

Jacobus Goyer(1651-1689) at the Dawn of Homeric Scholarship

Masaaki Kubo

The present paper, the 4th under the same title, continues to examine the nature and quality of the annotations which Jacobus Goyer of Utrecht inscribed on the margins of his copy of Homer printed by Aldo in 1517, focussing our attentions this time mainly on those he annotated on the passages, shortly before and in the Catalogue of Ships, B455-B877.

It is shown that some of these annotations, on B484-605, were the first ones of all he inscribed, on the ground of careful examination of the line-numbers which Jacobus Goyer meticulously inscribed in red before he started annotating in black. Only the margins of B484-605 had been already filled with annotations when the line-numbers were about to be written in, so that the numerals had to be written in the open and irregular spaces left for them. These preoccupants, including several excerpts from the Leiden scholia(Le by Erbse, Voss Gr. F. 64), and a long quotation from Cuyper's *Consecratio Homeri*, p. 130, clearly made up the starting premises, for or against which Jacobus Goyer started his Homeric explorations.

First, the excerpts from Le help to simply glorify Homer's poetic power and his skillful use of similes, then comment on the poet's prayer to Muses, with the emphasis on the poet's special preparation for launching upon a theme new and never attempted before. Second, the quotation from Cuyper's rests on, as remarked by Jacobus Goyer, Porphyrius's statement, that the Catalogue represents the comprehensive total picture of the world, in respects of both geographical descriptions and topographical details of individual cities and towns. And that is the reason why the law came to be established in the Greek world for the boys to learn the Catalogue by heart. Now in face of these two kinds of excerpts from the ancient sources, one is bound to question how they are related to the rest of annotations, about 40 in total for the main body of the Catalogue. Jacobus Goyer inscribes the passages of Statius and other poets whose Latin versions markedly differ from the Homeric Greek, or Strabon, Pausanias, or Pomponius Mela, whose

Homeric quotations widely differ from the Aldine Homer. Jacobus Goyer is very far from blindly accepting Cuyper's or Porphyrius' estimate of the Catalogue. Moreover, his geographical searches do not stop at the ancient sources, but try to reach as far down as the contemporary geographical and historical surveys, by Vossius, Spon and Ricaut, for examples, of the east Aegean regions. The 40 or so annotations add up to a possible conclusion that the annotator, in contrast to Cuyper, saw the picture of the Aegean world in the phases of metamorphoses, and its archetype, Homer's Catalogue, subject to the continuous flux of textual variations.

Now the poet, the creator of the archetype, is led to find his new place, no longer consecrated on the Olympos, but right on the trodden earth: the Catalogue could have been deemed by Jacobus Goyer to represent a record of the laborious passages along which the poet travelled and collected the locally preserved materials for his stock book of the Trojan songs.

(The Japan Academy)

Telemachus in the bow contest in Book 21 of the *Odyssey*

Noriko Yasumura

In the scene of the bow contest in Book 21 of the *Odyssey*, several questions are raised, among which are why Telemachus joined the contest for choosing the husband of Penelope, and what he really means by his speech at 21. 113-7. It is the aim of this paper to consider how the motif (story pattern) of "the conflict between father and son" is working behind this scene, and how the poet of the *Odyssey* incorporated this motif into his story.

In the first section, the characterisation of Telemachus is looked at. The main feature of his identity that is given emphasis is the son who is like his father. In the first four books of the *Odyssey*, the emphasis is on the similarity of his appearance to his father, as Telemachus is still a powerless youth at this stage. But at the same time, it is hinted at that he is to become a true hero like his father. Viewed from this context, the narrative that he could have strung his father's bow if Odysseus had not given a warning

nod and stopped him (*Od.* 21. 128-9) shows that Telemachus is now similar to his father in power as well. Since no proof of identification is shown to Telemachus for him to recognise Odysseus, this episode functions as a proof of their identity as father and son; stringing his father's bow would be the most definite demonstration of their similarity.

