

Museums (Brit. Mus. ref. BMT 131 and 449 respectively; the former was tested by Mrs M.-A. Seeley). In both cases, the TL signal was in saturation indicating insufficient firing during manufacture. These findings were confirmed by the observation of kaolinite in the X-ray diffraction patterns of the samples. Kaolinite only remains in low fired ceramics. A sample from the pottery lamp no. 2 above (BMT 300) produced similar results. It was not possible, therefore, using TL to determine whether or not these three objects are of ancient manufacture.

S. G. E. BOWMAN

Research Laboratory,
The British Museum

Theophrastus on fungi: inaccurate citations in Athenaeus

Ancient authors often cited each other inaccurately through misunderstanding or carelessness; and this can cause problems in the collecting of fragments of authors of whose works some, but not all, survive. For a distinction has to be made between inexact citations of extant works and citations which, although resembling such works, do in fact seem to derive from material now lost. Such problems occur repeatedly in connection with the botanical writings of Theophrastus;¹ and one particular group of problems stems from a section in the epitome of Bk ii of Athenaeus.

At *Deipn.* ii 61–2 Athenaeus attributes to Theophrastus five passages in all concerning fungi.² Of these five, the first (Thphr. fr. 168 Wimmer) is explicitly cited as from Theophrastus' *Historia Plantarum*; it is not, however, in the transmitted text of that work. Neither is the fifth passage, which is the longest (Thphr. fr. 167 Wimmer); Regenbogen, following Rose and Wellmann, thought it might have been taken by an intermediary, perhaps Pamphilus, from another work of Theophrastus. The other three passages, the second, third and fourth, all derive from the *HP*; but in each case there are inaccuracies or alterations.

Passage (2) in Athenaeus reads: *φησὶ δὲ (ὁ Θεόφραστος) καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῇ περὶ Ἡρακλέους στήλας θαλάσση ὅταν ὕδατα πλείω γένηται, μύκητες φύονται πρὸς τῇ θαλάσση, οὓς καὶ ἀπολιθιοῦσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φησὶ.* (Theophrastus) also says that in the sea around the Pillars of Heracles, when there is more water, fungi grow by the sea, and these, he also says, are turned to stone by the sun.' This corresponds closely to *HP* iv 7.2, except that Theophrastus located this phenomenon by the Red Sea and not near the Pillars of Heracles. There is, however, a reference to the Pillars shortly before this passage in the *HP*, and it seems likely that Athenaeus, or his source, was misled by this.³ The 'fungus' referred to in this passage is probably coral,⁴

and the words 'when there is more water' may well simply refer to tides.

In passage (3), Athenaeus cites Theophrastus as referring in *HP* to 'smooth-skinned (plants), like the ὕδνον, μύκης, πέζις and γεράνειον'. Theophrastus at *HP* i 6.5 gives a list which appears in the MSS as ὕδνον, μύκης, πύξος, κράνιον'. The scholiast emended πύξος to πέζις and κράνιον to γεράνειον, probably on the basis of the passage in Athenaeus; for γεράνειον Wimmer, followed by Hort (Loeb, 1916) preferred κεραύνιον (see below).

What is striking, however, is that the list, which Athenaeus quotes as concerned with smooth-skinned plants, is in fact clearly given by Theophrastus as a list of plants with no roots. Once again, as with the Pillars of Heracles, the term 'smooth-skinned' does appear shortly before in *HP*, but in a different context.⁵ Athenaeus' account again seems to reflect error resulting from an over-hasty compression.

