

PAIDEIA

FORMAR E EDUCAR

ONTEM E HOJE



TO FORM AND EDUCATE
YESTERDAY AND TODAY

HUMANITAS

PAIDEIA & HUMANITAS

Formar e educar ontem e hoje

To form and educate yesterday and today

Editores: Alberto Filipe Araújo · Custódia Martins
Henrique Miguel Carvalho · José Pedro Serra · Justino Magalhães

Capa: António Pedro

© Centro de Estudos Clássicos da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa
Instituto de Educação da Universidade do Minho
Instituto de Educação da Universidade de Lisboa
ISBN: 978-972-9376-50-4

Edições Húmus, Lda., 2018
Apartado 7081
4764-908 Ribeirão – V. N. Famalicão
Telef.: 926 375 305
humus@humus.com.pt
ISBN: 978-989-755-386-8

Impressão: Papelmunde, SMG, Lda. – V. N. Famalicão
1ª edição: Dezembro de 2018
Depósito Legal: 448522/18

Alberto Filipe Araújo
Custódia Martins
Henrique Miguel Carvalho
José Pedro Serra
Justino Magalhães
(Editores)

Este trabalho é financiado por Fundos Nacionais através da FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., no âmbito dos projetos UID/ELT/0019/2013 e UID/CED/04107/2016.

húmus

- Moreno, P. 1984. Argomenti lisippei. Xenia. Semestrale di antichità 8, pp. 21-26.
- . 2002. Il genio differente. Alla scoperta della maniera antica. Milano: Electa.
- . 1974. Lisippo. Vol. I. Bari: Dedalo Libri.
- . 1987. Vita e arte di Lisippo. Milano: Mondadori.
- Motz, T. A. 1993. The Roman Freestanding Portrait Bust: Origins, Context, and Early History. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Neudecker, R. 1988. Die Skulpturenausstattung römischer Villen in Italien. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Pollitt, J. J. 1986. Art in the Hellenistic Age. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richter, G. M. A. 1965. The Portraits of the Greeks. London: Phaidon Press.
- Saladino, V. 1998. Artisti greci e committenti romani. I Greci. Storia, Cultura, Arte e Società, II. Una storia greca - Trasformazioni. A cura di S. Settis. Torino: Einaudi, pp. 965-990.
- Smith, R. R. 1991. Hellenistic Sculpture: a Handbook. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Stewart, P. 2004. Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Youtiras, E. 1994. Sokrates in der Akademie: Die früheste bezeugte Philosophenstatue. Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung 109, pp. 133-161.
- Wrede, H. 1985. Die antike Herme. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Zanker, P. 1997. La maschera di Socrate. L'immagine dell'intellettuale nell'arte antica. Traduzione di F. de Angelis. Torino: Einaudi.

AULUS GELLIUS' DEFINITION OF HUMANITAS, AELIUS ARISTIDES AND WILLEM CANTER*

Simone Mollea
University of Warwick

When it comes to defining the Latin value-term *humanitas* and its implications, scholars very often start from Aulus Gellius' discussion at *Noctes Atticae* 13.17. In this "article" – to borrow Andrew Stevenson's fitting definition for Gellian sections of the work – the Latin encyclopedist seeks to explain what he sees as the right meaning of the word, by resorting to the Greek concepts of παιδεία and φιλανθρωπία. As a result, modern scholars usually interpret the various occurrences of *humanitas* in Latin authors by principally referring to these Greek concepts. While the main trend has been to oppose instances of *humanitas* standing for παιδεία to those standing for φιλανθρωπία, some studies have sought to show that these two Greek ideas can be closely related to one another, or at times even overlap within the single Latin word *humanitas*. With this same aim in mind I argue in this paper that the equation *humanitas* = παιδεία + φιλανθρωπία can also be verified by starting from Greek texts in which the unusual pairing of φιλανθρωπία and παιδεία, without necessarily being an explicit attempt to reproduce the double meaning of Latin *humanitas*, might be the result of the contemporary spread of this Latin ideal. In particular, this happens in a couple of speeches by Aelius Aristides, that is, roughly in the same age and cultural milieu in which Gellius wrote his reflections on *humanitas*. Willem Canter, the first to translate all of Aelius Aristides' work into Latin in the XVI century, seems also to have been the first to understand Aristides' possible attempt to render *humanitas* into Greek, or at least this is what we can infer from his (re-)translating Aristides' φιλανθρωπία τε καὶ παιδεία into Latin as the simple *humanitate*. As well as revealing Canter's extraordinary sensitivity in both Greek and Latin, the translation of these two Greek words also indicates that Renaissance humanism, by the time of its maturity at least,

