Infine, Hunink non intende dare un nuovo testo critico, ma solamente un testo criticamente riletto, per cui è logico che non dica niente della tradizione manoscritta. Come si è detto sopra, lo scopo del lavoro era quello di far comprendere il _De pallio_, ed il commento, con le riserve che sopra ho presentato, è riuscito nel suo intento.

Pisa

Claudio Moreschini

---


The three ‘Vatican Mythographers’, whose editio princeps dates back to 1520 (Paris), were critically edited by Angelo Mai already in 1831, but only the first and second of them have since been translated into a modern language. Of the third mythographer this has now happened in 2005, and so the present French translation with commentary by Mr. Dain can rightfully be called its ‘translatio princeps’. If Mai’s critical edition was still based on only four mss., and the following one by Georg Heinrich Bode (1834) on seven, the present translation has made use of no fewer than 43 mss., and also of much better text editions of the sources quoted in it, such as Servius’ Virgil commentary (4th cent.), Macrobius’ _Saturnalia_ (c. A.D. 400), Fulgentius’ _Mythologiae_ (c. A.D. 500), Remigius of Auxerre’s commentary on Martianus Capella (9th cent.), and other works like the various scholia. Though not all of these 43 mss. are present, of course, in the Vatican Library, where Mai found the first copies, one keeps referring to these three works as the ‘Vatican Mythographers’. The mss. of the 3rd mythography mention as its author either the well-known medieval scholar Alexander Neckam (1157–1217), or an ‘Albericus Londonensis/Lundoniensis’, who has been identified as a chanon of St Paul’s Cathedral in London and who is attested there between the years 1181 and 1202. Since Eleanor Rathbone’s article in ‘Medieval and Renaissance Studies’ vol. 1 (1941, pp. 35–38) there has been a general consensus about the latter being the real author, although there are also some who maintain, with Jean Seznec, that ‘Albericus’ was the pseudonym of the former (_The Survival of the Pagan Gods_ 1961, pp. 170–171). The work of Albericus, then, consists of a Prooemium about the origin of idols and polytheism, and of fourteen subsequent chapters about: Saturnus, his wife Cybele, their children Jupiter, Juno, Neptunus and Pluto, and on Jupiter’s children: Proserpina, Apollo, Mercurius, Pallas, Venus, Bacchus, Hercules and Perseus, and finally a fifteenth chapter on the Zodiac. Evidently some genealogical order has been followed. After the primeval couple Saturnus-Cybele, whom the author equates with Kronos-Rhea, and to whom he ascribes only four children, probably on the ground of their naturalistic interpretation as heaven, air, water and earth, there follow the different divine and mortal children of the supreme god Jupiter by various other mothers, while the chapter on the Zodiac stands outside of this genealogy. This genealogy is far from complete. According to Hesiod, Apollodorus and others, Kronos and Rhea had two more children, Hestia and Demeter, but these are identified here with Vesta and Ceres and treated in the chapters on Cybele.
and Proserpina. To the spouses of Jupiter and Pluto, Juno and Proserpina special chapters have been devoted, but not so to the unimportant wife of Neptunus, who is mentioned only in passing. The same holds good of the further deities that make up the twelve Olympian gods, Vulcanus/Hephaestus, Mars and Diana/Artemis, who are dealt with respectively under Pallas, Venus and Proserpina. So it seems that the genealogy as such is not over-important to the author but provides him only with a pragmatic subdivision: Saturnus’ father Caelus is likewise mentioned only in passing (1,7); that Cybele was his sister has been wholly omitted; the author even commits a mistake when he says that the Titans were the sons of Saturn’s brother «Titanus» (3,4). In the first chapter, the Prooemium, Albericus deals with two general subjects: the origin of idols and idolatry, and the origin of polytheism. According to him idols stem from the images of deceased beloved persons in front of which their relatives could express their grief. This is a euhemeristic explanation, which he supports with a derivation of the Greek word eidolon from «species doloris», which implies ‘eidos doloris’, a typically medieval pra-critical etymology, which only takes into consideration the similar parts shared by the word to be explained and the word adduced as its explanation. Polytheism, he thinks, can be accounted for as having arisen from the many names which humanity has assigned to the one and only creator-god in accordance with the manifold tasks and functions which he performs. He even appeals to the Stoa for explaining the masculine names from the more active capacities of this god, and the feminine names from the more passive states in which he may be. The following chapters 2 to 14 which deal with separate deities usually start with etymological explanations of their names, and then treat of the meaning of their appearance, attributes and functions, of which all kinds of rationalistic explanations are offered: natural-historical, psychological, symbolical, allegorical, etc.

