

ISSN 1018-9017

SCHOLIA

Studies in Classical Antiquity



NS Vol. 5 / 1996

South Africa

ISSN 1018-9017

SCHOLIA

Natal Studies in Classical Antiquity

Editor: W. J. Dominik

NS Vol. 5 / 1996

South Africa

SCHOLIA

Natal Studies in Classical Antiquity

ISSN 1018-9017

Scholia features critical and pedagogical articles and reviews on a diverse range of subjects dealing with classical antiquity, including late antique, medieval, Renaissance and early modern studies related to the classical tradition; in addition, there is information about Classics programmes in African universities and schools, news about museums and articles on classical artefacts in museums in Africa, and the B. X. de Wet Essay. (Not all sections necessarily appear in any single volume.)

Manuscripts: Potential contributors should read the 'Notes for Contributors' located at the back of this volume and follow the suggested guidelines for the submission of manuscripts. Articles on classical antiquity and the teaching of Classics in Africa are particularly welcome. Submissions are usually reviewed by two referees. Time before publication decision: 2-3 months.

Subscriptions (1997): Africa R20 (+R2,80 VAT for RSA orders); outside Africa US\$20/UK£13 (2 years: US\$34/UK£22). *Foreign subscriptions cover air mail postage, packaging and bank charges on institutional and personal cheques.* After initial payment, a subscription to the journal will be entered. Back numbers may be ordered from the Business Manager.

Address: Correspondence concerning manuscripts and subscriptions should be directed to *Scholia*, Department of Classics, University of Natal, Durban 4041, Republic of South Africa. Telephone: +27 (031) 260.2312; fax: +27 (031) 260.2698; telegram: University telex 621231SA; electronic mail: dominik@classics.und.ac.za (Editor) or hilton@classics.und.ac.za (Reviews Editor).

New Series: *Scholia* is indexed and abstracted in *L'Année Philologique*, indexed in *Gnomon*, and listed in *Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory* and *Index to South African Periodicals*. Faxed copies of articles and other sections of *Scholia* are available through UnCover; photocopies are available from the British Library Document Supply Centre (BLDSC no. 8092.54348). The tables of contents and abstracts of articles are accessible electronically through TOCS-IN. Information about the journal and the electronic, pre-publication versions of its reviews, known as *Scholia Reviews*, is available on the World Wide Web at <http://www.und.ac.za/und/classics> and <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~scholia/scholia.html>. *Scholia* is published with the support of the Foundation for Education, Science and Technology, the University of Natal, and the Classical Association of South Africa.

SAPSE Accreditation: *Scholia* is approved for subsidy purposes by the Department of Education and Culture, South Africa.

Cover Illustration: Drawing by E. A. Mackay based on an Attic black-figure fragment (inv. L.1989.K) in the Museum of Classical Archaeology, University of Natal, Durban (on permanent loan from M. A. Gosling).

Typesetting: W. J. Dominik and T. Lockyer

Printing: Multicopy Centre, UND

Copyright: UND Classics 1996

SCHOLIA

Natal Studies in Classical Antiquity

ISSN 1018-9017

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE (1995-96)

W. J. Dominik	Editor/Business Manager
J. L. Hilton	Reviews Editor
T. Lockyer	Assistant Editor
A. P. Bevis	Proof Editor/B. X. de Wet Essay
E. A. Mackay	Advisory Editor/In the Museum
M. Lambert	In the Universities/In the Schools
D. Harrison, J. O. Ige,	Editorial Assistants
S. Masters, S. C. McGill,	
R. Ngidi, B. X. de Wet	

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD (1995-96)

J. E. Atkinson	University of Cape Town
S. J. Bastomsky	Monash University, Australia
D. J. Blyth	University of Auckland, New Zealand
J. M. Claassen	University of Stellenbosch
P. J. Davis	University of Tasmania, Australia
S. G. Farron	University of the Witwatersrand
P. A. Gallivan	University of Tasmania, Australia
M. A. Gosling	University of Natal, Durban
J. G. W. Henderson	King's College, University of Cambridge, UK
W. J. Henderson	Rand Afrikaans University
S. B. Jackson	University of Natal, Durban
D. Konstan	Brown University, USA
B. P. P. Kytzler	University of Natal, Durban
R. A. LaFleur	University of Georgia, USA
D. H. J. Larmour	Texas Tech University, USA
C. A. E. Luschnig	University of Idaho, USA
K. O. Matier	University of Durban-Westville
M. R. Mezzabotta	University of Cape Town
S. T. Newmyer	Duquesne University, USA
L. A. Sussman	University of Florida, USA
B. X. de Wet	University of Natal, Durban
R. A. Whitaker	University of Cape Town
M. J. Wilson	University of Auckland, New Zealand
I. Worthington	University of Tasmania, Australia