In the second section, Telemachus' speech (21. 113-7) is examined, where he talks of the reason for his joining the contest. The ambiguities in his speech are (1) whether οὔ(115) should be taken with μοι ἀχνημένω(115) or with λείποι(116); and (2) what ἀέθλια (117) actually means. On the first point, it is concluded that οὔ (115) goes with λείποι (116), and on the second, it is argued that ἀέθλια (117) denotes "the prize" instead of "the contest" or "the weapon". Thus Telemachus joins the contest in order to gain Penelope and the kingship of Ithaca.

The third section points out the reasons why the motif of father-son conflict could have intruded into this epic. The relevant factors are: (1) the poet's knowledge of the episode in the *Telegony*, in which Odysseus is killed by his son by accident; (2) the close contact between the Trojan and Theban epic cycles, as is shown by mention of Teiresias (*Od.* 11.90-151) and Oedipus (*Il.* 23.679; *Od.* 11.271-80), in which the motif of father-son conflict is the basic pattern of the story; (3) the parallel relationship of Telemachus and Telegonus to Odysseus; (4) the widespread motif of father-son conflict throughout the Indo-European world.

Thus, in this scene of the bow contest, the poet of the *Odyssey* seems to have alluded to the story of Odysseus' death by his own son, but also presents us with the new relationship between father and son, narrating Telemachus' acceptance of his father's warning nod. This interpretation of their momentary crisis and reconciliation well explains the episode of the two eagles, who come flying close together and depart in the same way, but in the meantime harm each other (*Od.* 2.146-56). Although this episode has been regarded as difficult to interpret, it fits well with the situation of Odysseus and Telemachus at the bow contest; the son is now equivalent in strength to his father, which might cause dangerous tension between them, but they are reconciled at once and establish a new relationship. In this way, the motif of father-son conflict seems to underlie the bow contest scene.

(Kanazawa University)

Pan und die Musen in Theokrits "Syrinx"

Yuko Furusawa

Das Technopaignion "Syrinx"(Anthologia Palatina 15.21), das unter dem Namen Theokrits überliefert ist, ist ein Figurengedicht, das eine Panflöte darstellt. Der unbekannte Autor, der sich Simichidas-Paris nennt, widmet dem Hirtengott Pan eine Hymne. Da die Syrinx das Musikinstrument der Hirten ist, symbolisiert diese Form zugleich die Verbindung von Musenkunst und Hirtenleben.

Die ‚Syrinx‘ ist ein Rätselgedicht. Die Namen der Personen sind verschlüsselt. Es beginnt mit der ‚Gattin Niemand’s‘ (Penelope), die die Mutter Pans ist, der einen ‚Diebesvater‘ (Dieb = Hermes) hat und zugleich ‚vaterlos‘ ist. Solche Umdeutungen bieten neue Bilder von Pan und auch von seinen Geliebten, den Nymphen Pitys, Syrinx und Echo. Pan hat den Namen des Ganzen und ist zugleich ein ‚Doppelwesen‘ (*dizon*) (aus Mensch und Bock) (v. 5). Da das Wort *dizon* aber auch ‚zweifelnd‘ bedeutet, ist Pan ein zweideutiges und wendiges Wesen.

Die Nymphen sind bukolische Musen. Denn ‚Pitys‘ (Kiefer) bereitet den Hirten kühle Schatten zum Flötenspiel und Singen; ‚Syrinx‘ veranlasst die Liebeskrankheit, verwandelt sich in Schilf und dann in die Panflöte. Sie spielt das Lied von der unerfüllbaren Liebe (v. 8), d.h., sie ist das Instrument für das wichtigste Thema der bukolischen Dichtung. ‚Echo‘ gibt immer nur den letzten Teil eines Rufes wieder, ändert so die Bedeutung der Worte und gibt ihnen durch eine unerwartete Perspektive einen neuen Sinn. Der Überlieferung nach (s. Schol. Eur. Or. 964 und Kall. fr. 685) gebar Echo Pan zwei Töchter, Iambe und Iynx. ‚Iambe‘ heißt ‚Spott, Schimpf‘, ‚Iambe‘ hat also eine besondere Beziehung zu den Jambographen, den Dichtern von Spott- und Schimpfliedern. ‚Iynx‘ benutzte man zum Liebeszauber, sie hat eine enge Verbindung mit der Liebesdichtung. Pan hat in seinen zwei Töchtern also gleichsam die beiden literarischen Gattungen der Bukolik gezeugt. Pan und die Nymphen zeigen so, mit welchen Themen sich die Dichtungen des Autors befassen, und welche Ausdrucksweise er bevorzugt. Man kann die "Syrinx" daher als eine Poetik des Autors verstehen.

