders of annual reports of the Greek Department; and the Henry Noble McCracken Papers as well as the colleagues who kindly hosted me — Barbara Olsen, Robert L. Pounder, Eve D’Ambra, Curtis Dozier and Mary Lyndon Shanley — during my visit to Vassar on September 12–13, 2018. My gratitude, too, to Susan Halpert and Dale Stinchcomb of the Harvard University Houghton Library archives for their assistance with the papers of Werner Jaeger in June 2015. I would also like to thank T. Corey Brennan, Stanley Burstein, Elizabeth Carney, Sheila K. Dickison, Katherine A. Geffcken, Erich S. Gruen, Donald Lateiner, Maria Marsilio, Hans-Peter Obermayer, Eugene O’Connor, Ann Raia and Christopher Stray for their unwavering and generous support on this project.
APPENDIX ONE:

ON LILY ROSS TAYLOR AS AN “HONORARY MALE”

Barbara McManus’ characterization of Lily Ross Taylor — first made two decades ago in her book about Classics and feminism (1997) 32–35, then repeated in her biography of Grace Harriet Macurdy (2017) 246 when contrasting the two women — has occasioned considerable discussion and indeed criticism. The context is important. After describing Macurdy’s formidable scholarly achievements leading to international recognition, McManus remarks “Most significantly, [Macurdy] earned this distinction as ‘a woman and a scholar’ in such a way that neither side of the equation diminished the other, as happened with two other outstanding female classicists of the era. In the case of her early role model, Jane Ellen Harrison, gender was accentuated at the expense of recognition as a ‘sound scholar,’ while the womanhood of Macurdy’s younger colleague Lily Ross Taylor was ignored in her achievement of scholarly status as an honorary male.”

Several scholars, such as Geffcken (2018), have taken strong issue with McManus’ characterization of Taylor as an “honorary male.” They observe that Taylor was a tireless champion of other women, most notably in her energetic efforts, joined by Haight, and extending from 1921 to 1938, to provide more and better residential accommodations for women scholars at the AAR. Geffcken claims that Taylor did not think much about gender, as she was endlessly generous to both males and females who had good minds and used them ... she did not pay any attention to what you were, as long as you were bright and hardworking. One of her more important Bryn Mawr students was [the Jewish] Phyllis Goodhart Gordan ... Goodhart Hall at Bryn Mawr was built by Phyllis’ father in memory of her mother Marjory Walter. Phyllis ran the AAR Friends of the Library, endowed an AAR Fellowship, endowed the Bryn Mawr Rare Book Room, was the first female AAR Trustee, and also endowed the Brearley School. And [Taylor] was endlessly generous to my Classical Fulbright colleagues of 1954–55, [who included individuals] representing Jewish and Catholic backgrounds.

Geffcken also argues “if one follows [McManus’] line of thinking, a female archaeologist ought to concentrate on depictions of women only or on objects connected with women only.”

But Taylor could easily have included women as well as men in her investigative purview, whether in her research on emperor cults or on Roman politics. As Geffcken herself pointed out, “McManus implies that Macurdy was the first classicist to publish on ancient women. That is not true. Mary Gilmore Williams of Mount Holyoke worked on Severan women in her Michigan dissertation, and also when a student at ASCSR in the late 1890s; and published two
articles (Julia Domna et al). Several women worked on the Vestal Virgins (including Van Deman), and Adeline Hawes of Wellesley wrote about families, children etc. Macurdy’s work may have been far superior to that done by these women, but I think they nevertheless deserve acknowledgment.”

At issue here, however, is not the quality of Macurdy’s work on Hellenistic and vassal queens compared to that of these other women on Roman topics, but its innovative nature and wide, interdisciplinary scope as well as its publication in two major volumes from the Johns Hopkins University Press. Furthermore, the work of these earlier female scholars on women’s roles in Roman religion and governance furnished Taylor with research that she could have employed, as both model and evidence, to expand her own definition of what emperor cults and Roman politics embraced. Macurdy emphasized that her identity as a woman influenced what she studied and how she chose to approach the ancient testimony about it: under these circumstances, male scholars could not overlook her differences from as well as similarities to them.

Brennan (2018) also noted that Taylor was the only woman listed and depicted in a group of leading historians entitled “Galaxy of Eminent Men,” published by the journal Current History in 1923. As he comments: “Already as an associate professor, she found herself included in a high-profile venture launched by Current History magazine, that had nothing to do with the ancient world. The notion was that a dozen or so “area experts” from leading American universities would post monthly updates on contemporary world affairs. Taylor was the only woman and certainly one of the youngest members of this group of proto-bloggers. The New York Times, which at the time published Current History, heavily promoted this feature in large-format ads with rhetoric to match.”
APPENDIX TWO:

LILY ROSS TAYLOR’S REPORT AS ACTING PROFESSOR IN CHARGE OF THE SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES, AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME, 1934–35

Quoted in full from Taylor (1935):

To Trustees of the American Academy in Rome.

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor of submitting to you through the Director my report as Acting Professor in Charge of the School of Classical Studies for the year 1934–5.

Before the formal work of the year began on October 2, all the staff and the fellows had gathered in Rome. Miss [Aline] Abaecherli [Boyce] [1905–1994, Bryn Mawr PhD 1933; Taylor’s own student], Mr. [George Kenneth] Boyce [1906–1992] and Mr. [Meyer] Reinhold [1909–2002, Columbia PhD 1933], after travelling independently for two months in Italy and Northern Europe, returned to Rome as soon as or before the Academy Building was opened on September 15. Professor [Albert William] Van Buren [1878–1978, AAR Professor of Archaeology] and I were here on September first. The three first-year fellows, Mr. [Richmond] Lattimore [1906–1984, Illinois PhD 1934], Mr. [Naphtali] Lewis [1911–2005, Strasbourg PhD 1934] and Mr. [George] Siefert [1910–1984, University of Pennsylvania PhD, 1948], arrived the last week in September. Three visiting students registered for the work of the entire year, and in addition Professor Herbert Hoffleit [1905–1981] of the University of California at Los Angeles and Mrs. Annie Hare Graham, Ph.D. of Johns Hopkins, joined us for the first half of the year.

Professor Van Buren has reported elsewhere on his course on topography and monuments. I took charge of the lectures and excursions dealing with Etruria. As usual the Academy had the benefit of the generous aid given us by the Ingegnere Mengarelli who lectured in the Museo di Villa Giulia and at the necropolis of Cerveteri. I conducted excursions to Veii, Tarquinii, Nepet, Sutri, and Falerii, and later in the year with Miss [Alice] Bockstahler [1906–1984, who married Lattimore in 1935], Miss Van Buskirk and Mr. Lattimore took a motor trip of two weeks to Etruscan-sites further north — Pitigliano, Sovana, Grosseto, Vetulonia, Populonia, Volterra, Florence, Fiesole, Marzabotto, Bologna, Arezzo, Corona, and Perugia. From time to time throughout the year I organized excursions to other sites — to the necropolis of Isola Sacra, over Monte Gennaro to Horace’s Farm, a two-day trip to Segni, Anagni, Ferentino, Alatri, Palestrina and Subiaco. I also made six visits with the students to Roman museums, where we devoted our attention chiefly to important inscriptions. Two other trips were conducted by foreign scholars, one to Ardea and Lavinium by Professor Axel Boethius [1889–1969], who, just before giving up his work as Director of the Swedish Archaeological Institute in Rome, found time to take us on this delightful visit to the country of the Aeneid, and one to Hadrian’s Villa by Professor Karl Lehmann-
Hartleben [1894–1960, dismissed from his position as Professor of Classical Archaeology at Muenster owing to Hitler’s race laws in 1933]. Director [James Monroe] Hewlett [1868–1941] and members of the School of Fine Arts shared with us in the pleasure of hearing a most interesting discussion of the Roman Villa. Early in June those of us who were still in Rome visited with Professor [Guido] Calza [1888–1946] the important tombs which have lately been laid bare along the Autostrada at Ostia Antica.

Aside from the lectures given by scholars at various sites there has been only one lecture at the Academy, that given by Professor Elizabeth Hazleton Haight of Vassar College on “Prose Fiction in the Augustan Age: Seneca’s Controversiae” [published in Haight (1936)].

Because of the varying preparation and interests of the small group of students it seemed wise to attempt during the year no regular courses except the work on topography and monuments and the Italian class, given as usual by Professor De Masi. Instead I had regular interviews throughout the winter with those students who were beginning new problems here and spent a good deal of time on the competed manuscripts submitted by the more advanced students. Every regular member of the school submitted at least one paper before the year was over. Since our group was small and all second-year students had already reported on their investigations last year, it did not prove to be feasible to hold the customary meetings of the Seminar. I did, however, have the advantage of spending two hours with Mr. Boyce on the Lararia of Pompeii and of hearing Mr. Lattimore and Mr. Reinhold discuss in museums inscriptions of special interest for their work.

Miss Abaecherli spent the first weeks of the year recasting her thesis to be published in 1936 in Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni. During the year she completed two papers, one on “Certain Imperial Symbols on Flavian Coins,” which appeared in the April number of Classical Philology; and one on “Fercula, Tensae and Carpenta in the Roman Procession,” which will be published in a forthcoming number of the Bollettino dell’Associazione di Studi Mediterranei.” She has further work in progress on the pompa circensis. Mr. Boyce has completed his catalogue of the Lararia in the houses of Pompeii which will be published in the Memoirs for 1937. His catalogue of the shrines at the Compitalia and his general discussion of household cults are well on the road to completion, and will probably be published elsewhere. Mr. Reinhold has published two brief articles and a review in the Classical Weekly and has completed a paper on the great fortunes of the Augustan Age. He has also in progress a study of Augustus’ relations with client princes. The Academy has felt great pride in the many enthusiastic reviews which his dissertation on Marcus Agrippa has received. Mr. Lattimore, who with the consent of Academy authorities has resigned his fellowship to accept an Assistant professorship of Greek at Bryn Mawr College, has practically completed his book on “The Themes in Greek and Latin Sepulchral Inscriptions,” which is to be published by the University of Illinois. Mr. Lewis has written two papers which have been accepted by the Études de Papyrologie, one on “Greek Literary Papyri in the Strasbourg Collection,” the other on “Ostraca grecs du Musée du Caire.” He has in preparation two other studies, one on a hoard of Roman Coins from Seltz (Alsace), the other, the publication of a number of
Greek papyri transcribed in Cairo which are to appear in the *Collection de la Société Royale de Papyrologie*. Mr. Seifert, after working for some time on the cults of the Volscian towns and writing up part of his material on Antium, has decided that another type of subject would be more in accord with his interests and has begun work on an edition and commentary of the fragments of Varro’s *De Vita Populi Romani*. Miss [Berthe] Marti [1904–1995, Bryn Mawr PhD 1934] has been engaged here and in Switzerland in a study of Arnulfus of Lisieux. Miss Bockstahler wrote a paper on representations of the dance in Etruscan monuments and Miss Van Buskirk completed this summer a study of private property in Rome which was in the possession of Cicero, his family and his close friends. Mrs. Graham continued while in Rome her work on his dissertation on the devotees of the Oriental cults and Mr. Hoffleit worked here and in Vienna on the manuscripts of Plato. I published in the April number of *Classical Philology* a paper on “The *Selisternium* and the Theatrical *Pompa*” and have since then completed three papers on the restoration of various inscriptions. Another paper on “Recent American Work in Roman Religion,” the text of a lecture which I gave at the *Istituto di Studi Romani*, will appear this year in the *Studi Romani nel Mondo*. I have also made some progress on a paper on the cults of Ostia in the light of the excavations and research of the twenty-three years since I published my dissertation on the subject.

It will be apparent from this account that various members of the Academy are publishing their studies in other journals than the Academy publications. The next number of the *Memoirs* is to be made up of the work of two former fellows, Dr. [Marion] Blake [1892–1961, Cornell PhD 1921, then teaching at Mount Holyoke College] and Dr. [Bernard Mann] Peebles [1906–1976, Harvard PhD 1940] and there is actually no place in it for work of the present student and staff. The limitation of the publication programme incidental to the budgetary difficulties of the time is a disadvantage both for the young scholars who ought to have their work appear as soon as possible and for the Academy, which should have credit for research done here.

The fund contributed to aid the work of members of the Classical School has been of great value. Through it we were able to secure the necessary photographs for the work of Miss Abaecherli and Mr. Boyce, to pay for the plate which illustrated Miss Abaecherli’s article in *Classical Philology*, and to have a series of plans drawn for the article of Mr. [Philip W.] Harsh [1905–1960, Chicago PhD 1933] which appeared this year in the *Memoirs*.

The Greek Island cruise, which in part compensated for the lack of an organized Greek trip, is described in Professor Van Buren’s report. In addition to that journey in which five students took part, members of the Classical School undertook fairly extensive travel. Mr. Lewis was, with the consent of the Academy authorities, absent for four months during the winter. He spent the major part of his time in Egypt where, through the courtesy of Professor Pierre Jouget, he shared in the opportunities of the French Archeological Institute. On his return from Syria, Constantinople, and Greece in April, Mr. Reinhold joined him in Northern Italy and they both represented the Academy at the International Papyrological Congress [in Florence]. Mr. Reinhold also travelled in Sicily and Tunis. Miss Marti, Miss Abaecherli and
I all made brief trips to Sicily and Mr. Siefert spent a month journeying, mainly by bicycle, in Southern Italy and Sicily.

Visits of American scholars have been less frequent than usual this year, but we have had with us several people who have had close connection with the Classical School. Professor W.T. Semple [1881–1962, Professor at the University of Cincinnati], a member of the Classical Committee, was here for two weeks in March. Professor E.H. Haight, Chairman in 1934 of the Advisory Council, spent May and June in Rome, and Professor H.E. Burton, a former Annual Professor, was in Rome for some weeks in the spring. Professor J.W. Swain of the University of Illinois and Professor Helen Law [1890–1966, Vassar Class of 1911] of Wellesley College also spent some time in Rome.

The closing of the Academy from July 15 to September 15, decided upon as a measure of economy, seems to me to have its disadvantages for the work of the Classical School. Since our students regularly travel at other periods in southern lands, it seems questionable whether two months of continuous absence each summer are desirable for all the fellows who are attempting to complete their plan for research. This year, as in my own experience as Fellow of the Academy, I have found that the quiet of Rome and the Academy library has great advantages for concentrated work in the summer months. The facilities of the library and the generous aid of [Assistant Librarian] Colonel de Daehn are always at our disposal in the summer, but conditions of living are not altogether simple for students who remain, as two were forced to do, to complete work this summer. My feeling is that in the interests of research they should be encouraged rather than discouraged from staying here.

I should like to express my appreciation for the unfailing courtesy and cooperation which I have received from the administrative authorities of the Academy, Director Hewlett, Mr. Benton and Mr. Davico, for the constant counsel and aid which Professor Van Buren has so generously supplied from his long experience in Rome, and for the advantages of the Library, which under Mr. Schnacke’s direction is a splendid instrument of research. My relations with the officers of the Academy and with the students, a serious and able group of young scholars, and my contacts with older Italian and foreign scholars have made this a very pleasant and profitable year for me.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lily Ross Taylor, August 31, 1935
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LA LETTERA DI CATILINA: NORDEN, MARCHESI, SYME

— LUCIANO CANFORA —

ABSTRACT
Una discussione delle principali interpretazioni moderne del testo della lettera di Catilina a Q. Lutatius Catulus nel cap. 35 del Bellum Catilinae di Sallustio e del ruolo che questo testo ebbe nel dibattito sul ruolo dei documenti nella storiografia antica, a partire dalla Antike Kunstprosa di Eduard Norden.

A discussion of the main modern interpretations of the text of Catiline’s letter to Q. Lutatius Catulus in ch. 35 of Sallust’s Bellum Catilinae and of its role in the scholarly debate on the role of documents in ancient historiography. Eduard Norden’s Antike Kunstprosa provides a valuable starting point.
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I
Quando aveva appena trent’anni Eduard Norden pubblicò un capolavoro, Die Antike Kunstprosa (1898). Questi esponenti della migliore stagione filologica d’Europa maturavano in fretta. Wilamowitz, che era di venti anni più vecchio di Norden, pubblicò lo scritto più innovativo intorno alla oscurissima biografia tucididea (Die Thukydi-deslegende, «Hermes» 1877) a ventinove anni. Reso, però, questo necessario omaggio, una delle tesi centrali di Norden, il vincolo cioè della «Einheitlichkeit» stilistica nella storiografia greca e romana, va reconsiderata. Formulata nel modo estremo in cui Norden la formula, quella tesi sembra poggiare su di una petitio principii: 1) la ‘legge’ della «unità stilistica» ha trovato insperata conferma nella Tavola di Lione (discorso «de iure honorum Gallis dando») ampiamente e liberamente parafrasata da Tacito (Annali, XI, 24); 2) poiché dunque tale legge è esistita, e ha operato, la presenza — in opere storiografiche antiche — di documenti, anche ampi, trascritti in extenso è la prova dell’incompiutezza e/o non rifinitura di tali opere o almeno del contesto in cui quei documenti

1 Antike Kunstprosa, I, pp. 88–89, part. p. 88: «Dass die Historiker die Reden, Urkunde, Briefe mit ihren eigenen Worten wiedergeben, ist eine bekannte That-sache». 

II

Due sole volte infatti Sallustio nel *Bellum Catilinae* dichiara di trascrivere fedelmente dei documenti, e si tratta in entrambi i casi di lettere: quella che Catilina fa recapitare a Q. Lutazio Catulo (console nel 78) per raccomandargli, nel momento in cui sta passando “in clandestinità”, la moglie sua amatissima Aurelia Orestilla (34, 3–35), e quella che il congiurato Publio Cornelio Lentulo Sura (console nel 71, radiato dal Senato l’anno dopo, daccapo pretore nel 63, dunque pretore congiurato!)² invia a Catilina (44, 4–5) per incitarlo ad accogliere nell’armata rivoluzionaria «anche gli *infimi*» (cioè gli schiavi³, che invece Catilina allontanerà — quantunque accorsi numerosi — nell’imminenza della battaglia). Lentulo, pretore in carica, ucciso senza indugi a seguito della sentenza di morte emessa dal Senato, nella stessa notte del 5 dicembre 63, suggeriva in quel messaggio: *auxilium petas ab omnibus, etiam ab infumis*. Catilina, nella lettera a Catulo, adopera invece il più generico *miseri*: *publicam miserorum causam pro mea consuetudine suscepi* («io assunsi pubblicamente la causa degli infelici, che ho sempre difeso» traduce Concetto Marchesi [1878–1957])⁴. *Miser* doveva essere termine peculiare del suo lessico, perché lo si ritrova nella parafrasi di una sua allocuzione, che dobbiamo a Cicerone nell’orazione *Pro Murena* (metà novembre 63). Lì Cicerone — che aveva, come sappiamo, le sue spie nella congiura — sostiene di poter parafrasare discorsi tenuti da Catilina in *contione domestica*, nei quali affermava non potersi trovare *fidelis defensor miserorum* se non in chi *ipse miser esset* (*Pro Murena* 25, 50).

³ Nel messaggio verbale, affidato a colui che doveva recapitare la lettera, Lentulo parlava apertamente degli *schiavi* (44, 6: *quo consilio servitutia repudiet?*).
Questa frase era tra le preferite di Concetto Marchesi, il quale in un suo articolo del 1949 per un settimanale di partito così la rielaborò: «Nessuno — diceva Catilina ai compagni — può difendere la causa degli oppressi se non sia un oppresso anche lui. Io direi: se non abbia l’animo dell’oppresso»⁵. Dieci anni prima — nell’Introduzione all’editio maior del suo commento al Bellum Catilinae — l’aveva parafrasata più fedelmente, recuperando il termine miser che è nel testo: «I miseri — diceva — possono essere fedelmente difesi soltanto da uno che sia misero come loro»⁶. Ed è nel contesto di quella stessa pagina che Marchesi lanciò la formula, piuttosto fortunata: «Così Catilina fondava la factio miserorum, il partito dei miserabili». (Reminiscenza hugoiana, da parte di un poliedrico studioso, che a Messina, negli anni della prima guerra mondiale, aveva insegnato anche letteratura francese, oltre alla latina).

E miser è termine rimasto anche nel lessico di un ex-catilinario pentito, quale Sallustio, il quale nella celebre (e poco capita) comparazione tra Cesare e Catone — che di fatto è un monumento al ‘nemico’, cioè a Catone — di Cesare dice che era miseris perfugium, laddove Catone, integerrimo, era malis pernicies (Bell. Cat. 54, 3).

**III**


A potenziare il sospetto interveniva poi il raffronto col caso del biglietto di Lentulo a Catilina, citato anche da Cicerone ma con varianti.

Anche di quel secondo, assai breve ed efficace, messaggio Sallustio dice che sta fornendo fedele copia: quorum (epistularum) exemplum infra scriptum est. Però Cicerone, nella Terza Catilinaria, pronunziata

---

⁶ Sallustio, Bellum Catilinae (1939) cit., p. XXV.
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Ad populum il 3 dicembre 63, dopo il riuscito “agguato” agli Allobrogi ormai suoi complici, bloccati sul Ponte Milvio, cita lo stesso biglietto cambiandone tuttavia la sintassi:

a) Sallustio (Bell. Cat. 44, 5): Qui sim, ex eo, quem ad te misi, cognosces. Fac cogites in quanta calamitate sis, et memineris te virum esse. Consideres, quid tuae rationes postulent. Auxilium petas ab omnibus, etiam ab infumis.

b) Cicerone (Cat. III, 5, 12)7: Quis sim scies ex eo quem ad te misi. Cura ut vir sis et cogita quem in locum sis progressus. Vide equid tibi iam sit necesse et cura ut omnium tibi auxilia adiungas, etiam infimorum.

Cicerone parla in un ‘comizio’, e dà comunque un dettaglio non del tutto ozioso: la lettera era sine nomine.

Proprio la differenza tra i due testi di questo secondo e più breve documento ha indotto a dubitare anche del primo. Un appassionato filocatilinario come Luigi Pareti metteva in guardia: «Non lasciamoci spingere a considerarlo del tutto fedele [il messaggio di Catilina]: il confronto, per il testo analogo di XLIV, 5 con Cicerone Catil. III, 12, ci deve rendere guardinghi» (Commento a Sallustio, La guerra di Catilina, Firenze, Le Monnier 1935, p. 59). Era l’ammonimento già di F. Antoine e R. Lallier nel loro commento alla Conjuration de Catilina (Paris, Hachette, 1888, p. 117); secondo i due, Sallustio con exemplum vuol dire semplicemente «qu’il se tient très près du texte: cfr. 44, 4». Però i due riconoscevano che la lettera di Catilina «est écrite d’un style bien particulier» e contiene frasi e parole «qui ne se trouvent nulle part chez Salluste». Ed esemplificavano: «ex nulla conscientia de culpa» (35, 2). Nello stesso anno 1888 usciva a Lipsia il saggio “incoronato e premiato” del giovane Hans Schnorr von Carolsfeld (1862–1933), Über die Reden und Briefe des Sallust, che metteva in luce una lontananza non solo lessicale: «Già alla prima impressione — scriveva Schnorr von Carolsfeld — la lettera dimostra che il medesimo Sallustio non può aver dato la parola a Catilina in modi così difforni: per un verso nei discorsi ai congiurati e per l’altro in questa lettera» (pp. 25–26). «Le ragioni — proseguiva — che hanno indotto Catilina a congiurare sono, nella lettera, tutt’altre rispetto a quelle espresse nei violenti ed arroganti discorsi ai congiurati» («Die Beweggründe, die ihn zur Verschwörung trieben sind hier [nella lettera] andere als bei Sallust», cioè, appunto la scelta di

7 Norden (loc. cit.) non parla di questo secondo documento, forse per l’incertezza determinata dalle due varianti.

IV


Le notazioni stilistiche dei due sono tutte degne di nota. Marchesi: «Periodi scabri con nessi insoliti, con parole ripetute a brevissima distanza in vario significato, con la incuria frettolosa di uomo costretto a scrivere nell’urgenza di un’ora grave e decisiva. Espressioni come ex nulla conscientia de culpa (= ex nullius conscientia culpae); alienis nominibus con sottinteso aes alienum; alienatum (= abiectum o repulsum) non sono dello stile sallustiano»¹⁰. Syme: «La lettera è estranea allo stile e al linguaggio di Sallustio. Ha un periodare involuto, e contiene una assai grossolana espressione: satisfactionem ex nulla conscientia de culpa proponere decrevi. La frase honore honestatos è plautina (Captivi 247;

⁸ Sallust, p. 72 (tr. it. 1968, p. 88): «Here speaks the authentic Catilina».
⁹ Ibid. nota 53: ‘The letter is remote from the style and language of Sallust’.
¹⁰ La parte finale della nota, da «Espressioni» a «stile sallustiano» era già nella prefazione del 1939, p. XXIV, nota 3.
Non accade mai che Sallustio usi honesto, o satisfactio, commendatio e commend. Inoltre la formula di saluto, haveto, è solenne e arcaica: non la troviamo mai nelle lettere di Cicerone»11.

A proposito dell’altro testo epistolare (Lentulo a Catilina) Syme non ha dubbi: il testo letto da Cicerone davanti alla contio (III Catilinaria, 12) è quello autentico, Sallustio «corregge l’originale, modificando due espressioni colloquiali e rendendo più incisive e concrete due proposizioni»12. Mentre con la lettera di Catilina siamo di fronte ad un testo finito di sicuro tra i documenti degli Acta Senatus, nell’altro caso si tratta di un biglietto fatto sequestrare dal console nell’agguato al Ponte Milvio. Certamente Cicerone lo ha ostentato nel trionfale discorso ad populum, ma le Catilinarie che leggiamo sono riscritte rispetto ai discorsi effettivamente pronunziati (anche, e a maggior ragione, quella ‘improvvisata’ l’8 novembre): riscritte dopo alcuni anni, se è soltanto nel giugno 60 a.C. che Cicerone annuncia ad Attico (II, 1) di aver allestito il corpusculum delle sue orazioni consolari (incluse le quattro catilinarie). Sallustio scrive venti anni dopo (intorno al 42?) e dichiara di conoscere l’edizione delle orazioni consolari di Cicerone (Bell. Cat. 31, 6). Sembra però alquanto singolare che Sallustio, mentre afferma di trascrivere quel breve biglietto (exemplum infra Scriptum est) attinga — per quel documento — all’orazione ciceroniana e riscriva per intero il messaggio. Non si può escludere che anche quel compromettente documento (ancorché privo di sigillo e anonimo) fosse confluito negli Acta Senatus; e che lì Sallustio lo abbia rintracciato. (Escludiamo invece che Sallustio fosse stato, all’epoca, talmente intrinseco con gli ambienti dei congiurati da possedere di suo una copia di quel messaggio). Che Cicerone, nel rielaborare le proprie Catilinarie lo abbia parafrasato non è improbabile, tanto più che lo preannuncia con un meno impegnativo erant ita.

Perché Catilina scrisse proprio a Catulo? Marchesi spiega così l’iniziativa: «Suo scopo è la protezione di Orestilla. Soltanto l’amore e la tenerezza per

11 Sallust, p. 72 (tr. cit., p. 88 nota 53): «The letter is remote from the style and language of Sallust. It has an involved sentence, and a very clumsy expression — “satisfactionem ex nulla conscientia de culpa proponere decrevi.” The phrase “honore honestatos” is Plautine (Captivi 247; 356). Sallust happens not to use “honesto” — or “satisfactio,” “commendatio,” and “commendo”. Further, the formula of farewell, “haveto,” is solemn and archaic: never in Cicero’s letters. »

12 Sallust, p. 72 (tr. cit., p. 89): «Sallust improves on the original by modifying two colloquial expressions and by making two sentences more sharp and concrete». 
una donna potevano spingere, in quella notte, a quell’ora, Catilina a rivolgersi al capo della fazione avversaria, che era anche suo amico e di amicizia gli aveva dato prove manifeste. Nessun protettore è più sicuro di un avversario potente; e a lui si rivolge Catilina, avanti di partire, perché Orestilla, sua moglie, abbia quel rispetto che i nemici esterni accordano spesso alle donne e i nemici interni quasi mai. La nota dell’affetto domestico soverchia quella del contrasto politico»13. Quest’ultima notazione non sembra appropriata giacché il contenuto della lettera è soprattutto politico. Non è esatto che qui Catilina «non fa la difesa della propria condotta» (Marchesi, *ibid.*). È vero piuttosto, come osserva Syme, che «facendo appello alla fides di Catulo, Catilina protesta per l’ingiuria subita [l’aggressione verbale, e non solo, in Senato l’8 novembre], per l’insulto e l’offesa fatta alla sua dignitas», e spiega ampiamente perché ha assunto su di sé la miserorum causa; soltanto «termina col raccomandare la propria moglie, Aurelia Orestilla, alla fides dell’amico Catulo»14. Marchesi accentuava il côté romantico, Syme quello ‘prosopografico’.


Luciano Canfora  
*Università degli Studi di Bari «Aldo Moro»*  
luciano.canfora@uniba.it

---

13 Introduzione all’edizione Principato (giugno 1939, p. XXIV) = [*Voci di antichi*, 1946, p. 76].

14 Syme, *Sallust*, pp. 71–72 (tr. cit., p. 88): «appealing to the “fides” of Catulus, Catilina protests that he has been wronged, insulted and thwarted in his “dignitas”».

15 Diodoro Siculo XL, 5a.
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ABSTRACT

J.C. Stobart’s two books, The Glory that was Greece (1911) and The Grandeur that was Rome (1912), were published at the same historical moment as the Loeb Classical Library (1912). Like it they were aimed at a new readership interested in classical antiquity but without Latin or Greek, but adopted very different strategies: the Loeb’s were small and cheap, while Stobart’s books were monumental, expensive and heavily illustrated volumes. Stobart aimed to provide lucid and approachable texts which commented on their illustrations, while clinging to the traditional view of Classics as a source of eternal value that resisted the change and relativity characteristic of the late nineteenth century. His publisher Frank Sidgwick, son of a celebrated classical teacher, turned from Classics to English literature, and so belonged to a transitional generation in which Latin and Greek were marginalised. Stobart’s two books stood out among contemporary popularising literature as large, expensive and beautifully produced Gesamtkunstwerke.
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My subject is a pair of books published just before World War I: The Glory that was Greece (1911) and The Grandeur that was Rome (1912).¹ Their author, John Clarke Stobart, took their titles from Edgar Allan Poe’s poem ‘To Helen’:

Helen, thy beauty is to me
Like those Nicaean barks of yore,

¹ I should like to dedicate this paper to Ann Baer, Frank Sidgwick’s daughter, and to John Spurling, John Stobart’s grandson, with thanks for their generous help and convivial hospitality. For John Spurling, see www.johnspurling.com; for Ann Baer, see S. Markham, ‘Guardian of the Ganymeds: Ann Baer at 100’, The Book Collector 63 (2014), 417–26. The image below shows Stobart’s two books, with (L) a volume in the Loeb Classical Library (1912), and (R) a volume in the Home University Library (1911). Photograph by the author, taken in Cambridge University Library, North Front 4.
That gently, o’er a perfumed sea,
The weary, wayworn wanderer bore
To his own native shore.

On desperate seas long wont to roam,
Thy hyacinth hair, thy classic face,
Thy Naiad airs have brought me home
To the glory that was Greece
And the grandeur that was Rome.

Lo! in yon brilliant window-niche
How statue-like I see thee stand
The agate lamp within thy hand!
Ah, Psyche, from the regions which
Are Holy-Land!

These two books, now almost forgotten, were widely admired when they first appeared, went into several editions and were still in print fifty years later. A century after the *Glory* was published, a distinguished student of Greek religion, Robert Parker, wrote that

In relation to Greece, the classicizing approach that sought there models of timeless perfection has largely fallen out of fashion. J.C. Stobart’s *The Glory that was Greece* seems finally to have gone out of print; instead we are urged to remember that, for all its superficial familiarity, the ancient world was ‘desperately alien’ from our own.

Parker was referring to academic fashions, but Stobart’s book was aimed at a general audience, and one that was unlikely to know Greek. It is however true that the anthropological turn of the 1960s and ’70s filtered down to schools and to the general reading public. The phrase ‘desperately alien’ probably originated with Moses Finley, and it should be remembered that Finley was not only a leading ancient historian but also a prolific populariser, through his journalism, and an influential figure in

---


school curriculum reform, through the JACT Ancient History Committee. As a result, perspectives employed or argued for in his writing are likely to have influenced readers at several levels: I can still remember the impact *The World of Odysseus* made on me when I was at secondary school. The final editions of both the *Glory* and its companion volume the *Grandeur* were published in 1987, but since then a variety of reprints have been issued, some in the ‘Classics Reprint’ series of Forgotten Books, and Kindle versions are also available. For the publishers of such reprints, classicizing or anthropological approaches are less important than the expiry of Stobart’s copyright, 70 years after his death in 1933: a point which illustrates the way in which the histories of scholarship and of the book can be mutually illuminating. Stobart himself, as we shall see, did intend his books to encourage a search for timeless perfection, but much of his text can be read without engaging in such a search, and this is even more true of the revised editions of both books in the 1930s (by F.N. Pryce) and 1960s (by R.J. Hopper for the *Glory*, and by W.S. Maguinness and H.H. Scullard for the *Grandeur*).