As an example we have chosen the chapter on Mercurius about whom int. al. the following is said: he is the god of language and rhetoric, his name is explained by several etymologies (such as «mercatorem kyrion»; because language is important in trade, his birth happened in Arcadia, for this was the country where rhetoric reached perfection; that he was born after his brother Apollo brings to expression that wisdom arose first and that then only came language to express it; his allegorical marriage with Philology is also in line with this; as the son of Jupiter and the mortal Maia he himself is of a mixed character so that he can explain both divine and human affairs. Furthermore, he is also the god of the thieves, because as a rule merchants cheat their customers. He is always represented as wearing a hat because language hides man’s real intents, while his winged shoes symbolize the great rapidity of the human word. That is also why the planet named after him has such a great orbital velocity, whereas its irregular course runs parallel to the fact that he is the messenger between the gods in heaven and the people on earth.

In connection with this last made point there follows now an excursus on the importance of astrology, and also one about the ancient opinions on the existence and activity of the gods, their interference, if any, with humanity, and about such general notions as nature and death, destiny and coincidence. In the other chapters, too, all kinds of subjects come up for discussion, which sometimes have little to do with the deity treated there: the origin of mankind, the first language, religion and superstition, the underworld, body and soul, the incarnation of the soul, reincarnation, funeral customs, consecration of temples,
sacrifices, gem-stones, divination, auspices, foretelling, etc. In doing so Albericus refers to and sometimes quotes from no fewer than fifty ancient and medieval authors, from Solomon (Ecclusiastes 11, 28), Homer and Pythagoras up to John the Scot and Remigius of Auxerre. He can even refer to such relatively little known authors as Licinius Calvus (ll. 30 BCE), Tiberianus (A.D. 336), or Valerius Soranus 82 BCE. It is a striking fact that in comparison with the First and Second Vatican Mythographers the Third, that is Albericus, relates few actual myths, and that when he does he is very brief. One gets the impression that the readers are more or less expected to know these stories already. So Albericus is least of the three a mythographer in the proper sense, like Apollodorus was, Hyginus, etc. He rather wants to explain than to narrate. This justifies the variation in the titles assigned to his work according to the editions of 1525 en 1843: «Allegoriae Poeticae» and «De diis gentium et illorum allegorisa», respectively. It is curious, however, that Mr Dain’s translation does not reproduce any of these titles and that no text critical explanation is offered of their absence. A similar usage occurs in g, 3 (p. 167) «sive ab 'Egyptia graeco, quod disserere interpretatur». And as Remigius himself reads there «apo tu daemon id est a principatu populi» (ed. C. E. Lutz; no textual variants), he is clearly the one who made the link with daemon, probably because his copy of Martianus Capella had a variant reading similar to the one found in A. Dick’s edition of this author, app. crit.: «apo te dedaemonu id est a principatu populi». One might add, though, that the addition of this word must be due to the mythographer himself or to his copyists. One may think that Theophrastus did not write «Isis» meant «water» in Egyptian, which stems from Servius
In 2, 1 (p. 39) Albericus explains the word ‘daemones’ «a daemonios» (vv. ll. «a demonti»; «quasi demoni»), and says that this explanation stems from Remigius of Auxerre (Commentary on Martianus Capella 2, 65, 19). According to Mr. Dain the text is here corrupt because the preposition ‘a’ cannot combine with the nominative case (p. 44 n. 7). But a similar usage occurs in g, 3 (p. 167) «sive ab ‘Egyptia graeco, quod disserere interpretatur». And as Remigius himself reads there «apo tu daemon id est a principatu populi» (ed. C. E. Lutz; no textual variants), he is clearly the one who made the link with daemon instead of daemon, probably because his copy of Martianus Capella had a variant reading similar to the one found in A. Dick’s edition of this author, app. crit.: «apo tu daemonu id est a principatu populi».
Furthermore, about the remark in 4, 5 (p. 61) ‘C’est pourquoi quelqu’un a écrit: Regarde ce qui reste’, that is, of ‘the riches and fame in this world’: Mr. Dain traces it rightly to Fulgentius’ Mythologiae 2, 1, 69 «Theophrastus in his moral writings declared: Heed what is left behind», but then comments, that Theophrastus did not write ‘Moralia’ but a book called ‘Characters’. «Moralia», however, translates here only the adjective of the full title of the work «Hēbrioi Άγιοι Καθημερίνας» (p. 68 n. 29). In 7, 4 (p. 133) Albericus says that «Isis» meant «earth» in Egyptian, which stems from Servius Aen. 8, 696. Here one might have commented that indeed in Coptic «Isis» = «Egypt; ground; soil» = ‘eset’, which lends some support to Servius’ equation. And where Albericus says 8, 22 (p. 152), in explanation of the name of the Muses, that ‘moys’ means «water» in Greek, Mr. Dain rightly traces this to Remigius 6, 286, 17. The text edition of Lutz reads there «nam MOYCA dictur aqua», without the word ‘Græce’, and with the critical note: «MOYCA codd. dett. MOYC Q», i.e. ‘codices deteriores MOYCA, omnium codicum consensus MOYC’, «Q» indicating the consensus of the five ms. used for the edition. Here Mr. Dain quotes (p. 165 n. 118) what Mai commented on the word «Græce»: «Immo Aegiptiacae» «rather in Egyptian», and says that the addition of this word must be due to the mythographer himself or to his copyists. One might add, though, that the addition of ‘Græce’ is not present in the edition of 1520 (f. 33a), and that Remigius’ «MOYC» can only stem from Philo De vita Mosis 4, 17, or Josephus Ant. 2, 228, where it is said, in explanation of the name Moses/Moysos, that Egyptian «µως» means «water» (cf. Coptic
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The implicit appeal to Philo/Josephus in this connection may have been facilitated by the well known Hellenistic identification of Moses and Musaeus, the pupil of Orpheus (by Artapanus at Eusebius Praep. Ev. 9, 27, 3). In 9, 3 (p. 167) the name Hermes is explained as «debatte» («ab Έμης græco quod disserere interpretatur»). This is rightly connected with Fulgentius Mythologiae 1, 18, which runs «Ermes quoque Grece dicitur ab eo quod est ermeuse quod nos Latine disserere dicimus». Mr. Dain remarks then: «Tel quel, le mot ermeneuse ne veut rien dire. Mais c'est une mauvaise transcription de έμης que nous rencontrons chez Servius [i.e. ad Aen. 4, 242], le modèle de Fulgence».