Natürlich geht das Gedicht nicht systematisch oder theoretisch vor, aber es äußert sich in Andeutungen und symbolischer Praxis.

Auch in den Thalysien Theokrits geben sich der Ich-Erzähler Simichidas und der Ziegenhirtendichter Lykidas gemeinsam als bukolische Dichter zu erkennen, die sich in Opposition zu den Homernachahmern fühlen. Simichidas bezieht sich dabei auf die Dichterweihe Hesiods. In ähnlicher Weise zeigt der Dichter der "Syrinx", was für einen Charakter seine Dichtkunst hat und woher sie stammt, indem er die Schutzpatrone Pan und die Nymphen besingt, denen er als Zeugnis seiner Dichtungsweise das Technopaignion "Syrinx" in der Form eines Hymnus widmet. Der Dichter nennt sich Paris, weil er die Schönheit der Göttinnen beurteilen, θεοκρίνειν, kann. Dieser Hymnus kann als ein deklarationsartiges Bekenntnis zu den bukolischen Musen und zu Pan interpretiert werden. Sie stehen für die richtige musische Kunst der Bukolik, die in diesem Figuren-Rätsel-Gedicht verwirklicht ist, und die durch sie zugleich beglaubigt und anerkannt wird.

(Hitotsubashi University)

Interrelation among Stories in Orpheus' Song (Ov. *Met.* 10.148-739):

Gravity, Lightness, Earth and Sky

Shiro Kawashima

Ovid's *Metamorphoses* can, as announced in its opening lines (1.1-4), be characterized as an epic which is one continuous song composed of variegated stories of metamorphoses. According to B. Otis, this characteristic consists of three elements: continuity, variety and unity. Furthermore in some cases *Metamorphoses* shows a structure in which a story is told in yet another story. The aim of this paper is to demonstrate the importance of this characteristic in connection with Orpheus' song (10.148-739). In book ten Orpheus sings seven stories, and they are connected with each other to be one unified song. This paper examines the first two stories ('Ganymede' and 'Hyacinthus') and the last two ('Adonis' and 'Atalanta') in his song. We shall discuss the

interrelation among these stories in respect of the common elements, 'gravity', 'lightness', 'earth' and 'sky', which can be found in them.

First, in the stories of 'Ganymede' and 'Hyacinthus' we find that the elements of 'gravity and lightness' and 'earth and sky' are emphasized. These two stories are connected by these elements which point to the contrast between Ganymede and Hyacinthus. For instance, Ganymede was loved by Jupiter and snatched away into the ether, whereas Hyacinthus, who was loved by Apollo on earth, became flower on the ground after his death. Moreover, in the scene of death and transformation of Hyacinthus these elements are important in that they underline the contrast between mortals and immortals. Mortals have the attribute symbolized as 'earth and gravity'. On the other hand, immortals including Ganymede after he was brought up to heaven, have the attribute of 'sky and lightness'. This shows that these elements create not only the narrative continuity but also the correspondences between the stories. These elements play a vital role in unifying the stories.

Second, we shall discuss the interrelation between the stories of 'Adonis' and 'Atalanta'. Adonis, who is described as having the attribute of 'gravity' in the first part of story, obtains the 'lightness' when he is transformed into an anemone. In contrast, Atalanta, who has the 'lightness' in the first part, obtains the 'gravity' when she is transformed into a lioness. Even though their metamorphoses show a striking contrast, they resemble each other in that they both relate to the 'earth'. This resemblance becomes clearer when we compare them with the elements of 'lightness and sky' of Venus and notice the contrast between mortals and immortals. By focusing our attention on the 'gravity and lightness' and 'earth and sky', we perceive the interrelation between these stories.

The first two stories and last two, which form the outer frame of Orpheus' song, depict love and sorrow of humans and gods. These stories draw the contrast between mortals who have the attribute of 'gravity and earth' and immortals characterized by the nature of 'lightness and sky'. We conclude that these elements create interrelation among stories and the unity of Orpheus' song.