* It is my pleasure to thank the organisers and participants of the Colóquio Internacional "Paideia e Humanitas formar e educar ontem e hoje". I am grateful to Andrea Balbo, Elisabetta Berardi, Daniela Caso, Gianmario Cattaneo, Ermanno Malaspina, Victoria Rimell and Maude Vanhaelen for reading different drafts of this paper and offering some helpful comments. Needless to say, they are not responsible for any errors or omissions.

1. See for example Stroh (2008), who will be cited at length later on in the present paper. Probably in more opaque terms, the same idea was already in the pioneering Pohlenz (1947, 451).

did not regard *humanitas* as mere erudition, as Gellius had maintained, but was also aware of its philanthropic significance.

To clarify this scenario, let me start by returning to *Noctes Atticae*:

Qui verba Latina fecerunt quique his probe usi sunt, "humanitatem" non id esse voluerunt, quod vulgus existimat quodque a Graecis philanthropia dicitur et significat dexteritatem quandam benivolentiamque erga omnis homines promiscam, sed "humanitatem" appellaverunt id propemodum, quod Graeci παιδείαν vocant, nos eruditionem institutionemque in bonas artis dicimus. (...) Sic igitur eo verbo veteres esse usos et cum primis M. Varronem Marcumque Tullium omnes ferme libri declarant (13. 17.1-2).

Here Aulus Gellius blames his contemporaries for misusing the term *humanitas*. According to him, they have forgotten that *humanitas* is an equivalent of the Greek term παιδεία and should therefore stand for "education and training in the liberal arts". Instead, they consider it, wrongly, as a synonym of φιλανθρωπία, thus signifying "a kind of friendly spirit and good-feeling towards all men without distinction". The greatest, unchallengeable evidence in support of this claim, Gellius argues, is that both Cicero and Varro, the *auctoritates* par excellence when it comes to Latin grammar and language, gave that very meaning to the word. Needless to say, this passage has always raised several problems for modern scholars. Without lingering too long on it, I would like to highlight a couple of points which are particularly relevant to the development of this paper.

First, as Robert Kaster (1986, 8) has shown, the "contemporaries" whom Gellius blames are actually learned men of Gellius' social rank, who can at least in part be identified as the grammarians. To those who are acquainted with Gellius, this will come as no surprise, for the grammarians are often the target of Gellius' attacks². More importantly, perhaps, Kaster's interpretation allows us to verify among the literary texts that have come down to us whether Gellius' statement stands up to scrutiny. In other words, there is no need to assume that Gellius was criticising uneducated people whose misuse of Latin language was quite obvious. After all, these men were unlikely to read Gellius' work, nor would they have appreciated his learned quotation from Varro's *Rerum humanarum libri*:

2. On the grammarians as polemical target of Gellius' oeuvre see Marache (1962, 210-213), Maselli (1978, 31-32, 83), who correctly points out that Gellius' polemical target is the grammarians' teaching rather than the grammarians themselves, Astarita (1993, 204), Vardi (2001, 50), who lists some grammarians whom Gellius "spares", Keulen (2009, 2, 28), Howley (2013, 10). It will not be superfluous to highlight that Vardi (2001, 53) adds that, because of their esoteric Weltanschauung, "experts in all disciplines are equally bad, and we should probably ascribe the relatively large proportion of grammarians among them to the fact that language and literature are the topics which most interest him [scil. Gellius]".

Itaque verba posui Varronis e libro rerum humanarum primo, cuius principium hoc est: "Praxiteles, qui propter artificium egregium nemini est paulum modo humaniori ignotus" (Noc. Att. 13.17.3).