Stobart’s books appeared at a specific historical moment, just before World War 1, when the old dominance of Classics in elite British culture

---

4 For the phrase, see Finley’s preface to P.E. Easterling and J.V. Muir (eds), *Greek Religion and Society* (CUP, 1985), xiii. My thanks to Robert Parker for discussion.

was fading, and when attempts were being made both to shore up its position in schools and universities, and to reach out beyond them to maintain interest in it among a wider readership which had neither Latin nor Greek. Like so many other things, these attempts were interrupted by the outbreak of war. As my mention of education and publication indicates, this paper stands at the interface between the histories of Classics and of publishing, and I shall be concerned to look at the relationship between the two. One could discuss Stobart simply by reading what he wrote, but that would be to leave out of account the way his text is printed on paper and bound in board, and the way it is enhanced by a few coloured and large numbers of black and white photographs and line drawings, and by the way the boards are moulded in bas relief. The role of illustration is of special importance in this case, since Stobart and his publisher, as we shall see, viewed the text as a commentary on the illustrations.

---

Parameters of change 1850–1920: institutions, ideologies and publishing

Between 1850 and 1920, the central position of Classics in British schools and universities was undermined by social and institutional changes. New subjects were introduced in the ancient universities from the 1850s: history, law, economics, modern languages, natural sciences, and eventually English (Oxford in the 1890s, Cambridge in the 1910s). In the new municipal secondary schools set up after the 1902 Education Act, Latin was available but not Greek. After World War 1, the compulsory Greek requirement for entry to Oxford and Cambridge, first challenged in 1870, was abolished. The franchise was extended to working-class men, and eventually to women (aged 30 in 1921, aged 21 in 1928); the elite social order for so long identified with a classical education was beginning to crumble. State schooling was introduced, at an elementary level from 1870 (compulsory from 1881) and at the secondary level from 1902. Literacy was almost universal, university extension teaching became popular,

---

6 The Glory bears an image of Athena Parthenos, the Grandeur a medallion showing the head of Germanicus.


8 See Stray, Classics Transformed, 167–270.
and a growing market for self-education was created among skilled workers who had no prospect of going to university.⁹

Among the institutional responses to the marginalising of Classics were the foundation of the Classical Association of England and Wales in 1903, and of the Association for the Reform of Latin Teaching a decade later. The Classical Association’s founder, the Cambridge Latinist J.P. Postgate, warned that without concerted action Classics could disappear from school curricula; the founder of the ARLT, the headmaster W.H.D. Rouse, sought to recreate an imagined golden age of pre-industrial harmony by teaching Classics through conversation in Latin and Greek.¹⁰

**Ideologies**

Responses to these changes can be seen both in the defences and justifications composed by classical scholars, and in the books brought out by publishers as they reoriented to new markets and new readerships. A long tradition of using classical antiquity as a source of timeless and universal exemplars was coming to an end, as classicists developed a wide range of reformulated visions of the subject. Some of these involved modulated versions of the absolutist conception of the timeless and universal value of the classical; others sought an accommodation to relativity and change. Among the most influential examples of the latter position was Gilbert Murray’s conception of ‘evolutionary humanistic Hellenism’, in which the Hellenic spirit embodied a kind of change which was controlled by its progressive directionality.¹¹ What is striking about Stobart’s books is that


they represent an attempt to maintain the absolutist position which one might see reflected in Poe’s reference to Greece and Rome as a ‘home’ for the ‘weary traveller’ on ‘desperate seas’. As he wrote in the preface to the *Glory,*

> My claim for the study of Hellenism would not be founded on history. I would urge the need of constant reference to some fixed canon in matters of taste, some standard of the beautiful which shall be beyond question or criticism; all the more because we are living in eager, restless times of constant experiment and veering fashions ... The proper use of true classics is ... to keep them as a compass in the cross-currents of fashion. By them you may know what is permanent and essential from what is showy and exciting. (Glory 5)

The source of Stobart’s absolutism can perhaps be found in the waning of religious faith in the later nineteenth century and the search for alternative exemplars of value. From about 1855, a steady decline can be seen in the ordination rates of Oxford and Cambridge graduates; in Stobart’s generation, graduates were more likely to go into teaching, the law or the civil service than into the church.12 His own father was a clergyman, and we could compare W.H.D. Rouse, son of a Baptist missionary, who devoted his adult life to a secular mission: to convert teachers and pupils to the direct method, teaching and learning Latin and Greek through conversation in the classical languages.13 Others in Stobart’s generation inherited secular missions from their fathers, as in the case of the Latinist J.P. Postgate, son of a food purity reformer.14 Frank Sidgwick’s father Arthur Sidgwick was a political and cultural liberal who like his brother Henry had never been ordained. The Sunday homilies he delivered to the sixth-formers at Rugby in the late 1860s were designed to counter the chapel sermons of the conservative headmaster Henry Hayman, to whom Sidgwick and his colleagues were bitterly opposed.15 Where others’ commitment to Classics can be seen as a substitute for religion, for Stobart the two ran in parallel. At the BBC, his religious faith will have recommended him to the sternly religious Sir John Reith, the

13 Stray, *The Living Word.*
14 Stray, *Classics Transformed,* 225.
15 The conflict led first to Hayman’s sacking Sidgwick, and eventually, in 1873, to the school governors’ sacking Hayman. See the *ODNB* on Hayman article, revised by M.C. Curthoys; the original *DNB* article was, unusually, anonymous, in itself an indication of contention.
first director-general, who greeted a new employee at interview by asking, ‘Do you accept the fundamental teachings of Jesus Christ?’  

Stobart was put in charge of a range of programmes, including religious talks. Stobart’s own religiosity can be seen in the titles of two books collecting his essays: *The Gospel of Happiness* (1933) and *The Divine Spark* (1934). A reviewer of the first book declared that Stobart was ‘essentially a preacher, a reverently-minded man with a message’. In April 1929 Stobart went on a lecture tour of Canada, and in Victoria, British Columbia, spoke at the City Temple: his title was ‘Jesus the Poet, or the Holiness of Beauty’. At the BBC Stobart introduced the custom of broadcasting every New Year’s Eve a ‘Grand Goodnight’, in which a ‘message of hope and encouragement’ was broadcast to listeners. In the broadcast on the last day of 1932, he declared that what the nation needed was a return to Jesus Christ. The broadcast came from a microphone installed in his bedroom, where he was dying of diabetes; an offer of a knighthood was on its way to him when he died on 11 May 1933.

To return to Stobart’s conception of Classics: despite his overall absolutism, he does not hold to the position that fifth-century Greece was a transcendent exemplar, and applauds the Greekless reader for being ‘much less likely [than the professional philologist] to overrate that narrow strip of time which classical scholars select out of Greek history as “the classical period”’ (*Glory* viii). In fact ‘This volume is fortunate in the moment of its appearance, for it is now possible for the first time to illustrate the prehistoric culture of Greece in a worthy manner’ (*Glory* ix). Stobart goes on to mention ‘the models of the treasures of Crete and Mycenae’ held in the Ashmolean and British Museums, and to acknowledge Arthur Evans’s permission to reproduce them in colour (*Glory* Plates 5 and 7).

Stobart’s references to Crete and Mycenae, and so to the work of Schliemann and Evans, point to the changes that had come over Classics in the late nineteenth century, after archaeological discoveries revealed a Greece very different from that of the fifth century BCE. A significant

---

16 R.S. Lambert, *Ariel and All his Quality: An Impression of the BBC from Within* (Gollancz, 1940), 25. For Henry Sidgwick, see B. Schultz, *Henry Sidgwick — The Eye of the Universe: A Biography* (CUP, 2004).

17 Undated review of *The Gospel of Happiness*, in the Stobart scrapbook held by John Spurling.

18 Information from press cuttings in the Stobart scrapbook.


20 See the informative Wikipedia article on Stobart, written by his grandson John Spurling.
moment in this process was the foundation in 1879 of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, whose object was to promote archaeological rather than linguistic or literary exploration of ancient Greece.\textsuperscript{21} When the first volume of the Society’s \textit{Journal of Hellenic Studies} came out in 1880, it was reviewed by the Oxford Homerist David Binning Monro.\textsuperscript{22} In his review, Monro quoted the Society’s rules, which declared that its main object would be ‘to advance the study of Greek language, literature and art, and to illustrate the history of the Greek race in the ancient, Byzantine, and neo-Hellenic periods’ (Rule 1: JHS 1, ix). Monro went on to point out that such aspirations were different from those of earlier classical revivals. The new features he finds are first, ‘the idea of development, which impels us to look at the continuous history of a literature or a nation, rather than to dwell exclusively on brilliant epochs.’ Secondly, ‘the idea of science, which tends to put all phenomena on the same level, rather than choose out this or that portion as especially worthy of study’; thirdly,

the idea of nationality ... which is satisfied by the long historical life of the Greek people ... All these ideas are distinctively modern; and their influence may be seen in the province marked out by the new Renaissance. That province is “Hellenism” — Hellenism of every period and in every exhibition of its spirit. And the success which has so far attended the movement is due, not merely to the literary prestige of Hellenic Studies”, but still more to the consciousness that what they offer is in a supreme degree the conditions of scientific interest.\textsuperscript{23}

Monro’s point about development may have been fuelled by his personal focus on Homer, to whom no more than lip service was paid by those scholars for whom fifth-century Athens was the peak of Greek civilisation. The more fundamental point about development was that it undermined the crucial argument for classical antiquity, that it provided timeless exemplars of value. Once the notion of historical change was introduced, that bulwark crumbled. His second point referred to another corrosive of the classical ideal, the amoral world of scientific naturalism.\textsuperscript{24} As it


\textsuperscript{22} For Monro, see his article in ODNB, and J. Cook Wilson, \textit{David Binning Monro: A Short Memoir} (OUP, 1904).


\textsuperscript{24} Stray, \textit{Classics Transformed}, 152; cf. F.M. Turner, \textit{Between Religion and Science: The Reaction to Scientific Naturalism in Late-Victorian England} (Yale UP, 1974);
emerged in the later nineteenth century, this set up a powerful alternative
to the world of literary and humanistic value of which Classics had been
a central part. Monro’s final point, about nationalism, brought up another
serious challenger to the world of universal value manifested in the
history of Latin as a European lingua franca which underpinned the res
publica litterarum. Nationalism went along with the shift to vernacular
language and publishing, both of which had made significant advances in
the eighteenth century. Particularism, then, worked against the universal
value seen by so many as exemplified by Classics, the bulwark against
change and relativity.

As Yeats put it in 1920 in his apocalyptic poem ‘The second coming’,
‘Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; mere anarchy is loosed upon
the world’. But it was not only the wider world that was falling apart, but
also the smaller world of classical scholarship. Stobart was writing for a
new audience which could not be assumed to know Greek or Latin, but he
was also trying to give an integrated picture of classical civilisation at a
time when he saw scholarship fragmenting into specialisms. As he put it
in the preface to the Glory, ‘Real students are now like miners working
underground, each in his own shaft, buried far away from sight or earshot
of the public, so that they even begin to lose touch with each other’ (Glory
v). Stobart’s conclusion was that we must either compile ‘encyclopaedic
works under slight editorial control’ or ‘present a panorama of the whole
territory from an individual point of view’; the latter plan is clearly what
he is following, though he is aware that ‘The best that [he] can hope for is
that his archaeology may satisfy the historians and his history the
archaeologists’ (Glory vii–viii).25

Any reader of Stobart’s books cannot fail to realise that they are
indeed viewing ‘a panorama … from an individual point of view’. Dis-
cussing the Homeric ‘king’, Stobart comments that ‘The truth, of course,
is that he’s a king in buckram. He is only a country squire with a pedigree,
dressed up as a Basileus to suit the conventions of the epic’ (Glory 47).26

At Sparta ‘prefects’ were appointed to look after younger boys: ‘the latter
had his [sic] “fags” entirely under his orders’ (Glory 91). This glimpse of

---

25 His reference to encyclopaedic works is surely to Pauly-Wissowa, Encyclopaedie
des Altertumswissenschaft. This had first appeared in 1837–52 in 6 vols in 7 and grew
under successive editors till it is now in 49 volumes in 83.

26 Note the colloquial ‘he’s’, invoking the atmosphere of a fireside chat. Buckram was
a loose-woven cotton fabric stiffened with paste: in other words, a plain everyday
material very different from regal robes. Cf. Shakespeare, Henry VII, IV.vi, ‘thou
buckram lord’. 
the public-school system that Stobart knew as both pupil and teacher is paralleled in his reference to the ‘dog-eared texts and grammars’ which ‘waft back’ to a graduate ‘the strangely close atmosphere of the classical form-room’ (Glory 1). At times, the author writes of his own feelings, as when in discussing Gibbon he remarks parenthetically that ‘I write as one who cannot change trains at Lausanne without emotion’ (Grandeur viii).  

He also offers highly idiosyncratic opinions at times, as when describing a funereal monument:

> Commentators tell us that the cat (*felis domesticus*) was not kept as a pet in Greece, but that when ancient commentators talk of the ‘wavy-tail’ who catches mice they mean the weasel. Would any one but a commentator keep a weasel for a pet?‘ (Glory 193).  

Remarks such as this explain why the editors of the fourth edition of the Grandeur (1961) wrote that ‘It is hoped that readers of the present edition will not miss Stobart’s engaging flippancy’. A review of the first edition of the Glory had made the same point:

> A title *ad captandum* of the most hackneyed sort and a flippant literary manner designed also, no doubt, to catch, have to be set against the very real merits of Mr J.C. Stobart’s book ... 

Stobart’s publisher Frank Sidgwick, on the other hand, will have appreciated Stobart’s flippancy, since his own family was known for making flippant remarks in discussions of serious subjects, a trait referred to as ‘Sidgwickedness’. The term was first used of Frank’s uncle, the philosopher Henry Sidgwick.

---

27 Gibbon had lived in Lausanne in 1753–8, 1763–4 and 1783–94.

28 Stobart evidently did not know anyone who kept ferrets, and surely was unaware of the competitive sport of ferret-legging (keeping ferrets inside one’s sealed trousers), for which the current world record is 5 hours 10 minutes ([https://www.topendsports.com/sport/unusual/ferret-legging.htm](https://www.topendsports.com/sport/unusual/ferret-legging.htm), last accessed 09.12.19).

29 W.S. Maguinness and H.H. Scullard, Preface, *The Grandeur that was Rome*, fourth edition, ix. (How could readers miss it, unless they had already read earlier editions?)


31 See A. and E.M. S[idgwick], *Henry Sidgwick* (Macmillan, 1906), 586. The use of the term in a poem in the St John’s College magazine *The Eagle* (Easter 1897), 583, in the phrase ‘Sidgwickedness shifty and shady’, perhaps represents independent invention, referring as it does to Sidgwick’s failed attempt to have women made eligible for degrees. The term is also used in F.C.S. Schiller’s spoof philosophical journal *Mind!*
Stobart makes it clear that his books are inevitably based on the specialised work of other scholars: anyone who adopts his plan ‘is compelled to ... tread on innumerable toes with every step he takes. Every fact he chronicles is the subject of a monograph, every opinion he hazards may run counter to somebody’s life-work’ (Glory vii). Yet he is not afraid to criticise or disagree with eminent authorities: ‘Mommsen, like a true Bismarckian German, has a striking comparison of the ancient Gallic Celt with the modern Irishman’ (Grandeur 115). ‘I think, in opposition to Ferrero ...’ (Grandeur 170); ‘It is ... unhistorical to assert, as does the foremost of living historians in Germany, Dr Eduard Meyer ...’ (Grandeur 171).

**Publishing**

In response to the changes outlined above, new kinds of books were published. The textbook series launched in the first two decades of the twentieth century were designed to be more approachable, easier to work through and with less focus on the detailed rules of grammar and syntax. Literary texts were given more extensive notes, and in some cases vocabularies were added, thus creating problems for the publishers of dictionaries. Illustrations were introduced to make books more attractive to young learners, in some cases with a limited use of colour; limited because of the cost of printing in colour. A relatively elaborate example was Atkinson and Pierce’s *Dent’s First Latin Book* (J.M. Dent, 1902), which carried 12 colour plates by Mary Durham.32

Beyond the school market, new series of books were published to appeal to new audiences who could not read Latin or Greek. The Loeb Classical Library, an Anglo-American venture planned in 1911, began to issue volumes in 1912, each volume including a Latin or Greek text and facing translation; some read the translation, while marking up the facing

---


(Williams and Norgate, 1901), 140. I owe my own knowledge of the term to conversation with Frank Sidgwick's daughter Ann Baer.
original. With a much wider remit, the Home University Library of Modern Knowledge (1911) was edited by the classical scholar Gilbert Murray (Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford 1908–36), his friend the historian H.A.L. Fisher (President of the Board of Education 1916–22),


the biologist J. Arthur Thompson, Regius Professor of Natural History at Aberdeen, and William T. Brewster, Professor of English at Columbia University. Murray’s own book *Euripides* was published in the series in 1913, and later classical titles were contributed by Jane Harrison and Maurice Bowra. Murray remained an editor till his death in 1957.34

Stobart’s books were written for the same new audiences, but were different in an important respect: they were large-format and heavily illustrated, their text serving almost as an accompaniment to their illustrations, and thus they were inevitably expensive. They were aimed, we must conclude, at the upper sectors of the new readership, and as gift or prize books.35 I referred above to publishers’ reorienting toward the new markets: Sidgwick had less of a problem than some, since his firm had been founded only in 1908 (its history is discussed below).

Among the consequences of the academic specialisation decried by Stobart has been the separation between the history of science and of the humanities. This is made all the more evident by the scale and quality of work produced in the history of science.36 In the case of the publishing for new readerships in the early twentieth century to which Stobart’s books belong, it is characteristic that an excellent general account is available, as it is not for the humanities. Peter Bowler’s Science for All: The Popularisation of Science in Early Twentieth-Century Britain (2009) can provide us with several perspectives on Stobart’s books, both parallel and complementary. In the case of the Home University Library, which as I have suggested (n. 19) deserves a full-scale study, Bowler reports evidence from the papers of scientific contributors. For example, a printed prospectus hailed the series as ‘a landmark of modern book production’ and identified its readership as ‘thousands of students in upper elementary schools ... university extension classes, evening schools, home reading circles, literary societies etc.’37 Bowler’s excellent discussion of the new readerships and on the way in which publishers and authors responded to them (pp. 81–90) is to a degree generalisable to humanities publishing. An interesting parallel to Stobart’s books mentioned by Bowler is the prolific Scottish scientific populariser Charles Gibson’s The Autobiography of an Electron (1911), an approachable and often humorous account (p. 35).38

35 The classicists who have told me of their encounters with the books remember them as volumes in their school libraries.
37 Bowler, Science for All, 128–19, citing the papers of Patrick Geddes in the National Library of Scotland, 153a.
38 Another study worth mentioning here is Matthew Skelton’s, ‘The paratext of everything: constructing and marketing H.G. Wells’s The Outline of History’, Book History 4 (2001), 237–75, which draws on correspondence and publishing records.
The look of the book

Let me turn to the books themselves. The first editions of 1911–12 are large format (super-royal octavo, 10 ½ in. x 7 ½ in.), thick and heavy — the Glory is just under 300 pages and weighs in at 1.825 kg; the Grandeur is 350 pages and 1.975 kg. They were printed in Monotype Caslon Old Face Standard, the leading typeface of the time for serious books. The text was printed on high-quality paper and heavily illustrated, each volume having 100 illustrations of different kinds: collotypes, half-tones, line drawings, a few of the half-tones being in colour, as were photogravures made by Emery Walker. Walker was a distinguished printer who

\[\text{This section has benefited greatly from discussion with Michael Twyman.}\]

\[\text{This typeface had been released by the Monotype Company in 1906, following another version of Caslon (Old Face Special) released in 1903. On receiving early proofs of the Glory, Sidgwick complained to his printers, the Ballantyne Press, that they had mistakenly introduced examples of the earlier face into the text. Sidgwick to Ballantyne, 26 Feb. 1911: Bodleian Libraries, Oxford, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 12.21.}\]
had befriended and worked with William Morris, and was the most influential engraver and typographer of his day: ‘It is scarcely too much to say that his influence, direct or indirect, can be discerned in nearly every well-designed traditional typographical page that now appears, and that to him more than to any other man the twentieth century’s great improvement in book production in Britain was due.’ The use of Walker’s skills is one of several indications that Sidgwick was determined to apply the highest standards to Stobart’s books. Another such indication is that many of the illustrations were printed on a ‘dull art paper’ specially commissioned by Sidgwick from the London firm of Grosvenor Chater; Sidgwick was clearly determined to avoid the ‘spotty photos on shiny paper’ (half-tones) that he had referred to in a letter to Stobart. The title

42 Sidgwick to Stobart, 13 Oct. 1910: MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 10.145. Sidgwick was proud of this paper, and drew attention to it when sending out review copies. This is mentioned in some reviews: see the section on reception below. Sidgwick to C.H.
pages of the two books are classically austere, but their austerity is relieved by the use of rubrication and by the triangular panel below the title (see illustration above). This panel, which carries the firm’s acronym ‘S J & C’, is in the style of the Arts and Crafts movement, begun in 1887 to foster decorative design. The title page as a whole thus reminds us of the combination of, and potential tension between, the classical values explored in Stobart’s text and the rather different artistic ten- 
dencies of contemporary book-making.

In choosing to print Stobart’s text (and some illustrations) on high-
class paper, with art paper tipped in, Sidgwick took a different route from

---


---

McCall (Ballantine Press), 16 Oct. 1911: MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 14.358. In 1920 Sidgwick brought home dummy copies of both books sent him by the binders, for his daughters Elizabeth and Ann to use as albums; they found the (blank) paper too shiny to write on. (Information from Ann Baer.)

43 Michael Twyman suggests that the design of the triangular panel reflects the work of Lewis F. Day, a founder member of the Arts and Crafts Society, who died in 1910. Among Day’s wallpaper designs, now held in the Victoria and Albert Museum, are ‘Greek’ and ‘Athenian’. As far as I know, Sidgwick did not use the triangular design on any other books.

44 The tension is expressed in the difference between the moulded classical cameos of the cover and the logo panel on the title page.
that adopted by other publishers. Sydney Roberts’ *Picture Book of British History*, published in three volumes by Cambridge University Press from 1914, was printed throughout on art paper. Roberts’s Preface opened as follows:

Great emphasis is now laid by educational authorities upon the importance of pictorial illustration in the teaching of history. The Board of Education, in its most recent circular on the subject, describes it as ‘an indispensable aid at all stages’, and recommends that ‘portraits of eminent persons, reproductions of old prints, documents and other famous records ... will often form the best means of representing social life and customs, pageants and battles, the apparatus of husbandry, trade and war’.45

Another book of this kind, A.F. Giles’s *The Roman Civilization* (T.C. and E.C. Jack, 1918) was also printed on art paper. It belonged to a series of illustrated books entitled ‘Through the Eye’ (the series title is displayed on the cover), a popular contemporary phrase which summed up the doctrine reflected in the Board of Education’s circular. Jennifer Lynn Peterson has described the phrase as ‘a common conceit of the era’, and cites a 1912 editorial in the *New York Evening Journal* which declared that moving pictures ‘will educate, through the eye, hundreds of millions of children’.46

To return to Stobart’s books: the illustration does not stop at the endpapers (which all feature maps), however, since they have elaborately decorated covers with embossed gold medallions, reminiscent in some ways of Edward Burne-Jones’s silver and grey bas-relief panels for his Perseus series.47 The colour scheme varies: the *Glory* is in two shades of brown, the *Grandeur* silver and grey. The contrast could hardly be greater between these massive volumes and those in the series brought out in the same period by other publishers. The Home University Library, whose volumes ran to about 50,000 words each, had a standard price of 1s.

---

45 Roberts was probably referring to Board of Education Circular 833, *Suggestions for the Use of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools, Instalment no.6: Suggestions for the Teaching of History* (HMSO, 1914). This reminded teachers that ‘Pictorial illustration ... is an indispensable aid at all stages’ (p. 15).


47 The series was commissioned by Arthur Balfour in 1875, and worked on for ten years. The surviving preliminary studies are in Southampton Art Gallery, some finished panels in the Staatsgalerie at Stuttgart.
Harper’s Library of Living Thought, which included volumes on archaeology, consisted of books of less than 200 pages priced at 2s 6d. More upmarket was Heinemann’s Regions of the World series, beginning in 1902, whose volumes were priced at 7s 6d; even more so the publications of the Medici Society, founded in 1908, whose series Handbooks to Ancient Civilisations was priced at 12s 6d a volume and included illustrations, some in colour. Amara Thornton, to whose pioneering work in this area I am indebted, regards this series as ‘on the expensive end of the “popular” scale’. On this reckoning Stobart’s two books were well off this scale, selling as they did at 30s each, rather than the guinea Sidgwick had estimated in advance. To find more massive and more expensive

A.F. Giles, *The Roman Civilization*  
(T.C. and E.C. Jack, 1918)

48 Thornton, *Archaeologists in Print: Publishing for the People* (UCL Press online, 2018), 110. Cheaper than any of these were the volumes of Benn’s Sixpenny Library, founded in 1926, whose small-format yellow paperbacks ran to less than 100 pages.  
49 Sidgwick to Stobart, 13 Oct. 1910: MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 10.145.
volumes, one would have to go to Liddell and Scott’s *Greek–English Lexicon* (8th edition 1897: xvi, 1,776 pages, 11¾ in. x 9 in., 4.25 kg), priced at 42s. Its Latin counterpart, Lewis and Short’s *A Latin Dictionary* shared its format with Stobart’s books (10½ in. x 7½ in.); it was thicker and heavier (xiv, 2,010 pages, 2.65 kg) but was cheaper at 25s. Later editions of the *Glory* in Stobart’s lifetime were sold at reduced prices. The printing and publishing history of both books up to 1924 can be extracted from the firm’s ledgers. The *Glory* was published in December 1911, priced at 30s. The print run was 1,500, followed in June 1913 by a run of 1,200 for a Swedish translation. By the end of 1914, 541 copies had been sold at home, and 268 in the USA. A second ‘cheap’ edition was issue in 1915, priced at 7s 6d. The much reduced price of the second edition probably reflects both the reduced sophistication and complexity of the boards, and the fact that some first edition costs were one-off rather than recurrent.

A new impression in 1918 was priced at 15s, another in 1920 at 21s. By the end of 1924, the second edition had sold 3,088 copies at home, and 1,538 in the USA; American editions were also published by J.B. Lippincott of Philadelphia in 1913 and 1915. A third edition, revised by F.N. Pryce, appeared in 1933, and was reprinted seven times by 1960; a US edition was published in 1933 by Grove Press. The fourth edition, revised

---


51 King’s College Modern Archive, Cambridge, papers of Rupert Chawner Brooke, RCB/S/16.2.1. The ledgers cover the period 1908–51; it is not clear why the entries for Stobart’s books end in 1924. The archive was acquired by King’s College from Maggs in 2015: see P.M. Jones, ‘Rupert Brooke and the profits of poetry’, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* XVI (2016), 107–23. My thanks to Peter Jones for alerting me to the existence of the Schroder deposit and for helpful discussion.

52 This was *Hellas’ härlighet: en skildring av Greklands Kultur under forntiden*, trans. P.G. Norberg (P.A. Norstedt, 1915). Norstedt was a publishing house founded in 1823; the connection was made through the British representative of another Swedish publisher (Albert Bonnier), Margaret Dowling, who also worked for Sidgwick and Jackson. See the prefatory note to the catalogue of MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, Reading Room 1, Weston Library, Oxford.

The *Grandeur* was published in December 1912, priced at 30s, and by December 1920 755 copies had been sold at home and 557 in the USA. The second edition, priced at 21s, appeared in 1920, and by the end of 1924 had sold 1,200 copies at home, and 460 in the USA. American editions (Lippincott again) appeared in 1913 and 1915. The third edition, revised by F.N. Pryce, was issued in 1934 and reprinted six times by 1960; a US edition was published by Appleton-Century in 1938. The fourth edition of 1961, revised by W.S. Maguinness and H.H. Scullard, was reprinted in 1965 by the New English Library, and in 1971 and 1976 by Book Club Associates.

A few general conclusions can be drawn from the above details. First, the *Glory* was more popular than the *Grandeur*. Second, US sales made up about a third of the total for both books. Third, they were clearly seen for several decades as worth reissuing in revised form rather than replacing, even after the appearance of such books as R.H. Barrow’s *The Romans* (Penguin, 1949) and H.D.F. Kitto’s *The Greeks* (Penguin, 1951).

**Reception**

Reviews of both books were overwhelmingly positive, though a few complained of errors of fact.\(^{53}\) Here is a representative example, published under the heading ‘Hellenism for the Barbarian’:

> Mr Stobart has produced the very book to show the modern barbarian the meaning of hellenism ... Nor has the learned author a dull chapter. Mr Stobart’s danger, indeed, lies not in heaviness, but in the excess of sprightliness ... But we forgive this and an occasional touch of cocksureness for the sake of a work so attractive and suggestive and of learning so lightly worn. ... The book is nobly illustrated ... no such collection of beautiful things ... has yet been placed before the English public, and never before have we seen the difficulties of successful reproduction so successfully combated; in particular the publishers call attention with legitimate pride to the fact that the surface of the paper used for the illustrations is similar to that of the letter-press, instead of the shiny abomination which usually mars books of this kind. The result is a book

---

\(^{53}\) For example, the review of the *Glory* in the *Athenaeum* of 6 April 1912 largely consists of a long list of errors, though the reviewer ends by praising the book’s ‘many merits’. 


to buy (the price is high, but could hardly be lower), a book to beg, borrow or steal.\textsuperscript{54}

The \textit{Pall Mall Gazette} offered Stobart warm masculine praise:

A fair-minded, unprejudiced man paying attention to all the beauties contained in this book can only come to one conclusion: My son must enter this paradise and become familiar with it. (30 October 1911)

The \textit{Grandeur} was similarly well received. The \textit{Observer} was especially enthusiastic:

[Stobart] treats not one phase of Roman history in his book, but the whole scope of her story; and he treats it with magnificent freshness and lucidity. It is a book which must be read; it is a book which should be in the library of every school and every college; and it is an ideal book to be given as a prize in place of the standard classics on which the dust has settled too thickly. (Sunday, January [1913])

The American editions were also well reviewed. The \textit{Christian Science Monitor} commented on the \textit{Grandeur} that ‘Mr Stobart has written an important and an interesting book, and English literature is, in every way, the richer for its publication’ (n.d.).\textsuperscript{55} The New York magazine \textit{Tribune}, reviewing the \textit{Grandeur}, remarked that “The Glory that was Greece” had lent itself magnificently to illustration. The author has been no less successful in making Roman art serve his purpose ...’ (5 April 1913)

Stobart’s books also had a literary afterlife, though it is not always easy to distinguish between references to them and to Poe’s poem. The seventh episode of Joyce’s \textit{Ulysses} has a section entitled ‘The Grandeur that was Rome’, in which a character remarks that

We mustn’t be led away by words, by sounds of words. We think of Rome, imperial, imperious, imperative. ... What was their civilisation? Vast, I allow: but vile. Cloacae: sewers. The Jews in the wilderness and on the mountaintop said: \textit{It is meet to be here. Let us build an altar to Jehovah}. The Roman, like the Englishman who follows in his footsteps,

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Saturday Review}, 9 December 1911. The art paper is also singled out for mention in the \textit{Observer} of 10 February 1912: ‘It is satisfactory to note that the publishers have adopted, with signal success, a dull surface paper for the printing of the half-tone illustrations.’

\textsuperscript{55} This and the previous review, held in a scrapbook inherited from Stobart by his grandson John Spurling, lack some or all date information.
brought to every new shore on which he set his foot (on our shore he never set it) only his cloacal obsession. He gazed about him in his toga and he said: *It is meet to be here. Let us construct a watercloset.*

In 1935 Joyce wrote to his children that:

There is nothing like the classics before breakfast. You did not know? Pshaw! It is of the pshiunplest. As:

My dear grandeur that was Rome, may I not tempt you to another slice of bacon? You had such a tiny piece!

Thanks, dear glory that was Greece, your bacon is truly delicious. It is crispness porkonafried!

A few years later, in his autobiographical poem *Autumn Journal* (1939), Louis MacNeice gave an account of his Oxford education:

The Glory that was Greece: put it in a syllabus, grade it
Page by page
To train the mind or even to point a moral
For the present age:
Models of logic and lucidity, dignity, sanity,
The golden means between opposing ills
Though there were exceptions of course but only exceptions —
The bloody Bacchanals on the Thracian hills.

Two years later, MacNeice wrote the script for a BBC broadcast, ‘The Glory that is Greece’, transmitted on 28 October 1940. This went on air within hours of Metaxas’s famous response to Mussolini’s ultimatum: ‘Ochi!’ (‘No!’). MacNeice’s title alluded to Stobart’s *Glory*, and both books were referred to in a *New York Times* editorial on the following day entitled ‘The hour of Greece’:

The Grandeur that was Rome has declined to the mean bravado of a bully, striking at those who are not expected to strike back. But the

---

56 J. Joyce, *Ulysses* (Simon and Brown, 2011), 189. The novel was serialised from 1918 to 1920, then published in book form in 1922.

57 Joyce to Giorgio and Helen Joyce, 13 August 1935: S. Gilbert (ed.), *The Letters of James Joyce* (Faber, 1957), 379–80. Joyce had had neither of Stobart’s books in his library in Trieste, where he lived from 1904 to 1920, so the reference is probably to Poe.