(Tokyo Metropolitan University)

Soul and Ageing: The Views of Plato and Aristotle on Old Age

Masahisa Seguchi

In *Old Age* Simone de Beauvoir argues that Plato and Aristotle reached opposite conclusions concerning old age: the optimistic and the pessimistic. B.Y.L. Simon challenges Beauvoir's suggestion on three main points, claiming

- (1) Plato and Aristotle both agree that the elder is to rule and the younger to be ruled and that people must respect elder persons and old parents.
- (2) They do not appreciate old age in general but only exceptional cases of philosophers or the elite.
- (3) They think that old age is going to degenerate not only physical conditions but also intellectual capacity of the soul.

In this paper I examine these three points and show that they are not supported from the texts of Plato and Aristotle.

First, I point out that their physiological theories of old age are significantly different. In *Tim.*81B-D Plato explains the physiological mechanism of old age based on the assumption that connate elemental triangles, which function to digest nutrients, are doomed to wear out with age. However, he never suggests old age necessarily brings about deterioration of intellectual faculties. Plato distinguishes old age from disease and then suggests a way of living a healthy life to harmonize movement of soul and body. His suggestion is not limited to the intelligent elite but targets ordinary people (*Tim.*88C). On the other hand, Aristotle believes that ageing leads to deterioration of the intellect. According to his physiological theory Vital Heat, which plays an essential role to cook down food into blood carrying necessary nutrients to each part of body, will be decreased as the process of ageing hardens the lungs and destroys the balance of its cooling mechanism. He supposes that decreasing or lack of the amount of Vital Heat would make the blood colder and scarce and eventually could cause degeneration of sense perception and intellectual ability. Moreover, he does not make a clear distinction between old age and disease and even approves of old age being called a natural disease in *GA.*784b

Second, I investigate the usage of terms used to refer to old age or the elderly in Plato and Aristotle. There are two major groups of words to indicate old age in Greek: πρέσβυς and γῆρας. Γῆρας means old age in a proper sense but πρέσβυς indicates relatively elder one and has a positive meaning of importance or ambassador. Plato uses πρέσβυς twice more than γῆρας. On the contrary, Aristotle applies γῆρας twice more than πρέσβυς. Plato seldom uses these words in a negative way although he sometimes ironically refers to old age. Aristotle uses γῆρας more often due to his greater interest in biological research. He observes a large variety of species whose lifecycles are much shorter than human beings and tries to identify specific features in old age to each creature. Various unpleasant phenomena of ageing are objectively explained with only two principles: dryness and coldness. Their contrasting usages of these words suggest that their attitudes toward old age are quite different.

Third, Aristotle certainly agrees that the elder or *full-grown adult* is to rule the younger, but he criticises the office of Elders in Sparta as a gerontocracy in *Pol.*1270b-1271a because he believes that there is old age of mind as well as of body. By contrast, Plato allows the examiners of the magistrates to hold their important office until the age of 75 in *Lg.*946C. Finally, I indicate that Plato gives far more sympathetic treatment to very old grandparents or parents than Aristotle.

(Nagoya Institute of Technology)

Flux and Language in Plato's *Timaeus* (49b-50b)

Takeshi Nakamura

In *Timaeus* 49b-50b, Plato presents the difficulty of describing the phenomenal world in flux. H. Cherniss called this place “A Much Misread Passage” about 50 years ago, and presented an alternative interpretation to a traditional position.

Right after presenting the difficulty, *Timaeus* gives us “the safest answer”. Traditional (T) and Alternative (A) interpreters have disagreed on how to read this “safest

answer”. T interpreters (Cornford, Zeyl et al.) read the core sentence (ἀεὶ ὁ καθορῶμεν ἄλλοτε ἄλλη γιγνόμενον, ὡς πῦρ, μὴ τοῦτο ἀλλὰ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐκάστοτε προσαγορεύειν πῦρ) of the safest answer as follows: [it is the safest] to characterize that, i.e. fire, not as “this”, but each time as “such”. On the other hand, A interpreters (Cherniss, Lee et al.) read it as follows: [it is the safest] to characterize not this, but what on each occasion is such, as “fire”.