It follows that we can say that Gellius was probably right in saying that his "more or less" contemporaries identified *humanitas* with φιλανθρωπία or a similar concept. Very little of the Latin literature of Gellius' day is extant, but a survey of the occurrences of the term in Fronto, and, above all, Apuleius, seems to confirm his statement. As for 2nd-century grammarians, unfortunately there is no trace of the word *humanitas* in the manuals by authors such as Velius Longus, Quintus Terentius Scaurus or Flavius Caper.

Secondly, it is evident that Gellius' interpretation of *humanitas* in Cicero and Varro as meaning solely παιδεία is not accurate. In the case of Cicero, the numerous (229 in total) instances of *humanitas* in his extant work have provided scholars with abundant material for study, and have consequently revealed various nuances that *humanitas* takes on. As a result, the specific bibliography on Ciceronian *humanitas* is so vast that it is impossible even to sketch an outline of it in this context. However, there can be little doubt as to what has been the main trend in interpreting it over the last century, that is, by indicating three semantic fields of application and their equivalent translations: 1 mankind and its nature, 2 φιλανθρωπία, 3 παιδεία. As Christian Høgel (2015, 44) rightly remarks, this scheme, which is also reflected in dictionaries and commentaries, draws heavily on Gellius' passage. But other critics have pushed the reasoning one step further, persuasively showing how the ideas of φιλανθρωπία and παιδεία can be tightly connected to one another or even overlap in Ciceronian *humanitas*. A passage by Wilfried Stroh (2008, 551-552) is absolutely worth quoting in full:

Iam videmus igitur ex aliqua parte quomodo illae duae notiones φιλανθρωπίας et παιδείας ortae interque se commixtae sint. Atque initio humanitas non est illa quidem, si stricte interpretamur, eadem atque φιλανθρωπία, i.e. amor hominum et mansuetudo, sed magis communis natura humana, quam cum homo in altero esse sentit, a crudelitate auocatur, ad mansuetudinem misericordiamque commouetur. Postea per metonymiam quandam nomen humanitatis ipsam uirtutem declarat, quae plerumque mansuetudo aut clementia est, interdum etiam urbanitas et facilitas morum. Sed quia illa urbanitas litteris potissimum augeatur, ipsae quoque litterae vel artes, quibus παιδεία constat, humanitatis nomine dici possunt.

At this point, some more or less equivalent questions might arise: did the Greeks ever link φιλανθρωπία and παιδεία? Or, to put it another way, did they have an equivalent idea(l) of *humanitas* according to which humane customs could be seen as the direct consequence of a superior education? A survey of

the Greek literary texts which have come down to us reveals that we never find φιλανθρωπία and παιδεία within the same sentence before Diodorus Siculus (1st Century BC). In his *Bibliotheca historica*, Book 37, for instance, Diodorus reports the example of Sempronius Asellio, probably governor of Sicily in 96 BC. When he arrived in Sicily, he found “the province ruined, but by the excellence of the measures he employed succeeded in restoring the island”, and all this thanks to his good advisors, whom Diodorus describes in detail. One of them in particular was an otherwise unknown Publius:

χωρίς γὰρ τῶν ἐκ τῆς τύχης ἀγαθῶν καὶ ταῖς κατὰ ψυχὴν ἀρεταῖς διέφερεν. σημαντὶον δὲ τῆς εὐσεβείας αἱ θυσίαι καὶ αἱ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς κατασκευαὶ καὶ τὰ ἀναθήματα, τὸ δὲ τῆς σωφροσύνης τὸ τὰς ἀσθήσεις μέχρι τῆς ἐσχάτης τοῦ βίου γραμμῆς ἀσθεῖς ἔχειν, τὸ δὲ τῆς παιδείας τε καὶ φιλανθρωπίας τὸ προτιμᾶσθαι παρ’ αὐτῷ περιττώτερον τοὺς πεπαιδευμένους. καθόλου δὲ τοὺς ἀπὸ τινος ἐπανουμένης μούσης ὀρμωμένους ἐβέργετε, συλλαμβάνων ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας οὐσίας ἀφειδῶς (D.S. 37.8.2 = Const. Exc. 2(1), p. 317 = Posidon. Fr. 215 Theiler).