Greeks in this hour, outnumbered as they are, poor in the instruments of modern war, remember and defend the glory that was Greece.\(^{59}\)

By then an abridgment of the *Glory* had appeared: Elsie Herrin’s *Teach Yourself about Greece* (1939).\(^{60}\)

The *Glory* was the first book put on the shelves of the farmhouse in Arcadia bought by Stobart’s grandson, the novelist and dramatist John Spurling and his wife, the biographer Hilary Spurling, in 2006. In a ‘Letter from Arcadia’, published two years later, Hilary Spurling recorded the purchase and renovation of their Greek home, using Stobart’s own description of Greece to illuminate her and her husband’s experiences.\(^{61}\)

This history of reception should not overlook the possibility of hybrid formations. A single example will suffice: Douglass Cross’s lyrics for the song ‘I left my heart in San Francisco’, written in 1953.

The loveliness of Paris seems somehow sadly gray
The glory that was Rome is of another day
I’ve been terribly alone and forgotten in Manhattan
I’m going home to my city by the Bay.

Why Rome and not Greece, since they are metrically equivalent? Perhaps because this verse is about cities, not countries. Why glory and not grandeur? Because it works better semantically in this context.

**Author and publisher**

Stobart (b. 1878) and Sidgwick (b. 1879), almost exact contemporaries, both belonged to a generation in which Classics was being dethroned from its central position in English high culture, and in which the boundaries between school and university teaching were relatively fluid. Sidgwick’s father Arthur Sidgwick, one of the best-known classical scholars and teachers in late-Victorian England, had moved from Rugby School to

---

\(^{59}\) The text is reprinted in A. Wrigley and S.J. Harrison (eds), *Louis MacNeice: The Classical Radio Plays* (OUP, 2013), 43–80, with an introduction by Gonda Van Steen; quotation from p. 44.

\(^{60}\) This was one of the first volumes in a long-running series published by English Universities Press, a subsidiary of Hodder and Stoughton.

\(^{61}\) H. Spurling, ‘Letter from Arcadia’, *The Hudson Review* 61 (2008), 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16–17. The ‘Zeus-like’ British classical scholar whose visit she describes without identifying him was Peter Green.
Corpus Christi College, Oxford, just after Frank was born. 62 Both men read Classics at Trinity College Cambridge; then Stobart went into school teaching, Sidgwick into publishing. Both author and publisher belonged to a transitional generation in which Classics gave way to English, and some members of an academic elite turned inward to disciplinary scholarship, while others in response turned outward to engage with new markets and new readerships.

John Clarke Stobart

Stobart taught Classics in two schools (1901–7), and History at university level (1907–10), and then became one of His Majesty’s Inspectors of Schools (HMI). During World War 1 he worked for the Ministry of Munitions, and was then assistant secretary to the Cabinet in 1917–18. After returning to the inspectorate, he was seconded to the British Broadcasting Company (as it then was) in 1924, where he later served as its first director of education (1926–33).

Stobart wrote his books after spending three years as a lecturer in history at Trinity College, Cambridge (1907–10). He had been an undergraduate there, sitting the Classical Tripos Part I in 1899 (1st class, division 2) and Part II in 1901 (2nd class). Part I consisted largely of language and literature; Part II was divided into five optional sections, literature, philosophy, history, archaeology and comparative philology. In its characteristically elitist fashion, the Cambridge University Calendar only recorded sections chosen by those who obtained first-class honours, so we do not know which Stobart took; but a remark in the Glory suggests that he studied archaeology (section C):

... circumstances have so directed my studies that they have been almost equally divided between the three main branches — archaeology, history, and literature. I have experienced the extraordinary sense of illumination which one feels on turning from linguistic study to the examination of objective antiquity on the actual soil of the classical countries, and then the added interest with which the realities are invested by the literary records of history. (Glory viii)\(^{63}\)

‘History’ refers to his three years’ giving lectures on the subject to Trinity and intercollegiate students 1907–10; ‘literature’ to Part I of the Classical Tripos; and so ‘archaeology’ must refer to his Part II specialisation.\(^ {64}\)

Consciously or otherwise, Stobart’s words echo the point made by Gilbert

---

\(^{63}\) At this point it was possible to sit for two sections in Part II of the Tripos. No candidates are recorded as gaining distinctions in more than one section after 1894.

\(^{64}\) ‘directed my studies’ might be taken as an allusion to the characteristically Cambridge institution of the Director of Studies, an office separate from that of the moral tutor.
Murray in his inaugural lecture as Regius Professor of Greek at Glasgow in 1889, that for many people the focus of their learning should be wider than the traditional concentration on language and literature:

... Greece and not Greek is the real subject of our study. There is more in Hellenism than a language, though that language may be the liveliest and richest ever spoken by man.65

Referring to the new audience of the 1910s, Stobart wrote that:

The Greek language has now, probably for ever, lost its place in the curriculum of secondary education for the greater part of our people ... But there has always been a genuinely cultivated public to whom Greek was unknown, and it is undoubtedly very much larger in this generation. To them, though Greek is unknown Greece need not be wholly sealed. (Glory viii)

After he left Cambridge, Stobart went on to teach Classics at Merchant Taylors’ School, at first as assistant to the headmaster, Revd John Arbuthnot Nairn, and then as a form master. Nairn, a friend who was four years older than Stobart, had been a high-flying classicist at Trinity (a double first and several prizes); he became well known to a later generation of classicists as the author of a useful reference tool, Nairn’s Classical Hand-List, a bibliographical guide to the study of Classics published in 1931 (2nd edition 1939, 3rd edition 1953).66 Nairn, who officiated at Stobart’s wedding in Oxford on 27 July 1904, had published an edition of the mimes of Herodas in that same year, but later found that he could not combine academic work with being a headmaster, and retired early in 1926 at the age of 52, five years before his Hand-List was published. Stobart himself began to publish while still teaching at Merchant Taylors’: a series of nine short introduced selections, ‘Epochs of English Literature’, running from Chaucer to Tennyson in nine volumes, appeared in 1906–7.

65 G. Murray, The Place of Greek in Education (J. MacLehose, 1889), 13.
66 This in effect replaced J.B. Mayor’s Guide to the Choice of Classical Books, 1st edn 1874, 2nd 1879, 3rd 1885, supplement 1896. Nairn was appointed to his headship in 1900, aged 26. See Nairn, ‘Threaded beads of memory: my eighty years’, printed for private circulation, 1954. I know of only two copies: one in a private collection in the UK, the other in Kansas University Library, to whose staff I am indebted for a scanned PDF copy.
Frank Sidgwick

Frank Sidgwick was the elder son of the celebrated Oxford classical scholar Arthur Sidgwick, originally a Trinity (Cambridge) man, who had taught at Rugby School before becoming a Tutor at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and later Reader in Greek in the University. Sidgwick senior was the author of widely-used classical textbooks, some of which are still in print. Frank began his schooling at Oxford Preparatory School, later called the Dragon School. The headmaster C.C. Lynam became a lifelong friend, and Frank often sailed with him in Lynam’s yacht *Blue Dragon*. His elder son was a disappointment to him, achieving only a third-class degree in Classics: Arthur Sidgwick wrote to his sister-in-law Eleanor that ‘Frank is no scholar … I have never had any illusions about his Tripos’. Frank did however gain the Chancellor’s Prize for English

---

67 ‘It is high time that someone wrote a life of Frank Sidgwick’, declared an anonymous writer (probably Nicolas Barker): The Book Collector 28 (1979), 113.

68 Sidgwick was appointed steward on the boat; hence the pseudonym ‘B.D. Steward’ that he adopted for his only published novel, Treasure of Thule: A Romance of Orkney (Sidgwick and Jackson, 1912).

69 Arthur Sidgwick to Nora (Eleanor) Sidgwick, 28 June 1901: Trinity College Library, Cambridge, Add MS b.71/12. Frank Sidgwick did however play the leader of the chorus in the Agamemnon, the Cambridge Greek play of 1900.
and the Winchester Reading Prize. He left Cambridge in 1901 after gaining a mediocre degree in Classics (Part I, 3rd class division 2), which was at that time sufficient to enable him to graduate BA. In 1902 he joined A.H. Bullen as a junior partner in the Shakespeare Head Press, set up in Stratford on Avon to produce a complete edition of the plays in Shakespeare’s home town. Here for five years he learned the art of printing and publishing, and of coping with Bullen’s poor managerial and financial skills. This experience was recorded in his diary, published in 1975 by his daughter Ann Baer. While he was with Bullen he brought out a selection of early English lyrics with E.K. Chambers. In 1908 he founded the firm of Sidgwick and Jackson, bringing in the young Scot Robert Jackson, who had previously worked for Brimley Johnson and J.M. Dent, as a junior partner. After Sidgwick’s marriage in 1911 to Mary Coxhead, the couple attended the Thursday soirees of Naomi Royde-Smith, who had been editing the ‘problems and prizes’ page of the Saturday Westminster Gazette since 1904, and with whom Sidgwick collaborated on editing the page. The second of two compilations from the page was published by Sidgwick and Jackson in 1909. After Jackson’s death in France in September 1917, the bibliographer R.B. McKerrow briefly ran the firm while

70 Peter Jones (‘Rupert Brooke and the profits of poetry’, p. 110) suggested that Sidgwick went into printing and publishing ‘despite his academic credentials’, but his poor degree would hardly have helped him to secure an academic post, though school teaching might have been a possibility. English had only just been introduced as a degree subject in Oxford, and in Cambridge had to wait until 1917.

71 Bullen was a family friend, and had in fact brought Sidgwick’s parents together. Sidgwick brought to the enterprise money lent him by his father and by his old Rugby housemaster Robert Whitelaw (well known for his 1883 translation of Sophocles into English verse). Bullen was hopeless with money, and the loans were never repaid. P. Morgan, ‘Arthur Henry Bullen and the Shakespeare Head Press’, in Frank Sidgwick’s Diary, and Other Material relating to A.H. Bullen and the Shakespeare Head Press (Blackwell, 1975), 68–95, at 78.

72 Frank Sidgwick’s Diary. This nicely produced book, designed by Ruari Maclean, begins and ends with notes by Ann Baer, who generously gave me her ‘spare copy, a trial copy with the wrong endpapers’ (light rather than dark blue) and a pressed rosemary leaf picked by her in the Press’s former garden in Stratford in Avon. Rosemary is for remembrance.

73 Early English Lyrics: Amorous, Divine, Moral and Trivial, Chosen by E.K. Chambers and F. Sidgwick (Sidgwick and Jackson, 1907).

74 For Naomi Royde-Smith, see her article in ODNB. A pleasant glimpse of Mary and Frank’s relationship is afforded by a letter written to her mother on 16 June 1911, on the day after their wedding, in which she wrote, ‘A very tactless woman sat with us in the train ..., and Frank could only kiss me surreptitiously in the tunnels’. Sidgwick family papers: quoted by permission of Ann Baer.

Sidgwick was on active service.76 After the war, C.H. McCall of Ballantyne, the firm that had printed the Glory and the Grandeur, found Sidgwick a well-paid job in Cambridge advising decommissioned officers on employment.77 Sidgwick then ran the firm till his death in 1939. His best-known author was Rupert Brooke, whose Poems Sidgwick published in 1911; the success of Brooke’s volumes of verse was the origin of the firm’s status as the leading publisher of poetry in Britain, until the rise of T.S. Eliot and Faber & Faber in the 1930s. Its history can be followed in detail thanks to the purchase of material from its archives by John Schroder in 1957.78 Schroder’s interest was in Rupert Brooke, but as he bought the firm’s early publication ledgers, it is possible to trace the publication history of other books, including Stobart’s Glory and Grandeur.

Sidgwick himself was a keen collector and publisher of early English poetry, especially ballads. He and E.K. Chambers published a substantial collection of early English lyrics in 1907, but even before then Sidgwick had himself published through Bullen’s press an edition of Everyman and the work of the seventeenth-century poet George Wither.79 He continued in this vein, bringing out over a dozen volumes of ballads, as well as poems of his own and an introduction to writing verse.80 As an undergraduate Sidgwick had won the Chancellor’s prize for English verse (1900), and had also contributed skits and parodies to the Cambridge magazine The Granta.81 The best-known of these was his parody of ‘Sumer is icumen in’: ‘Winter ys icumen -in / Lhoudly sing tish-ù’. This was published in his Some Verse (1915), the year before Ezra Pound’s better-known parody appeared.82


77 M.C. Sidgwick, ‘Memoirs’, 74. Sidgwick was paid £800 p.a., considerably more than he had earned at Sidgwick and Jackson, where he drew about £500 in salary: Elizabeth (Sidgwick) Belsey, ‘Great Missenden remembered, 1916–1925’, privately printed, 1987–8), 1. For McCall, see n. 65 above.

78 See P. M Jones, ‘Rupert Brooke and the profits of poetry’ (n. 50 above).


80 Some Verse (1915), More Verse (1921); R. Swann and F. Sidgwick, The Making of Verse (Sidgwick and Jackson, 1934).

81 The volume for 1898–9 carries eleven of his skits, all signed ‘Sigma Minor’.

82 ‘Winter is icumen in / Lhude sing Goddamm.’
Stobart and Sidgwick were friends, the relationship having presumably begun during their time as undergraduates at Trinity College. In his diary, Arthur Sidgwick recorded two visits to his Oxford home by his son and Stobart, first in December 1902, then in July 1904, when Stobart was married at a local church. Frank Sidgwick recalled a conversation with literary friends in which one of them referred to Poe’s poem and remarked that ‘The glory that was Greece’ and ‘The grandeur that was Rome’ would make splendid book titles, and Frank himself responded. ‘And I know exactly the man to write them, my old friend Stobart’. Stobart and Sidgwick’s relationship can be compared with other links between classicists and publishers. George Macmillan, a director of the publishing firm, was also secretary of the Hellenic Society; the firm published the Society’s *Journal of Hellenic Studies* from its foundation in 1880 until 1947. Edward Sonnenschein, Professor of Latin at Birmingham and a prolific textbook author, was the brother of the publisher William Swan Sonnenschein, who published his books. Stobart and Sidgwick collaborated effectively to produce the two books, Sidgwick commissioning drawings from the British Museum and from museums and photographic libraries in England, Germany, Italy and Greece. In doing so, he took advantage of recent technological advances which made it possible to include good-quality images in books. Evidence from Sidgwick and Jackson’s commercial records, and from Sidgwick’s daughter and from Stobart’s grandson, has made it possible to build up a detailed picture of the compilation and publishing of the two books.

How did Sidgwick get into publishing large, heavily illustrated books? An earlier book from Sidgwick and Jackson, E.K. Chatterton’s *Sailing Ships: The Story of Their Development from the Earliest Time to the Present Day* (1909), can be seen as a precursor to Stobart’s books. It was a royal octavo, so almost large as the *Glory* and the *Grandeur*, with a coloured frontispiece and 130 illustrations, and appropriately bound and printed with blue. Acknowledgement is made to a variety of museums and individuals, just as in the classical books, and Chatterton’s preface makes it clear that the book is aimed at the general reader. Sidgwick will have been attracted to its subject matter, as a keen sailor himself; and the following year he published Chatterton’s account of a sailing trip, *Down Channel in the Vivette*, which had a colour frontispiece and 50 illustrations. Both books were printed by the Ballantyne Press, as were Stobart’s

---

85 The allusion was perhaps not just to the sea, but specifically to the *Blue Dragon* on which Sidgwick so often sailed.
books; the press, which had been run since 1883 by Charles McCall, was well used to printing illustrated books and limited editions. Sidgwick’s interest in fine illustrated books is reflected in his founding membership of the Double Crown Club (1924), along with S.C. Roberts.

**Printing and publishing history**

Stobart’s book appeared at a point when the publishing of books and periodicals in Britain had reached an unprecedented peak. The emergence of mass-circulation newspapers, the New Journalism, the introduction of more efficient powered presses, the take-up of Linotype and Monotype machines, along with the conjunction of large and cheap print runs and almost universal literacy, made the Edwardian period a golden age for publishing.

---

86 See C.H. McCall and L. Danson, ‘Max and Mr McCall revisited: Halcyon days at the Ballantyne Press’, *Princeton Library Record* 49 (1987), 78–86. An in-house history was based on material gathered by one of its readers, W.T. Dobson: *Ballantyne, Hanson and Co., The Ballantyne Press and its Founders 1796–1908* (Edinburgh, 1909). A London branch was opened in 1876 and it was this with which Sidgwick dealt. During World War 1 the Edinburgh firm closed down, and the London branch was taken over by Spottiswoode to make the new firm of Spottiswoode, Ballantyne.

87 For the club, see J. Moran, *History of the Double Crown Club* (Westerham, 1974). Roberts was the author of the *Picture Book of British History* discussed above; he went on to be secretary to CUP 1922–48.
age for publishing, an industry as yet unchallenged by other media. It was at this point that Sidgwick, after his experience of fine printing with A.H. Bullen from 1902 to 1907 and the early years of his own firm since 1908, engaged to publish *The Glory* and the *Grandeur*.

Stobart approached Sidgwick and Jackson with a proposal for the two books in September 1910. In his reply of 6 October, Sidgwick noted that Stobart proposed ‘a narrative on a new plan’, while he himself thought of a picture book. The books published in 1911 and 1912 represented a combination of those two conceptions. The project was approved a week later, and alternative payment options discussed; the eventual agreement was for payment of royalties until the total reached £120, when they would cease. From November till March 1911, Stobart prepared his text while Sidgwick gathered images. Some came from commercial companies who had collections of photographs, including W.A. Mansell in England, Alinari in Rome, and the English Photographic Company in Athens. This last firm appears to have been founded by the Englishman Shirley Clifford Atchley, who reached Greece c. 1887 and was later First Secretary of the British Legation. Its photographs were sold by the firm of Beck and Barth, based in Panepistimiou (University) Street in Athens, which published a multi-volume series on the holdings of the National Archaeological Museum and the *Mitteilungen* of the Athens branch of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut; its owners had links both to the German ancient historian Georg Busolt and to the nearby bookshop founded in 1898 by Kostas Eleftheroudakis.

---


89 The 2019 equivalent is nearly £3,500. In 1955, Sidgwick’s widow wrote to the firm asking if she was owed any money, and was reminded of the agreement, made in 1910. M.C. Stobart to Sidgwick and Jackson, 16 Nov. 1955; J. Knapp-Fisher to M.C. Stobart, 21 Nov. 1955. Bodleian Libraries, Oxford, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 260.71–2.

90 For Atchley, see his obituary in *The Times*, 22 June 1936. Beck and Barth published archaeological texts and site guides from their shop in Syntagma Square. Beck may have been the German photographer Henri Beck, whose *Vues d’Athènes* (Berlin: Asher, 1868) contained 52 images of the city (copies in the Bavarian State Library and in the Gennadius Library, Athens). Wilhelm Barth (1856–1940) also wrote books on archaeology. Beck shared lodgings with the German ancient historian Georg Busolt: see M.H. Chambers, *Georg Busolt: His Career in his Letters* (*Mnemosyne*, Supplem. *entum 113*: 2000), 18 n. 44. He may have been connected with the Munich firm of C.H. Beck, which published Busolt’s books on the constitutional history of ancient Greece. The Eleftheroudakis shop was a fixture in Athens throughout the 20th century, but closed down in 2016. In 1920 the English Photographic Company published Wilhelm Barth’s *Hellas*, a picture book published in Athens and using the Company’s slides. This book, which seems to consist of two slim fascicles, is held in two university
Hill, who kept a photographic shop in Syntagma (Constitution) Square. The English Photographic Company was evidently known to Stobart, since the contact came at his suggestion. Sidgwick also contacted the Hellenic Society, whose library contained large stocks of slides and prints of archaeological sites, and other publishers, including Cambridge University Press and John Murray, for permission to reproduce illustrations from their books. The British Museum was a major resource, not only for photographs of its exhibits but also for line drawings made by one of its staff. In May 1911 Sidgwick announced that he would soon be sending Stobart paper proofs, and asked him, ‘will you keep a bright eye for the words demanding glossarialisation? “Aniconic” would give the General Reader the dry gripes, and even a scholar a moment’s pause.’ ‘Glossarialisation’ referred to one of the features of the book that reflected its orientation at a general audience, a glossary of technical terms (Glory 267–9); in the Grandeur this was replaced by a Chronological Table. A close eye was also kept on page layout; Sidgwick told Stobart in April 1911 that section headings would be centred, and that they would not be numbered as ‘we think it looks too schoolbooky’.

Later editions

The third edition of the Glory (1933) was edited by Frederick Norman Pryce (1888–1953), who was on the staff of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum. Pryce became Keeper of the department in 1936, but was required to resign in 1938 after the scandal

libraries in Bavaria (Erlangen, Regensburg) and two in Switzerland (Zurich, Lausanne); I have been unable to trace copies in Greece, the UK or the US. In 1921 Atchley donated about 1,000 slides to the Hellenic Society library in London. My thanks to Debi Harlan (British School at Athens) and Dimitris Grigoropoulos (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Athen) for information on the company.

91 He had presumably made contact with them on a visit to Athens: ‘From your hotel window in Athens you can see hill-tops in the heart of the Peloponnese’ (Glory 7). Stobart appears to have had no contact with the British School of Archaeology (now the British School at Athens), founded in 1886, whose hostel was often used by English university students and graduates, and where A.E. Zimmern worked while writing his The Greek Commonwealth, published in the same year as the Glory.

92 The Greek and Roman and Coins and Medals departments of the British Museum are thanked in the acknowledgments in the Glory, but not in the Grandeur. Sidgwick may have found that it was easier or cheaper to rely on commercial picture libraries.

93 Sidgwick to Stobart, 3 May 1911: MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 12.413. Sidgwick’s reference to glossarialisation is a typical jest, since the word could itself be seen as in need of glossing.

94 Sidgwick to Stobart, 8 April 1911: MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 12.288.
of the ‘cleaning’ of the Parthenon marbles broke.\textsuperscript{95} His revision dealt largely with matters of detail, particularly in the opening chapters, where change was needed ‘in view of the great advance made in recent years in the study of the prehistoric civilisations of Greece’ (\textit{Glory}, 3rd edition (1933), viii). More substantial changes were made for the fourth edition of 1961 by R.J. Hopper, Professor of Classical Archaeology at Sheffield. Hopper’s editorial preface is interesting in the way it sees Stobart’s book as part of a history of classical reception:

Some of the views expressed in the original version rest on attitude and values different from those of the present day, and it is therefore in itself a valuable document of a past age, and evidence of something growing rarer in our times: the influence of Greek studies seriously pursued on a man of education, an amateur in the best sense of the word rather than a professional scholar. The eternal and universal appeal made by the ancient Greeks is thus demonstrated as it should be. (\textit{Glory}, 4th edition (1961), viii)

The sudden switch from historicism to timelessness and universality in the final sentence is startling, using relativity as it does to bolster its opposite. But as with Stobart himself, and also Gilbert Murray, these opposites offered the challenge of reconciliation.

In his preface to the second edition of the \textit{Grandeur} (1920), Stobart wrote that

\begin{quote}
I am glad to know that this book, which is a glorification not so much of Rome as of Peace and Civilisation, has survived the Great War, and I hope that in a cheaper form it may be brought within the reach of those classes of adult readers who are showing an increased interest in the history of society. (\textit{Grandeur}, second edition (1920), x)
\end{quote}

More mundanely, he was able to correct errors in the text. The first edition of the \textit{Grandeur} had contained this comment on the unreliability of stories of early Roman history:

\begin{quote}
Thus it is necessary to throw overboard a great mass of edifying and famous history in the interest of youth. (p. 26, lines 1–2)
\end{quote}

Admirable sentiment! But any careful reader would suspect the final word, and in the second edition it was changed to ‘truth’.

The third edition, like that of the *Glory*, was revised by Frederick Pryce, who remarked that

... the obvious duty of a reviser ... was to tamper as little as possible with the book. ... The illustrations have been revised, a number of new ones added, and some of the older plates withdrawn; among them more than one old favourite which has long served to illuminate Roman history in this country, only to meet with condemnation at the hands of this specialist generation. (*Grandeur*, 3rd edition (1934), ix)\(^{96}\)

More radical changes were made to Stobart’s text by the editors of the fourth edition (1961), W.S. Maguinness and H.H. Scullard, Professors of Latin and Ancient History respectively at King’s College London:

Considerable changes have been made in the text ... On the historical side the time has come to redress the balance in favour of the Roman Republic; care has been taken to ensure that the Empire, for which he was so enthusiastic, has not suffered in the process. The advance of knowledge during the last thirty or forty years has made alterations necessary in the account of early Rome and Italy. The pages on literature, notably those on drama and elegiac poetry, have also undergone substantial change. (*Grandeur*, 4th edition (1961), ix)

Maguinness and Scullard went on to comment on Stobart’s ‘engaging flippancy’, in a sentence quoted above.

Stobart’s two books were followed by others in what was later labelled ‘The Great Civilisations’: Margaret Murray, *The Splendour that was Egypt* (1949), A.L. Basham, *The Wonder that was India* (1954), and H.W.F. Saggs, *The Greatness that was Babylon* (1962); but as the publication dates show, these were late afterthoughts. In some ways more interesting is the book Stobart himself never wrote, a two-volume sequel to the *Glory* and the *Grandeur* devoted to English civilisation. As I have suggested elsewhere, the stories of books which were planned but never appeared are an important and neglected part of the historical record.\(^{97}\)


‘England’: a sequel that never was

In January 1921, Sidgwick wrote to Stobart to propose a sequel to the *Glory* and the *Grandeur*:

The project before us is: ‘England’, by J.C. Stobart, 2 vols, profusely (or rather, perhaps, sumptuously) illustrated; so written that a reviewer may say ‘Mr Stobart has now done for England what he did for ancient Greece and Rome ... a perspective view of English culture and civilisation ... pictures are still an essential part of Mr Stobart’s scheme, and their reproduction reflects great credit on Messrs’ etc.

For preliminary reading of the subject, if you wish from time to time to try what books you want, we will endeavour to get them for you, permanently or temporarily. We also propose to collaborate, as far as the pictures are concerned, submitting for your verdict anything choice that we come across. As far as reproduction of pictures is concerned, we mean to go all out, and knock spots off any previous work of the kind.

You estimate two years for the work. We cannot form any exact idea of what it will cost us, or what price we can publish at: but roughly the two vols. will be as much, in letterpress and pictures, as Greece and Rome together. You will no doubt like to see the colour of your cheque as you go along, and we are ready to pay you say £200 in advance of royalties, lump by lump as the copy comes in, or some on signing of agreement with us. But will you have it now or wait till you get it? — I mean this: we propose that any advance we pay you should be reckoned as an advance of a 10% royalty, so that the larger the advance you have the longer you wait for a rise of royalty. But perhaps you will tell me frankly how much you expect and when you would like it. As far as I can see we shall have to put a couple of thousand into the production alone. That has a lovely rich sound; but we do mean rather to ‘feature’ this book, as the movies say — even if we have to suppress other projects.

I have got you a charming 18th century fragment of pure English life — a Ms alluding to the ‘glad eye’ (literally) in 1250 — which awaits you here, with other material. When we get going, you might look in periodically to see what we have amassed.

This letter was followed the next day by a contract for the new book. Then silence till October, when Sidgwick asked Stobart how the book was going, adding, in characteristically jocular fashion:

---

98 The payment offered was the equivalent of about £6,000 in 2019 values.
We are not the least concerned to have that £50 returned, though I can imagine that you don’t find it easy to get going. In fact I rather guessed you reculing to mieux sauter the premier pas qui compte. But encourage yourself: hast dared a thing more doggish of yore: none but the brave! Excelsior Avanti; gutta cavet lapidem; recte si possis, or other wise.\footnote{Sidgwick to Stobart, 11 Oct. 1921: MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 51.755.}

A year later, Stobart returned his £50 advance. Sidgwick in response wrote that:

I have now opened a letter containing a cheque for £50 with some regret. I expect the failure is due to you having tried to start at the beginning of a subject that hasn’t any, and I still believe you could have written con amore and currente calamo if you had settled on 1400 \([\text{CE}]\) or so. However, hope springs eternal.\footnote{Sidgwick to Stobart, 22 Oct. 1922: MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 53.691.}

So ended a project whose proposal and planning, however unsuccessful, in retrospect add considerable resonance to the story of the *Glory* and the *Grandeur*. Additional resonance, however, comes from its remarkable similarities to another failed project. In the year of the *Glory’s* publication, a rather different book on Greece was published: this was Alfred Zimmern’s *The Greek Commonwealth: Politics and Economics in Fifth-Century Athens*, published by Oxford University Press. It had a publishing history similar to that of Stobart’s books: 2nd edn. 1915, 3rd 1922, 4th 1924, 5th 1931; paperback 1961. At some point Zimmern agreed to write a modern sequel, to be entitled *The English* \([\text{or} \, \text{Modern}]\) *Commonwealth*, but like Stobart, he never really engaged with it. Modern writers who have discussed Zimmern mention the failed project, but no detailed account of it has been given.\footnote{See P. Millett, ‘Alfred Zimmern’s *The Greek Commonwealth* revisited’, in C.A. Stray (ed.), *Oxford Classics: Teaching and Learning 1800–2000* (Duckworth, 2007), 168–202, at 198 n. 33; J. Stapleton, ‘The classicist as liberal intellectual’, at 277–8.} Nor, to my knowledge, has any comparison with Stobart’s work, published or unpublished, been attempted. There are obvious difficulties in comparing two failed projects, of course, but in addition Zimmern’s seems to have left few traces, while the reason for Stobart’s career and publications not having received any attention from historians is probably because he wrote trade books for a non-academic audience.\footnote{The nearest approach to a discussion of Stobart comes in Asa Briggs’ history of the BBC, where his career as its first director of education is mentioned: A. Briggs, *The
Conclusion

The *Glory* and the *Grandeur* stood out in the world of Edwardian publishing because of their size, their cost and the quality of their book-making. Like Richard Jebb’s seven-volume edition of Sophocles (1883–96), but even more strikingly, they were *Gesamtkunstwerke*, combining paper, binding, text and images into an integrated whole which both explored and exemplified the values of classical culture.\(^{104}\) The books also stood out because of their price, which as we have seen was far higher than that of the majority of the books aimed at the new, non-classically educated reader of the period. In them, Stobart spoke to his readers with an individual voice, summarising vast amounts of historical material while avoiding the fragmentation and specialisation of contemporary classical scholarship. What made the books so successful, despite their price, was not only their production values, but the approachable, informal, and at times humorous nature of Stobart’s text. It was perhaps inevitable that these humane aspects of the books would be excised by professional scholars in the 1930s and 1960s, the inheritors of the narrowing and specialising tendencies Stobart had deplored in the 1910s.\(^{105}\)

Christopher Stray
*Swansea University*
c.a.stray@swansea.ac.uk

---


\(^{105}\) Though they were not revised in this way, for longevity and ‘rereadability’ one might compare Zimmern’s *The Greek Commonwealth: Politics and Economics in Fifth-Century Athens* (1911) and Finley’s *World of Odysseus* (1956).
A Note on Sources

The major source of information on the firm of Sidgwick and Jackson is the collection from which the image below was taken; the collection contains 381 shelfmarks. It includes large numbers of carbon copies of out-letters to authors, and as the example below shows, some of the copies are at or beyond the limits of legibility. The firm’s ledgers 1908–51 are held in the King’s College Modern Archive, Cambridge, as part of the Schroder Collection of material relating to Rupert Brooke (GBR/0272/PP/RCB). Correspondence and other papers of Frank Sidgwick are held by his daughter Ann Baer and by other members of his family; I am especially grateful to Ann Baer’s nephew Justin Lumley for his help in locating and copying material. Correspondence relating to Sidgwick’s time at A.H. Bullen’s Shakespeare Head Press is held by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, Stratford on Avon. Sidgwick’s commonplace book is held in Trinity College Library, Cambridge, Add.Ms. a 578. Scrapbooks and other material on J.C. Stobart are held by his grandson John Spurling.

An almost illegible letter from Sidgwick to Stobart, from MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, Bodleian Libraries, Oxford. The blue-pencil numbering refers to the previous and next letters in the thread on a topic.
JULES MAROUZEAU AND L’ANNEE PHILOLOGIQUE: THE GENESIS OF A REFORM IN CLASSICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

— ILSE HILBOLD —

ABSTRACT

In the early twentieth century, bibliography was subject to a large-scale reform effort, spearheaded by institutions such as the League of Nations and the International Institute on Intellectual Cooperation, which attempted to internationalize scientific practices. The French Latinist Jules MAROUZEAU conceived his newly created bibliography L’Année philologique as a part of that movement. The history of the publication’s origins, which should be read in light of MAROUZEAU’s professional ambitions, provides a new perspective on the scientific rivalry around bibliography, a tool for science and a driver of internationalization.
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In recent years, the history of disciplines has become an increasingly important research field. The usual tools employed by students of Antiquity have been complemented by others from epistemology, sociology, political history and gender studies. Since the 1990s, several important works have paved the way for a research that combines the study of institutions and actors. In this historiographical movement, sciences once considered as ancillary have gained greater exposure. Their role in the development of international dynamics and intellectual mobility, for instance, has been highlighted. In that sense, the history of

---

1 This paper was adapted from the author’s presentation at the Société Études Latines (Paris), 9 June 2018 (see REL 2019). The author would like to thank Jean-Yves Bart for translating from the original French. All citations have been newly translated from the French, except those by Gilbert Murray.

bibliography is an area of special interest, pertaining as it does to a discipline that is currently largely ignored (and thus under-researched\(^3\)) although it was an intensely investigated area in twentieth-century European science. Indeed, from the early years of that century, a genuine demand was voiced across a variety of research fields for a modernization of bibliography, triggering responses by disciplinary specialists, librarians, politicians, League of Nations civil servants and members of the International Institute on Intellectual Cooperation. Bibliography underwent a normalization process whose roots were found in the standardization of research tools in Europe and beyond.