According to T interpreters, Plato demands that we must not call the phenomenal fire “this” (τοῦτο) identically, but rather “such” (τοιοῦτον) predicatively. In this interpretation, we are not prohibited from calling the phenomenon “fire” or “water”. Plato is just requiring us not to regard the phenomenal fire as a substantial thing to which we can refer “this,” but as an insubstantial thing to which we can only refer as “such”. On the other hand, A interpreters argue, Plato demands that we must not call *this* phenomenon “fire” but call *such and such* a character “fire”. In this interpretation, Plato says that the proper referent of the word “fire” is not *this* transient phenomenal fire but *such and such* a character (the character of fire, in this case).

However, each side has its difficulties. As to the construal of the Greek, the T reading is not so natural as the A reading. On the other hand, in the A interpretation, we have four items in Timaeus’ ontology, whereas he explicitly declares that there are only three items (Forms, Form copies, receptacle). Thus, it has been a challenge for A interpreters to construe what the fourth item (such and such a character) is.

In the face of these difficulties, I propose to take the A reading of the safest answer, but to interpret the passage differently from A interpreters. So far, both T and A interpreters have translated the relative clause at 49d4-5, ἀεὶ ὁ καθορῶμεν ἄλλοτε ἄλλη γιγνόμενον, ὡς πῦρ, as “what we observe becoming different at different times ... fire, for example”, and so, have taken the referent of this clause to be phenomenal fire. Unlike those previous interpreters, I interpret the referent of the clause as the receptacle, and translate it as “what we observe becoming different ... for example, fire ... at different times”.

The biggest advantage of this interpretation is that we can take the referent of *such* to be each phenomenon, e.g. phenomenal fire or water, because the referent of *this* is taken to be the receptacle. The A interpreters have taken *this* to refer to the transient

phenomenon, and thus couldn't have taken *such* to refer to the phenomenon. As a result, they have assumed the self-identical character as the referent of *such*. In my interpretation, Plato requires that we must not call this part of the receptacle "fire" or "water", but call each phenomenon "fire" or "water". In this interpretation, we can avoid both the unnatural T reading of the safest answer, and the difficulty of how to interpret the fourth item in Timaeus' ontology.

(University of California, Irvine)

Soul and Causal Agency in Aristotle's *Motu Animalium*

Yoshihiko Kaneko

In *Motu Animalium* (*MA*, hereafter), Aristotle repeatedly says, "The soul *moves* the body", "Desire *moves* the animal", etc.. Commentators, who interpret Aristotle's philosophy of mind in a non-dualistic way, would find these claims perplexing, since they appear to imply that the soul is a non-material substance, separable from body, and imparts motion to body. Martha Nussbaum, one of the most influential proponents of the functionalistic interpretation of Aristotle, argues that the capacities of the soul are called "the movers of the animal" because of their role in the explanation of goal-directed motions, not of their causal agency, and so his claims there do not imply the Cartesian or Platonic conception of the soul as an incorporeal agent.

However, although this sort of view is dominant in the recent literature, I don't think that it is a plausible reading. A number of passages in *MA* suggest that Aristotle takes the animal soul, or part of it, to be a causal agent in the quite literal sense, by which an animal can be moved to act. That wouldn't be so embarrassing if you saw that it is his theory of causation and other connected doctrines that lie behind the account of animal movements in *MA*. My aim in this paper is to show that this is a crucial aspect of Aristotle's philosophy of mind and action developed in *MA*.

The first part of my discussion treats the *MA*'s account of the initiation of animal (and human) movements. Aristotle explicitly says that the capacities of the soul, such as perception, imagination, thought and desire, have by themselves the power to alter a bodily organ (on his view, the heart). It is important to notice that he thinks such an

alteration occurs because an animal's soul receives a certain form from the external world and thereby acquires the power to change its physiological state. The idea is that the form itself, both internal and external, has the causal efficacy by virtue of which the alteration in an animal at the material level can be brought about. I show that this idea is the key to understanding Aristotle's view, and that he makes use of it here on the basis of both the theory of formal and efficient causation he has established in *Physics* and his other writings, and the view which might be called "isomorphism" developed in *De Anima*.