[The latter, indeed, was] a man of exceptional personal qualities, quite apart from the gifts of fortune. His piety is attested by the sacrifices, the improvements made to temples, and the dedications offered in his name, his sobriety by the fact that he retained his faculties unimpaired to his dying day, and his culture and humanity by the special consideration he showed to men of learning; in general he was the benefactor of practitioners of any of the esteemed arts, whom he assisted from his personal fortune without stint (my emphasis).

In his Loeb edition Walton translates the phrase τῆς παιδείας τε καὶ φιλανθρωπίας as “his culture and humanity”, but in Latin one word, *humanitas*, would be sufficient. Unfortunately, this is a case of indirect tradition, for this passage has come down to us thanks to Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus’ *De virtutibus et vitiis* (10th Century AD). Not only: Willy Theiler even attributed the authorship of this passage to the philosopher Posidonius, but in previous editions Ludwig Edelstein and Ian Kidd, and Jacoby had not. In sum, doubts about authorship, period of composition and number of steps distancing the text we read today from its original status make any argument concerning this passage highly speculative. Nor do we have Latin historical sources – Livy for instance – for a linguistic comparison of the episode.

This passage aside, we only have two other simultaneous instances of παιδεία and φιλανθρωπία before the Byzantine period, and they are both to be found in Aelius Aristides’ work, that is to say roughly in Aulus Gellius’ day³.

3. The publication of Gellius’ *Noctes Atticae* is generally dated to the last years of Marcus Aurelius’ reign, that is after 177 AD; see e.g. Holford-Strevens (1977, 101, 109; 2003, 16-21) and Keulen (2009,

The Συμβουλευτικὸς περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν κωμωδεῖν (*Concerning the Prohibition of Comedy*, Or. 29 Lenz-Behr = 29 Keil = 40 Dindorf) is a very short oration (probably written between 157 and 165 AD and delivered in Smyrna) in which Aristides stands up against the possibility to perform during the Dionysia public satire or comedy which might slander individuals⁴. This speech ends as follows (§ 33):

οἴμαι τόνυν ἐγὼ πᾶσι μὲν ταῦτα συμβουλευέων ὀρθῶς ἂν ποιῆν, οὐχ ἥμισυ δ’ ὑμῖν. ὅσφ γὰρ παιδείᾳ καὶ φιλανθρωπία προέχειν δοκέετε, τοσῶδε ἀσχιον ἂ μὴ χρῆ φάνεσθαι διώκοντας.

I think that I would be right in offering this advice to all men, but not least of all to you. For by as much as you seem superior in education and generosity, it is so much the more shameful for you clearly to pursue what is not fitting.

The second instance is to be found in the Πρὸς Πλάτωνα ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων (*To Plato: in Defence of the Four*, Or. 3 Lenz-Behr = 3 Keil = 46 Dindorf), which was composed around the same time as *Concerning the Prohibition of Comedy*, and is again concerned with reputation⁵. Aelius Aristides makes a stand against the attack by Plato’s Socrates, in the *Gorgias*, on the four leading statesmen of fifth-century Athens: Miltiades, Themistocles, Cimon, and Pericles. At § 382, while describing Plato’s second journey to Sicily, Aelius Aristides reports that, when the tyrant Dyonisius decided to expel Plato from Sicily, a certain Pollis carried him to Aegina where he was sold to Anniceris:

νῆ Δι’ ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν σὺ χείρων, εἰ παρέπαιε Πόλλης καὶ Διονύσιος. οὐδέ γ’ ἡμεῖς, ὃ μακάριε, εἴ τις περὶ ἡμῶς φαῦλος Ἀθηναίων ἐγένετο. εἰς τοῖνον τοῦθ’ ἦκεν ὁ Πόλλης ὑπερβολῆς καὶ οὕτω σφόδρα ἐποῦδάσαε κύριος καταστάς βουλευέσασθαι περὶ ἀνδρὸς οἴου μηδ’ ὄναρ ἤλπισεν, εἴτα φανῆναι τι παμμέγεθες βεβουλευμένους καὶ ὑπερβᾶλλον φιλανθρωπία τε καὶ παιδείᾳ, ὥστε κομίσας εἰς Ἀγῖνον, ἐν ᾗ θάνατος προσέητο εἴ τις Ἀθηναίων ἐπιβαίνων ληφθεῖη, ἐνταῦθα ἐκβιβάζει σε.