Classical bibliography took part in this momentum, propelled in France by one key figure in particular: Jules MAROUZEAU (1878–1964). The author of a *Traité de stylistique latine* and of *L’Ordre des mots dans la phrase latine*, MAROUZEAU also founded two scholarly societies, the *Société de Bibliographie Classique* (1921) and the *Société des Études latines* (1923), as well as two specialized classical bibliography publications, the *Revue des comptes rendus* (1911) and *L’Année philologique* (1926). Although they were aimed primarily at French colleagues, MAROUZEAU harboured international ambitions for these publications, which were based on the principle of better circulation of scientific information. In effect, his project was successful largely because he secured the collaboration of both members of Parisian academic institutions and international actors in the field of bibliography.\(^4\) This double base (French and international) offered a resolution to the crisis experienced by the field of Classics. MAROUZEAU’s emphasis on internationalism may have become a key asset for his academic career, but it also bore the mark of the deep-seated rivalry in interwar international relations. There is a patriotic dimension to MAROUZEAU’s concept of science, as with many of his contemporaries.

This tension between patriotic sentiment and promotion of internationalization, which calls for a history of scientific knowledge and policies, transpired throughout MAROUZEAU’s academic career, as bibliography was a driver of internationalization *par excellence*. The history of the origins of *L’Année philologique* (*APh*) allows us to investigate what bibliography represented for the scientific community, and in the process

\(^3\) The history of bibliography remains an underdeveloped field. See, however, HALE 1970; JASENAS 1973; RAABE 1990. For more recent research, see the works of Fr. BARBIER listed on his website (https://histoire-du-livre.blogspot.com/search/label/bibliographie, last accessed 9 September 2019); TOURNES 2016, p. 211–220.

\(^4\) For a prosopography of *APh* contributors and sponsors, see HILBOLD [forthcoming].
contributes to the study of a complex movement that travelled across twentieth-century Europe.

1. Bibliography, the tool of a career

We know a good deal about MAROUZEAU’s early years in Paris, beginning in 1899, thanks to his accounts of those times in his 1962 Entretiens with Ian HERESCU and his 1937 autobiography Une Enfance. In both books, MAROUZEAU’s merits in the various undertakings of his life are highlighted, echoing Jacqueline CHAMPEAUX’s description of him as “a pure product of Republican meritocracy”. However, his “resistance”, “tenacity” and “obstinacy” — all words he used to describe himself — were only one facet of his career and success among others.

In effect, whatever merit he had in climbing up the social ladder was made possible by the connections he was able to draw upon in a notoriously competitive environment. These connections, which are far less documented in his autobiographical narratives, deserve to be examined by historical research, as they shed new light on the construction of MAROUZEAU’s academic identity.

One individual in particular shaped MAROUZEAU’s career: Louis HAVET (1849–1925), a powerful philologist, member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, and soon to be Director of Section IV of the École Pratique des Hautes Études (ÉPHÉ), whose classes MAROUZEAU began attending in 1902 at the Sorbonne, the ÉPHÉ and the Collège de France. HAVET was quite likely the one who steered MAROUZEAU towards classical bibliography, and he encouraged him to carve an original path, combining research, teaching and bibliography. Indeed, in

---

5 MAROUZEAU 1937; HERESCU & MAROUZEAU 1962.
6 In his own account, MAROUZEAU relates this idea of merit to his success at the Fleurat high school, his literature studies at the Sorbonne, the Collège de France and the ÉPHÉ, the grants he received to do research in Germany and Italy, and his subsequent academic career.
7 CHAMPEAUX 2013, p. 17.
8 HERESCU & MAROUZEAU 1962, p. 36.
9 For examples on the competition between MAROUZEAU and ERNOUT in the ÉPHÉ and the Revue de philologie, see HILBOLD [forthcoming].
10 See the letter from MAROUZEAU to HAVET, dated 23 August 1904, in which he mentions the class he attends at the Sorbonne and the Collège de France: Fonds Havet, NAF 24499 XXI F. 185, BnF; see also MAROUZEAU’s application for admission to the ÉPHÉ, to attend classes by HAVET and A.-M. DESROUSSEAUX, dated 30 September 1902: 4EPHE cotation provisoire 1602/33 (MAROUZEAU’s personal ÉPHÉ file).
heretofore under-exploited archival collections, there are extensive records of this master–student relationship, which lasted from MAROUZEAU’s enrolment at the ÉPHÉ in 1902 to HAVET’s death in 1925.

In a 1904 letter, for instance, MAROUZEAU asked HAVET for advice on the construction of his PhD subject and his teaching career.11 Another set of letters and cards, spanning nearly ten years, from 1912 to 1921, was penned by Hely MAROUZEAU, MAROUZEAU’s wife. It exemplifies the role of wives in the academic community,12 as Hely MAROUZEAU, who had become friendly with Mrs HAVET, wrote with very regular updates on her husband’s health, after he suffered from life-threatening atherosclerosis.13 The records of the presidency of Section IV of the ÉPHÉ, drafted by HAVET between 1912 and 1925, offer very clear evidence for practices of patronage,14 mentioning requests that MAROUZEAU submitted to his mentor.

In 1912, for instance, a “slightly distressed letter” reads like a call for help. MAROUZEAU explains that the precariousness of his situation weighs too heavily on him: “I am doing all sorts of things without being able to devote myself wholly to one, and ultimately without being anything definite”.15 At the time, MAROUZEAU was indeed splitting his time between his scientific activities at the ÉPHÉ16, where the “close proximity” of Louis HAVET and Antoine MEILLET “create[d] such a salutary working atmosphere in Paris”, and his teaching at the ÉPHÉ, the Guilde and the Collège Sévigné,17 which earned him a living. Additionally, he was active

11 Fonds Havet, NAF 24499 XXI F. 185, BnF.
12 On the role of wives in the academic community, see the examples of Ena BAZIN-FOUCHER, Alfred Foucher’s wife (FENET 2011), of Suzanne DOGNON-FEBVRE, Lucien FEBVRE’s wife, or Simone VIDAL-BLOCH, Marc BLOCH’s wife (DAVIS 2017).
13 Correspondance Havet J-Z, 4EPHE cotation provisoire 1602/980.
14 Carnets de la Présidence (Journal de L. Havet, 1912–1925), 4EPHE cotation provisoire 1602/980; see for instance in an entry dated 9 January 1913: “For Marouzeau, let us try to get something at the Collège de France from the Prix Saintour. Lévi and Pelliot will provide the connection with the Collège de France.” (« Tâchons d’avoir pour Marouzeau, au Collège de France, quelque chose du Prix Saintour. Lévi et Pelliot fourniront le lien avec le Collège de France. »)
15 Letter sent from Milan by MAROUZEAU to HAVET, dated 6 August 1912 (Correspondance Havet J-Z, 4EPHE cotation provisoire 1602/980): « Je fais toutes sortes de choses sans pouvoir me consacrer entièrement à aucune et en somme sans être rien de défini. »
16 See Timeline below.
17 On the Collège Sévigné, a State-subsidized private school, see MAYEUR 1977, p. 86–90; Collège Sévigné 1982; DE GIORGIO 2017 (esp. ROGERS 2017, p. 73–98). I was unable to identify “La Guilde”, but it was likely another private school.
at the *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes*, where he hoped to “make [himself] useful through [his] bibliography work”.\(^{18}\)

Apart from this early autobiographical mention, no other archival sources attest to MAROUZEAU’s presence at the *Revue de philologie*. However, a search in the volumes indicates that in 1911 he founded and edited a new bibliographical fascicle,\(^{19}\) entitled *Revue des comptes rendus d’ouvrages relatifs à l’Antiquité classique*.

The reason why MAROUZEAU founded the *Revue des comptes rendus* lay probably in the great need for manpower that characterizes all bibliographical endeavours.\(^{20}\) Here it is also worth recalling MAROUZEAU’s relationship with HAVET, who had precisely edited the *Revue de philologie* from 1877 to 1879 alongside Édouard TOURNIER and Charles GRAUX. This suggested reconstruction, which emphasizes the vertical relationship between master and student, is also based on possible echoes with other activities undertaken by MAROUZEAU in the wake of HAVET or in which the latter had him take part. In 1906, J. MAROUZEAU was appointed at the *Société de linguistique de Paris*, on a proposal by HAVET,\(^{21}\) who had been the society’s deputy secretary himself. At the ÉPHÉ, MAROUZEAU was a guest lecturer until 1919 after regularly requesting teaching duties to HAVET, who presided Section IV.\(^{22}\) Eventually, in a dutiful tribute to his master, MAROUZEAU offered the first presidency of the *Société des Études Latines* to HAVET in 1923.

A significant range of evidence thus suggests that HAVET provided critical support to MAROUZEAU’s career, and that he was also the one who introduced him to the idea of committing to bibliography, at the time when the scholarly community was beginning to gain interest in the discipline. Bibliography indeed turned out to be one of MAROUZEAU’s

---

\(^{18}\) Letter sent from Milan by MAROUZEAU to HAVET, dated 6 August 1912 (Correspondance Havet J-Z, 4EPHE cotation provisoire 1602/980): « ... la Revue de Philologie où j'espère pouvoir rendre des services par mon travail de bibliographie. »

\(^{19}\) The 1911 foundation of the *Revue des comptes rendus* took place five years after MAROUZEAU’s first involvement with the *Revue de philologie*, which dated back to 1906, when his first paper on “la mise en relief par disjonction” (see timeline below) was published.

\(^{20}\) See Ernest LAVISSE’s account in his entry on the exemplary life of Charles GRAUX: LAVISSE 1885, p. 303–305.

\(^{21}\) “Séance du 13 janvier 1906”, *BSL* 54–55, 1905, p. 149.

\(^{22}\) See Carnets de la Présidence (Journal de L. Havet, 1912–1925), 4EPHE cotation provisoire 1602/980; Correspondance Havet J-Z, 4EPHE cotation provisoire 1602/980.
areas of expertise: he devoted himself to it to the extent that he spearheaded an extensive bibliographical reform, first as part of the *Revue de philologie*, and then, when he was denied editorial duties at the *Revue*, with a new publication, the *APh*.

2. **MAROUZEAU: the driving force of bibliographical reform**

Initially, MAROUZEAU did not transform the existing bibliography sections of the *Revue de philologie* — the leading one being the *Revue des revues*, then published by Adrien KREBS. Yet, he created the *Revue des comptes rendus* in 1911, and, when KREBS died in 1923, he merged it with the *Revue des revues*, in the process homogenizing the bibliographies in the *Revue de philologie*.²³

In practice, by 1911, MAROUZEAU offered a “critical” bibliography in the *Revue des comptes rendus*, in which reviews and the academic works they discussed were listed separately. In the *Revue des revues*, KREBS addressed original works, whereas MAROUZEAU dealt with reviews in the *Revue des comptes rendus*. MAROUZEAU’s lists were divided into ten thematic sub-sections, a new classification system for the *Revue de philologie*, which until then had used geographical entities, and that the *APh* picked up and went on using until 1996 (vol. 67).

These editorial choices had significant human and financial costs. One of the solutions devised by MAROUZEAU to afford those costs was the foundation of the *Société de Bibliographie Classique* (SBC) in 1921.²⁴

---

²³ MAROUZEAU 1923–1924b, p. 47; see also J. MAROUZEAU, “Mémoire concernant un projet de bibliographie des sciences philologiques et historiques” (1923), Archives de la Société des Nations, Geneva, CICI/B/10, p. 2: “On the one hand, a proper ‘Journal of Journals’, where analyses of papers published in periodicals are classified by discipline, according to a layout that is conducive to making consultation easy without an index. On the other hand, a ‘Journal of Reviews’, where the titles of published books are listed separately, with mentions of their reviews.” (« D’une part, une *Revue des Revues* proprement dite, où sont classés par matières, selon une disposition propre à rendre la consultation aisée sans le secours d’index, les analyses d’articles des périodiques. D’autre part, une *Revue des Comptes-Rendus* où sont classés de la même manière les titres d’ouvrages édités séparément, avec la mention des comptes-rendus qui en ont été faits. »)

²⁴ While much later sources (J. ERNST, “Au service de la documentation dans le domaine de l’Antiquité gréco-latine. Expériences d’une bibliographe”, Presentation given on 20 February 1942 to the Association vaudoise des femmes universitaires, at the Lyceum de Lausanne, Fonds J.-M. Flamand, Paris, p. 8; MAROUZEAU 1944) indicate that the SBC was founded in 1922 or 1923, a letter dated 21 October 1923, sent by J. MAROUZEAU to Polish historian and Secretary of the League of Nations Oskar
which allowed him to request funding from the *Confédération des Sociétés scientifiques françaises*:

In 1919, the *Confédération des sociétés scientifiques françaises* was founded with the main objective of subsidizing bibliographical publications drawing on funds allocated by Parliament. As these funds could only be attributed to Societies, I took the initiative of forming a *Société de bibliographie classique*, tasked with reorganizing the bibliographical publications issued by the *Revue de philologie*.25

The difficult circumstances of the post-war period threaten to compromise the fate of these two publications [the *Revue des revues* and the *Revue des comptes-rendus*], which were systematically delayed and marred by gaps liable to hinder scientific work, when, last year, a *Société de bibliographie classique* was formed, and thanks to subsidies from the *Confédération des Sociétés scientifiques françaises*, allowed us to resume and reorganize the editorial work.26

In the absence of any centralizing organization that could achieve an international coordination, it seemed to me that the most urgent task was to expand and perfect one of the existing undertakings: under these conditions, I worked for many years writing the bibliographical section of the *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire anciennes. [...]*

Halecki, suggests it dates back to 1921: “I will represent [at the next session of the CICI’s bibliography sub-committee] the *Société de bibliographie classique*, which I founded two years ago to ensure the publication of the bibliographical section of the *Revue de Philologie.*” (« J’y représenterai [à la prochaine session de la Sous-commission bibliographique de la CICI] la *Société de bibliographie classique*, que j’ai fondée il y a deux ans pour assurer la publication de la partie bibliographique de la *Revue de Philologie.* »)

25 Marouzeau 1927b, p. 16: « En 1919 s’était fondée la *Confédération des sociétés scientifiques françaises* dont le principal objet était de subventionner des publications bibliographiques à l’aide de fonds alloués par le Parlement. Ces fonds ne pouvant être attribués qu’à des Sociétés, je pris l’initiative de constituer une *Société de bibliographie classique* dont l’objet serait de réorganiser les publications bibliographiques qui paraissaient dans le cadre de la *Revue de philologie.* »

26 Marouzeau 1923–1924b, p. 47: « Les difficultés de la période d’après-guerre menaçaient de compromettre le sort de ces deux publications [c.-à-d. la *Revue des revues* et la *Revue des comptes-rendus*], qui ne paraissaient plus qu’avec des retards et des lacunes préjudiciables au travail scientifique, lorsque, au courant de l’année dernière, s’est constituée une *Société de bibliographie classique* qui, grâce à une subvention de la *Confédération des Sociétés scientifiques françaises*, a permis de reprendre et de réorganiser le travail de rédaction. »
Following a trial-and-error process, in successive transformations, and sometimes interrupted for lack of material resources or delayed by the war, ultimately assisted and encouraged by the grant from the Fé-
dération des Sociétés Scientifiques, I was able to develop the existing system...27

Founded in 1919, the Confédération aimed at securing French public funding for bibliographic enterprises that were formalized as societies, as a response to the need for reform in the field expressed by French scholars.

The reform spearheaded by MAROUZEAU with the foundation of the SBC stands out in that its scope actually extended far beyond the sphere of the Revue de philologie. Like many of his contemporaries, MAROUZEAU was convinced that Classics was facing a crisis that only a pooling of efforts at national and international level could contain. The coordination of bibliography was one of the project’s areas of implementation, but MAROUZEAU added a reflection on research and teaching in Classics. This combination of research, teaching and bibliography was the distinguishing factor of MAROUZEAU’s project, consistent with the profile HAVET had urged him to build, and it materialized with the 1923 creation of the Société des Études latines. The Société was the communication organ that would enable the scientific coordination advocated by MAROUZEAU, at a time when “in a not entirely fortuitous coincidence [...] various questions are raised as to the organization and future of our scientific document-
ation”.28 Bibliography, which had an important place from the outset in the Revue des Études Latines,29 contributed to improving the conditions

27 J. MAROUZEAU, “Mémoire concernant un projet de bibliographie des sciences philologiques et historiques” (1923), Archives de la Société des Nations, Geneva, CICI/B/10, p. 1: « En l’absence de toute organisation centralisatrice susceptible de réaliser une coordination internationale, la tâche la plus urgente m’avait paru de développer et de perfectionner l’une des entreprises existantes ; c’est dans ces condi-
tions que j’ai travaillé pendant de longues années à la rédaction de la partie bibliogra-
phique de la Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d’Histoire anciennes. [...] Après divers tâtonnements et par transformations successives, arrêté parfois faute de res-
sources matérielles, retardé par la guerre, aidé et encouragé en dernier lieu par une subvention de la Fédération des Sociétés Scientifiques, j’ai pu réaliser l’organisation actuelle... »

28 MAROUZEAU 1923–1924b, p. 47: « par une coïncidence qui n’est pas tout à fait fortuite, [...] se trouvent posées diverses questions qui intéressent l’organisation et l’avenir de notre documentation scientifique ».

29 On the REL’s bibliography project, which competed with the one proposed by the Revue des comptes rendus, see MAROUZEAU 1923–1924b, p. 48.
of scientific work, not least because, like the *Revue* and the *Société des Études Latines*, it was a key component of scientific relations.\textsuperscript{30}

### 3. Bibliography as a stake in national rivalries

Since the nineteenth century, science in the broadest sense had become a national concern for countries that attempted to demonstrate their power through the modernity of their resources. In 1978, Brigitte SCHRÖDER-GUDEHUS wrote that “scientific research [had around 1910 become a part] of the arsenal of national resources, of factors of power”.\textsuperscript{31} Bibliography was also one of the instruments of scientific rivalry, being among the most fundamental and modern tools for researchers, not unlike the corpora published in Germany since the mid-nineteenth century. In the 1920s, the benefits of bibliography were praised; one of the key actors of the reorganization of bibliography, the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation (CICI), asserted that “scientific organization, in particular in the field of bibliography, is the basis of all intellectual cooperation and [...] scientific relations strongly depend on it”,\textsuperscript{32} and that “the international organization of bibliography brings scholars from various countries closer together, and at the same time facilitates their respective researches”.\textsuperscript{33} The interest in bibliography in the scientific community was also a result of the crisis of that tool at the time, which was problematic for researchers in practice. Many scholars complained of the difficulty of accessing ever more numerous and more expensive publications.\textsuperscript{34} Ultimately, bibliography, in Classics as well as in other

\textsuperscript{30} MAROUZEAU 1923–1924a, p. 18; see also, the text of the circular announcing the foundation of the *Société des Études Latines*, dated April 1923, which can for instance be consulted in the UB-Leipzig’s Wilhelm Streitberg fonds (NL 245/M/Ma/30).

\textsuperscript{31} SCHRÖDER-GUDEHUS 1978, p. 30. See also, for instance, TOURNÈS 2012, p. 68.

\textsuperscript{32} “Rapport du secrétariat sur les travaux de la sous-commission de bibliographie et de la commission plénière concernant la conférence de bibliographie analytique (abstracts) (Genève, 5 mars 1924)”, Archives de la Société des Nations, Geneva, CICI/B/35/13c/34639/20085, p. 1: « l’organisation scientifique, en particulier de la bibliographie, est à la base de toute coopération intellectuelle et que les rapports scientifiques en dépendent étroitement ».

\textsuperscript{33} *Ibid.*: « l’organisation internationale de la bibliographie rapproche les uns des autres les savants des divers pays, en même temps qu’elle facilite les recherches de chacun d’eux ».

\textsuperscript{34} See for instance a letter from É. G. RACOVITZA to the CICI’s President, dated 18 May 1923, sent from Cluj, Romania (Archives de la Société des Nations, Geneva, CICI/B/63): “It is more and more difficult to complete an exhaustive bibliography on a given manner; it is not even possible for libraries to keep their old collections
fields, was part of a complex movement that precisely meets the definition of what Schröder-Gudehus called “scientific internationalism”, wherein international solidarity among researchers was limited by the patriotism of scholars. They had identified bibliography as a field and a scientific tool that needed to be mastered, improved and rationalized to stay afloat in the international scientific competition, until then largely dominated by the French and German twin enemies. Under the circumstances, the scientific reorganization of Classics bibliography naturally entailed political, patriotic, if not nationalist engagements. The bibliographers were working to develop international relations between researchers whilst working towards the scientific development of their own countries and pursuing the first place in the international competition out of a national interest.35

Marouzeau may have been cosmopolitan and committed to intellectual cooperation, but he very likely shared these ambivalent feelings towards Germany. Like his contemporaries, he was drawn to compete with German research. This is evidenced by his multiple comments on the Bibliotheca Philologica Classica (BPhCl), the German Classics bibliography published in the Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.

I have just seen a colleague waste hours looking for the key of an SBW reference, which was not explained by any bibliographical index; who

updated. The reasons for this crisis are the following: 1. The gradual increase in the number of scientific publications. 2. The gradual increase in the price of scientific publications. 3. The utter lack of funding granted to scientific libraries for book purchases [...] Most subscriptions had to be discontinued and it is quite likely that incomplete collections will never be completed.” (« Il est de plus en plus difficile de faire la bibliographie complète d’une question, il n’est plus possible de se tenir au courant des nouvelles publications, il n’est même plus possible aux bibliothèques de tenir à jour leurs vieux fonds. Les raisons de cette crise sont les suivantes : 1. L’augmentation progressive du nombre des publications scientifiques. 2. L’augmentation progressive du prix des publications scientifiques. 3. L’insuffisance complète des fonds attribués aux bibliothèques scientifiques pour l’achat des livres. [...] La plupart des abonnements ont dû être arrêtés et il est bien probable que les séries interrompues ne pourront plus jamais être complétées. ») See also Marouzeau 1927b, p. 13–16 and “Rapport du secrétariat sur les travaux de la sous-commission de bibliographie et de la commission plénière concernant la conférence de bibliographie analytique (abstracts)” (Geneva, 5 March 1924), Archives de la Société des Nations, Geneva, CICI/B/35/13c/34639/20085, p. 5.

35 For more on scientific internationalism, see for instance Schröder-Gudehus 1978; Schröder-Gudehus 1986; Reinbothe 2006; Rasmussen 2007, p. 1–8; Defrance 2016.
Ilse Hilbold

Ilse Hilbold hasn’t been irritated by the protean appearance of a periodical that is sometimes called “the Jahresbericht of Classical Antiquity”, sometimes “the Bursian”, sometimes “the Bibliotheca philologica classica”, sometimes “the Vogel Bibliotheca”, sometimes “the JAW”, sometimes “the BPh C”, sometimes “Burs Jb”, etc.?36

German bibliography has greatly suffered since the war: [...] the venerable Bibliotheca philologica classica, which every trimester would empty its huge wealth of titles and references into Bursian’s Jahresbericht, was only just barely able to recently publish its 1919 instalment, which only contains a very incomplete documentation.37

MAROUZEAU’s criticisms were not without ulterior motives. Indeed, pointing out these weaknesses allowed him to make a case for creating his own bibliographical publication, at a time when the Bibliotheca Philologica Classica had indeed long enjoyed the favours of the international community thanks to its precision.38 Beyond the publicity move element, MAROUZEAU’s criticisms also reflected his different conception of bibliography. Where the BPhCl, a quarterly publication, provided lists of titles that offered quick and easy access to documentation, the Revue des comptes rendus (and later L’APH) included short summaries of the main works. This made it a “critical” bibliography, which the BPhCl was not. The services provided by the two bibliographies were complementary, then, but in MAROUZEAU’s view, the BPhCl’s worsening shortcomings (publication delays, lack of exhaustiveness) took it out of play.39 In 1928, when the BPhCl stopped listing archaeological works for budgetary reasons,40 MAROUZEAU (and the international community) took it to task,

---


37 MAROUZEAU 1923–1924c, p. 79: « La bibliographie allemande a particulièrement souffert depuis la guerre : [...] la vénérable Bibliotheca philologica classica, qui tous les trimestres déversait dans le Jahresbericht de Bursian son matériel énorme de titres et de renvois, vient de faire paraître à grand peine son fascicule de 1919, qui ne contient qu’une documentation très incomplète ». See also WHEELER 1924, p. 95.

38 On the early twentieth-century bibliographical landscape, see HILBOLD [forthcoming].


40 REISLAND & MÜNCHER 1929, p. III–IV.
and the position of the APh, which included an archaeology section, was strengthened.41

Marouzeau’s investment in the scientific rivalry with Germany also transpires in some of his other actions, particularly the highly productive relationships he maintained with two professors of biology at the Collège de France, André Mayer (1875–1956) and Charles Moureu (1863–1929). Mayer and Moureu had been alongside Jean Perrin the founding fathers of the Caisse Nationale des Sciences (1930), and were part of the circle of scholars who had refused demobilization against Germany in 1918.42 Their fight for the reorganization of French science was notoriously supported by a Parisian nationalist right-wing Member of Parliament, Maurice Barrès, the very same person who had succeeded in getting a bill passed for publically funding the publication of the APh’s first volume in 1926.43

While it is likely that Marouzeau met Moureu and Mayer on several occasions,44 the archives only mention one meeting between Marouzeau and Moureu, which took place on 20 December 1922. This encounter occurred in Paris during the second session of the CICI’s bibliography sub-committee. The League of Nations had indeed become active in the field of bibliography very early on, and had set up a specialized sub-committee operating under the CICI’s helm to support its activities.

4. Marouzeau and the League of Nations
The second session of the bibliography sub-committee, presided by the French philosopher Henri Bergson, brought together nine members of the League of Nations45 and four bibliography experts who were asked to

41 N.N. 1932, p. 10–11; Harrison 1936, p. 85.
42 On cultural demobilization, see Rasmussen 2007, p. 3; Defrance 2016, p. 172; Schröder-Gudehus 1986; Robic 2010.
43 See Herescu & Marouzeau 1962, p. 87. As M. Barrès died in 1923, these subsidies had been decided before the APh’s first publications. Logically, they must have been originally earmarked for the Revue de Philologie’s bibliography outlets, via the SBC.
44 See Marouzeau’s account of a lecture given by A. Mayer at the Collège de France in Marouzeau 1927a, p. 26.
45 The members of the League of Nations were H. Bergson, President; M. Destrée, Committee member; M. Godet, Director of the Swiss National Library; H. Wright, Director of the London Library; D. Johnston, Director of the American Library in Paris; W. G. Leland from the History Department of the Carnegie Institution of
give their opinions on the proposals formulated by the Polish and naturalized-French physicist and chemist Marie Curie, a member of the bibliography sub-committee, in 1922. The guest experts were Marouzeau, Moureu, representing the International Union of Chemistry, Théophile Homolle, representing the International Union of Academies (an organization operating in the field of humanities and social sciences), and Lucien Herr, a prominent intellectual and librarian at the École Normale Superieure in Paris. The choice of guests reflected the various forces involved — the actors already active in the bibliographical field, who were far from entirely in favour of the CICI’s competing bibliography project.

During the session, the discussion focused on the reorganization of bibliography and on possible means to pool efforts internationally. The writing of abstracts was more particularly targeted by this rationalization project, since, as they regarded periodicals, they were a quick way for scholars to exchange information. On this subject, Marouzeau supported all the proposals, even though he considered it particularly important to know if the complete research findings would be published in a new international journal or in existing journals.

Most importantly, for Marouzeau, the session would mark the start of a collaboration with the CICI. A few months later, on 14 February 1923, the organization’s secretary Oskar Halecki asked Marouzeau to submit a report on Classics bibliography, in light of the “interesting observations [he had] made during [the] first session regarding analytical bibliography in the field of philology”.

Washington; M. Nitobe, Under-secretary General of the League of Nations; J. Luchaire, Committee expert; O. Halecki, Secretary General of the Committee.


47 On the rivalries between the CICI and the Union of International Associations, as well as the International Research Council (IRC), which all had a stake in the bibliographical question, see Tourrès 2016, p. 211–213; see also Hilbold [forthcoming].


In March 1923, MAROUZEAU addressed to HALÉCKI his “draft report on the organization of philological bibliography”. The report painted a damning, but certainly realistic picture of the state of bibliography at the time (“an anarchic situation, characterized by maximal effort for minimal results”), and went on to propose solutions that he had been unable to implement at the Revue de philologie, for lack of resources. In a nutshell, MAROUZEAU called for the creation of a central bibliography platform, gathering all reviews conducted by partner countries and redistributing them to all subscribers, which would allow national bibliography journals to independently publish more exhaustive listings, because they would be based on international data:

Regarding periodical publications, an existing or newly created organization in each country would be in charge of reviewing all the Journals published in its field; the reviews, written on records following a previously agreed model and in one of the most common languages (German, English, Spanish, French, Italian, Latin), would be sent at a fixed date to an international central platform that would keep the entirety of the collected documentation at the disposal of each interested organization. In turn, the interested organizations, being subscribers to the central platform’s services, would be tasked with classifying, elaborating, in some cases translating, and eventually printing these records. In practice, their expenses would increase because they would have to translate part of the collected material, to print more documentation, and to pay their subscription to the central platform; yet, on the other hand, they would decrease in that each of them would only be tasked with part of the documentation (and that part would in effect be compensated by the central platform). Additionally, their resources would probably increase as a result of the added value acquired by their publications. Ultimately, there could be a balance and a compensation between increases in costs and increases in challenges. [...] It goes without saying that only the general classification by domain would fall to the central office, and that each subscribing organization would be in charge of presenting its material in the way that it would

au sujet de la bibliographie analytique en matière de philologie, j’ai l’honneur de vous demander si vous seriez disposé à rédiger pour notre seconde session un rapport ou mémoire où seraient résumées vos expériences si précieuses et les conclusions pratiques auxquelles vous êtes arrivé. »

Ilse Hilbold

deem most practical and best adjusted to the interested parties' working habits.\textsuperscript{51}

Despite the novelty of the proposal, MAROUZEAU emphasized the need to protect existing bibliographies:

In implementing such a project, the greatest caution would naturally have to be exercised with respect to acquired situations in each country; it should not happen for a given existing bibliographical enterprise, living off its own resources, or helping a related publication to subsist, and which would effectively have paved the way for the new organization, to find itself deprived of the advantages acquired at the cost of sacrifices and of a long-term devotion to science as a result of the newly introduced facilitation of the activities of competing organizations.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{51} J. MAROUZEAU, “Mémoire concernant un projet de bibliographie des sciences philologiques et historiques” (1923), Archives de la Société des Nations, Geneva, CICI/B/10 (p. 2–4): « Pour ce qui est des publications périodiques, une organisation existante ou à créer dans chaque pays se chargerait du dépouillement de toutes les Revues publiées sur son domaine; les analyses, faites sur fiches d’un modèle convenu, et rédigées dans l’une des langues les plus répandues (allemand, anglais, espagnol, français, italien, latin), seraient envoyées à date fixe à une centrale internationale qui tiendrait l’ensemble de la documentation ainsi réunie à la disposition de chaque organisation intéressée. À leur tour, les organisations intéressées, abonnées à la Centrale, se chargeraient de classer, d’élaborer, éventuellement de traduire, enfin d’imprimer les fiches ainsi recueillies. Pratiquement, leurs frais se trouveraient augmentés du fait qu’elles auraient à traduire une partie du matériel obtenu, à imprimer une documentation accrue, et à payer leur abonnement à la centrale ; d’autre part, ils se trouveraient ainsi diminués, du fait que chacune n’aurait plus à sa charge qu’une partie de la documentation (qui, du reste, lui serait remboursée par la Centrale) ; de plus, leurs ressources seraient sans doute augmentées du fait de la plus-value qu’acquerreraient leurs publications. En définitive, il pourrait y avoir équilibre et compensation entre l’accroissement des charges et l’accroissement des difficultés. [...] Il va sans dire du reste que seul, le classement général par domaines incomberait à l’office central, et que chaque organisme abonné aurait la tâche de disposer son matériel de la façon qui lui paraîtrait la plus pratique et la plus conforme aux habitudes de travail des intéressés ».

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., p. 5: « Dans la réalisation d’un tel projet, la plus grande circonspection s’imposerait naturellement vis-à-vis des situations acquises dans chaque pays ; il ne faudrait pas que telle entreprise bibliographique existante, vivant de ses propres ressources, ou aidant à subsister une publication connexe, et qui aurait du reste préparé les voies à l’organisation nouvelle, se trouvât, par suite des facilités offertes désormais à des organisations concurrentes, frustrée des avantages qu’elle se serait acquis au prix de ses sacrifices et d’un long dévouement à la science ». 
The report was discussed during a CICI bibliographical session; immediately after that, on 19 April 1923, HALECKI announced to MAROUZEAU that the bibliography sub-committee had “picked classical philology as one of the sciences with which it intends to launch its efforts”, alongside physics and chemical physics. MAROUZEAU passed on the good news in one of his “Chronicles” for the REL:

On the one hand, a subsidy granted by the **Confédération des Sociétés scientifiques françaises** has made it possible to resume, complete and update the bibliography published yearly by the **Revue de philologie**; on the other, the League of Nations Committee on Intellectual Cooperation has been considering the organization of an international bibliography and intends to experiment first with classical antiquity, possibly using the publications of the **Revue de philologie** as a basis.