The discrepancy becomes significant, however, if one tries to identify the plants named. Thus Hort, for example, identified ὕδνον as *Tuber cibarium* Sowerby and κεραύνιον as *Tuber aestivum* Vitt.⁶ In fact, these are both names for a single species of subterranean fungus, a member of the large group commonly called truffles; and the most obvious feature of this species is its markedly warty exterior—so that, if Athenaeus (or his source) had a specific plant in mind, rather than mechanically reproducing Theophrastus' words without attention to the implications of his altered text, it cannot have been this one. Conversely, Houghton based his identification of πέζις as the giant puff-ball (*Lycoperdon giganteum*, *Lycoperdon bovista* L., i.e. *Langermannia gigantea* (Pers.) Rostkovius) on the fact that Athenaeus includes it in a list of smooth-skinned plants;⁷ but his doing so seems to be the result of an accidental error, and we cannot be sure that he was conscious of the implications. It seems clear that the fungi mentioned by Theophrastus and by Athenaeus cannot now reliably be identified to species level, so that it is more sensible to follow Buller and Maggiulli in regarding ὕδνον and πέζις as non-specific names for truffles and puff-balls respectively, and μύκης as a general name for fungi.

Passage (4) raises more problems than any of the others. Athenaeus here cites Theophrastus as referring to 'the ὕδνον, which some call γεράνειον, and any other underground (plant)'. In fact, at *HP* i 6.9 Theophrastus refers to 'the ὕδνον, and what some call ἄσχιον, and the οὔγγον and any other underground (plant)'.

The first problem concerns the word γεράνειον. This (as the name of a fungus, and not to be confused with γεράνιον, the flowering plant) occurs in Greek only in our Athenaeus passages (3) and (4) and in a passage in Eustathius (*in Hom. Il.* xv 302, p. 1017.19) which is clearly dependent on (4). It is, however, also found in a Latinized form in Pliny the Elder, in a text (*NH* xix 36) which is very close to passage (5) in Athenaeus, though it does not mention Theophrastus by name. However, the text of the passage in Pliny is disputed. The fungus to which he refers appears as *geranium* in two MSS

¹ The present note reflects studies undertaken as part of a project, organised by Prof. W. Fortenbaugh, to collect and edit all the fragments and testimonia relating to Theophrastus.

² Cf. O. Regenbogen, 'Theophrastos', *RE* suppl. vii (1940) cols 1444–5.

³ As was pointed out by Schweighäuser, *Animadv. in Athenaei Deipnos.* i 414.

⁴ Cf. A. H. R. Buller, 'The fungus lore of the Greeks and Romans', *Trans. Brit. Mycological Soc.* v (1914–16) 47–8.

⁵ i 5.2; Schweighäuser 415. Smoothness of roots is mentioned in i 6.4; G. Maggiulli, *Nomenclatura Micologica Latina* (Genoa 1977) 117.

⁶ Loeb, ii 481 and ii 456 respectively.

⁷ 'Notices of fungi in Greek and Latin authors', *Annals and Magazine of Nat. Hist.* ser. 5 xv (1885) 35; Buller (n. 4) 54–5.

(Mayhoff's d and Q); and *geranium* is also the form in the list of contents in bk i. In the other MSS at xix 36, however, the name appears as *ceraunion*, or a more or less garbled version thereof. Apart from Wimmer's emendation in Thphr. *HP* i 6.5 (above), *κεραύνιον* as the name of a fungus occurs elsewhere only in an obscure passage of Galen (*de Succedaneis* xix 731 Kühn).

Budé suggested that *γεράνειον* in Athenaeus was simply a corruption of *κεραύνιον*. This suggestion was rejected by de Saumaise, Hardouin and Schweighäuser, because of the occurrence of *geranium* in the list of contents in Pliny *NH* i.⁸ It was revived, however, by Houghton;⁹ and, as already mentioned, Wimmer in his edition of Theophrastus preferred *κεραύνιον* to *γεράνειον* in *HP* i 6.5.

It would indeed be difficult to attach much sense to *γεράνειον* if it were interpreted in the most obvious way as 'crane-truffle'. However Winter has argued that *γεράνειον* is derived from the same root as *γρῶνα*, a Laconian word for 'sow' given by Hesychius—since pigs are often used to detect truffles—and that *κεραύνιον* is popular etymology based on the belief that truffles are produced by thunder.¹⁰ So *γεράνειον* does seem to be the correct reading.