Yes by Zeus, but you were no worse if Pollis and Dyonisius were foolish. Nor were we, dear sir, if some Athenian behaved badly toward us. Then Pollis went to this excess and when he was empowered to make decisions about a man such as he never expected

198, 235). Earlier dates have for example been proposed by Marache, who opted for the mid 150s (see references in Holford-Strevens 1977, 102 n.39), and Astarita (1993, 14), who believes they were published before 161 AD.

4. On the date of this speech see Behr (1968, 95).

5. See Behr (1968, 94) on its date.

even in a dream, he became so eager to have clearly decided on some really great act of surpassing generosity and refinement, that he brought you to Aegina, where death was proclaimed for any Athenian apprehended in the territory, and here he disembarked you.

In discussing the meaning of παιδεία during the so-called Second Sophistic, Graham Anderson (8) claims:

It is as difficult to define παιδεία in this period as it is to define the sophists who are the chief claimants, along with philosophers, to purvey it. Its implications are not just education but the values that go along with it to make men civilised, as is the case of 'the humanities' in English. It presupposes someone who has read the approved canon of classical texts and absorbed from them the values of Hellenism and urban-dwelling man alike, and who applies those values in life.

By mentioning "the humanities", Anderson indirectly evokes the word and concept from which they originated, that is the Latin *humanitas*. Yet Aelius Aristides reproduces *humanitas* with greater precision by adding φιλανθρωπία, a value which is for example crucial to his Παναθηναϊκός (Or. 1), to παιδεία.⁶ Whether or not this was deliberate it remains that these two passages constitute the first two certain occurrences of the pairing of these two Greek concepts, and that they are to be found in an author who was roughly contemporary of Gellius. Moreover, it should be noted that, as Albrecht Dihle (2013, 214-215) remarks, in this period "administration and jurisdiction became increasingly humane or humanistic". Accordingly, if it might seem far-fetched to assume that Aelius Aristides was explicitly trying to translate the concept of *humanitas* back into Greek, it is probably safe to assume that there was something new in the air in the bilingual but Romano-centric world of the 2nd Century AD which prompted him to juxtapose two Greek concepts which required just one Latin word, but that the Greeks had seldom, if ever, juxtaposed before.

That the meanings of φιλανθρωπία and παιδεία could overlap in Latin *humanitas* not only results from contemporary studies, but also emerges from the first Latin translation of the aforementioned passages by Aelius Aristides. In 1566 the first Latin translation of all Aelius Aristides' oeuvre appeared⁷. The transla-

6. On the key role of the Greek, Athenian idea of φιλανθρωπία in Aristides' Παναθηναϊκός see Oudot. In general, if we exclude those works which are usually deemed spurious, the term φιλανθρωπία appears no fewer than 57 times in Aelius Aristides' oeuvre, and it can also be twinned with concepts such as ἐπιστήμη, παρότης, κοινότης, ἀνδρεία, μεγαλοψυχία, αἰδώς, κακία, τιμή, εὐνοία. As for παιδεία, there are 38 instances excluding spurious works, and it rarely appears in conjunction with other concepts (σοφία or ἄρετή).

7. Specific research into Canter's translation of Aelius Aristides is to my knowledge yet to be undertaken. See however Caso on earlier humanistic translations of some of Aelius Aristides' orations. See also Caso (439 n. 2) for further bibliography on Aristides' Fortleben in western culture.

tor, the Dutch scholar Willem Canter, is best known for his *Ratio emendandi*, a sort of handbook of classical philology whose focus is on the emendation of ancient texts, and which also appeared in 1566. His translation of the two passages analysed above gives us further insight into the way the concepts were understood by 16th Century classical scholars. In the case of the first passage I quoted above, namely Or. 29.33 Lenz-Behr, Canter translates as follows:

Atque arbitror ista me cum omnibus, tum vobis praecipue rectissime posse suadere. Quanto etenim ceteris humanitate praestatis atque doctrina, tanto vobis est, si rebus inhonestis operam detis, turpius futurum (my emphasis).