A series of letters was then exchanged between HALECKI and MAROUZEAU, until the fourth session of the bibliographical sub-committee, held in Paris on 30 November and 1 December 1923. It was very likely in that meeting, in which MAROUZEAU was a participant, that the decision to send a circular on the international organization of Classics bibliography was made:

Concerning the future plans I have already described to readers of this **Revue**, new exchanges of views have taken place between the bibliography sub-committee delegated by the League of Nations Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, and myself, as a representative of the **Société de Bibliographie classique**. The sub-committee has decided to launch an international survey to establish which existing or yet to be developed type of bibliography is better suited to the needs of the

---


54 For feasibility reasons, the CICI had to scale down its initial plans of an international, universal bibliography, and to limit itself to three disciplines.

55 MAROUZEAU 1923b, p. 47: « D’une part, une subvention accordée par la **Confédération des Sociétés scientifiques françaises** a permis de reprendre, de compléter et de mettre à jour la bibliographie que publie chaque année la **Revue de philologie** ; d’autre part, la **Commission de coopération intellectuelle** de la Société des Nations étudie l’organisation d’une bibliographie internationale et se propose d’en faire l’expérience d’abord pour l’antiquité classique, en prenant éventuellement pour base les publications de la **Revue de philologie**. »
scholarly community; furthermore, it has examined plans for an organization of which I was led to present the guidelines, and that we may consider implementing now to a certain extent, while waiting for the benefits of international agreements.\textsuperscript{56}

The first survey, sent in July 1924 to European and North American scholars, described desired characteristics for the new Classics bibliography (expected to be analytical, periodical, international, etc.\textsuperscript{57}) and asked the following question: is there an existing bibliographical enterprise that meets these conditions?

Despite a rather low response rate,\textsuperscript{58} the survey yielded two findings. From the data it was (tentatively) concluded that the \textit{Revue de philologie} was best because it was more exhaustive than the \textit{BPhCl} — MAROUZEAU would later quote that observation, citing the opinions of colleagues who praised his work. Secondly, and most importantly, Gilbert MURRAY, the famous British Hellenist who was now in charge of the matter at the League of Nations, decided that a second survey needed to be launched. MURRAY’s arrival was greatly disruptive for MAROUZEAU, who until then had enjoyed the CICI’s support. With MURRAY, the CICI adopted a tougher line, in that he believed that the League of Nations should take the lead in the internal cooperation. The second survey supervised by MURRAY in October 1925 held that no existing Classics bibliography was satisfactory,\textsuperscript{59} and questions focused on the modalities of a new, yet-to-be-
created bibliography. Murray’s intentions were clearly understood by the experts convened for the Paris January 1927 session of the CICI; as one of them, the archaeologist Edmond Pottier, bluntly put it to the president of the meeting, Julien Luchaire:

The debate is dominated by the question of whether the IICI [the CICI’s Paris branch since 1926] intends to publish a universal bibliography itself or to task various journals from various countries to do that work, each of them being solely in charge of the territory it covers.

Ultimately, while in its resolutions the expert committee officially renounced the creation of a new bibliography, it pushed a crucial reorganization of the bibliographical field. In effect, the expert committee, in which Murray turned out to be absent, proposed coordinating existing bibliographies by tasking each of them with researching works in its own linguistic area. The BPhCl would thus deal with German-language journals, the Year’s Work would tackle English-language periodicals, and Marouzeau’s bibliography would be in charge of French-language ones. The CICI would publish bibliographical collections for each of these linguistic areas.

This principle, proposed then by Friedrich Vogel, from the BPhCl, but found in and after 1922 in all CICI draft projects, was adopted by domain of early Aegean or Mediterranean civilisation with its various branches.” — See the answer by G. Murray, dated 14 July 1924, to Survey no. 1 (“Bibliography of Greco-Roman Antiquity”, CICI/B/53, Archives de la Société des Nations, Geneva): “There is, at present, no bibliographical enterprise in the world which fulfils the conditions required.”

Survey no. 2 (“Memorandum by Professor Gilbert Murray”, CICI/B/60, Archives de la Société des Nations, Geneva): “1) Is some further coordination desirable in the bibliography of classical antiquity? Or short of that, is some action desirable to maintain in some existing record the standard of completeness which existed at the end of the last century?”

At the meeting, Pottier represented the International Union of Academies, and defended its bibliography project.

“Comité d’experts pour la coordination de la bibliographie gréco-latine”, BGL/1e session/PV1, Archives de l’Unesco, Paris, p. 2: « Le débat est dominé par la question de savoir si l’IICI a l’intention d’éditer lui-même une bibliographie universelle ou s’il chargera différentes revues des divers pays de faire ce travail, chacune d’elles ne s’occupant que du territoire sur lequel elle rayonne ».

See “Rapport du secrétariat sur les travaux de la sous-commission de bibliographie et de la commission plénière concernant la conférence de bibliographie analytique (abstracts), Genève, 5 mars 1924”, Archives de la Société des Nations, Geneva, CICI/B/35, which reproduces Marie Curie’s proposals, dated 20 December
the committee’s experts, with six votes in favour and one against. MAROUZEAU, the only dissenting voter, harshly criticized what he called the “nationalization of bibliography” on the grounds that the system would lead bibliographers to work on a country-by-country basis instead of rallying around a common project. This argument openly referred to the scientific rivalry between nations, to which, as we have seen, bibliography was clearly no stranger. Arguably, the reason why MAROUZEAU was so angry and tempestuous during the session was not only the “[considerable step backward from the current state of documentation made by the projected bibliography]”. He was also disappointed on a personal level, and perhaps afraid that his efforts would amount to nothing.

Since the beginning of his collaboration with the League of Nations, indeed, MAROUZEAU had constantly called attention to the fact that scientific reorganization should not affect existing initiatives. This was

1922, in full: “In view of their subsequent centralization, analyses should be prepared in each country by national organizations affiliated with international organizations whenever possible, for each group of sciences” (« Les analyses devraient être, en vue de leur centralisation ultérieure, préparées dans chaque pays par des organismes nationaux affiliés autant que possible à des organismes internationaux, pour chaque groupe de sciences »).

64 “Comité d’experts pour la coordination de la bibliographie gréco-latine”, BGL/1er session/PV5, Archives de l’Unesco, Paris, p. 4: “With that organization [i.e., the one proposed in Marouzeau’s project] we would have achieved a genuine international collaboration, or rather coordination, to use the term adopted by Professor Gilles Murray in his letter. On the opposite, this project [Vogel’s] leads to nationalizing bibliography, replacing the idea of coordination with the mere juxtaposition of efforts.” (« Par cette organisation, on eût réalisé une véritable collaboration internationale ou plutôt une coordination, pour reprendre le terme adopté dans sa lettre par le Professeur Gilbert Murray. Le présent projet conduit, au contraire, à nationaliser la bibliographie, en substituant à l’idée de la coordination celle de la simple juxtaposition des efforts. ») See also (same reference code) “Rapport de J. Marouzeau”, p. 5: “He [Marouzeau] contends that the implementation of the projected bibliography would be a huge step backward from the current state of scientific documentation”. (« Il estime que la réalisation de la bibliographie projetée marquerait un recul considérable par rapport à l’état actuel de la documentation scientifique. »)

65 “Comité d’experts pour la coordination de la bibliographie gréco-latine”, BGL/1er session/PV5, Archives de l’Unesco, Paris, p. 5. See also MAROUZEAU 1932, p. 208: “The International Institute on Intellectual Cooperation has researched the matter [of the organization of bibliographical work] on Mr. Marouzeau’s initiative, but the Expert Committee convened to that effect has found that only national bibliographies could be envisioned.” (« L’Institut International de Coopération Intellectuelle s’est préoccupé de la question [de l’organisation du travail bibliographique] sur l’initiative de M. Marouzeau, mais un Comité d’experts réuni à cet effet n’a cru pouvoir envisager que l’organisation de bibliographies nationales. »)
precisely the danger posed by the creation of a new, international-level cooperative journal, and MAROUZEAU stood to lose a lot from this. In 1926, in the immediate wake of Louis HAVET’s death, MAROUZEAU had narrowly lost the race for the direction of the Revue de philologie, which fell to his colleague Alfred ERNOUT and his master Pierre JOUGUET, a Hellenist and Egyptologist from Lille. For MAROUZEAU, who had worked for the Revue since 1908, and hoped to “make [himself] useful” there, to quote his 1912 letter to HAVET, and who, last but not least, had instigated a comprehensive reform, particularly by creating the Société de Bibliographie Classique, this came as a crushing blow:

My masters Chatelain, Haussoullier and Serruys had entrusted me with a modest bibliography task at the Revue de Philologie; the work paid little, but opened the doors to the scientific horizon of a great Journal... Haussoullier dies [†1926], Chatelain follows [†1933], Serruys leaves; the editor in charge of the Journal intervenes; then one day I learn that I am ruled out for the direction, replaced by two eminent colleagues. Should I go on?66

Then came a twist of fate that I have already had occasion to mention to you: one fine day, I was excluded from the Revue de Philologie by the editor in charge’s decision to call on two of my most eminent colleagues. Was I going to give up? Everything pointed in that direction: discouragement, caution, the risk I was running. I stood up to the test, pondered the matter, and I concluded: So be it! I’m leaving, but I’m taking the two titles of which I was in charge at the Revue de Philologie: the bibliography part and the Latin part. This is how L’Année philologique and the Revue des études latines were born.67

66 HERESCU & MAROUZEAU 1962, p. 62: « Mes maîtres Chatelain, Haussoullier et Serruys m’avaient confié une modeste tâche de bibliographe à la Revue de Philologie ; travail peu rétribué, mais porte ouverte vers l’horizon scientifique d’une grande Revue... Haussoullier meurt, Chatelain le suit, Serruys s’en va ; l’éditeur responsable de la Revue intervient : j’apprends un jour que je suis éliminé de la direction, remplacé par deux éminents collègues. Faut-il continuer ? »
So as not to have to give up on his ongoing work, MAROUZEAU had decided to take with him what belonged to him — the SBC — and to create a new journal that would continue the bibliography initiated by the *Revue de philologie*, almost from scratch. The *APh* was thus born out of a failure, a consequence of MAROUZEAU’s exclusion from the succession at the *Revue de philologie*. The *APh*, being the second version of MAROUZEAU’s bibliographical reform, was conceived to meet the recommendations of the League of Nations:

It appears to him to transpire from the responses to the survey circulated by the bibliography sub-committee delegated by the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation [...] that as of today there are two bibliographical publications that rather exactly fit the expressed requirements: the *Bibliotheca philologica classica* (Germany) and *L’Année philologique*, formerly *Revue des Revues et des Comptes rendus* (France). He indicates in particular that *L’Année philologique* has just been reorganized following a new system by the *Société de Bibliographie Classique*, which is itself an organization for international intellectual cooperation.68

With the *APh*, MAROUZEAU also entertained the ambition to take and retain a hegemonic place in the international field — as evidenced for instance by the scope of his bibliographical research outside of France. The VOGEL project of January 1927, which tended to limit the scope of the *APh*’s research to the benefit of other national bibliographies, therefore thwarted MAROUZEAU’s efforts and threatened his international ambitions.

5. Conclusion

Eventually, *L’Année philologique* prospered as the lack of agreement between its protagonists prevented the CICI’s project from coming to fruition. The German bibliography, the *Bibliotheca Philologica Classica*, endured for a few years before ceasing publication and letting the *APh* take on an increasingly crucial role in the field of Classics bibliography. Furthermore, the dispute between MAROUZEAU and the CICI did not last indefinitely, since he collaborated on a project for the “unification of linguistic terms” between 1928 and 1930.69

To conclude this study on the origins of the *APh*, it seems important to note that although the history of bibliography has so far remained under the radar, it leads us to reckon with a number of topical interconnected historiographical areas, such as biography, the history of knowledge, internationalism, and international scientific relations. The history of the origins of the *APh* is certainly that of MAROUZEAU, since the journal arose from his setback with the *Revue de philologie* and the ultimately disappointing trials and tribulations of his collaboration with the League of Nations. However, MAROUZEAU’s scientific ambitions, which were great out of necessity, also led him to take part in a debate that involved numerous stakeholders under the tutelage of the powerful League of Nations and CICI. In that context, as he defended his reform project, he took part in the scientific rivalry between nations at a time when it was particularly fierce — the interwar years. Thus the history of the *APh* yields valuable evidence for the patriotic sentiment expressed in the professional practices of early twentieth century Classics scholars, which are to be seen in the broader light of the complex matter of interwar French and German nationalism. This point in particular calls for further research to elucidate the longevity of the journal and its decades-long success, thanks to the work of Juliette ERNST and its close ties to the International Federation of Associations of Classical Studies (FIEC) founded in the immediate aftermath of the war on a proposal by MAROUZEAU.
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### Timeline

**Jules MAROUZEAU’S ACADEMIC CAREER**  
(Born in Fleurat, 1878 – died in Iteuil, 1964)  
*1904–1927*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Passed the <em>agrégation</em> exam for Classics school teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAROUZEAU 1906.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAROUZEAU 1907a; MAROUZEAU 1907b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Treasurer of the <em>Société de linguistique de Paris</em>.</td>
<td>MAROUZEAU 1908.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAROUZEAU 1909.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Doctorate Lecturer at the ÉPHÉ</td>
<td>MAROUZEAU 1910a; MAROUZEAU 1910b; MAROUZEAU 1910c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910–1912</td>
<td>Research trips abroad (Germany, Italy, England).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1911 | Founded the *Revue des comptes rendus* as part of the *Revue de philologie*.  
Prix Volney of the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* for *La Phrase à verbe « être » en latin* (main doctoral research). | MAROUZEAU 1911a; MAROUZEAU 1911b; MAROUZEAU 1911c. |
| 1912 | Lecturer and substitute lecturer at the ÉPHÉ, the Guilde and the Collège Sévigné (Paris). | MAROUZEAU 1912. |
| 1913 | Prix Saintour, Collège de France. | MAROUZEAU 1913a; MAROUZEAU 1913b. |
| 1914–1918 | Sent up to the front, taken prisoner. |  |
| 1914 | | MAROUZEAU 1914. |
| 1916 | | MAROUZEAU 1916. |
| 1921 | Founded the *Société de Bibliographie Classique* (SBC).  
Secured initial funding from the *Confédération des Sociétés Scientifiques Françaises* (SBC/*Revue des comptes rendus*). | MAROUZEAU 1921a; MAROUZEAU 1921b; MAROUZEAU 1921c. |
<p>| 1922 | | MAROUZEAU 1922a; MAROUZEAU 1922b; MAROUZEAU 1922c. |
| 12/1922 | (First?) contacts with the bibliography sub-committee of the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation (CICI). |  |
| 1923 | | MAROUZEAU 1923a; MAROUZEAU 1923b; MAROUZEAU 1923c; MAROUZEAU 1923d; MAROUZEAU 1923e. |
| 03/1923 | Founded the <em>Société des Études Latines</em> in Paris. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/1923</td>
<td>Mémoire-projet concernant l’organisation de la bibliographie philologique. [Draft report on the organization of philological bibliography]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/1923</td>
<td>Brussels session of the CICI’s bibliography sub-committee. The CICI chooses philology as a pilot discipline, alongside physics and chemistry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11–</td>
<td>Fourth session of the bibliography sub-committee in Paris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12 1923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>MAROUZEAU 1924a; MAROUZEAU 1924b; MAROUZEAU 1924c; MAROUZEAU 1924d; MAROUZEAU 1924e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/1924</td>
<td>Survey no. 1: The CICI sends scholars a first circular on the new cooperative, international bibliography. G. MURRAY joins the CICI’s bibliography sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>MAROUZEAU 1925a; MAROUZEAU 1925b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/1925</td>
<td>Findings of survey no. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1925</td>
<td>Survey no.2: The CICI sends scholars a second circular with a memorandum by G. MURRAY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>A. ERNOUT becomes the editor of the Revue de philologie. MAROUZEAU founds L’Année philologique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/1926</td>
<td>MAROUZEAU 1926a; MAROUZEAU 1926b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27–29/</td>
<td>The expert committee meets in Paris (IIIC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–13/</td>
<td>Ninth session of the bibliography sub-committee in Geneva. MAROUZEAU’s reports on the expert committee meeting of January 1927 calls into question the choice of philology as a pilot discipline for the League of Nations bibliography project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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E.R. Dodds’ Lecture Notes on Hesiod’s Works and Days¹

— Ben Cartledge —

Abstract
This article offers the text of a lecture on Hesiod’s Works and Days written by Eric Robertson Dodds, along with transcriptions of the extensive marginalia he wrote in his copy of Frederick A. Paley’s edition of the poems. The pages provide an insight into Dodds’ thinking about the poet, reflected in his published work. They also show the style of Dodds’ work on both philological detail and broader themes, his skill as a translator, and the intellectual climate of discussion of Hesiod in the mid-twentieth century (before the landmark editions of Martin L. West). Extensive discussion is added to Dodds’ notes to show how this newly discovered lecture fits into the history of scholarship on the poet.
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E.R. Dodds; Hesiod; wisdom literature; Works and Days; M.L. West

This paper provides a transcription and discussion of four quite closely written pages tucked into Eric Robertson Dodds’ copy of the edition of Hesiod by Frederick A. Paley.² The handwriting has been confirmed as Dodds’ by Prof. Donald Russell (Oxford), who was a graduate student of Dodds’ in the 1940s. The first page is headed ‘Notes for introductory lecture on Works and Days’. Whether this ‘introductory

¹ I received valuable help and advice on this paper from Annette Lawrence, Assistant Librarian, Library of the University of Lancaster; Prof. Donald Russell; Prof. Gerard O’Daly; Dr Enrico Prodi; from two anonymous reviewers and the editors of HCS; and Prof. Christopher Pelling, who in his capacity as Dodds’ literary executor kindly allowed me to publish these pages. Dr Christopher Stray read the whole thing several times and kindly provided help on some difficult decipherments. Like many classicists, one of the first academic books I ever read was Dodds (1951), and it is a huge privilege to uncover part of Dodds’ intellectual legacy.

lecture’ was ever delivered, and if so whether this was at Birmingham, Oxford, or some other venue entirely, is impossible to ascertain from its contents; some suggestions will be considered in the main part of the paper, but little hangs on the question. The notes are a fascinating insight into Dodds’ thinking about Hesiod, as well as showing the sort of content he thought relevant for an introductory lecture. Comparanda may perhaps be traced among Dodds’ papers in the Bodleian Library, but this contribution focuses solely on the documents at hand.

1. The Book
I acquired Dodds’ copy of Paley from an online bookseller in March 2019. A bookplate in the front bears the inscription ‘Lancaster University Library, from the library of Prof. E.R. Dodds’; the flyleaf bears Dodds’ signature. There is in addition a library stamp recording an accession date of 17th April 1984. Dodds bequeathed his library to Lancaster on his death (in 1979); the plan seems to have been formed as early as 1969, and was intended to enrich the holdings of the fledgling department. In the event, Classics at Lancaster closed in 1989. The book had been part of a reserved collection for books that were neither frequently consulted nor particularly valuable in their own right. The book had, according to the slip in the back cover, never been taken out of the library, which no doubt accounts for the preservation of the notes. It is hard to explain why the library stamped the book only in 1984, but it may have taken a relatively long time to catalogue the books and determine which were to be kept.

It can be no coincidence that the marginalia in the Works and Days are extremely frequent but almost non-existent in the Shield (two notes only, on 425) and Theogony. Despite this scarcity, the Theogony notes are interesting because they can be dated. First in chronological order is

3 For Dodds’ (1893–1979) career, one can draw in the first instance on his autobiography, Dodds (1977), and the biographical note by Todd, ‘E.R. Dodds’, in id. (2004) 1.247–51; also on three informative obituary notices by Martin Litchfield West (1979) = (2013) 480–2, Lloyd-Jones (1980), and especially by Russell (1981). Stray et al. (2019) is a comprehensive assessment of Dodds’ life and scholarship. Various other papers of Dodds have received posthumous attention; see Todd (1999) for two striking early examples.


5 Hermann (1902), with letters from R.E. Witt to E.R. Dodds, was acquired at the same time from the same bookseller: see Cartlidge (2019).

6 I am grateful to Prof. Gerard O’Daly, who responded generously to an email request for information on this point.

7 On the history of Lancaster’s Classics department, see Jim (2015).
a reference to F. Solmsen on Th. 472; another is to the 1951 paper by Nilsson on the ἄρπη (Th. 175), the other (the only ink note in the book) cites a correction by West (Th. 540 τοῖς for τῷ) and therefore postdates 1961.\(^8\) Less relevant notes on Theogony are two records of Homeric epithets (τε βοῶπις Il. 18.40 for τ᾽ ἐρόεσσα Th. 245; ἀγακλειτή Il. 18.45 for εὐειδής Th. 250) and a (to my mind rather doubtful) parallel in Herodotus (Th. 220 cf. Hdt. 6.12, for the construction of παραβασίαι, παραβάντες). On one occasion, Dodds remarks on a deletion (that of 473 by Heyne); by contrast, Dodds frequently takes issue with deletions in the text of the Works and Days (I record all cases below), and this is an index of the different concentration Dodds brought to bear on the two poems. There are also sporadic pencil marks. The intense activity on Works and Days argues for this being the copy Dodds read or reread while writing these notes. The marginalia are in pencil of varying degrees of clarity (which may not mean they were written at different times) and are not easy to read. I have not attempted to transcribe all of them: many are trivial notes on vocabulary, underlinings, question marks etc. I reproduce a selection based on (i) what could be securely read, (ii) illustrations of the character of the notes, (iii) remarks with particular bearing on the lecture notes. Abbreviations have been expanded using rounded brackets; Dodds’ comments are always in single quotation marks; bold numbers refer to the Works and Days. Beneath each note I have added some light annotation in smaller font. I have not compared translations systematically, but I have made constant reference to Most’s Loeb, on the assumption that it is a widely used version of Hesiod.\(^9\)

1 (on Πιερίηθεν): ‘is this why patriotic Heliconians suppressed it?’ See Paus. 9.31.3; Dodds is referring to a tradition that the proem was missing from a copy preserved on lead at Helicon.

1–10, where Paley has cited Paus. 9.31.3, Dodds adds ‘but see W(ilmowitz)-M(oellendorff)’s defence of the proem’ See Wilamowitz (1928) 39–41; further literature (for and against) in Schmid & Stählin (1929) 278 n. 2; Koechly & Kinkel are, to my knowledge, the latest editors.

\(^8\) Solmsen (1949) 158 n. 151; Nilsson (1951); West (1961) 137–8. On the latter, see also Renehan (1980) 344. It is likely that West sent Dodds an offprint of this paper; otherwise Dodds will have seen the emendation either after 1961 or on publication of the Theogony edition in 1966. I thank Stephanie West for help on this point.

\(^9\) In the sections in smaller type, West = West (1978); ‘ad loc.’ refers to the relevant lemma in the commentary, page numbers to the introduction. Other works are cited in full by page number, unless the reference has been taken from West (1978).
to have deleted the verses. West *ad loc.* gives the doubters short shrift, without even citing the literature, a plain indication of changed priorities.

6–7: ‘cf. wisdom literature’

A revealing note in the light of West’s commentaries on Hesiod — see in particular West 3–25 — in which the concept of ‘wisdom literature’ was first exploited to its fullest extent.

9 (on κλῆθι): ‘pay heed’

‘Give ear to me’ (Most 2006, 87).

21 (on χατίζει): ‘v.l. χατίζει, ἔργοι χατίζειν sh(oul)d mean “out of work”; but if so, ὁς is relative, and the sentence is unfinished (possible?) S(inclair) takes it, doubtfully, to mean “slack”: then ὁς is demonstr(ative). χατίζει probably a false emendation?’

Dodds’ note is based on the account by Sinclair (1932) 4–5; the passage is a difficult crux. Sinclair and Dodds approach the text through ὁς, which either has ἔργοι χατίζειν as antecedent, or πλοίασων. West, *ad loc.*, takes a different approach by asking which of the available verbs (either in the text or acquired by conjecture) is the main verb.

34–5. Paley remarks ‘αὖθι is explained by the Schol. αὐτόθι and ἐν τῷ παρόντι’: Dodds writes: ‘so S(inclair)’


39 (on τῆνδε δύσομι): ‘this kind of justice (Mazon)’

See Mazon (1928) 87: ‘telle justice’. But see West (*ad loc.*): ‘The τῆνδε can only mean this (known) verdict’.

44 (on κ’ εἰς), in favour of the reading κεῖσ (Goettling), Dodds writes: ‘γρ(άφε) κεῖσ, so S(inclair)’

See Sinclair (1932) 8.

63–4. Paley writes ‘the short α in καλόν is fatal to the genuineness of the verse’: Dodds comments: ‘No, see Theog. 585’

καλὸς < *kalwó-; *w was lost in most Greek dialects, but at different times and therefore with different outcomes. In Attic, *w was lost without any further change; but in Ionic, when *w was lost after a consonant, the preceding vowel was lengthened. Hence minimal pairs (Attic: Ionic) ξένος: ξένος, νόσος: νοῦσος — and καλός: καλός. In epic, it is usual that the adjective has its Ionic shape, but 63 and *Th.* 585 are exceptions; emendation has been considered for both lines, but see Edwards (1971) 107.

66: ‘passion that makes the limb heavy (or cuts them — κεῖρω) but ῥπιοβόρους’
Dodds has noted the etymology of γυιόκορος ‘satiating, rendering listless, the limbs’ given by Paley (i.e. deriving the second member from κόρος); this is implausible, as other compounds of κόρος appear to have a nominal rather than verbal second member (i.e. derived from κόρος rather than κορέννῡμι). The other two etymologies are endorsed respectively by Goettling (κείρειν γυῖα, rejected out of hand by West, 1964, 159) and Gaisford, who adopts Stephen’s conjecture γυιοβόρους. The latter solution has also been endorsed by West, with reference to a supposed etymology of μελεδώνη as ‘limb eating’ (μέλεα, ἔδειν); see West (1964) 158–9. It has since been found in a mediaeval manuscript (West’s ψ42).

67 (on the suspicion that 69–80 are not genuine): ‘so W(ilamowitz)-M(oellendorff) — but why was it added?’

West (on 70–80) notes that Kirchhoff (1889) and Lisco (1903) had already proposed deletion of this passage.

79: ‘cf. v. 61: but φωνὴ = language, αὐδή = voice?’

The note addresses part of the crucial problem leading to the athetesis of 69–80 mentioned above: Hermes is said to give Pandora a voice at 79–80 while the job was given to Hephaestus at 61. Dodds’ note reflects the distinction made in the scholia (see Pertusi 1955, 41) which Paley regards as ‘forced and arbitrary’.

95 (on ἐμήσατο): ‘merely “brought about”? ἐλύσατο Paley’

Cf. West ad loc.: ἐμήσατο ‘has probably come to be a mere synonym of ἔρεξεν’.

96: Paley’s note is struck out, in the margin Dodds adds: ‘Hope is a blessing which is denied to men’

Contrast West ad loc.: Hope’s ‘detention in the jar, therefore, cannot mean that it was withheld from us, but on the contrary that is remained with us instead of being lost’, endorsing Paley over Dodds in this case.

99: Dodds has struck out the athetising brackets

106–8: ‘106–8 genuine, I think’

The lines are deleted by Goettling (1843) 173, Paley (1861) 18–19 and as late as 1902 by Rzach; they are seen as filler needed only to join the narrative of the Five Races to what precedes. 108 is bracketed in Mazon and Solmsen. Wilamowitz 54–5 and West, ad loc., ably defend 108. Wilamowitz on the ground that its removal creates a lacuna, West because gods and men ‘started on the same terms’; see further Meyer (1924) 34–5 = Heitsch (1966) 489. On the lines’ interpretation see Wakker (1990).

108: ‘refers to l. 122? or to the verses quoted in Paley’s note on 120’

108 reads ‘how the gods and mortal men were born from a common source’; 122 ‘good, walking the earth, the watchers of mortal men’, referring to the Golden Race who became δαίμονες. Presumably Dodds took ὁμόθεν to mean ‘alike’ in a less strict sense (contrast West ad loc. ‘properly of blood-relationship’). Paley’s note on 120,
however, quotes other hexameter verses on ‘common feasts’ between gods and men.

114: ‘ever unfaltering in their (dancing?) hands and feet’
Most (2006) 97: ‘they were always the same in their feet and hands, and delighted in festivals’. Dodds’ translation again is a picturesque version.

121 (on καὶ): ‘γρ(άφε) δὴ (Plato, S(inclair))’

126 (on πλουτοδόται): ‘the dead as fertility daemons’

132: ‘ἀνηβήσειε? MSS vary. “ἀν prob wrong” S(inclair)’
See Sinclair (1932) 19. Since ἀνηβᾶν usually means ‘grow young again’, it is out of place here. Its use at Call. H. 1.56 raises interesting questions about how old the corruption is: Callimachus may have based his usage on what he read in a faulty MS of Hesiod.

145 ‘cf. Il. xxii. 126, Od. xix. 126 ἀπὸ δρυὸς ἠδ’ ἀπὸ πέτρης ἦδ’ ἀπὸ πέτρης. A pre-Achaean motif, laughed at in Homer?’
The passage in Hesiod describes the appearance of men from trees (particularly ash-trees, see Wilamowitz (1928) 57–8 for the Norse tradition). The literature on the proverb, which also appears at Th. 35 (where see West’s very full note) is huge; see now J.T. Katz (2018).

150: ‘cf. the bronze appliqué in Mycenaean houses and Homer’s χαλκοβατὲς δῶ’
Dodds’ ‘bronze appliqué’ seems to be a version of Sinclair’s assertion (1932) 20 of bronze murals in Mycenaean times (echoed without further elaboration by West, ad loc.). For later ages, see Thuc. 1.128, 1.134, Paus. 3.17.2, 6.19.2. There seems to be no evidence in the archaeological record for this; it is hardly thinkable that such large pieces of bronze, had they existed, should have survived to the present day unmolested (my thanks to Dr Zosia H. Archibald, Liverpool, for discussion of this point). The assessment of the relationship between the myth of the five ages and the historical record is an extremely complex issue. Early positivist scholarship is summarised by Gatz (1967) 1, and more generally 1–6; Gatz saw a ‘new historicism’ emerging in contemporary Hesiod criticism (4). For the kinds of views reflected in Dodds’ note, see Rzach (1913) 1176, and more closely still Myres (1908) 127–8. See p. 3 of the lecture notes below on ‘Hesiod’s world’ (with footnotes).

152: ‘a genuine tradition of the wars that ended the great palace period at Knossos?’
See Burn (1936) 11–12 for an early view (earthquakes at Knossos are not sufficient as explanations for the collapse of society) and Myres (1908) 127–8. On memory of Mycenaean civilisation in epic, see Vermeule (1972) 309–12: this (perhaps derived from an earlier edition — the book was first published in 1964) might
reflect something of the view that Dodds adopts, though Vermeule is much more focussed on Homer than Hesiod.

160: ‘προτέρη γενεή? (So S(inclair)’
The reading was found on a papyrus, P. Genav. 94; see West in app. ad loc.

178 (on φθειρόμενοι): ‘wasting’
See now West ad loc. (note the misprint in the edition of 176 for 178), who conjectured τειρόμενοι convincingly on the basis of later parallels and the papyrus evidence; see Renehan (1980) 344. Most (2006) 103 now translates ‘being worn out by suffering’.

182–9: ‘S(inclair) compares Mark xiii.12’

182 (on ὀμοίους): ‘like-minded? But cf. v. 235’
Cf. Renehan (1980) 348: ‘the meaning here is “similar in disposition”, “like-minded”, thus also Most (2006) 103. The etymology proposed by Athanassakis (1976) is implausible. Dodds’ reference to 235 (τίκτουσι δὲ γυναῖκες ἐοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσι, ‘women bear children similar to their parents’) would make the reference of 182 one of literal similarity.

186: ‘βάζοντες dual makes no satisf(actory) sense’
Paley’s note gives a lot of detail on MSS readings and the secondary tradition; but as West points out ad loc. the dual could only refer to the parents, not to the children.

189 (on χειροδίκαι): ‘cf. Faustrecht, χειρὸς νόμος’
The formulation χειρὸς νόμος is given by Goettling (1843) 181. See D.L. Cairns (1993) 152 for the link between violence, the loss of aidōs, and the ‘iron race’.

191 (on ὑβρίν): ‘? read κακόν (Fick) and treat both κακόν and ὑβρίν as objects of ῥεκτῆρα’; “a piece of insolence”? or is this adj?’
West ad loc. rejects Fick’s idea out of hand; ὑβρίν is ‘apparently qualifying ἀνέρα … He is Hybris incarnate’. Dodds’ translation, it would seem, hits closer to the mark than the interpretations he records. Most (2006) 103 has ‘the doer of evil and the outrage man’.

200 (on Αἰδώς καὶ Νέμεσις): ‘i.e. sense of the shameful, the unfitting’
See Murray (1934) 82–3 on translating these terms (Murray suggests the quaintly archaic ‘Ruth and Wrath’). For aidōs and nemesis see D.L. Cairns (1993) 51–4.

202 (on αἶνον): ‘parable’
Interesting adoption of explicitly Biblical phraseology — other translations have ‘fable’ or ‘tale’.
— (on φρονέουσι και αὐτοῖς): ‘who know that the cap fits [the kings will treat us both as the hawk did the Nightingale]’
An example of Dodds’ spirited translation. Compare Most (2006) 105: ‘who themselves too have understanding’. Sinclair (1932) 25 remarks: ‘there is a sort of antithesis between αἶνον and φρονέουσι’; Dodds’ translation indicates a different view. The wisdom of the kings is precisely that they do understand the relevance of an αἶνος.