The second problem lies in determining how many plants are being referred to in these passages. The translation of Theophrastus by Theodore Gaza omitted the first two 'ands' in i 6.9, so that only one plant is apparently named. The Aldine edition omitted the first 'and', thus distinguishing two named plants, but regarding the *ῥδνον* and the *ἄσχιον* as identical. Hort identified the *ἄσχιον* as *Lycoperdon giganteum*, the giant puff-ball; like Houghton, he identified the *πέζις* (see above) as *Lycoperdon bovista*, but this is simply another name for the same species. Carnoy also considers the word *ἄσχιον* to refer to the giant puff-ball.¹¹ The context in Theophrastus is, however, concerned with underground plants, and giant puff-balls have only ever been observed growing above ground; so Houghton (43) followed by Buller (61–2) is probably right in suggesting that *ἄσχιον* refers to some sort of truffle. This, however, does not necessitate dropping the first 'and' in the Theophrastus passage; he might have referred first to truffles in general (*ῥδνα*) and then to a specific type.

The third problem concerns the correct reading of the word *οὔγγον*, in Theophrastus but not in Athenaeus, and the identity of the plant referred to. The best MS, U, and Gaza's translation have *οὔγγον*; inferior MSS have *οὔπιον*.¹² *οὔγγον* occurs in one other place in *HP*, i 1.7, but here it is clear that the reference is not to any sort of fungus, but to an Egyptian herbaceous plant, *Colocasia antiquorum* (L.) Schott, which produces large underground edible tubers. *Colocasia antiquorum* is mentioned again at *HP* i 6.11, but here the MSS give *οὔτρον*.¹³ *Oetum* is also given as a name for the Egyptian

plant by Pliny (*NH* xxi 88); and Hesychius stated that *οὔτρον* was an alternative name for *οὔπιον*, though without indicating what sort of plant was meant. It therefore seems reasonably clear that *οὔγγον* or *οὔπιον* is not the name of a fungus, but rather of the Egyptian plant; the name is doubtless of native Egyptian derivation (Carnoy 272), but enquiries from the Egyptologists have failed to indicate which form of the name is correct.

Unfortunately, the issue has become confused because in the fifth of the Athenaeus passages, which does not correspond to anything in the transmitted text of *HP*, Theophrastus is cited as referring to a Thracian truffle called *ἴτρον* or *ἴστον* (itum in Pliny, *NH* xix 36); and the similarity of this to *oetum/οὔπιον* has led editors to emend the texts in various ways. Thus Budé and Schneider both read *οὔπιον* for *οὔγγον/οὔπιον* in *HP* i 6.9 (Schneider iii 34); and Kaibel read *οὔτρον* for *ἴτρον* in the fifth of the Athenaeus passages.

To read *οὔπιον* in i 6.9 as well as in i 6.11 and interpret it as the name of the Egyptian plant would involve going against the best MS in i 6.9 and, apparently, all the MSS in i 1.7. But to read it and interpret it as the name of the Thracian truffle seems at best an unfounded conjecture. Casaubon and de Saumaise were probably right when they argued against Dalecamp that the *οὔγγον* or *oetum*, the herbaceous plant, has *nothing* to do with *ἴτρον* or *itum*, the truffle.¹⁴ After all, the context in *HP* i 6.9 is concerned with underground growths in general, not specifically with fungi; so the Egyptian plant might well have been mentioned there. This might even explain its omission by Athenaeus, or his source, since his concern was with fungi. It does not explain the substitution of *γεράνειον* for *ἄσχιον* in Athenaeus, but this could have resulted from the occurrence of *γεράνειον* in the third Athenaeus passage just before; again, the question arises whether, if *γεράνειον* and *ἄσχιον* do both refer to truffles, the change was an informed one or the result of a mechanical accident.

There is one apparent difficulty in taking *HP* i 6.9 as referring to the Egyptian plant; but the difficulty is apparent rather than real. The point that Theophrastus is there making is that not everything that is underground is a root; if it were, the whole of a truffle would be a root.¹⁵ This implies that, just as the whole of a truffle is not a root,¹⁶ so the large edible underground part of the Egyptian plant is not either. And indeed, in i 1.7 Theophrastus refers to it as a fruit; but in i 6.11 he refers to it as 'the root . . . and, as it were, the fruit'. However, as the preceding section i 6.10 shows, Theophrastus was an accurate observer and was able, as a modern botanist would be, to distinguish between a root in the true sense and a corm or tuber (which is anatomically composed of stem tissue); and so it seems that the reference to the corm or tuber of the Egyptian plant as a 'root' in i 6.11 is not to be taken in the strict sense of that term.