As far as the phrase παιδεία καὶ φιλανθρωπία is concerned, he opted for the Latin *humanitate atque doctrina*, in which an inversion of the Greek order of the concepts is to be assumed. This pairing has an easily detectable – to modern scholars at least – Ciceronian feel. Cicero however seems to have added *doctrina* to *humanitas* so as to strengthen further the educational nuance of *humanitas*, and not to give to *humanitas* the meaning of φιλανθρωπία. This is particularly clear at *Tusc.* 5.66: *quis est omnium, qui modo cum Musis, id est cum humanitate et cum doctrina, habeat aliquod commercium, qui se non hunc mathematicum malit quam illum tyrannum?* ("Who in all the world, who enjoys merely some degree of communion with the Muses, that is to say with liberal education and refinement, is there who would not choose to be this mathematician rather than that tyrant?" tr. King), where Cicero explicitly equates *humanitas* and *doctrina* with the *Musae*, the personification of the liberal arts.⁸ At this point, two different considerations can be drawn from Canter's translation above. Of course one may conclude that Canter's choice, although defensible in and of itself, becomes questionable if the Ciceronian echo is not fortuitous. But perhaps more sensibly, this case shows how pervasive the Ciceronian model was in the Renaissance, to the point that word-for-word translation could be sacrificed to the benefit of style and Ciceronian imitation.

But more relevant for the purpose of this paper is Canter's translation of the second occurrence of παιδεία καὶ φιλανθρωπία in Aelius Aristides, that in Or. 3.382 Lenz-Behr, which reads:

At non ideo tu peior, si Pollis ac Dionysius delirarunt: neque nos, bone vir, si quis erga nos Atheniensis improbus extitit. Pollis deinde eo progressus est, atque ita studuit, cum de tali viro, qualem ne somniarat quidem, statuerdi potestatem nactus esset, magnum

8. For other joint occurrences of *humanitas* and *doctrina* in Cicero see Flacc. 62, Cael. 24 and 54, Lig. 12, Rep. 2.35, ad Q. fr. 1.1.29. This pairing also appears in Cornelius Nepos (Att. 3.3 and 4.1) and Livy (37.54.17).

quiddam et humanitate plenum decernere videri, ut in Aeginam, in quam Athenienses sine capitis periculo venire non poterant, delatum te exponeret.

By translating ὑπερβᾶλλον φιλανθρωπία τε καὶ παιδεία as *humanitate plenum*, Canter clearly demonstrates an awareness that the ideas of φιλανθρωπία and παιδεία overlap in Roman *humanitas*. At this point, a short parenthesis on the characteristics of *humanitas* in, and its importance for, the Renaissance is in order. Paul Oskar Kristeller (1961) before others identified Renaissance humanism with an educational programme which ultimately rested on the *studia humanitatis* – hence the noun *humanism* – a quite rare phrase in classical Latin, found in Cicero, Pliny the Younger and Gellius, which became a key expression in humanistic writings⁹. More specifically, the revival of this phrase in the Renaissance is linked to Petrarch's discovery of Cicero's *Pro Archia poeta* in 1333, an oration in praise of literature where the expression *studia humanitatis* plays a central role¹⁰. However, according to Kohl (1992, 186, 188), it was not until 1369 that such phrase made a comeback in the West since antiquity, when Coluccio Salutati wrote a letter to Ugolino Orsini on 30 September of that year¹¹. It is true, then, that Salutati wrote in another letter, which dates to 1377, that “those who delight in the *studia humanitatis* will themselves be humane toward others”¹², but, in its earlier stages at least, Renaissance humanism mainly seems to have regarded *humanitas* as a concept related to education and culture rather than to philanthropy or humanitarianism¹³. Nor is it easy to mark an exact turning point of this trend. Despite Salutati's letter apparently suggesting that he already perceived overlap of these two categories in the word *humanitas*, for Stéphane Toussaint (2008, 47–51; 2015, 9) the notions of φιλανθρωπία and παιδεία seem to be subsumed in the idea of *humanitas* no sooner than in Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499), while conversely Christian Høgel maintains that the Dutch Erasmus of Rotterdam (died 1536) was the first to whom the discourse of the humane became again crucial – which is to say that, according to the Danish scholar, Erasmus was the first to readopt *humanitas* in a sense approaching the full semantic field found in Cicero's usage of the term.