Next, I turn to another passage from *MA*. It is supposed to strongly support the functionalistic interpretation because Aristotle seems to introduce the connate *pneuma* to provide a material basis for mental causation. However, a careful reading will show that he insists there is a distinct type of alteration that the soul itself, rather than its material correlate, would undergo, which he calls "*energeia*" elsewhere. Here too he holds that a physiological change like that of *pneuma* takes place just as the result of this formal level causation.

I conclude by suggesting in brief that such a picture of Aristotle's philosophy may throw some light on the problem of mental causation.

(Tokyo Metropolitan University)

What is the *seisachtheia* ?

Tadashi Ito

There have been many debates concerning *seisachtheia*, a key word of Solon's reform that means 'the shaking-off of burdens'. Solon's *seisachtheia* is normally thought to mean the cancellation of debts. The first mention of this word is in the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*. But, curiously, this word appears nowhere in Solon's extant poems. The author of *Athenaion Politeia* says(6.1) that "they call"(*kalousin*) the cancellation of private and public debts "*seisachtheia*", not that Solon called it so Plutarch says(*Solon*, 15) "it seems"(*hos eoike*) Solon was the first to call *seisachtheia* the cancellation of debts. We may suppose that if the author of *Athenaion Politeia* (and Plutarch) did not find the

actual word *seisachtheia* in Solon's own writings, it is quite probable that this word was not there at all.

More curiously, Aristotle not only fails to mention *seisachtheia* in *Politics*, but also his interpretation concerning Solon's reform differs from that in *Athenaion Politeia*. Possibly the interpretation of *seisachtheia* as the cancellation of debts is an inference from *fr. 36*(West), 5-7. That is, the author of *Athenaion Politeia* identified the *horoi* appearing in *fr. 36*, 6 with the *horoi* mortgage-stones of fourth century B C. Athens, and he thought Solon cancelled the debts on real security by removing the *horoi*. If the author did think in this way, the people mentioned in *fr. 36*, 13-14 must have been those who had been slaves before and were freed by the *seisachtheia*, namely, debtors at the mercy of their creditor masters. It is possible that the author considered them the *hektemoroi* at *Ath. Pol.*, 2, 2.

Nevertheless, according to *Politics*(1273b36ff. and 1274a15-17) Solon put an end to oligarchy and liberated the people from slavery, and he gave to the people the minimum of political power, namely, the function of electing magistrates and of calling them to account. Aristotle then says(1274a17-18) "for if even this were not under the control of the populace, it [the powerless populace] would be a mere slave". This interpretation is also possible from Solon's poems(*fr. 36*, 13-14 and *fr. 5*, 1-2). Finally, the discrepancies in details between *Athenaion Politeia* and *Politics* make it clear that they have different authors. It thus seems reasonable to assume that the author of *Athenaion Politeia* has introduced anachronistic ideas into his account of events of Solon's time, and that his assumption concerning *seisachtheia* rests on an anachronistic interpretation of *fr. 36*, 5-7. It is also reasonable to view the assumption of *Politics* as sound. That is to say, the *seisachtheia* liberated the people from slavery by putting an end to the oligarchy and giving political power to the people.

(Kagoshima University)

Italian Cities and Administrative Reconstruction during the Third Century A.D.:

A Reappraisal of the Como Inscription

Yutaka Oshimizu

Following the Social War, Italian cities enjoyed some privileges in the Roman Empire. However, Italy was divided into many provinces (*regiones*), and governors (*correctores*) were sent by emperors during the third century.

Although many scholars believe that these governors began to control Italian cities, the evidence is limited. Although most literary sources are unreliable, we have about twenty inscriptions regarding *correctores* during this period. Most of these inscriptions were dedicated to emperors by *correctores* or to the *correctores* themselves by communities or individuals. These inscriptions do not in fact support the interpretation of extensive governor control over Italian cities. Only one inscription (*AE* 1914.249 = *AE* 1917/18.124 = *AE* 1919.52) from Como seems to lend itself to such a reading. The wording of this inscription is as follows: “T. Fl. Postumius Titianus, *clarissimus vir*, *corrector Italiae*, perfected and dedicated the Temple of Sol by the order of Our Lords the Diocletian and Maximian emperors, and Axilius Iunior, *clarissimus vir*, curator of the city, took charge”. Although this inscription seems to support the hypothesis of governor control over cities, contextual analysis suggests other possibilities.