The conclusions that can be drawn from this discussion are both particular and general. As far as particular passages are concerned, it seems that it is unwise to try to identify the fungi mentioned in *HP* i 6.5

⁸ Schweighäuser 417.

⁹ Houghton (n. 7) 43; Buller (n. 4) 62.

¹⁰ W. Winter, 'Two Greek names for the truffle', *AJP* lxxii (1951) 63–4. For truffles and thunder cf. Pliny *NH* xix 37, Athen. ii 62b, and Juv. v 117.

¹¹ A. Carnoy, *Dictionnaire étymologique des noms grecs des plantes* (Louvain 1959) 40.

¹² Cf. J. G. Schneider, ed., *Theophrasti Opera* iii (1818) 34 and v (1821) 5.

¹³ Schneider iii 36, v 5; Hort i 50.

¹⁴ Schweighäuser 417.

¹⁵ Cf. Maggiulli (n. 5) 133.

¹⁶ Indeed truffles have no roots at all, in Theophrastus' view: *HP* i 6.5.

with particular species; and that in i 6.9 ὄβρα are truffles in general, the ἄσχιον perhaps a particular type of truffle, and the οὐγγον not a fungus at all. In general, it seems that some of the differences between Athenaeus and Theophrastus are errors resulting from careless quotation and perhaps also from over-compression; elsewhere the variation may be a deliberate and conscious reflection of the particular interests of the Athenaeus passage. In the former case, if we are to use Athenaeus' statements as evidence to help in the identification of the plants concerned, we cannot escape asking whether—even when what he was writing was a careless mis-reporting of Theophrastus—he was conscious of its implications and concerned with whether it made sense, or not. And finally, it is interesting how often in the discussion of this material useful insights can still be obtained from commentaries and discussions dating from before 1830.

R. W. SHARPLES
D. W. MINTER

University College London
Commonwealth Mycological Institute,
Kew, Surrey TW9 3AF

Ritual for a Seleucid king at Babylon?*

A. K. Grayson's valuable volume, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*,¹ contains not only a rich collection of historiographic writing from the period before the Macedonian conquest, but has also added several new fragments to the Babylonian Chronicles series for the early hellenistic period, in addition to a useful re-edition of the *Chronicle of the Diadochoi*.² These fragments constitute what survives (or is known at present to survive) from the apparently last chronicles of the corpus which began in the reign of Nabonassar (747–34 BC) and continued down to and into the early Seleucid period.³ When precisely (and why) the corpus came to an end is at present unknown. The new post-Alexander fragments are probably all from the third century BC, nos 11 and 12 from the early third century, while nos 13 and 13b are of later third century date.⁴

This note is concerned with no. 13b, a text of considerable interest for the history of Seleucid policies towards Babylonian temples and cult in the third century BC. Grayson has provided transliteration, translation and notes for the surviving bottom portion of a clay tablet from Babylon which Pinches had cited

* In discussion of this text I have benefited from the remarks of Dr I. Finkel, Dr M. Geller, Dr S. Hornblower, Miss G. R. Hart and Prof. D. J. Wiseman.

¹ Texts from Cuneiform Sources v (Locust Valley, NY 1975) (hereafter 'Grayson').

² Grayson no. 10.

³ See Grayson 8–28 and 'Assyria and Babylonia', *Orientalia* xlix (1980) 140–94, at 173–5.