9. See Cic., *Arch.* 3 and Mur., 61, Plin., *Pan.* 47.3 and Gellius, 9.3. For the state of research on the importance of the expression *studia humanitatis* in the Renaissance as well as on other interpretations of humanism see Baker (2015, 1–35).

10. On the role of this Ciceronian oration as well as of the expression *studia humanitatis* in giving birth to the definition of Renaissance Humanism see also Reeve (1996, 21–22).

11. See details of this letter in Kohl (1992, 188).

12. This is Kohl's (1992, 189) rendering of Epist. 1. 229 (to Alberto degli Albizzi): “Ego quidem neminem vidi qui his humanitatis studiis delectaretur, qui se scribentibus non exhibeat benignum et mitem”.

13. See for example the summary of John McManamon's view of Humanism (1989) as it emerges from *Funerall Oration and the Cultural Ideals of Italian Humanism* in Baker (2015, 14).

Irrespective of the position one takes on this issue, from a linguistic perspective at least, Canter clearly set himself in the wake of these prominent figures of the mature Renaissance. As the monumental *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* by (Robert and) Henri Estienne, which appeared in 1572, some six years after Canter's translation of Aelius Aristides' oeuvre, reports in both the entries on φιλανθρωπία and παιδεία Gellius' passage and proposes *humanitas* as a possible translation of these two Greek words, it is clear that *Noc. Att.* 13.17 was well-known by Canter's time, but nowhere else than in Aelius Aristides would Canter have come across a concrete case of simultaneous combination of the Greek concepts of φιλανθρωπία and παιδεία. Or, to put it another way, only Aelius Aristides could offer Canter a chance to display his sensitivity in both Greek and Latin. To modern readers and scholars he is mostly unknown, but, even if taken alone, his translation of two Greek words into one Latin term contributes to outlining the features of the mature Renaissance humanism, and, so to speak, enables us to square the circle: the equation *humanitas* = φιλανθρωπία + παιδεία eventually found its concrete application.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aelius Aristides. 1986. *The Complete Works: Volume 1, Orations I–XVI*. A cura di C. A. Behr. Leiden: Brill.
- Anderson, G. 1993. *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge.
- Astarita, M. L. 1993. *La cultura nelle “Noctes Atticae”*. Catania: Università di Catania.
- Aulus Gellius. 1927. *Attic Nights: Volume 1, Books 1–5*. A cura di J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 185. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1927. *Attic Nights: Volume 2, Books, 6–13*. A cura di J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 200. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1927. *Attic Nights: Volume 3, Books 14–20*. A cura di J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library 212. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Baker, P. 2015. *Italian Renaissance Humanism in the Mirror*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Behr, C. A. 1968. *Aelius Aristides and The Sacred Tales*. Amsterdam: Hakkerit.
- Caso, D. 2016. *Le traduzioni latine di Elio Aristide in età umanistica (1417–1535)*. *Ælius Aristide écrivain*. A cura di L. Pernot, G. Abbamonte e M. Lamagna. Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 439–459.
- Dihle, A. 2013. *Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire. From Augustus to Justinian*. 1989. London: Routledge.
- Diodorus Siculus. 1957. *Library of History: Volume XI, Fragments of Books 21–32*. A cura di J. F. Walton. Loeb Classical Library 409. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1967. *Library of History: Volume XII, Fragments of Books 33–40*. A cura di F. R. Walton. Loeb Classical Library 423. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Edelstein, L. e Kidd, I. G. 1972. *Posidonius: Volume I, The Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Høgel, C. 2015. *The Human and the Humane. Humanity as Argument from Cicero to Erasmus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht/Taipei: National Taiwan University Press.
- Holford-Strevens, L. 1977. Towards a Chronology of Aulus Gellius. *Latomus* 36 (1), pp. 93-109.
- _____, J. 2003. *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howley, J. A. 2013. Why Read the Jurists? Aulus Gellius on Reading Across Disciplines. *New Frontiers: Law and Society in the Roman World*. A cura di P. J. du Plessis. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 9-30.
- Jacoby, F. 1923-1958. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Leiden: Brill.
- Kaster, R. A. 1986. *Humanitas* and Roman Education. *Storia della storiografia* 9, pp. 5-15.
- Keulen, W. H. 2009. *Gellius the Satirist: Roman Cultural Authority in Attic Nights*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kohl, B. G. 1992. The changing concept of the *studia humanitatis* in the early Renaissance. *Renaissance Studies* 6 (2), pp. 185-209.
- Kristeller, P. O. 1961. Humanism and Scholasticism in the Italian Renaissance. *Renaissance Thought. The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanistic Strains*. London: Harper & Row; pp. 92-119.
- Marache, R. 1952. *La critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaisant au If siècle de notre ère*. Rennes: Plihon.
- Maselli, G. 1978. *Lingua e scuola in Gellio grammatico*. Lecce: Milella.
- McManamon, John. 1989. *Funeral Oratory and the Cultural Ideals of Italian Humanism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Oudot, E. 2016. *Le Panathénaique d'Élius Aristide (Or. 1): les voies et les enjeux d'une nouvelle histoire d'Athènes. Élius Aristide écrivain*. A cura di L. Pernot, G. Abbamonte e M. Lamagna. Turhout: Brepols, pp. 23-58.
- Pohlenz, Max. 1947. *Der hellenische Mensch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Reeve, M. D. 1996. Classical Scholarship. *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. A cura di J. Kraye. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 19-46.
- Stevenson, A. J. 2004. Gellius and the Roman Antiquarian Tradition. *The World of Aulus Gellius*. A cura di L. Holford-Strevens e A. Vardi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 118-155.
- Stroh, W. 2008. De origine uocum humanitatis et humanismi. *Gymnasium* 115 (6) pp. 535-571.
- Theiler, W. 1982. *Posidonios, die Fragmente*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Toussaint, S. 2008. *Humanismes/Antihumanismes de Ficin à Heidegger: Tome I, Humanitas et Rentabilité*. Paris: Les belles lettres.
- _____. 2015. Sull'umanesimo: *Humanitas* e pensiero moderno. *Umanesimo: storia, critica, attualità*. A cura di M. Russo. Firenze: Le Lettere, pp. 1-42.
- Vardi, A. 2001. Gellius against the Professors. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 137, pp. 41-54.