222–3: ‘i.e. justice returns invisibly after being cast out?’
‘Invisible’ likewise Paley and West (ad loc.).

232 (on δρῦς): ‘√tree’
In modern terms, from a paradigm *dóru, dreu̯-; the English form, via Germanic *trewa- (Gothic triu) reflects thematic *dreu̯o-.

248 (on βασιλεῖς): ‘βασιληὲς Rzach, S(inclair)’
The reading entails a synizesis paralleled also at 607, and removes from the text a late form of the nominative plural.

249 (on δίκην): “custom” S(inclair): but cf. l. 256’
Sinclair (1932) 29 suggests ‘right usage, good custom’, i.e. not in the sense of ‘vengeance’ or ‘punishment’ as translated by Mair (1908) 10 and Evelyn-White (1914) 21; Most (2006) 107 has ‘justice’. Paley capitalises the form Δίκη at 256 (likewise most editors). Dodds seems to be hinting that the idea may be personified here as well; editors have not as yet endorsed this view.

251–2: ‘i.e. the Men of the Golden Age?’
The phraseology echoes that at 123; where one might content oneself with a line number, Dodds’ marginal note underlines the issue at hand.

257 (on θεοῖς): ‘θεῶν S(inclair) from a papyrus, cf. δῖα θεάων’
The papyrus in question is P.Oxy. 1090 (West’s Π10); West himself does not adopt its reading (though he endorsed it in his note on Th. 240), but his commentary ad loc. does not argue against it.

270–3: ‘honesty only justifiable if it is the best policy’
A nice remark, worthy of note by the commentary literature on the poem.

281 (on γιγνώσκων): ‘answers to ἑκὼν’
‘emphasizing the correspondence between what he knows and what he says, as ἑκὼν emphasizes the divergence’ (West, ad loc.). The note is written in a markedly different hand to the note on Th. 540; consequently I do not think Dodds has derived this from West.

284–5: ‘the inherited curse [unHomeric]’
See now Gagné (2010) 2–3. Gagné cites Dodds (1951) 33; that passage only refers to Hesiod in passing. This marginal note shows that Dodds had indeed made the connection explored by Gagné.

289: “Before her gate high God did sweat ordain” (Spenser’)

The imitation of Hesiod by Spenser (Faerie Queen 2.3.41) was recognised already by Elton (1815) 37, and even earlier by the editor of Spenser Upton (1758) 2.447. If Dodds did not get it from his own knowledge of Spenser, another possible source is Merriam’s review of Jowett’s translation of Plato, which discusses Op. 289 in Plato’s citation at length, see Merriam (1893) 179–80. The reception of Hesiod by Spenser demands further study: Wolfe (2018) 439–40 is brief (and focuses almost entirely on Theogony); a useful collection of parallels is given by Revard s.v. ‘Hesiod’, in Hamilton (1990) 369–70.

291: ‘ίκηαι in Plato’s citation’


291–2: ‘sound answering to sense’

It is impossible to be sure what Dodds might have heard here. The repeated r-sounds might have been the salient factor. Dodds makes no general remarks about ‘sound effects’ in Hesiod in the lecture notes.

293 (on αὐτῷ): ‘R αὐτός, Aristotle, ?papyrus’

West (in app. ad loc.) records this reading at Arist. EN 1095b10, and on Π5 (P. Vindob. G 19815) and Π33 (P. Michigan 5138), but prints αὐτός.

294: Dodds has struck out the athetising brackets

The basis for the athetesis is that the verse is frequently omitted by the authorities that quote the lines (again, see Arist. EN 1095b10); see West ad loc., however. Dodds, it will be seen, repeatedly restores verses deleted by Paley (and others); see above on the difference in his reading of Op. and Th. on this point.

306–7: Dodds has struck out the athetising brackets

The objections to the lines are Paley’s: (i) 307 resembles 301; (ii) ἔργα is used without account of the digamma. But the resemblance is not so close as to rouse suspicion; as for digamma see 382.

306: Dodds has underlined ἔργα μέτρια κοσμεῖν, adding ‘manage a decent farm’

At several points, Dodds translates ἔργα as ‘farm’, see 549 and (less directly) 756; Paley’s translation of the title (1861) 5 is ‘farming operations and lucky and unlucky days’. See Dodds’ remarks in the lecture notes on the Works and Days as a ‘farmer’s vade mecum’. West is curiously silent on the subject.
Paley writes ‘Goetpling puts this verse within brackets’; Dodds adds: ‘so Mazon’

Cf. Mazon (1928) 97: the line has been relegated to the apparatus.

313: ‘ἀρετή includes economic good?’
For this notion, virtually a paraphrase of the line by Dodds, compare p. 3 of the lecture notes: ‘[Hesiod] identifies riches & happiness as the poor do everywhere always’.

314: ‘cf. Sophocles, O.C. γενναῖος πλὴν τοῦ δαίμονος’
The reference is to S. O.C. 76. The parallel, missed by West, is a further argument against Lehrs’ tentative conjecture (which ‘strikes a prison chaplain’s rather than a Hesiodic tone’ — thus West, ad loc.) δαμόων, ὧς ἔησθα. Less good, Gow (1917) 114.

320, trans. Paley as ‘wealth is not to be clutched at’: Dodds adds ‘so Mair’ ‘Property is not to be snatched’ (Most 2006, 112).

327–8, Paley writes of a ‘catalogue of offences ... giving a code of principal sins according to the early Hellenes. We do not find our notions of the graver crimes, murder, fornication, nor adultery in the general sense, here recognised’: Dodds comments: ‘No: these are violations against αἰδώς’.

See Murray (1934) 87 for this interpretation (referring to 327ff. as ‘five deadly sins’). For a modern treatment, see Cairns (1993) 148–56.

330 (on ἀλιταίνεται ὀρφανὰ τέκνα): ‘cf. Astyanax in Homer?’
See Il. 6.431–2 in general and 22.490–9 (cited also by West ad loc.) specifically.

339–41: ‘do ut des’

353: ‘be at hand for him who comes to you’
Most (2006) 117: ‘go visit those who visit you’. Dodds’ rendering requires a less proactive approach by the recipient of the advice.

378 (on θάνος): ‘θάνοι Hermann (Rzach, W[ilamowitz]-M[oellendorff])’
West ad loc. gives an account of these lines, including the discovery of Hermann’s conjecture (‘die leichte Verbesserung Hermanns’, Wilamowitz 1928, 86) on a papyrus (P. Michigan 6828 = Π19).

380 (on πλεῖον μὲν πλεῖόνων μελέτη): “the work of more” (Mair), “more goods to look after” (Waltz), “more sons to look after” (S[inclair])’
Most (2006) 119 follows Mair: ‘more hands, more work’.

381 (on ἕσων): ‘ἕσων as 2nd person S[inclair] with most MSS cf. Apoll. Rhod. iv. 1015’
Rather than ‘second person’ it is more accurate to relate the pronoun to the reflexives (thus West, ad loc.)

403 (on ἐπέων νομός): ‘the range of your eloquence’
Most (2006) 121: ‘the rangeland of your words’, a more pointed version of the metaphor.

406: ‘potential without ἄν? “who could at a pinch” (καί)’
Most (2006) 121: ‘one who can’; Dodds adds a colourful touch.

455: ‘T. W. Allen w(oul)d <…> “hasty” cf. ἂφνω — a less good sense’
The two words before “hasty” are illegible. See Allen (1897) 397. Allen’s suggestion, which he commends to the leniency of the etymologists, has not found favour; Dodds’ etymological judgement was sound. On ἂφνειός and ἂφνως see Willi (2004).

462: ‘many ed(itors) reject 462–4 (wrongly)’
The lines were deleted by Steitz (cf. Koechly & Kinkel 1870, 133, in app.) but few later editors have raised concerns. Mazon (1928) 103 reordered 462 and 463.

468 (on ὁρπηκα): ‘v.l. ὁρπηκα (Brunck)’
Brunck’s conjecture has since materialised on a mediaeval manuscript (Vat. gr. 57, 14th c.); see West ad loc.

469: ‘τυτθος codd. Waltz, W(ilamowitz)-M(oellendorff), Mair, S(inclair)’

481: ‘said to be the practice today in Attica and parts of France’
For the French practice, see P. Mazon (1914) ad loc.

492 (on πολιόν): “cloudy” (W[ilamowitz]-M[oellendorff]), cf. Apoll. Rhod. ἄηρ πόλιος’
Wilamowitz (1928) 100, citing a number of passages of Apollonius; Dodds is citing 3.275.

493 (on ἔπαλεα): “warm” Proclus, Mair; “crowded” Evelyn-White, S(inclair), Paley’
An etymological crux. The latest proposal on this word (characteristically ignored by Beekes 2010) is Jouanna (1983). He suggests that the group ἀλεύομαι, ἀλέομαι, ἀλεεινός, ἀλέα pertain to a root *ałew- ‘avoid, protect’ (in modern notation *h₃leũ-, cf. Tocharian B ǳḥyintra ‘they shall keep away’; the λέσχη is a ‘protecting’ place. The scansion suggests a formation *(ep-)ałw-ës; this is preferable to the view relating ἐπαλης to ἀλέα ‘heat’ < Proto-Greek *h₂walea < *sêlH-ea, cf. Lith. svilti ‘scorch’, OE swelan ‘burn’ pointing to a root *sêlH-, which requires the additional hypothesis (unstated in the handbooks) of metrical lengthening (a secondary association with the meaning ‘warm’ is no objection to this). Furthermore, zero-grade of the root in an s-stem adjective has important theoretical consequences
for this type of adjective, joining the evidence for hystero-kinetic inflection; for (sceptical) discussion of the issue see Meissner (2005) 160–5.

497 (on \(\pi\alpha\chi\nu\nu\)): ‘swollen (from chillblains?)’
Derived from Sinclair ‘swollen with frost-bite’, perhaps, but with an added picturesque detail. Most (2006) 127 n. 25 thinks of malnutrition; see West ad loc., including a telling entry in Hesychius s.v. \(\pi\alpha\chi\nu\pi\omicron\dot{a}\) (i.e. \(\pi\alpha\chi\nu\ \pi\omicron\dot{a}\)?)

499 (on \(\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\alpha}o\ \theta\eta\mu\dot{\iota}\dot{\omicron}\dot{\omega}\)): ‘addresses reproaches? gathers evil thoughts? latter fits 500 better’
Most (2006) 129 takes the opposite view to Dodds: ‘says many evil things to his spirit’; West ad loc. also assumes an act of self-address (comparing Od. 5. 298–9). Dodds may have based his view on Mair, who renders ‘garnereth many sorrows for his soul’ (1908, 18).

511: Dodds has struck out the athetising brackets
The athetesis appears to be Paley’s suggestion, and to be inadequately motivated.

526 (on \(\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\)): ‘Aeolism?’
This note may derive from Sinclair (1932) 57, but it may alternatively post-date the publication of West’s Theogony, where (1966, 83) this reading is energetically defended as an Aeolism; see also West ad loc. in more detail.

527 (on \(\kappa\nu\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\ ν\acute{\alpha}\dot{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\dot{\omega}\)): ‘Ethiopians?’
Thus Sinclair; see also West, ad loc.

530 (on \(\mu\nu\lambda\lambda\acute{i}o\omicron\nu\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\)): ‘chattering teeth √molar: but S(inclair) pr(efers) \(\mu\nu\kappa\acute{a}\omicron\mu\dot{\iota}\)’
The reference is to the root of the Greek word for ‘molar’ \(\mu\acute{\iota}\lambda\nu\nu\) (\(\iota\)); the difference in quantity is difficult, hence Dodds’ interest in Sinclair’s alternative. West ad loc. attributes the change in quantity to metrical lengthening.

538: ‘weave much woof on little warp’
Most (2006) 131: ‘Wind plenty of woof on a puny warp’; Dodds’ translation is punchier.

549 (on \(\mu\acute{\alpha}k\acute{a}\acute{r}ων \acute{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\)): ‘on the farms of happy rich men’
The correction brings the translation in line with Sinclair’s note (1932) 59.

—— (on \(\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\rho\ \pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\)): “fruitful mist”; -\(\omicron\nu\)s Hermann, <crossed out> but cf. the French saying “brouillard en février vaut du fumier”
The French proverb is cited in Mazon (1928) 106 n. 1 (whence recorded also by Sinclair ad loc.). Hermann’s conjecture is accepted and robustly defended by West (ad loc.); it also appears in a single mediaeval manuscript.
555 (on μείς): ‘month (mensis)’

562 (on ἵσωσθαι νῦκτας τε καὶ ἦματα): ‘let the long nights balance the long days’? [i.e. go to bed with the sun]’

567 (on παμφαίων): ‘if this means “shining all night”, it puts H. at beginning of c. viii (Waltz)’

West (ad loc.) gives a full review of the difficulties inherent in dating Hesiod by means of this line. Most (2006) 133 translates ‘shining brightly’.

——— (on ἀκροκνέφαιος): ‘on the edge of darkness, i.e. in the evening’

Most (2006) 133: ‘just at dusk’; I find Dodds’ rendering evocative.

568 (on ὀρθρογόη): ‘or ὀρθρογόη shrill crying’

See Livrea (1967) advocating for ὀρθρογόη, rightly acc. West ad loc.

569 (on ἐς φάος ἀνθρώποι): ‘into the sight of men [has she been underground?]’

Dodds’ comment leads me to think that he is not convinced by Paley’s case for deletion. The line refers to the swallow, i.e. Philomela, the victim of rape and mutilation in the story of Tereus and Procne.

587: Dodds deletes the athetising brackets

589–96: Dodds deletes the athetising brackets

589: Dodds marks a brevis over τε and adds ‘so Theog 345’; to Paley’s reference to ‘Homer’s occasional use of Σκάμανδρος, σκέπαρνον, &c.’, Dodds adds ‘but S(inclair) says this license is unknown in Homer — ?’

For σκέπαρνον, see Od. 5.237, 9.391; forms of Σκάμανδρος, Σκαμάνδριος are always in Homer preceded by a short open syllable which does not count as heavy; see Chantraine (1942) 110 (§47). The same applies to Th. 345. Sinclair (1932) 62, quoted and rightly doubted by Dodds, based his erroneous view on Solmsen (1905), but must have misread him, for Solmsen at 495–7 gives a full list of the relevant examples; see further his 503 for Hesiod, and add West (1966) 98–9.

——— (on βίβλινος): Dodds alters the first letter to a capital and adds the note ‘Thracian’

βίβλινος oinos would mean wine made of the papyrus plant — an implausible idea.

Rather, ‘wine from Byblis’ is meant, i.e. Thracian wine; see West ad loc.

606–8: ‘W(ilamowitz)-M(oellendorff) puts 606–8 after 601, since getting in litter sh(oul)d be done at the end of autumn after the harvest, while hiring extra help sh(oul)d not. So S(inclair). But there is a grim joke about housing your corn and unhousing your tenant?’
See Wilamowitz (1928) 109–10. Papyrus finds have yet to show whether this transposition was known in antiquity; West, *ad loc.*, defends the paradosis.

609: ‘Sept. 18’
‘Mid-September’ (*ad loc.*).

614–17: ‘genuine’, without deleting the brackets

617: ‘? “the fulfilment [i.e. the new season’s seed] lie, duly set, beneath the earth” [or R εἴῃ, jussive?]’

618 (on δυσπεμφέλου): “stormy” or “perilous in the transit”
The meaning of this word is a crux known to Hellenistic scholarship already; see Herodicus (Ath. 5. 222a = *SH* 494) with B. Cartlidge (forthc.).

622: ‘sound’, without deleting the brackets

639–40: ‘the farmer’s grumble’
Burn (1936) 32: ‘though Hesiod may grumble at the climate, the farm did prosper …’

647: ‘or put stop at θημόν and γρ(άφε) βουλέαι δὲ (with MS authority) … λιμόν;’
A bold rearticulation of the passage.

648 (on μέτρα): ‘rules? cf. ἄστρων μέτρα “the periods of the stars” (Sophocles)’
The reference is to S. fr. 432.8 Radt, first adduced by Gow (1931) 12.

662 (on ἄθεσφατον): ‘inspired’
Most (2006) 141 has ‘inconceivable’.

666 (on κανάξας): ‘Aeolism. κατ-γάξας = καφάξας = κανάξας’
See Rzach (1913) 1186, with references to earlier treatments; apocope and progressive assimilation of κατά is certainly an Aeolic feature (the characterisation of the change as ‘diphthongization of the vowel + f(½)’, by West (1966) 83, is less precise).

701 (on πάντα μάλ’ ἀμφὶς ἰδών): ‘after considering pros and cons’
Strikingly modern! Most (2006) 143 has ‘after you have looked around carefully in all directions’, a more literal rendering.

714: “let not your looks prove false your (alleged) feelings towards your friend”, i.e. accept his apologies gracefully? [al. do not flatter people]’

718: ‘Whoso mocketh the poor reproacheth his Maker’ (*Prov. xvii.5*)
Taken from Sinclair (1932) 73.

720 (on ἵούσης): ‘when it wags’
Of a speaking tongue. Dodds’ instinct for colourful translation is on show once again, but perhaps, with μέτρον, and thus of measured and appropriate speech, a charis to the speaker, not entirely appropriately in this case.

722 (on δυσπέμφελος): ‘standoffish? at a parish outing’
See above on 618.

740: (on κακότητι) ‘other ancient readings are 1. κακότητι ἰδέ “unwashed of hands and wickedness”: This as S(inclair) says, sounds Orphic: so most MSS. 2. κακότητι ἰδε “has seen an evil”: impossible? 3. κακότητι ἔπι “to his undoing”: anticipates 741. Mazon would reject 740–1, following Aristarchus. But Paley’s reading may be right?’
The reading under (1) is adopted by Solmsen (1990) and by West (‘a bold zeugma’, ad loc.). The impossibility of (2) may either be because of the lack of observance of digamma, or more likely because of the sense (‘he who enters a river with unwashed hands has seen evil’ — why has he?). The third reading is preserved in the scholia vetera and goes back to Proclus, who gives it as an alternative reading (paraphrasing ἐπὶ κακῶ); see Pertusi (1955) 225. Mazon’s ‘rejection’ of 740–1 (following Aristarchus’ athetesis, likewise reported in the scholia vetera) was tempered by the time of his 1928 Budé edition, where the lines are printed in the text. Assuming West’s ‘bold zeugma’ is the best procedure — a classic case of lectio difficilior, from which all other versions can be easily explained.

744–5: ‘+ superstitions about crossing objects are not exclusively Xtian, acc. to Sinclair. Rose explains that to put the wine under anything is to expose it to various dangers’
See Sinclair (1932) 76, Rose (1925) 139–40.

746: ‘γρ(άφε) ἀνεπίῤῥεκτον with some ancient edd.’
The reading of the majority of manuscripts is ἀνεπίξεστον; the alternative, going back to Proclus, is reported in the scholia (Pertusi 1955, 227). West, ad loc., points out that this would be best explained as ‘accidental anticipation’ of 748.

751 (on δυωδεκαταῖον): ‘cf. τριταῖος; 12 days old Sinclair and Mair [is a 12 days old baby likely to sit on a tomb?] 12 years old Paley and Waltz’
West ad loc. remarks ‘the scholiast strangely interprets as if δυωδεκατη’; see Pertusi (1955) 229. Paley and Waltz follow the scholiast’s line of thought (Goettling 1843, 239–40 already endorses this interpretation, which he attributes to Proclus). Mair (1908) 27 translates ‘a boy of twelve days’, but Sinclair is apparently silent on the issue.

756 (on μομενεύω ἀδῆλα): ‘mock what you don’t understand (e.g. someone else’s farming culture)?’
'make dark murmur' (Mair 1908, 27); ‘carp destructively’ (Most 2006, 149, following the interpretation of West, duce Richardson; see West ad loc.).

768: ‘when the calendar is accurate’

——— Paley’s note reads ‘perhaps we should read λαοῖς for λαοί’; Dodds adds ‘yes, if this explanation is right, which I doubt’

772 (on γε μέν): ‘however’

See Denniston (1950) 387 on ‘adversative γε μέν’ (citing Mair 1908, 8), and lviii for the different interpretation of 772 and 774. Dodds nowhere refers to Denniston’s book (first ed. 1934) explicitly, but this note may reflect his use of it.

818 (on ἀληθέα κυκλήσκουσι): ‘give it its right name viz. ἀρίστη?’

Other marginalia on the ‘days’ mostly record which day of the month is meant, as well as some isolated remarks on the text.

The marginalia show splendidly that combination of exact and humanistic scholarship for which Dodds was so well known. Russell said of Dodds that he ‘could clearly have been a notable translator’,10 and some of the marginal notes on Hesiod reflect both Dodds’ own talents in this area and his interest in the translations of others (striking translations have been recorded above). Dodds read this edition of Paley with a battery of multilingual scholarship at his side, and plainly used the edition while thinking Hesiod out afresh. It is all the more interesting that Paley is not named in the lecture notes; the marginalia are on the whole more technical than the (preserved portion of the) lecture notes are, though there are some complementary elements. A name that is perhaps most frequently mentioned is that of Sinclair, who had produced a more modern edition of the Works and Days than was Paley’s. One wonders why Paley’s edition had been made the basis of Dodds’ work, rather than Rzach (1902), the editio maior, or why Dodds had not worked straight from Sinclair (1932). The unique status of Paley’s book — a complete annotated edition of Hesiod — probably ensured its role in Dodds’ study of the poet.11

If Dodds was lecturing on Hesiod as a ‘general book’ at Oxford, as part of a ‘circus’ given by different lecturers on a range of texts, it is likely that the more linguistic aspects of the notes did make their way into the

lecture. But a more intriguing possibility is suggested in the next section.

2. The Lecture Notes

The character of the notes is revealing: an introduction to Hesiod for Dodds meant an account of the poet’s life and work, his relation to Homer, and his role in the formation of ‘didactic’ literature (comparing the *Works and Days* to Lucretius as well as the *Georgics*). Furthermore, there is a short statement of the poetic qualities of Hesiod’s composition: I am assured that this would have been highly unusual in mid-century Oxford lectures; for that matter, it is not especially common now. On the whole, this fits with the scope of sections devoted to Hesiod in histories of Greek literature in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: biographies, followed by appraisals of the individual poems, some comment on Hesiod’s poetry and wider thematic interests, as a rule in explicit contrast with a preceding chapter on Homer. Of particular note is the account given by Sinclair of the *Works and Days* in his history of Greek literature, which I set out at length (omitting the odd phrase) for comparison with Dodds’ lecture:

The way of life which is the main theme of the *Works and Days* may be summed up in the advice “Work hard and do right”. ... for the first time in Greek history we find a man who judged deeds by their rightness and not their strength, brilliance or cleverness. There is a quality of moral earnestness in Hesiod which is reminiscent more of Hebrew prophets than of anything in Greek literature ... Further, like many amateur moralists and earnest preachers, Hesiod did not distinguish between moral and non-moral. Everything man does must be either right or wrong ... If you wish to obtain sufficient wealth — and it is assumed that you do — you must act justly and work hard. Just as acting justly is

---

12 Dodds (1977) 180 does not explicitly mention Hesiod among his lecture courses; the record of Dodds’ teaching at Oxford gathered by Rutherford, in Stray et al. (2019), does not include any mention of lectures about Hesiod. The notes may therefore reflect preparation for a lecture given in a less formal setting — a Classics society, at a college or a local branch of the Classical Association, perhaps even a school — or perhaps teaching at Birmingham. Hesiod formed part of the Mods syllabus at Oxford in the Sixties (in 1966, *Works and Days* plus *Theogony* 1–34, 507–616) and presumably earlier, so this might have formed part of a lecture for these purposes too (my thanks to Chris Pelling for discussion of this point).

13 Donald Russell and Chris Pelling (p.c.).

14 Sinclair (1934) 66–7.
demonstrated by a series of examples and precepts without which Hesiod knew his advice would be disregarded or not understood, so in the matter of work it was useless to tell many people, especially Perses, to work hard if they did not know how and when work was to be done. Hesiod’s long description of a year’s work on a farm is not an interpolation of a separate poem but a very important part of his teaching and which for him was just as much part of morality as the rest. Besides, for most people in this world the problem how to live at all comes before the problem how to live aright.

The Biblical comparisons (which Sinclair gives at length in his edition of the poem and which Dodds frequently adopts), the identification of wealth as a major theme of the poem, and the unitarian view of the poem’s structure are all echoed in Dodds’ notes. Sinclair, however, makes only a single comment on Hesiod’s style (almost certainly to be read as a significant silence).

At several points, Burn (1936) also seems to inform Dodds’ perspective. The following passage fits well with Dodds’ manner of presentation:

Certainly Hesiod’s outlook is pessimistic. We live in the Iron Age, even harder than the Age of Bronze, and the days of Gold are far away. The nobles who govern us are predatory and corrupt (Works, 36) but it is no use complaining. A stronger has got you, as the Hawk said to the Nightingale in the fable (207). The gods have hidden Life from men (42), and that is why we have to work so hard.

Dodds’ introductory lecture, then, aimed at a comprehensive examination of the text, going beyond the purely philological and text critical. The lectures are interested in the text as literature. It is tempting to relate this to Dodds’ post-war lectures on Homer in particular, but in fact it is more reasonable to think of this as part of Dodds’ conception of ancient literature in general.

Those familiar with Dodds’ general interests will be entirely unsurprised by the extensive remarks on Hesiod’s theology and eschatology,
including its relationship to Judaeo-Christian thought; the more general conception of the poem stresses its religious purpose over its practical ‘didactic’ quality, while the passage dealing with this in detail is by far the most fluently written passage in the notes. It is all the more intriguing that this passage bears no small resemblance to a section of *The Greeks and the Irrational*. I give the passage at length, with some excision of some (for these purposes) extraneous material:

19

In Mainland Greece … the Archaic Age was a time of extreme personal insecurity. The tiny overpopulated states were just beginning to struggle up out of the misery and impoverishment left behind by the Dorian invasions, when fresh trouble arose: whole classes were ruined by the great economic crisis of the seventh century, and this in turn was followed by the great political conflicts of the sixth, which translated the economic crisis into terms of murderous class warfare … Moreover, insecure conditions of life might in themselves favour the development of a belief in daemons, based on the sense of man’s helpless dependence upon capricious Power; and this in turn might encourage an increased resort to magical procedures … It is also likely, as I suggested earlier, that in minds of a different type prolonged experience of human injustice might give rise to the compensatory belief that there is justice in Heaven. It is doubtless no accident that the first Greek to preach divine justice was Hesiod — ‘the helot’s poet’, as King Cleomenes called him, and a man who had himself smarted under ‘crooked judgements’. Nor is it accidental that in this age the doom overhanging the rich and powerful becomes so popular a theme with poets — in striking contrast to Homer, for whom, as Murray has observed, the rich men are apt to be specially virtuous.

The phrase ‘the first Greek to preach divine justice’ in the book is very similar to the notes’ formulation ‘Hesiod invented divine justice because he lived in a dark age’; the notion of gods or a god being ‘a Power’ is likewise reflected in the notes. Similar observations occur in Dodds’ essay ‘The ancient concept of progress’. The similarities are at least revealing of something of the cast of Dodds’ thought on Greek poetry. Whether the other passage of *The Greeks and the Irrational* dealing with Hesiod (80–1) was also reflected in these notes is a moot point. The book was based on the series of Sather Lectures given by Dodds in 1949–50. I am

19 Dodds (1951) 44–5.
20 Dodds (1973) 3–4.
21 The Sather Professorships were instituted at the University of California, Berkeley, on the initiative of Benjamin Ide Wheeler and the generosity of Jane K. Sather in
inclined to think that the notes antedate these Lectures, as otherwise Dodds might, for his own purposes, have jotted a reminder to use his own material, but self-quotation from memory or self-paraphrase cannot be ruled out. The role of Sather Professor included a light teaching requirement; it is a tempting speculation that these notes were preparatory material worked up with this purpose in mind, but Dodds’ teaching at Berkeley focussed on Greek tragedy.

In terms of the notes’ place in intellectual history, one can make a few observations. Modern scholarship on Hesiod was changed entirely by the commentaries of Martin West on *Theogony* (Oxford, 1966) and *Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978). It is interesting to compare West’s approach to the kind of take on Hesiod outlined in these few pages. Dodds taught West, and was elected Honorary Fellow of University College, Oxford, in 1960, just before West’s own appointment to the Tutorial Fellowship there in 1963. Even if West rapidly developed an entirely independent line of thought about Hesiod, some possible connections between Dodds’ notes and West’s commentaries can be traced. I interpret such connections as reflecting contemporary understandings of ancient literature as much as any particular observations on Hesiod Dodds and West may ever have made in each other’s hearing (whether over tutorial sherry or high table port); certainly I infer nothing so crude as a ‘stemma’ of intellectual influence. As a trivial example, one might cite West’s hope (*Theogony*, viii) that his commentary on *Theogony* might correct the view that it is a less interesting poem than the *Works and Days*; this is a view set down by Dodds in these notes. With Dodds, West shares the view that Hesiod was not a professional rhapsode, indeed he develops that view in more detail. However, Dodds seems inclined to accept the idea that the *Theogony* might not be genuine, while West argues forcefully for the *Theogony* being the poem with which Hesiod made his name. Dodds, like West, rejects the idea that the *Works and Days* was ‘an early Greek Georgics’, and draws on contemporary scholarship making use of the

1914. Professors, distinguished visitors from other institutions, offer a course in one term and a series of six lectures in the other; these lectures are as a rule worked up into a book. See further Dow (1965) and the informative website of the professorship [https://www.classics.berkeley.edu/people/sather/history](https://www.classics.berkeley.edu/people/sather/history) (accessed 10/9/19).

22 I am grateful to the Archivist of University College (Oxford), Robin Darwall-Smith, for these details.


concept of ‘wisdom literature’. The characterisation of the genres within *Works and Days* as a whole is shared: with Dodds compare West (1978) 1. It is clear, however, that Dodds thinks of Hesiod as later than Homer (the notes to the text give references to relevant bibliography on this vexed question). The remarks on the poetics of Hesiod reveal an interesting contrast with modern preoccupations: one would today expect more discussion of the reception of Hesiod. Indeed, this is a positive industry in modern study of the poet. Dodds is not unaware of the potential for comparison with later literature (see the marginal note on *Op. 289*, for example), but it is — in these notes at least — nowhere the focus.

On the physical character of the notes only a little need be said. The notes are written in a blue-black ink, with some additions in pencil; some of these additions make the connection of thought clearer, add details, or nuance what has been written in pen. One of the pencil notes includes the single reference to Sinclair (1932); this is not of course evidence that the ink portions were drafted before that date, especially given the dense use of Sinclair’s book in the marginalia to *Works and Days*. In the transcription, (?) marks any doubt in the transcription, and a footnote explains if necessary; <this> indicates pencil; \this/ indicates material raised above the line; abbreviations (other than obvious names) are expanded in [square brackets] (the occasions on which Dodds himself uses square brackets should not cause confusion). The footnotes do not attempt to give a complete bibliography of the Hesiodic scholarship that engages with the ideas raised by Dodds; as well as citing the ancient evidence for convenience, they merely attempt to be indicative of later trends and to cite some of the standard handbooks and guides to modern Hesiodic scholarship. It is assumed that interested readers will have ways of tracking further references down.

***

26 West (1978) v, after the charming incident of his ‘waggish pupil’; Dodds cites the introduction of Mair (1908) whose conception of wisdom literature is entirely Biblical. For a considerably broader take on the subject, see West (1978) 3–25.

27 Already in 1962 the Hesiod volume produced by the Fondation Hardt in the *Entretiens* series was entitled *Hésiode et son influence*. For recent developments, see Koning (2010); Zogas (2013); Hunter (2014); Van Noorden (2015); Stamatopoulou (2017); and Vergados (2017). Well over half of Loney & Scully (2018) is dedicated to ancient (193–410) and modern (413–94) receptions.
Notes for introductory lecture
on Works and Days

1. Life

Homer impersonal; Hesiod personal. The W&D stars from a personal incident, tho[ugh] it develops into a farmer’s vade mecum. H. tells us: (1) his father a fact merchant of Cyme (Aeolis in Asia) who came ‘fleeing poverty’ to Ascra under Helicon; (2) Perses brought suit ag[ain]st him before the ‘kings’ of Thespiae and won it by bribery. But in the poem (396) P. is reduced to beg from H.; <ἐργάζευ, νήπιε Πέρση> (3) H. never crossed sea but once, to compete in poetry at funeral games in Chalcis, like a Welsh farmer at an Eisteddfod. (Authenticity denied by Plut. & some mod. editions.) Later legends: defeat of Homer; exile to Ozolian Locris (wh. some accept); the murder; the dolphins (or the faithful dog): <see Sinclair for details>

What was H.? Not a professional rhapsode like Demodocus at courts of kinds, not a crofter in a highland village. Hence v. banal(?), v. realistic, v. naif: but he knew his Homer & doubtless chanted him in his spare time.