The appeal to Servius is unnecessary, because the Greek word used by Fulgentius is nothing but the aorist infinitive έμης, although transliterated according to the medieval pronunciation, which means 'disseree'/‘to explain, translate’ etc. (According to Boisacq this verb has indeed been formed on the basis of the name Έμης). Finally, in 13, 1 (p. 235) the name of Hercules’ adversary Cacus is explained from the adjective κάκος. This is rejected by Mr. Dain because according to Plutarch Mor. 764f the name was «Κόκος», with quite a different accent. Nevertheless, this difference in accent strongly reminds of the well-known pattern γλαυκός - Πλατόν - Ερμής - Δοσιάκος, etc. It is true that the first vowel of κάκος is short, and that in Virgil Aen. 8, 194 «semihominis Caci facies quam dira tenebat» the first vowel of «Caci» is scanned long, but then again one may point to Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1, 39, 2-42, 2 where the name appears as «Κόκος».

These remarks are only trivial criticisms that touch upon details. They are meant to show that Albericus’ mastery of Greek was not so bad as it may seem here and there. In fact the one and only real shortcoming of the book is its reference system. The paragraphs of the chapters have now been numbered each time anew within each chapter, but regrettablely without the addition of the number of the chapter itself. The index of names, however, refers to chapter plus paragraph, e.g. «Minotaure 11, 7». In order to find the name one has to look up in the 'Table des matières' on which page chapter 11 begins and then go to § 7, which is cumbersome and unhandy. But otherwise this work can only be called excellent.

Utrecht
Gerard Mussies


Il volume analizza la storia di una 'confusione' – quella tra India e Etiopia, regioni estreme dell’ecumenε – conservatasi nella nostra tradizione fino all’età tardoantica. L’A. si propone di stilare un catalogo delle confusioni, di organizzarlo e di indagare le cause che produssero e mantennero questa confusione anche in tempi nei quali le ampiate conoscenze geografiche avrebbero dovuto rivoluzionare gli antichi pregiudizi. Il lavoro è, in questa prospettiva, diviso in tre parti: la prima (‘Inventaire’, pp.15-217) contiene la descrizione degli aspetti geografici, antropologici e etnografici, mitici e storici, zoologici, botanici, e mineralogici di quella sovrapposizione Etiopia-India che sembra, non tanto o non solo, risultato dell’ignoranza dei luoghi quanto elaborazione di schematismi che fusero insieme (cioè con-fusero) nell’intento di comprendere meglio le realtà remote, inserite in uno schema geografico (una carta?), in cui gli estremi non solo si toccavano ma si identificavano.
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