EDUCATIONAL CONCEPT OF PLUTARCH IN HIS TREATISE DE AUDIENDIS POETIS

Grzegorz Kotłowski
University of Gdańsk

It is not a surprise that while discussing “παιδεία” and “humanitas” we turn our attention also, if not above all, to the ancient times. Neither it is a surprise that the work of Plutarch is here being discussed, the author who on almost every page of his pieces seems to be not only a philosopher and moralist about also a pedagogue, that can be deservedly called – similarly to Homer – the educator of the whole Greece and, thereby, also of us, who are the heir of the Greek culture. The next reason we should deal with Plutarch is a magnitude of his legacy that forms the most plentiful collection of works of a single ancient author, though we have only one third part of it, as it results from the list of his works known as a Catalogue of Lamprias (Plutarch’s brother).

Let us remind, that for sure Plutarch was born before 50 AD, probably around 40 AD for he was sent by the citizens of his own city as a legate during the reign of Nero, and died after 120. He was from Chaeronea, a small place of Boeotia, that was mentioned in history for two reasons. Firstly, because of the battle that took place in 338 BC and is a symbol of the end of the Greek independence. Secondly, because of Plutarch. Plutarch was very attached to the city, where, after many voyages around the Greece, to Rome and even to Alexandria, he finally settled down, devoted to the literature, but also was an active member of a society and was organizing the school for youth, was taking part in legations, was in charge of responsible offices, so, when he became the lifelong priest in not far away temple of Apollo in Delphi in 95, the grateful citizens of Chaeronea and Delphi upraised to him a monument, out of which was preserved only the inscription that is nowadays exhibited in Archaeological Museum of Delphi.

Settling down in Chaeronea resulted from the marriage of Plutarch with Timoxena and having become a father of Soklaros. At the end of seventies more and more in works of Plutarch we can see advices concerning upbringing, what was of course caused by growing up of his son Soklaros. Experiences from this period was then written up as a treatise that is originally entitled Πῶς δεῖ τὸν νέον ποιημάτων ἀκούειν; that is traditionally known under the Latin title *De audiendis poetis*, and can be translated into English “How to study poetry?”,