---

29 See Burn (1936) 35–6.
32 Op. 650–62. This passage has been a central focus of modern Hesiod scholarship; see Rosen (1990) and Steiner (2005).
33 For Plutarch’s athetesis, recorded by Proclus and thence the Hesiod scholia, see West (1978) 319, and 67–9 on Plutarch’s and Proclus’ Hesiod scholarship more generally. The scholia vetera on Works and Days are edited by Pertusi (1955), for which see West (1978) 71 n. 3.
34 The account of the ‘contest’ in the Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi; see now Bassino (2018).
35 I find no indication in the sources that Hesiod had been exiled to Locri. For the relation of this tradition to the text of the Works and Days, see now Bershadsky (2011) 17–22.
36 Thuc. 3.96; Plut. sept. sap. conv. 162d.
37 Dolphins: Plut. sept. sap. conv. 162e, and see Beaulieu (2015) 120–9 for the comparison with the Arion story, e.g. in Hdt. 1.23–4; dog: Plut. de soll. animal. 969e; dolphin and dog together: Plut. de soll. animal. 984d.
38 Sinclair (1932) xxxvii–xlv.
2. Date. No direct/int[ernal] evidence except style:

- Hdt. said 400 years before <i.e. c. ix> himself: 40
- Parian marble said 61 years — before 1st Olympiad <776>. 41

Some incl. Parian marble/made him earlier than Hom., 42
some contemp[orary], 43
some later. 44
But certain that he borrows from Hom., not v[ice] v[versa]: 45
definitely a later civilisation: monarchy declining; 46
civil law & moral speculation beginning. 47
If Semonides of Amorgos knew him, as seems prob[able], he is earlier than c. vii. 48
Solon & others quote him in c. vi. 49
Most modern authorities say c. viii, but he may be earlier?

= P. 2

3. Writings

(a) W&D; (b) the Theogony; (c) Shield. Hesiodic Spa. 50
Inhabitants of Helicon recognised only W&D as authentic (Pausanias); 51
& author of Theogony uttered speaks of H. in third person, apparently as somebody

---

39 A fascinating deletion. One wonders if Dodds had a change of heart on the point,
or if he saved the exploration of the matter for another place.

40 Hdt. 2.53.

41 Parian Marble, FGrH 239.28–9; see now Rotstein (2016).

42 Hesiod earlier: Hippias B 6 D.-K., Ar. Ran. 1032–6, Pl. Ap. 41a. This position has
been championed in modern times by M.L. West: see West (1966) 46–7; West (1995)
= West (2011a) 188–208; West (2011b).

43 Hesiod and Homer contemporaries: Hdt. 2.53, Alcidamas (i.e. the ultimate source
of the Certamen, see n. 33).

44 Hesiod later: Xenophanes (apud Gell. 3.11.2), Heraclides Ponticus (fr. 177
Wehrli).


46 Burn (1936) 108–9.

47 See Rzach (1913) 1176; Burn (1936) 73–4.

48 Cf. Semonides fr. 6 West ~ Op. 702–3; for other reminiscences of Hesiod in early
Greek poetry see West (1966) 40 n. 4.


50 Very unclear, but perhaps an abbreviation for ‘spuria’. But the other poems in the
Hesiodic corpus see Schwartz (1960) 199–264, and more recently the papers in
Tsagalis (2017a); on the Catalogue of Women see Schwartz (1960) 265–483; West
(1985); Hunter (2005); Ormand (2014).

51 Pausanias 9.31.4.
distinct from himself.\textsuperscript{52} Shield now generally regarded as later.\textsuperscript{53} Both far less indiv\textsuperscript{i} and interesting than W&D.

4. W. & D.

loose constr\textsuperscript{u}ction  (a) exhort\textsuperscript{a}tion to Perses 1–382

(b) advice on agriculture, w\textsuperscript{i}th appendix on navigation 383–694 (Works)

(c) collection of wisdom, moral & religious 695–764

(d) calendar (Days) 765–end\textsuperscript{55}

Hesiodic Question again: e.g. Lehrs thought only (b) and (d) original,\textsuperscript{56} \textlt<Murray rejected (a)>/.\textsuperscript{57} But this makes Perses a fiction, or makes the second part build the first poem into a very unnatural personal framework.\textsuperscript{58} Wilamowitz etc. reject (d):\textsuperscript{59} but Heraclitus knew the ‘Days’ as Hesiod’s.\textsuperscript{60} Modern opinion tends to accept whole as genuine; apart fr\textsuperscript{om} minor interpolations. Prob\textsuperscript{a}bly H. wrote a bit now & a bit again, & advice to Perses gradually turned into advice to the world. \textlt<Doubtless much of the proverbial wisdom is traditional>.

\textsuperscript{52} Cf. Waltz (1906) 35 n. 2; for the biographical readings of \textit{Theogony} see Stoddard (2004) 1–33.

\textsuperscript{53} Modern treatment of the question with full bibliography by Stamatopoulou (2013).

\textsuperscript{54} Perhaps for ‘individual’, but the writing is unclear. On the ‘individuality’ of Hesiod see already the remarks in Schmid & Stählin (1929) 248, Lesky (1957–8) 94 (I cite this as the edition Dodds is more likely to have consulted); further on the \textit{Works} and \textit{Days} West (1981) 53–67 = West (2011a) 146–58. On the ‘individuality’ or otherwise of the Aspis, see Martin (2005).

\textsuperscript{55} The scheme adopted here is identical to that in Wright (1907) 56; while Dodds may have developed it independently (and does not copy Wright’s headings for each section), the four-part division is not a rule in general accounts of the poem, many of which favour more fine-grained divisions.

\textsuperscript{56} See Lehrs (1837) 221–48.

\textsuperscript{57} See Murray (1906) 56–7.

\textsuperscript{58} Precisely the unusual nature of the personal framework led West (and others) to think that Perses must be real; see West (1978) 34.

\textsuperscript{59} Wilamowitz (1928) 8; cf. Mahaffy (1883) 1.105. Rose (1948) 58 n. 4 terms this ‘the only question now seriously debated’; see M.P. Nilsson (1911) 438–9 with n. 1; Sinclair (1932) Ivi; Solmsen (1949) 76 n. 1; Lesky (1957–8) 97; Solmsen (1963). This might put Dodds ahead of the intellectual fashion, or indicate that this was to be a post-war lecture. For modern discussion of the issue, see Quaglia (1973) 229–42; West (1978) 346–7; Lardinois (1998).

\textsuperscript{60} Heraclitus B 106 D.-K., a testimony neglected by Wilamowitz.
5. Hesiod and Homer:61 (i) H. didactic, Hom. not.62 In what sense didactic: (a) not \mainly/ an attempt to make the common beautiful (like Georgics) and to make the abstract vivid, concrete (like Lucretius): he writes verse because memory is the mother of the Muses. (b) Not making a practical manual of agriculture: the moral purpose dominates the agricultural: the farmer’s year preaches the gospel of work. H. wants to put the farmer in touch w[ith] the gods & w[ith] the world: hence history of the world to date, theological scheme of things, and mixture of religious & practical precepts. Cf. wisdom literature (Mair):63 Same mixture of utilitarianism, protection(?) of divine justice: material rewards for goodness: parables, proverbs.

(ii) Hesiod’s world.64 The age of heroes is gone: they were all killed by πόλεμος \τε/ κακὸς καὶ φιλοπίς αἰνή.65 No longer ad Fighting no longer the most respectable of all professions. Homer on piracy.66 H. knows that piracy is (a) dangerous to the pirate, (b) a violation of the rights of private property. All the people he knows are in agriculture or trade. But they are mostly bad people, like Perses. 174ff. This is the iron age: πλείη μὲν γαῖα κακῶν, πλείη δὲ θάλασσα.67 The result of a Fall by mankind and Pandora’s Box <theft of fire = apple Pandora = Eve> the descent from Golden Age (Garden of Eden) to Iron Age. \[Heroic age a bit of history interpolated]/.68

How can we get back? (a) by keeping on the right side of the gods (b) by

61 For a systematic modern comparison see Koning (2010), but most literature on Hesiod has some remarks to make about Homer.
62 Cf. Nestle (1966) 44: ‘[Hesiod] will nicht unterhalten, wie Homer, sondern er will lehren und erziehen’.
63 Mair (1908) xii–xiv, 162. ‘Didactic’ vs. ‘wisdom’ literature: contrast the remarks e.g. in Mair (1908) xi (who vacillates), or Sinclair (1932) xi ‘didactic and admonitory medley’, with West (1966) 1–16, West (1978) 3–25. For more recent treatments of the problem see Heath (1985) 245–63, and Nightingale (2000) 156–91.
66 It is unclear what passage Dodds might have in mind, but see Od. 17.419–44, esp. 425–44.
working hard & getting rich: "if you want to be rich, ὧδ᾿ ἔρδειν καὶ ἔργον ἐπ᾿ ἔργῳ ἐργάζεσθαι". He identifies riches & happiness as the poor do everywhere always (cf. ὁλβίος “well-off”). In the Golden Age “they were rich in sheep, dear to the blessed gods” and lived without work or worry. But now there is nothing for it but work. Utilitarianism: justice necessary, lest we be punished: but don’t give something for nothing.

καὶ δόμεν ὃς κεν δῶ, καὶ μὴ δόμεν ὃς κεν μὴ δῶ

Pay your labourer his wages — and have a witness even if he is your brother. Don’t trust these wheedling women who are always trying to get money out of you. Have only one son, so as to keep your farm intact. This is the ancient, universal wisdom of the peasant, handed from mouth to mouth at the λέσχη (= pub). Just so old men talk today in chimney corners in Shropshire & Achill, in Normandy & the Black Forest.

But H. prophet as well as peasant: early hymns, modes (Pythia invented hexameter?)

The Gods. More mysterious & t than Homer’s: powers rather than persons, making the world silent & invisible. This is older <i.e. gods as powers>

= P. 4

than Homeric anthropomorphism — wh[ich] prob[ably] came into Greece from the North in the Achaean invasion. Hom’s gods just enjoy themselves like human beings: H’s have a moral plan(?) — to punish injustice,

---

69 Cf. e.g. Op. 637.
70 Op. 113.
71 Op. 354.
72 Op. 370–1; however, see West (1978) 249–50 for possible grounds for athetesis.
74 Op. 376–7. The style of this paragraph, in virtual quotation, echoes the paraphrase of Sinclair (1934) 70.
76 Cf. Pliny NH 7.57, Paus. 10.5.7.
78 Burn (1936) 44: ‘a preoccupation with unseen powers that is quite absent from Homer’; Nestle (1966) 46: ‘Die Götter sind kosmische und ethische Mächte’. See the remarks (in a book dedicated to Dodds) of Dodds’s pupil Adkins (1970) 50: ‘One could never guess from Homer’s portrayal of the Olympian gods the dark and bloody myths of the earlier generations of gods which appear in Hesiod’s Theogony’.
79 For this conception of Minoan or Pre-Greek religion being non-anthropomorphic, see Evans (1901). On the ‘Achaean invasion’, see Burn (1936) 46–7 (with refutation of
reward the virtuous. This view of the universe always arises when people are very depressed: Hesiod invented divine justice because he lived in a dark age after Troy & Crete & Mycenae had become remote legends. The Jews invented the Last Judgement & Resurrection when they were in captivity in Babylon.\textsuperscript{80} The X\textsuperscript{tian} heaven & the X\textsuperscript{tian} Hell were developed if not invented in the days of the persecutions.\textsuperscript{81} Hes. hopes for his reward in this life: but he also believes in special rewards after death for some people: the Heroes went to the Isles of the Blest, the Silver Men are \textit{μάκαρες θνητοὶ ὑποχθόνιοι}, the Golden Men are \textit{δαίμονες, φύλακες θνητῶν ἄνθρωπων}.\textsuperscript{82} ≠ Hom. (but cf. the case of Menelaus).\textsuperscript{83}

6. H. as poet:\textsuperscript{84} If more reflective than Hom., H. is far less imaginative.\textsuperscript{85} When his imagination works, it is often vague, bizarre, rather impressive: e.g. the Silver Age of men who never grow up (127ff.)\textsuperscript{86} <But> H’s realistic/pictorial skill:\textsuperscript{87} e.g. the farmer’s midday rest 582ff. Nature here as in Homer is the decorative background of the human scene. Nature is an intimate enemy in H. Practical thoughts never far away: he notes the first cuckoo, but notes it as a sign to the farmer that he must get to work & plough.\textsuperscript{88} — H’s enigmatic terms: The Boneless One \textit{<cuttlefish>/}.\textsuperscript{89}

earlier, racial interpretations). On the question of Pre-Greek and Indo-European elements in Greek religion (including history of the criticism of Evans), see W. Burkert (1985) 15–53.

\textsuperscript{80} Barton & Muddiman (2001) 10: ‘the Exile seems to have been the crisis that first focused the minds of Israel’s thinkers on the problem of how to make sense of apparently unjust suffering’.


\textsuperscript{82} Op. 141, 122–3.

\textsuperscript{83} Hom. \textit{Od}. 4.561–9.


\textsuperscript{85} Rose (1948) 60–1 contrasts Hesiod’s ‘reflective’ qualities and ‘earnestness’ with Homer.

\textsuperscript{86} Op. 131–2.

\textsuperscript{87} Cf. Mahaffy (1883) 108: ‘much fine and vigorous painting ... quaint and happy thoughts, expressed in terse and suitable words’; see also West (1978) 54 on Hesiod’s ‘taste for description for its own sake’ (differently Sinclair 1934, 71: ‘Rarely does he dwell long on descriptions’!)


\textsuperscript{89} Op. 524. A controversial identification. The view that \textit{ἀνόστεος} refers to the octopus (‘not the cuttlefish, as Paley and Mair have it’, West, \textit{ad loc.}) goes back to Antigonus of Carystus (\textit{Mir}. 21.1); see Jouanna (1983) 209–12, and the full literature review in Bagordo (2009) 32–4 n. 3. Others have proposed the snail, see Beall (2001) 159–60; Bagordo (2009) 38–40 with n. 18. Bagordo’s own view, building on contributions by Watkins and Campanile, is that the ‘boneless one’ is an impotent man
<φερέοικος snail>, the Three-legged One \(<γέρων>/. the Five-Branched One \(<\text{hand}>/. Are these dictated by avoidance of a dangerous name. Other explanations in Mair.

Dialect Homer’s Ionic plus a few Aeolisms (αἴνημι, τριηκόντων: from his father?), a few Doricisms (τέτορα: influence of Delphi?).

Ben Cartlidge
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masturbating (ὅν πόδα τένδει, with ‘foot’ used as a metaphor for ‘phallus’) during the winter. Watkins’ interpretation was published in 1978.

90 Op. 571.
91 Op. 533.
93 The concept Dodds is applying is that of the ‘taboo’ name, which has to be replaced in speech with an oblique description or a distorted form. Mair (1908) xvii refers to the language of Scottish fisherman: see now Lockwood (1955); Knooihuizen (2008) 106–8.
95 In general, see Edwards (1971).
96 Aeolisms in Hesiod: West (1966) 82–4, 90; West (1978) 30 with n. 3. This last note echoes Dodds’ observation that reminiscence of Hesiod’s father could have provoked stronger Aeolic dialect features; could the ‘Irishman’ in West’s note be Dodds? See West’s obituary (1979) 30 = (2013) 482 on Dodds’ ‘strong, unmusical Irish voice’.
97 Doricisms in Hesiod: for an early view see Wright (1907) 55. See now Morpurgo Davies (1964); West (1966) 85–90; West (1978) 31 with n. 4.
N. Bershadsky, ‘A Picnic, a Tomb, and a Crow: Hesiod’s Cult in the *Works and Days*’, *HSCP* 106 (2011) 1–45
J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1950²)
A. Evans, ‘Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult’, *JHS* 21 (1901) 99–204
C. Goettling, *Hesiodi Carmina* (Gotha, 1843)
A.S.F. Gow, ‘Miscellaneous Notes on the *Works and Days*’, *CQ* 11/3 (1917) 113–18
A.S.F. Gow, ‘ΜΕΤΡΑ ΘΑΛΑΣΣΗΣ’, *CR* 45/1 (1931) 10–12
E. Heitsch (ed.), *Hesiodos* (Darmstadt, 1966)
C.F. Hermann, *Platonis Dialogi VI* (Leipzig, 1902)
A. Koechly & G. Kinkel, *Hesiodea quae supersunt carmina* (Leipzig, 1870)
K. Lehrs, *Quaestiones Epicae* (Königsberg, 1837)
A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Bern, 1957–8)
E. Lisco, *Quaestiones Hesiodeae criticæ et mythologicae* (Göttingen, 1903)
W.B. Lockwood, ‘Word Taboo in the Language of the Faroese Fishermen’, *TPS* 54 (1955) 1–24
P. Mazon, Hésiode, Les Travaux et les Jours (Paris, 1914)
P. Mazon, Hésiode (Paris, 1928)
E. Meyer, ‘Hesiods Erga und das Gedicht von den fünf Menschengeschlechtern’, *Kleine Schriften II* (Halle, 1924) 15–66
A. Morpurgo Davies, “‘Doric’ Features in the Language of Hesiod’, *Glotta* 42 (1964) 138–65
G. Most, ‘Hesiod’s Myth of the Five (or Three or Four) Races’, *PCPS* 43 (1997) 104–27
W. Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos* (Aalen, 1966 [first ed. 1941])
M.P. Nilsson, ‘The Sickle of Kronos’, *BSA* 46 (1951) 122–4
A. Pertusi, *Scholia Veterea in Hesiodi Opera et Dies* (Milan, 1955)
H.J. Rose, *Primitive Culture in Greece* (London, 1925)
A. Rzach, *Hesiodi Carmina* (Leipzig, 1902)


F. Solmsen, ‘Die metrischen Wirkungen anlautender Consonantengruppen bei Homer und Hesiod’, *RhM* 60 (1905) 492–504

F. Solmsen, *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Cornell, 1949)


F. Solmsen, ‘The “Days” of the Works and Days’, *TAPA* 94 (1963) 293–320


C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Poetry in Fragments. Studies on the Hesiodic Corpus and Its Afterlife* (Berlin & Boston, 2017a)


J. Upton, *Spenser’s Faerie Queen with Notes* (London, 1758)


E. Vermeule, *Greece in the Bronze Age* (Chicago, 1972)

I. Wærn, *ΓΗΣ ΟΣΤΕΑ. The Kenning in Pre-Christian Greek Poetry* (Uppsala, 1951)


M.L. West, ‘Eric Robertson Dodds’, *University College Record* 7/5 (1979) 229–30
U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Hesiods Erga* (Berlin, 1928)
W.C. Wright, *A Short History of Greek Literature* (New York, 1907)
Notes on Introducing lecture
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1

Homeric hero: H. / Hercules. H. W. 0. Start. Fm. a person
in the city. This develops into a journey. Note name. H. fills us.
W. H. is founder. H. merchant of Argos (Athens to Asia) who
came for prospect to Attica under Helen. H. Pearson brought
this up. Rule the Thessalians. Greece goes it by birey.
But in the feud 137 2 P. is reduced to beg from 
the
men. (137 6) P. is reduced to beg from H. B. 11.

What was it? Not a professional robber with little
Demodocus at court of kings, but a citizen in a small
village. Hence no brute, no animal, no word. But he
knew his xonon. Doughters chanted him in his name.

2


But certain that he founded from homo, note W. 19th, a date.

island: In the course of time, and which is called the
civilization. Secondly recognizing, civilized, rough, 
uncivilized.

Beginning. If there were of strange names him was seen
19th. He is called, then. 19th. 19th. This quote him
in civ. Note modern antiqueties say CIVI, but he
may be earlier.
AN OVERSEAS LOOK AT BRITISH SCHOLARS:
PROSOPOGRAPHIE UND ADMINISTRATION DES
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ABSTRACT

At the FIEC 2019 Congress in London, as part of a panel discussion about the history of the Roman Society, the author was asked to speak on ‘The Development of Roman Studies in Britain from an Overseas Perspective’. In this paper, which stems from that presentation, the topic is discussed through a focus on the development of prosopographical methods since the publication of the Prosopographia Imperii Romani, both overseas and in Great Britain. The different methods of evaluating such data in Germany and France are compared with those in England, and the important critical contribution of British historiography from the late 1930s until the publication of the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire is given special attention.
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Die Fédération internationale des associations d’études classiques führt in regelmäßigerm Wechsel Menschen, die sich den Altertumswissenschaften verbunden fühlen, zusammen. Es ist meist ein bunter Strauß von Themen, die dabei erörtert werden. Auch Wissenschaftsorganisationen kommen dort zu Wort und geben Einblick in das
eigene Tun, in Fortschritte in ihrer Organisation oder auch in Probleme, wie die Zukunft, insbesondere von Zeitschriften, bewältigt werden kann, was in unserer schnelllebigen, von der Digitalisierung beherrschten Zeit vielleicht mehr als früher von Bedeutung ist.

So war es nicht überraschend, dass beim letzten FIEC-Kongress Anfang Juli in London u.a. die Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, die inzwischen auf ein Alter von fast 110 Jahren zurückblicken kann, sich in einem eigenen Panel präsentierte, dabei partiell den Blick zurücklenkte, aber auch Probleme der kommenden Zeit ansprach. Da die Society u.a. viele Mitglieder umfasst, die nicht aus dem Vereinigten Königreich stammen, hat man mich gebeten, den Blick von außen her auf die Entwicklung der Roman Studies in Britain zu wagen, wobei die Roman Society ein natürlicher Referenzpunkt sein sollte.

Es wäre freilich verwegen gewesen, als Einzelper eine Thematik zu sprechen, die, wenn man Roman Studies ernst nimmt, die gesamte römische Welt erfassen muss. Das ist ja auch das Ziel der Roman Society, die ihren Auftrag so formuliert: „Its scope is wide, covering Roman history, archaeology, literature and art down to about A.D. 700.“ Wer aber könnte all das, was in Britain, selbst beschränkt auf die Zeit seit der Gründung der Roman Society, dafür erarbeitet wurde, in einem Vortrag erfassen und wenigstens annähernd beschreiben? So entschloss ich mich, eine verengte Thematik zu finden, für die ich mich zum einen kompetent fühlte, mit der aber vielleicht in nuce Spezifika des vorgeschlagenen Themas: „Development of Roman Studies in Britain from an Overseas Perspective“ erfasst werden könnten.

Wissenschaft, also Erkenntnisgewinn, ist grundsätzlich keine nationale Angelegenheit, heute wohl noch weniger als in früherer Zeit; sie ist international, sie endet nicht an Grenzen. Und selbst ein Brexit, den manche unbedingt herbeiführen wollen, würde dafür keine Grenzen schaffen, trotz der schwierigen Probleme, die daraus entstehen werden, nicht so sehr für die Wissenschaft selbst, wohl aber für viele Menschen, nicht zum

1 Der Titel des panel war: „The Past and Future of the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.“ — Wichtige Hinweise verdanke ich der wie immer sehr freundschaftlichen Hilfsbereitschaft Tony Birleys.

2 In der Einladung war das so formuliert: „The development of Roman Studies in Britain from an overseas perspective, ideally with some reference to the Roman Society.“

3 Vgl. den Beitrag von Chester G. Starr, The History of the Roman Empire 1911–1960, im 50. Band des JRS 1960, 149–150, S. 149: „No single essay can hope to describe this mass in detail.“

4 Der Vortragscharakter ist in dem Beitrag weitgehend bewahrt worden.
Wenigsten für Studierende und junge Gelehrte. Trotz aller Internationalität gibt es jedoch mehr oder weniger ausgeprägte Eigenheiten der Wissenschaftskulturen der verschiedenen Länder. In manchen Nationen wird bestimmten Themen, Problemen und Methoden bereits zu einer Zeit eine besondere Bedeutung beigemessen, wenn diese in anderen Ländern vielleicht noch nicht als vordringlich erkannt werden oder, aus welchem Grund auch immer, noch nicht verwirklicht werden können.


---


10 B. Stech, Senatores Romani qui fuerint inde a Vespasiano usque ad Traiani exitum, Leipzig 1912.

11 A. Stein, Römische Reichsbeamte der Provinz Thracia, Sarajevo 1920.

12 A. Stein, Der römische Ritterstand, München 1925.
An Overseas Look at British Scholars


In den ersten Jahrzehnten des 20. Jahrhunderts seit der Publikation der ersten Auflage der PIR erschienen in Britain noch keine größeren Untersuchungen auf prosopographischer Basis. Doch zeigen kleinere Arbeiten, dass man auch dort das Potential, das mit solchem Personenmaterial verbunden war, durchaus kannte und zu nutzen versuchte. Die Zeitschrift, die die Roman Society seit 1911 publizierte, zeigt dies frühzeitig. Auf die Gründung der Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies hatte Francis Haverfield entscheidenden Einfluss. „In the empire of Classics, this was the final province waiting to be established“, wie es Christopher Stray in einem Text zum hundertjährigen Bestehen des JRS im Jahr 2010 formulierte. Haverfield wurde auch erster Präsident der Roman Society. Seine Hinwendung zu den römischen Monumenten und Inschriften Großbritanniens war durch seinen längeren Aufenthalt in

13 R. Syme, JRS 24, 1934, 80.
Berlin bei Mommsen wesentlich verstärkt worden.\(^\text{18}\) Dieser Einfluss machte sich von Beginn an auch im JRS bemerkbar. Schon im dritten Band von 1913 analysierte G. L. Cheesman eine Familie italischer Herkunft in der römischen *colonia Antiochia Pisidiae*: „The Family of the Caristanii“.\(^\text{19}\) Ihm stand dabei ein eben entdecktes Inschriftendossier aus dieser kleinasiatischen Stadt zur Verfügung. Im selben Band konnte Hermann Dessau, den man damals als den Altmeister der noch jungen Studien auf prosopografischem Basis ansehen konnte, eine ebenfalls aus Antiochia stammende Inschrift des domitianisch-traianischen Konsulars P. Calvisius Ruso Iulius Frontinus publizieren; Sir William Ramsay hatte ihm die Erstpublikation anvertraut.\(^\text{20}\) Der erste Weltkrieg führte zu einer kurzen Unterbrechung. Doch schon im Band von 1919 wurde die Abhandlung Steins über die Reichsbeamten der Provinz Thracia zwar nur kurz, doch recht lobend besprochen.\(^\text{21}\) Im JRS 1922 publizierte Donald Atkinson, „The Governors of Britain from Claudius to Diocletian“; seine Begründung für diese Arbeit war: „there does not appear to be anything like a complete list easily accessible to English students.“\(^\text{22}\) Für fast alle konnte er auf die PIR sowie auf die Artikel in der RE verweisen. Es war nur eine Liste der Personen mit Belegen, ohne weitere Analyse. Das zeigte sich schon ganz anders in der längeren Arbeit von C. S. Walton, „Oriental Senators in the Service of Rome: A Study of Imperial Policy Down to the Death of Marcus Aurelius“, im JRS 1929. Walton zog es vor, „to avoid the monotony of a detailed catalogue of mere names, … to introduce the claimants … successively into an historical framework, in which … he … traced the growing tendency to improved relations between East and West, and the development of the emperors’ policy towards the East, so far as it was definite enough to be called a policy at all.“\(^\text{23}\) Auf seine Ergebnisse ist freilich nicht weiter einzugehen, da seine Voraussetzungen recht

\(^\text{18}\) H. H. E. Craster, Francis Haverfield, *The English Historical Review* 35, Nr. 137, 1920, 63–70, hier 64: Mommsen became his master, and it was at Mommsen’s instigation that he betook himself to the study of Roman inscriptions found in the province of Britain. Siehe auch P. W. M. Freeman, *The Best Training-ground for Archaeologists: Francis Haverfield and the Invention of Romano-British Archaeology*, Oxford 2007.

\(^\text{19}\) G. L. Cheesman, *The Family of the Caristanii at Antioch in Pisidia*, JRS 3, 1913, 253–266.


\(^\text{21}\) JRS 9, 1919, xx.


unsicher waren und vor allem von nachfolgenden Arbeiten schnell als zu wenig fundiert nachgewiesen wurden.  

Die 30er Jahre zeigen sodann eine deutliche Entwicklung in Britain; prosopographisch ausgerichtete Arbeiten treten stärker hervor, wofür zahlreiche Artikel im JRS und anderen Zeitschriften symptomatisch sind. Es ist vornehmlich Ronald Syme, der dieses verstärkte Interesse zunächst verkörpert. Schon seit 1933, im selben Jahr, in dem der erste Band der zweiten Auflage der PIR erschien, stand er mit Arthur Stein und Edmund Groag in brieflicher Verbindung. Er hatte Sonderdrucke seiner Arbeiten an beide gesandt. In seiner Besprechung von Band I der PIR, die im JRS 1934 publiziert wurde, betont er: „prosopography, as it may conveniently be called, has been the object of a heightened interest coincident with the detailed study of the development and working of the imperial administration.“ Und zu den beiden Herausgebern formulierte er: „May these Dioscuri, guiding-stars in an ocean of detail, themselves be preserved and bring their own bark safe to harbour at last.“ Damals ahnte noch niemand, dass die politische Entwicklung gerade dies abrupt verhinderte; man konnte aber auch noch nicht ahnen, dass die drei Bände der PIR, die Stein zusammen mit Groag vollendete, kurz nach dem Krieg, im Jahr 1947, bei der Ernennung Steins zum Honorary Member der Roman Society entscheidend waren.

Symes eigene Arbeiten auf prosopographischem Feld folgen damals im schnellen Rhythmus aufeinander, zu spätrepublikanischen und zu

27 R. Syme, JRS 24, 1934, 80–81.
frühkaiserzeitlichen Themen. Im Mittelpunkt standen stets Personen wie Caesar, Asinius Pollio oder Decidius Saxa. An diesen Personen wurden zentrale politische Fragen der Epoche erörtert. Vieles allerdings, was Syme auf diesem Feld schriftlich ausarbeitete, wurde damals nicht publiziert; zahlreiche Arbeiten wurden erst durch postume Veröffentlichung bekannt, bedeutsame Texte sogar erst vor wenigen Jahren. The Roman Revolution, Symes Meisterwerk, erschien offiziell wenige Tage nach dem Beginn des 2. Weltkriegs. Seine eigentliche internationale Wirkung konnte das Buch erst nach dessen Ende entfalten, obwohl es in England sogleich fundamentale Diskussionen ausgelöst hatte, nicht zuletzt durch die heftige Kritik, die Arnaldo Momigliano in seiner Besprechung im JRS 1940 geäußert hatte. Schon der erste Satz der Rezension stellte klar, in welchem wissenschaftlichen Zusammenhang Symes Werk zu sehen ist: „It is easy to find the antecedents of this monumental piece of work — Gelzer’s Nobilität und Münzer’s Adelsparteien, with the articles in Pauly–Wissowa and in Prosopographia Imperii Romani. ... It is more difficult to describe the intrinsic value.“ Ohne ausdrückliche polemische Absicht würde heute vermutlich niemand mehr diesen letzten Satz Momiglianos, der gleich zu Beginn der Besprechung dem Leser serviert wurde, so formulieren. Man könnte hier auf die vielfältigen Wirkungen von Symes Arbeit auf die internationale Forschung verweisen, etwa auf

29 Diese sind im ersten Band von R. Symes Roman Papers, Oxford 1979, zu finden. Band 1 und 2 dieser wichtigen Sammlung werden Ernst Badian verdankt. Zur Kritik an Badians Auswahl siehe F. Millar, JRS 71, 1981, 144–152, hier 144: „Most unfortunately the method of selection has operated to reinforce the familiar conception of Syme as the master of political prosopography, and to obscure the fundamental importance of Latin literature for the whole of his work, and of military history in the earlier part of it."


Bis in die fünfziger Jahre des vergangenen Jahrhunderts hatte sich die analysierende Prosopographie — wenn man im Wesentlichen von Steins Ritterstand absieht — weitgehend mit der senatorischen Elite befasst, was insbesondere vom Blickpunkt der Republik aus leicht verständlich war. Symes Werk kann dabei als symptomatisch gelten. Schließlich waren Senatoren für einen langen Zeitraum der römischen Geschichte auch die zentralen Träger dessen, was man im damaligen Horizont Administration nennen darf. Doch dann trat, speziell in Frankreich der equester ordo stärker ins Zentrum der wissenschaftlichen Erforschung, zurecht und mit gutem Grund. Am Anfang stand Hans-Georg Pflaum, in den 60er Jahren folgten sodann fundamentale und umfangreiche Werke

34 Momigliano 78 (= Secondo Contributo, 411).
wie die von Claude Nicolet und später beispielsweise von Henriette Pavis d’Escurac sowie von Ségolène Demougin.


39 Henriette Pavis d’Escurac, La préfecture de l’annone, service administratif impérial d’Auguste à Constantin, Rom 1976.