⁴ See Grayson 26–8, for discussion of the dating of no. 11, concerning Antiochus the Crown Prince, probably Antiochus I; no. 12 is securely dated to the end of the reign of Seleucus I from the reference in the 2nd section of the obverse, line 3, to the 30th year of the Seleucid era (282/1 BC). On the problems of dating no. 13, possibly to the reigns of Seleucus II and III, see Grayson 27–8. On 13b see below.

briefly and partially translated nearly ninety years ago.⁵ The preserved portion contains 15 lines of which 13 can be deciphered. A new entry begins in line 3 (the first legible line) with a new regnal year, and records at some length arrangements by an important temple official, the *shatammu* of the temple of Esagil,⁶ for the sacrifices for one day of the Akitu festival, the New Year festival at Babylon. Grayson's text and translation from line 3 to the beginning of 8 are reproduced here for convenience:

- 3 [M]U LX(?)XXVIII^{kám} mSi-lu-ku šarri^{iti} Nisannu(bar)
ITI BI UD VIII^{kám} iltēn^{em} mār Bābili^{ki} lúšā-tam É-sag-gil
4 [X] X šá É-sag-gil ina pí šarri lib-bu-ú^{kuš} šī-piš-tum šá
šarri šá ina pāni-ma iš-šá-a
5 [X G]IN KÙ.BABBAR ultu bīt šarri ultu bīt ram-ni-šú XI
alpē^{bi} ma-ru-tu I ME lahṛē(u.)
6 [m]a-ru-tu XI^{mušen} paspasē(uz.tur) ma-ru-tu a-na
nindabē ina lib-bi [É-sag-gil]
7 a-na^d Bēl u^d Bēlti(gašan)-ia u ilāni^{mcs} rabūti^{mcs} ù a-na
dul-lu šá mSi-[lu]-ku [šarri]
8 u mārē(a)^{mcs} -šú il-ta-kan

(3) The eighty-eighth year of Seleucus, the king: in the month Nisan, that same month, the eighth day, a Babylonian, the *shatammu* of Esagil,⁷ (4) established, according to the command of the king, precisely in accordance with the parchment letter which the king had sent before, as [the offer]ing of Esagil (5) [N] shekels of silver from the house of the king, from his own house, eleven fat oxen, one hundred fat ewes, (6) eleven fat ducks for the offering, within Esagil, (7) to Bel (Lord), Beltia (Mistress), and the great gods and for the ritual of Seleucus, the king, (8) and his sons.

Two questions require further discussion: (i) problems arising from the date of 13b, and (ii) the significance of lines 5–8. First the date, year 88 of the Seleucid era (henceforth SE), i.e. 224/3 BC. The formula for the Seleucid year date is incompletely preserved at the beginning of line 3, where the left-hand edge is slightly broken and the signs for *mu* (year), the usual start of a new entry, are only partially preserved. The signs for 28 (10 + 10 + 8) are clear and agreed by both Pinches⁸ and Grayson. Grayson added traces of another stroke, not another *winkelhaken*, just visible on the tablet before the first of the two *winkelhaken* making up 20.⁹ Of the Seleucid kings called Seleucus to whose reigns the document could be dated, Seleucus IV (SE 125–137), the last Seleucid king of that name to rule Babylonia, can be excluded. Epigraphically the figure 100 + 28 = (SE) 128 is not admissible and the figure

⁵ T. G. Pinches, 'Rough notes on some texts of the Seleucidae', *Bab.Or.Rec.* vi (1892–3) 35–6 at 36; Grayson 283–4 no. 13b (plates xi, transcript, xxvi, photo) with discussion also at 277–8. The tablet is BM 35421.

⁶ On the functions of the *shatammu* in the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods see M. San Nicolò, *Beiträge zu einer Prosopographie neubabylonischer Beamten der Zivil- und Tempelverwaltung*, SBAW München (1941) 25–6 n. 37, 26 n. 40; M. A. Dandamayev, 'State and Temple in Babylonia in the 1st Millennium BC', in E. Lipinski, ed., *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East ii*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* vi (1979) 589–96.

⁷ The conventional translation of *shatammu* as 'bishop' of Esagil has the wrong connotations.

⁸ Pinches (n. 5) 36 and see Grayson's remarks 284 on line 3.

⁹ I owe thanks to Mr C. B. F. Walker of the Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities in the British Museum for kindly checking (and confirming) the reading of these numerals in this line.