First, in comparison to other inscriptions in which the emperors took the initiative, such as in the case of the bath complex at Rome, the role of the emperors does not stand out. Therefore, it is unlikely that the emperors took the initiative in Como.

Second, Titianus seems to have occupied a special position in the government, investigating in place of the emperors (*CIL* 6.1418). Therefore, we cannot generalize from this particular case.

Third, both Titianus, the governor, and Axilius Iunior, the curator, were senators, and the former did not seem to take precedence over the latter. The inscription was very likely produced around 291 A.D, a date that is quite significant. In the winter of 290-291, Diocletian met Maximian at Milan, near Como. The city authority for Como would have dispatched delegates to Milan to make a petition to the emperors regarding the Temple of Sol.

The curator probably played a key role in making this petition. His father had also been a curator of Como, therefore Axilius Iunior was more like a patron of the city than a member of the governor's staff. According to Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (9.2.1),

support provided by a curator of the city was key to making the city's petition to the emperor a success in 311. Perhaps Axilius Iunior played a similar role in 291. As a result, the governor Titianus "perfected and dedicated" the Temple of Sol by the "order" of the emperors, but this "order" was passive.

In conclusion, although at first glance the Como inscription suggests governor control over Italian cities, contextualization reveals other possibilities. The inscription was probably the result of active petitioning on the part of an Italian city; therefore, it cannot be read as proof of control. Further study of this inscription will yield new insights into the complex and shifting relationship among Italian cities, governors and emperors in the third century A.D.

(The University of Tokyo)

A New Interpretation of the Origin of the Great Persecution

Takaya Hosaka

In this paper we reassess Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* 8.1 and offer a new interpretation of the Great Persecution. To elucidate its origin Chap 10 of Lactantius' *De Mortibus Persecutorum* does not help us since it seems to be affected by a Christian bias, revealing a literary motif of anti-pagan propaganda. Eusebius, on the other hand, who vaguely describes how the Church incurred a persecution as divine punishment for her internal strife gives crucial clues to the present inquiry, though his account needs more careful analyses; internal strife had generally not been a cause, but a result of persecution, as was clearly attested in the letters of Cyprian and some passages from Tertullian(e.g. *Scorp* 1.5). We should understand that the strife mentioned in *HE* 8.1 originated from the "persecution" within the army (and not *vice versa!* Cf. *MartPalaest* 12.1[S]) which Diocletian launched in the last decade of the third century. Given this, we could reconstruct the prelude to the Great Persecution as follows.

During the Persian War the Emperor realises the necessity of redressing the military discipline and cancelled the exemption (given as a privilege to the Christian soldiers probably by Galienus) from performance of any pagan ritual. Thus there arose a

serious difference of opinion in the Church, and this developed in the course of time into a fatal schism among three groups, namely laxists, rigorists and moderates. The moderates to which most of the orthodoxy fathers belonged followed the traditional line endorsed by Callistus the Pope of Roman Church. Feeling obliged as soldiers of Christ (*II Tim* 2.3) to serve only one master, not two, they called upon all the church members to make a tenacious resistance to the demonic worship imposed by Romans.

It was when Diocletian had taken notice of these apparently rebellious and well-organised activities of the Church that the Great Persecution was triggered off. The Church intended in fact nothing but to keep her faith pure by refusing to participate in any pagan rituals whereas the government regarded it as a kind of political sedition or even a declaration of war against the Empire. This interpretation fits in with the fact that at the end of the third century the image of Church held by the government changed. We should emphasise that in this period the Church had been for the first time acknowledged to be, not only a nation *ἔθνος* at all (e.g.*HE* 9.9a.1), but a nation seditious and pernicious to the Empire(*MartPalaest* 9.12; cf. Liv 39.13.14), as was explicitly accused of disloyalty in the “Edict of Toleration” of Galerius who complained of their “assembling various nations” for an evil purpose. Recognition of the Church as a nation means that the government recognised her as a political body with whom to negotiate. Thus the repressive measure could be followed and replaced immediately by a protective one. Persecution and protection were the two contradictory fruits proceeding from one and the same seed.

(Chiba University)