Nach vorsichtiger Kritik an bestimmten Ausführungen zur Struktur der ritterlichen Laufbahnen in den *Procurateurs* etwa durch Eric Birley 44 begann gerade in Britain die vertiefte Auseinandersetzung mit Pflaums Konzeption, nachdem endlich im Jahr 1960 die *Carrières* erschienen waren. Diese waren, wie Fergus Millar in seiner Besprechung des Werks im *JRS* von 1963 betonte, „essentially not a work of reference alone, but an instrument in the demonstration of Pflaum’s theses about the equestrian cursus.“ 45 Millar äußerte große Anerkennung für die gewaltige Arbeit Pflaums; doch er formuliert auch seine grundsätzliche Kritik an der Annahme Pflaums, dass von Beginn an „the appellations *trecenarius*, *ducenarius*“ usw., „which are attached sometimes to the titles of equestrian posts and sometimes to the names of their holders, relate to established grades which gave the essential structure of the equestrian cursus throughout the period concerned.“ 46 Vielmehr sei, so Millar, frühestens mit Commodus eine Struktur erreicht, in der diese *grades* ein hierarchisches System des Aufstiegs bilden konnten. Millar kritisierte unter anderem auch, dass die Freigelassenen, jedenfalls unter funktionalen Aspekt...
innerhalb der Administration, völlig aus Pflaums System ausgeschlossen
wurden, obwohl bei ihnen ebenfalls die Bezeichnung *procurator* verwen-
det wurde. Ebenso sei wichtig, dass Pflaum es nicht als möglich angesee-
hen habe, dass einzelne Ritter überhaupt nur eine Funktion übernahmen,
nie jedoch eine Karriere durchlaufen hätten, was dann unter dem Blick-
punkt von Erfahrung und Beförderung zu deutlich anderen Urteilen in-
nerhalb des Systems führen müsse. Dies und andere Faktoren führten
Millar zu dem Urteil, dass Pflaum zwar in zutreffender Weise ein System
bei der Auswahl und Beförderung der Prokuratoren gesehen habe. Doch
war dieses, anders als Pflaum dies entwickelt hatte, in der römischen Re-
alität wesentlich flexibler und anpassungsfähiger für personale Konstel-
lationen, innerhalb der einzelne Kaiser Personen auch gegen das angeb-
liche System befördern konnten, wenn eine bestimmte Situation dies er-
laubte oder nötig machte. „Intelligible patterns“ können „within the
structure“ identifiziert werden, doch „explicit rules“ — die dann auch ver-
bindlich gewesen wären — „were [n]ever formulated for equestrian pro-
motions.“

Dies waren fundamentale Einsichten, die in Verbindung mit den Er-
kenntnissen Pflaums ein vertiefetes Verständnis ermöglichten, wie die
durchsprechenden Personen für die Notwendigkeiten der römischen Admin-
istration gefunden und befördert wurden, die für deren Funktionieren
zunehmend von Bedeutung waren. Das konnte vor allem Aussagen über
administrative Kompetenz und vorausgehende Erfahrung betreffen.
Denn nicht selten wurden diese Fähigkeiten aus der Analyse ritterlicher
Karrieren erschlossen (was ähnlich auch bei senatorischen Laufbahnen
angenommen wurde und zu problematischen Schlussfolgerungen führen
konnte), die sodann ihrerseits als Grund für die Wahl einer bestimmten
Person für eine bestimmte Position angesehen wurden. Doch Millar
warnte vor solch weitgehenden Schlussfolgerungen; denn zu viele andere
Faktoren konnten Einfluss darauf nehmen, welchem Ritter welche Auf-
gaben zu einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt übertragen wurden.

Das wurde freilich nicht überall erkannt. Umso wichtiger war dann
ein grundlegender Beitrag von Peter Brunt, der im JRS 1975 erschien und
die „Administrators of Roman Egypt“ als Exemplum nahm, um grundle-
gende Fragen detailliert zu klären, auf die Fergus Millar in seiner Bespre-
chung von Pflaums Carrières bereits hingewiesen hatte.48 Brunt verwies
auf Charakterisierungen der Präfekten von Ägypten, die in prosopogra-

47 Millar, JRS 53, 198.
phischen Untersuchungen für diese verwendet wurden, wie etwa „administrateur financier habile, chef énergique et courageux“ bei Pflaum oder „the prefects of Egypt were, by and large, men of outstanding ability“ bei Reinmuth. So stellte sich für Brunt die Frage, wie weit experience im Hinblick auf die weitgespannten Aufgaben, mit denen ein praefectus Aegypti konfrontiert wurde, schon ein entscheidendes Kriterium war, wenn ein Kaiser einen Ritter in die Provinz am Nil sandte, d.h. Erfahrung, die er in seiner vorausgehenden Laufbahn erworben hatte. Brunt fragte auch nach der experience, die ein Präfekt während seines dortigen Aufenthalts gewinnen konnte, oder ob er sich auf die Erfahrung anderer prokuratorischer Funktionäre, die neben ihm in Ägypten tätig waren, stützen konnte, eine administrative Erfahrung, die sich etwa in den cursus honorum gespiegelt haben müsste. Es ging ihm letztlich um die allgemeine, aber essentielle Frage, ob „specialization was increasingly favoured in Roman imperial administration.“ Peter Brunt überprüfte diese für die Gesamtadministration höchst entscheidende Frage an der Provinz Ägypten. Seine Antwort war eindeutig: „It appears to show that the conception is anachronistic." 

Die beiden eben genannten britischen Beiträge brachten einen nötigen Realismus in die Diskussion um die Frage: Welche Aussagen können Untersuchungen auf der Basis prosopographischer Quellen zur Entwicklung der Administration im Imperium Romanum wirklich geben; wo lagen andererseits die Grenzen der Erkenntnismöglichkeiten. Auch wenn die Kritik an dem, was international, vor allem außerhalb der Insel an prosopographischer Forschung geleistet wurde, partiell zu weit ging und manchmal einseitig war — verwiesen sei etwa auf den Beitrag von Brian Campbell: „Who were the ,viri militares'?“ — die Kritik hat nach meinem Urteil deutlich gemacht, dass unsere Vorstellungen vom römischen civil service oder der Entwicklung einer römischen Bürokratie nicht nach dem gestaltet werden dürfe, wie beides sich seit dem 19. und noch mehr seit dem 20. Jahrhundert in unserer Welt entwickelt hat. Die Forschung hat oft nicht genügend bedacht, wie unterschiedlich die Bedingungen waren.

In einem Beitrag von 1993 mit dem Titel „Überlieferung und historische Realität“ habe ich selbst formuliert: „Die historische Realität war oft..."

50 Brunt 142. Mehrmals spricht er von den hohen provincial administrators als amateurs.
vielfältiger, als es unsere oft so eindeutig erscheinenden Quellen vermuten lassen.“ Dass diese Erkenntnis sich in prosopographischen Studien seit längerem stärker bemerkbar macht, das ist ein wesentlicher Beitrag, den *Roman Studies in Britain* erbracht haben, hier kurz charakterisiert vom Blickpunkt der kaiserzeitlichen Prosopographie aus.

Doch das, was hier beschrieben wurde, ist nur ein kleiner Ausschnitt aus einem viel weiteren Feld von Forschungen, die sich auf Quellen dieser Art stützen. Nicht weniger, vielleicht sogar noch bedeutsamer ist der britische Beitrag, wenn man auf die Zeit seit Diokletian sieht. Im Jahr 2003 erschien in den *Proceedings of the British Academy* ein Sammelband zum Abschluss einer gewaltigen Forschungsleistung, unter dem Titel: *Fifty Years of Prosopography. The Later Roman Empire, Byzantium and Beyond*, herausgegeben von Averil Cameron. Denn die *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* in drei Bänden war vollendet.


---

52 Gemeint waren vor allem auch die *cursus honorum*.


55 Fifty Years of Prosopography. The Later Roman Empire, Byzantium and Beyond (Proceedings of the British Academy 118), hg. Averil Cameron, Oxford 2003.


57 John Morris hatte aus „politischen“ Gründen — er war Mitglied der kommunistischen Partei in Großbritannien — leichteren Zugang als andere an der Akademie der DDR in Ostberlin. Das zeigt sich an nicht wenigen Briefen im Archiv der Berlin–Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, zunächst vor allem für die Ausarbeitung von Artikeln für die PIR. Noch wichtiger aber waren wohl seine Bemühungen für die PLRE, da es seiner Energie zu verdanken war, dass schließlich das, noch unter der Ägide Mommsens und Harnacks, an der Akademie in Berlin gesammelte Material nach Cambridge transferiert werden konnte.

Werner Eck  
*Universität zu Köln*  
Werner.Eck@uni-koeln.de

**BETWEEN EAST AND WEST: MEMORIES OF THE COLD WAR**

— Oswyn Murray —

**ABSTRACT**

For the last fifty years the Respublica Litterarum in classical scholarship has been dominated by the divisions brought about by the Cold War. As this traumatic period begins to fade I have tried to recall the attempts of one classical scholar to bridge this gap between east and west. Let us not forget the past in building a new future.

**KEYWORDS**

Suez Canal, Ovid and the Cuban Missile Crisis, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Konopiste, Bibliotheca Academica Translationum, Tianjin

*Venio in campos et lata praetoria memoriae*

Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, 10, 8

And somewhere from the dim ages of history the truth dawned upon Europe that the morrow would obliterate the plans of today.

Preparations for the slaughter of mankind have always been made in the name of God or some supposed higher being which men have devised and created in their own imagination.

Jaroslav Hašek, *The Good Soldier Schweik*

The twentieth century was the bloodiest century since the seventeenth for the persecution of intellectuals. After the collapse of confidence in bourgeois liberalism in the trenches of the First World War, the terrors unleashed by Communism, Fascism, Nazism, and the threat of nuclear destruction, devastated the Western intelligentsia more effectively than any wars of religion. At a certain point one wakes up to discover that one has become truly an ‘ancient historian’ (as I declared my profession to be on my first passport: no-one understood, except an Italian frontier official — ‘Ah, la Storia antica’). That is, one has become not a historian, but a part of history itself.
I was born in 1937;¹ my generation came of age in the 1950s, and was dominated by the propaganda of the Cold War. In 1956 I was conscripted into the British army to fight Communism, but instead was assigned to the invasion of the Suez Canal; fortunately the Americans ordered the British to withdraw before we went out as the second wave of the occupying force. I had already decided to become a deserter, because we, who were busy painting our vehicles sand-coloured with a big white H on top (since it was intended that the Israelis should destroy the Egyptian air force before the invasion), already believed that the expedition was the result of a corrupt and secret plot between Britain, France and Israel; this fact is now revealed by the memoir of Patrick Dean, the junior British official who conducted the negotiations. The British Prime Minister burned his copy of the agreement in the fireplace of No 10 Downing Street, the French copy is ‘lost’; but the Israelis preserved theirs, and it is available on the web.²

That taught me the essential lesson that foreign policy is always based on lies, and that politicians and generals are fools who do not understand the nature of the historical forces that they unleash. The aborted invasion of Egypt resulted only in the destruction of yet another of the greatest and most civilised cities of the modern world — Alexandria, which once again rots in decay after the expulsion of all Italians, Greeks and Jews: the city of Cavafy, Ungaretti and Lawrence Durrell was destroyed by the stupidity of politicians along with Smyrna and Salonica, and perhaps now London.³ The same year the Soviets invaded Hungary, but because of the moral corruption of the West we were unable to intervene.

Instead I spent the rest of my military service defending the non-existent frontier between Northern Ireland and the Republic, until I was demobbed with a resoundingly ambiguous testimonial to two years military service: ‘Somewhat lacking in initiative and drive. But this (what?) should be more apparent in his civilian life.’ I had clearly joined the honourable ranks of the Good Soldier Schweik.

So I went to Oxford University and entered the ancient Republic of Letters, where I vowed to devote myself to ignoring the Iron Curtain that we were not supposed to penetrate. Friendship was my only weapon.

¹ If I had been born five years earlier, I would have been killed in the Korean War; for my battery in the Royal Artillery (170 Imjin Battery) fought at the battle of the Imjin River in 1951 alongside the ‘Glorious Glosters’, and like them was wiped out.
Most of my teachers were second-rate historians, whose careers had been stunted by seven years of war work. The intellectual life of the academic world was sustained by the Jewish refugees who had fled Nazi persecution in the thirties. I was saved by two great figures of this diaspora, both of them connected to the Warburg Institute, which had transported itself from Hamburg to London in 1934. The first was the art historian Ernst Gombrich (1909–2001), Director of the Warburg from 1959 to 1972, who opened my eyes to the visual element in history. The second was my doctoral supervisor Arnaldo Momigliano (1908–87), the most learned historian of his age, a refugee from Fascist Italy. It was from him that I learned the importance of the classical tradition for the defence of European culture.

As a penniless graduate student, I made money by teaching Latin to less than enthusiastic young women. I recall a traumatic moment on 27th October 1962, the day of the Cuban missile crisis. We were translating Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* (which I had selected as a suitable text to interest a bored young girl), when I became aware of an immense throbbing noise in the air: in order not to be caught on the ground, all the B52 bombers from the American airbases were circling above Oxford, fully armed with nuclear warheads. I continued my lesson, reflecting that if this was to be the last day of Western civilization, there could be no better way to die ‘waiting for the barbarian’ than studying Ovid. Nevertheless it caused me to join the Aldermaston March of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in 1963.4

My first eastern friend was the Polish archaeologist and papyrologist Zbigniew Borkowski (1936–91). In 1970 the Fondation Hardt in Switzerland was the only place where Western and Eastern scholars could meet; we bonded late at night over the Baron’s last bottle of whisky. We agreed that we had both been fools deluded by propaganda: we searched vainly for the Red Star in the night sky. Zbigniew told me that he had once been a member of the Communist Youth: ‘I am so convinced I even denounce my grandmother because she is reactionary’. ‘But I thought all grandmothers were by definition reactionary.’ ‘Yes,’ he replied with Polish Catholic logic, ‘But she is MY grandmother’.

4 The Aldermaston Marches from the Nuclear Weapons Research Establishment, Aldermaston to Central London (52 miles) were a mass protest against nuclear weapons that began in 1958; organised by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament they took place at Easter each year, and had a considerable effect on public opinion and ultimately government policy.
Zbigniew taught me to understand the holes that allowed transit through the Iron Curtain. In 1946 the great papyrologist Raphael Taubenschlag had gathered in Warsaw the best collection of legal papyri, and founded the very specialised *Journal of Juristic Papyrology*. In the Communist era, because of his marriage connection with the Polish Communist leadership, it was thought essential to maintain its publication; so Polish papyrologists were permitted to travel abroad to Western institutions to consult other collections. While on a mission in Syria (to Palmyra?) Zbigniew and his group were ordered to go to Alexandria and transform themselves into archaeologists (where he published the inscriptions from the late Roman hippodrome). They sent a telegram, ‘Arrivons jeudi complètement ivres’.

The reason for this sudden change of career was hidden deep in the economic arcana of the Cold War. After Suez the Soviets were secretly rearming the Egyptians with weapons made mainly in Czechoslovakia. But the Egyptians had no foreign currency to pay for these weapons. So the Soviets ordered the Poles to undertake major excavations and restoration work in Egypt, in order to supply the necessary Soviet bloc currency. Thus archaeology was turned into armaments.

Later Zbigniew visited Oxford to work on the Oxyrhynchus archive, and lived with me. In the summer evenings after work we would depart with a bottle of whisky in my camping van to the woods nearby, and spend the night singing Russian folksongs — the most haunting one I remember was ‘The girl on the high trapeze’. He would talk of the trackless forests of eastern Poland that we would one day visit together. Alas, twenty years later he died on just such an expedition, unwilling to go to hospital for a minor complaint.

In the late Seventies I met Gert Audring from the East German Academy of Sciences when he was on an official visit to England: he invited me to visit East Berlin. I well remember the fear with which I passed through Checkpoint Charlie, famous from so many spy stories: Gert was waiting for me discreetly hidden about a hundred yards into the Soviet Zone, and showed me round the remnants of former German culture, the Altes Museum, the Pergamon Museum, the opera house Unter den Linden and the other side of the Berlin Wall. He was very brave to offer friendship to a Western colleague. It was then that I formed the

---

5 Years later I read the wonderful book of Ryszard Kapuscinski, *Travels with Herodotus* (London 2007), and understood the great gulf that separated Poland from the West in the Fifties.

6 See Z. Borkowski, *Inscriptions des factions à Alexandrie* (Warsaw 1981); *Queen Hatshepsut and her Temple 3500 Years Later*, ed. Z. E. Szafrański (Warsaw University Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology in Cairo 2001).
opinion that one day Germany might perhaps be reunited; but no, all my young West German colleagues said it was impossible. I have not seen Audring since the reunification of 1992, but know that he has devoted himself to publishing the papers of the ancient historian Eduard Meyer.

Gert told me that if I ever went to Prague I must visit the great epigraphist and archaeologist, Jan Pecirka (1926–93), who possessed the best collection of Western books in the East, thanks to his friend in Cambridge, Moses Finley, who would send them to him: every Eastern scholar, he said, would visit Pecirka in his private flat for study, despite the fact that he had been expelled from the university for political reasons. Later I did indeed visit him, towards the end of his life: his work in the Crimea had been prevented and he was a very bitter man.

My visit to Prague was for the 16th Eirene conference in 1982, at the invitation of Pavel Oliva. The previous year I had invited him to come to Oxford to give a set of lectures on ancient Sparta as the visiting ‘Nellie Wallace Lecturer’. We took great care with the invitation, since we knew that Oliva was in trouble with the authorities: before issuing the formal invitation we had sent a private letter via a friend in the Netherlands to ask him whether he would like to be invited: he replied in the affirmative. And to our surprise he was allowed to visit together with his wife Vera Olivova. This was perhaps the first sign of that perestroika of 1986, when Gorbachev admitted he had been inspired by the ‘Socialism with a human face’ of Dubcek of Czechoslovakia. Something was moving in the Soviet bloc.

The reason for Oliva’s difficulties was that, despite being a senior member of the Czech Academy and well known in the West, he had been involved in the Prague Spring of 1968, and his wife had signed the famous Charter; unfortunately shortly afterwards in 1972 her book on Tomas Masaryk had (without her knowledge) been translated into English under the inflammatory title The Doomed Democracy. Before the secret police could arrest her, medical friends certified her insane, and she spent the next five years in a mental hospital, where as long as she was a patient she could not be dismissed from her university post; finally she was declared ‘cured’ and returned to the University, but was not allowed to write on modern history: instead she became an expert on ancient sport (in her youth she had been an international athlete). The problems of the Olivas were further compounded by the fact that both their children had recently fled to the West.

Nevertheless they came to Oxford and were made members of Balliol College Senior Common Room. I recall a moment during a guest night in Balliol, where the college silver is laid out and good food and vintage wine are served. As we sat talking in the common room after dinner, suddenly
with her characteristic honesty and directness Vera said, ‘How strange it is that here we are sitting in all this luxury, and thirty-five years ago Pavel was a starving boy walking barefoot across Europe with the SS guards from one concentration camp to another.’ ‘Yes,’ added Pavel, with a melancholy smile of regret, ‘and now perhaps you understand why I joined the Communist Party. I wanted a better world.’ In that moment, which I have never forgotten, I first fully understood the reality of the history which we had all experienced and the futility of the Cold War; that was reinforced later the next year, when I was one of the few Western scholars to attend the Eirene conference, and met so many colleagues from Eastern Europe; then too I visited the exhibition of art by my exact contemporaries, the Jewish children of the concentration camps who had not survived the war, and reflected on the suffering which everyone in our generation had known, directly or indirectly.

That visit to Prague was memorable in so many other ways. Oliva took me round the university; every so often we would meet an elderly man with a brush wearing worker’s overalls, and Pavel would formally introduce me to the Professor of Medieval History or Philosophy: they were all victims of the purge after 1968, but their colleagues still treated them as if they were in post. I began to respect the wit and ingenuity whereby the Czechs were circumventing the Communist system, worthy indeed of the Good Soldier Schweik.

The level of dissidence among Eastern classical scholars at the conference was obvious. The Russians had been ordered to give their communications in Russian; the majority insisted on speaking French. The conference was very friendly and everyone was keen to speak to the few Western scholars who had come; only when a member of the East German delegation entered the room, would they all suddenly fall silent.

We went on an expedition to Konopiště, the hunting lodge of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand. It was the most effective piece of propaganda against the former ruling classes of Europe that I have ever seen: every inch of the walls was decorated with stuffed birds and animals, all meticulously listed in books recording their massacre by the crowned heads of Europe in great shooting expeditions across India, Africa, the Far East and Europe. I began to understand that the First World War had been simply an extension of this royal pre-war shooting party, in which they were using machine guns to exterminate the peasants and the working classes for their pleasure.

We took our lunch at Konopiště, and I sat with Professor Irena Svencickaya (1929–2006) and her husband. The meat was surprisingly good: ‘Do you have meat like this in Moscow?’ I asked; ‘In Moscow we have no meat,’ she replied, and pointed across the room to a handsome
young man with a broken arm in plaster (much younger than any of the rest of the Russian contingent — where had he got that broken arm? I thought). ‘That is the KGB man,’ she said in a conversational tone. My English Philosophy colleague said brightly ‘Oh, I thought he was a poet.’ I lost all faith in philosophy.

Later I told this story to a young Rumanian scholar, Manuela Tecusan; the Rumanians were housed apart from all the other delegates in a hostel far from the centre of Prague. ‘We have a KGB man,’ she said mournfully, ‘But we do not know who he is.’

We kept in touch with Pavel and Vera, and I contributed to his Festschrift in 1999;7 I was delighted to meet him again on a second visit to Prague in 2014. His wife was already ill, and died in 2015.

Manuela Tecusan was a Rumanian rebel, who had been inspired by her uncle Petru Creţia (1927–97), professor of Greek, poet and literary critic, the great expert on Eminescu, in ideals of classical education that went back to the Thirties. She was fluent in French and English, and was determined to escape from Communism. She was helping her uncle prepare the first translation of Plato into Rumanian; at great personal risk she contributed an article on Plato’s sympotic writings to my book Sympotica (1990), and I would send her classical texts and lexica to Rumania: sometimes these would be returned as subversive literature, but they usually got through on the second attempt.

Finally Manuela escaped to England. Because she had not been a party member she had been prevented from studying for a doctorate; so I persuaded the students at Balliol to appoint her as a refugee scholar, paid for by their personal contributions; and she studied for a doctorate with me, which eventually won the Conington Prize as the best classical thesis of the year.8 She now lives in Cambridge.

Through Manuela my wife and I became friends with Petru Creţia, who visited us in Oxford in 1989. On 20th December Petru was due to return to Bucharest. He decided to compose an open ‘birthday letter’ of denunciation of Ceausescu, and we helped him translate it into English: he declared his intention of leaving it to be broadcast on the BBC Rumanian service as he returned. I knew that he was signing his own death warrant, but could not dissuade him. The day of his departure it was raining torrentially; and I wandered for hours through the streets of Oxford, distraught and wondering what I could do to save him. Finally I decided that the only chance was to publish his text in English in the Times newspaper, in the hope that the resulting publicity in the West

7 Eirene 35 (1999), Studia Graeca et Latina in honorem Pavel Oliva.
might protect him from summary execution. Through friends on the newspaper the essay was published next day, on the 21st December, the same day on which Ceausescu fell from power. Later I discovered that Petru had not gone home on arrival, but had hidden for several days underneath the railway arches until it was safe to emerge. Petru subsequently became the editor of a literary journal and a leading politician in the chaotic new party system. He visited us once again, but died in 1997.

With the arrival of perestroika and glasnost, personal relations between Eastern and Western scholars became easier. But Western governments did not respond; they were still imprisoned (as they are today) in a Cold War mentality, and simply tried to capitalise on the economic and political difficulties in the Soviet bloc. So I established a research programme which would offer bursaries for young scholars throughout Europe, but especially from the East. This was called Bibliotheca Academica Translationum, and aimed to create a bibliographical database of all translations of works of classical scholarship between all European languages. The idea was to offer travel awards to young scholars across Europe, so that they could work on the project in their own and foreign libraries. It was moderately successful and still continues, funded first by Oxford University and the British Arts and Humanities Research Council, then by the European Union, GoogleBooks and the Onassis Foundation, and based first in Oxford, then in Paris and now in Athens. We established links with young scholars in France, Germany, Spain, Italy, Greece, Russia, Hungary and the USA.

One of my earliest contacts was with a remarkable man, Gregory Bongard-Levin of the Russian Academy of Sciences, who did more than any other individual to protect and promote Classical Studies in the difficult days of the collapse of the Russian economy. He was a wise and good friend who is sadly missed. He had devised a similar scheme which created funds for young Russian scholars, by using his contacts to obtain for them short study trips to Western libraries: these travel bursaries, small enough by Western standards, provided Western currency sufficient to enable them to live for three or four years in Russia. So the leaders of the next generation were preserved for Russian scholarship. Sergei Karpyuk, editor of Vestnik Drevnei Istoriï, was one of Bongard-Levin’s beneficiaries, who has become a close friend, and has stayed with us twice on his visits to Britain. It was through this connection that I first travelled to Moscow and to the excavations at Anapa (Gorgippia) on the Black Sea, where I met Professor Gennadiy Andreevich Koshelenko.
Oswyn Murray (1935–2015), the teacher of another beneficiary of such East-West contacts who later came on a Soros Scholarship to Oxford, my former pupil, the Georgian scholar Gocha Tsetskheladze.

The BAT contacts also provided me with another friend in Hungary, Attila Ferenczi of Budapest, with whom we now have reciprocal ties of hospitality.

In September 1996 I was invited to tour the sites of the Crimea by my former pupil Raymond Asquith, British attaché at the Ukrainian embassy (and himself a major protagonist in the Cold War, whose ancestor had taken part in the ‘charge of the Light Brigade’ during the Crimean War, and returned with a captured Russian musket, which is still in the family). Together we visited the classical sites of the Crimea at a time when the archaeological service was deprived of virtually all funds: I was amazed at the dedication of archaeologists who were working without regular pay to preserve one of the greatest collections of classical sites in the world: in particular I think of one young girl who was spending the winter in a pair of metal shipping containers at the site of Kalos Limen, supplied only with food from a friend at the local collective farm, in an attempt to prevent the peasantry from stealing the foundation stones to use as hard core in the entrances to their fields: she said it was better than being an out-of-work secretary. We also met the staff of the museum and site at Chersonesos, surviving in their historic monastery only because of a dispute between the Ukrainian and Russian Orthodox Churches. A second visit with Raymond in 2013 occurred just before the Russian annexation of the Crimea, which has once again put in jeopardy the future of this World Heritage Site.9

In 1995, in preparation for the attempt to wrest the Olympic Games from the stranglehold of the West, contacts with China began to open up. One of the first visitors to Oxford was the doyen of Chinese Western ancient historians, Professor Wang Dunshu (born 1934), who has established at Nankai University (where my great-uncle started a missionary University around 1910) a graduate school of Western classical historiography which is now the largest in the world. Initially it was intended to produce experts in every ancient Western language from Sumerian to Egyptian, Greek and Latin; now it seems to specialise especially in Silk Route studies. I assume this enterprise is part of a programme of world

---

9 For the earlier story of archaeology at this historic site, see the excellent anonymous account on the web, entitled Chersonesos Taurica and all that is related about Chersonesos competent but not officially (http://www.chersonesos.org/?p=museum_hist&l=eng, last accessed 19.12.19).
domination: since the first principle in understanding Chinese civilization is the study of the teachings of Confucius, it was assumed that successful diplomacy with the West must begin from training diplomats in the origins of Western civilizations, despite the fact that these have long been forgotten in our cultures.

We invited Wang Dunshu to dinner to meet some Oxford colleagues. Halfway through the meal he said ‘this wine is not strong enough, have you anything stronger?’ After some thought I produced a bottle of vintage grappa, of which he proceeded to drink about half. When the meal was over we began to discuss the differences between Western and Chinese political systems. Wang Dunshu emphasised the importance of calligraphy, poetry and dancing in the training of the traditional Chinese elite (he himself was a survival from the mandarin class, whose uncle had passed out top in the Imperial Chinese Civil Service examinations in these three skills, and had immediately been appointed in his twenties as ambassador to the whole of South America). He told us that the current rulers of China were still experts in ballroom dancing, which they had learned as impoverished refugees in the dance-halls of Paris in the Twenties: Chou En Lai was especially famed for his skill at the foxtrot and the quickstep — all that is except Chairman Mao, who had no sense of rhythm (although of course he married a dancer). This seemed a damning criticism of the Great Leader. Wang Dunshu ended with a display of the forgotten art of performing ancient Chinese drinking songs accompanied by dancing that reminded me of the chorus of old men in Plato’s Laws.

As a consequence of this friendship I was invited to partake in the First International Congress of Ancient World Historians at Nankai University (Tianjin), and subsequently visited by primitive coach and train the ancient capitals from Xian onwards, and crossed the Gobi Desert to the Buddhist caves of Dunhuang and the cities of Turfan, Urumchi and Kashgar along the Silk Road. We returned on a decrepid plane borrowed from Uzbeki Airlines, which had the unfortunate reputation of a mere sixty per cent of successful flights. Twenty years later I was invited to another conference at Nankai, and participated in another Silk Road trip, this time in brand new aeroplanes and through brand new airports, as if several centuries had intervened.

One comment from our first proceedings stays in my mind. Professor Lin Zhi-chun in his nineties asked why Western scholars had been invited to the conference: after all, he said, the West kept forgetting its past, and was always needing to have Renaissances, whereas China had been a

---

10 Subsequently I learned that in Chinese the same word is used to denote all forms of alcohol.
continuous civilization for five thousand years. This reminded me of the rebuke of the Egyptian priests to Herodotus: ‘you Greeks are but children compared to us Egyptians.’

These memories are of course tiny footnotes in the black history of a century of intellectual persecution; but when I look back in my eighties I feel that I have tried to uphold the traditions of the ancient Republic of Letters that were defended in 1914 by my great-grandfather, Sir James Murray, editor of the Oxford English Dictionary. In his son’s unpublished biography there appears the following passage:

In 1914 he applauded the decision to join in the War, and, though he refused to sign the manifesto of Oxford Professors in the autumn of the year lest his doing so should be inimical to the interests of the Dictionary, he wrote to friends in South Africa in grateful recognition of what the Dominions were doing in aid of the mother country. ¹¹

And in 2015, in preparation for a talk on the centenary of his death, among the unsorted papers of Sir James Murray (Bodleian Library) in the box relating to 1914, under the rubric ‘undated’, I discovered the following letter:

82 Woodstock Road Oct 15th [of course 1914]

Dear Sir James

Thank you for your letter. I fully understand your position and think you are quite right not to sign. After all there will be peace some day & we must not imperil the Dictionary.

Yours very sincerely
Gilbert Murray

These somewhat opaque references relate to a famous series of episodes in September and October 1914, which began with a letter to The Times of 18th September, known as ‘The Writers’ Manifesto’, organised by his namesake (no relation), the great Liberal professor of Greek, Gilbert Murray (later founder of the League of Nations Union). This was signed by most of the ‘eminent writers’ of the age: it denounced German atrocities and militarism and renounced all contact with German colleagues. In turn the Germans responded with a pamphlet addressed to the world

¹¹ Harold J. R. Murray, Sir James Murray, editor of the OED, typescript ms. p. 276 (copies in the OED archives and the Bodleian Library).
of culture, *An die Kulturwelt!*, signed by 93 of the most eminent scientists, artists, musicians and academics in Germany.\(^\text{12}\) The British responded in *The Times* of 21st October with a ‘Reply to German Professors. Reasoned Statement by British Scholars’, signed by 118 eminent academics from all the Universities of Britain, including its protagonist Gilbert Murray. Similar actions were taken in France and Italy: honorary degrees and memberships of academies were rescinded and eternal enmity against ‘the Huns’ was declared. Wilamowitz, one of the protagonists of the German response, defiantly listed among his honours that of being a deposed member of the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*. As he recognised in his post-war memoirs, this was the definitive end to four hundred years of the international Republic of Letters: it poisoned relations between European intellectuals on both sides of the conflict until at least 1926, in which year Germans and Austrians were first readmitted to any international academic conference.\(^\text{13}\) It was not in fact until the diaspora of Jewish intellectuals expelled by Hitler that the wounds were healed, or at least superseded in a new crisis.

In both the letters to *The Times* of September and October 1914 the name of James Murray is absent. It is not at all easy to discover the very few intellectuals on either side who joined him in refusing to sign such declarations renouncing their friendship with the enemy; but they include some of the greatest names of the twentieth century, such as the philosopher Bertrand Russell, the Irishmen George Bernard Shaw and W. B. Yeats, G. F. Nicolai (professor of Medicine) and his friend Albert Einstein (who together created a counter-organisation for peace), the mathematician David Hilbert, and the authors Stefan Zweig and Hermann Hesse in the German-speaking world, Romain Rolland in France, and the composers Puccini, Leoncavallo and Mascagni in Italy.\(^\text{14}\)


\(^\text{13}\) German and Austrian scholars were only readmitted to meetings of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* (CVA) in 1930.

\(^\text{14}\) It is a pleasure to recall that my ancestor’s friendship and respect for the world of scholarship were reciprocated by some of his colleagues on the opposite side. He had been a Corresponding Member of the Vienna Royal Academy since 1905; in 1916 it published an obituary by Karl Luick, which ends with these warm words: ‘Aus seine Rede klang Tatkraft und Ausdauer, aber auch Wohlwollen. Gleich Furnivall war er immer bereit, deutsche Mitforschung anzuerkennen. Wie viele ihrer Träger haben in seinem “Scriptorium” und seinem gastfreundlichen Hause in Oxford angeregte Stunden verbracht!’ (K. Luick, ‘Sir James A. H. Murray. Gestorben am 26. Juli 1915’, *Almanach der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1916, 426–430).
I have kept the faith of my great-grandfather. But will the Republic of Letters survive the triumph of ruthless capitalism and nationalism that is the curse of the twenty-first century? Only the next generation can answer that question. We have kept faith, but will you?

**Oswyn Murray**  
*Balliol College, Oxford*  
oswyn.murray@balliol.ox.ac.uk

These memories were shared with colleagues and students of the ELTE University Budapest in June 2019, in the presence of Professor Zsigmond Ritoők, who had himself been involved in the events of 1956. This text was also presented to a meeting of the European Network for the Study of Ancient Greek History at Utrecht in October 2019, where it received a standing ovation. A version of this paper will also appear in a Festschrift for Gocha Tsetskhladze.