SCHOLIA

Natal Studies in Classical Antiquity

NS Vol. 5

1996

ISSN 1018-9017

CONTENTS

Editorial Note 1

ARTICLES

The Debate Over *Black Athena* 3
Stanley M. Burstein

Stoicism and the Character of Jason in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius 17
Mary Frances Williams

A Magic Stele in Durban 42
E. A. Mackay

Statius' Hypsipyle: Following in the Footsteps of the *Aeneid* 46
S. Georgia Nugent

Tongue in Cheek for 243 Lines? The Question of Juvenal's Sincerity in His
Seventh Satire 72
Peter Tennant

Lucan's Marble Gardens: Juvenal, *Satire* 7.79f. 89
Michele Valerie Ronnick

Regarding a Verbal Form in the *Carmen de Herbis* 91
Maria del Henar Zamora Salamanca

Persuading a Feminine Audience? Gratuitous Invective Apostrophe in
Juan Luis Vives' *On the Education of a Christian Woman* 94
Edward V. George

REVIEW ARTICLES

The Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilisation? Mary R. Lefkowitz and Guy Maclean (edd.), <i>Black Athena Revisited</i> (Toby A. H. Wilkinson)	112
Afrocentrism and Freemasonry: (De)constructing Myths About Egypt Mary R. Lefkowitz, <i>Not Out of Africa</i> (Michael Lambert)	117
Polymorphic Sexuality Eva Cantarella, <i>Bisexuality in the Ancient World</i> (Eva Stehle)	120
The Challenge of Time: Rome's Past and Ovid's Present Carole E. Newlands, <i>Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti</i> (Anne Gosling)	125
Performance Politics and Language in Imperial Rome Shadi Bartsch, <i>Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian</i> (William J. Dominik)	131
Reviews	136
Books Received	156
Retrieving <i>Scholia</i> Electronically	160
UND <i>Epos</i> and <i>Logos</i> Conference Proceedings	161
In the Museum	171
B. X. de Wet Essay	175
Exchanges with <i>Scholia</i>	186
Notes for Contributors	189
Forthcoming in <i>Scholia</i> (1997)	192
Subscription Form	193

EDITORIAL NOTE

Scholia has featured articles on various aspects of classical antiquity in Africa in previous volumes.¹ Three articles in *Scholia* ns 5 (1996) will be of particular interest to scholars interested in this area of classical scholarship. The issue of *Black Athena*'s scholarly merit is a feature of this volume. Stanley Burstein examines the controversy surrounding Martin Bernal's revisionist interpretation of Greek history.² In his review article Toby Wilkinson critiques Mary Lefkowitz and Guy Rogers' volume responding to the claims of *Black Athena* about the African origins of western civilisation,³ while Michael Lambert examines Lefkowitz's sole-authored volume on the Afrocentric approach to the historiography of classical antiquity.⁴ *Scholia* has greatly expanded its reviews sections in the past few years. The Reviews Editor, J. L. Hilton, with the advice of the rest of the Editorial Committee, selects reviews to be published from *Scholia Reviews*, which consists of the electronic, pre-publication versions distributed via e-mail to subscribers. *Scholia Reviews* can also be obtained via the internet at *Scholia*'s World Wide Web site.⁵

Scholia ns 5 (1996) reflects for the first time the expanded coverage of the journal in the areas of late antique and Renaissance studies related to the classical tradition. Edward George's article on Juan Luis Vives' *On the Education of a Christian Woman* examines this Renaissance humanist's techniques for persuading women.⁶ *Scholia* plans to continue publishing articles in these areas in future volumes.⁷

This volume also includes the conference proceedings of the international conference *Epos and Logos: Ancient Literature and Its Oral Context* held at the University of Natal in July 1996. Organised by E. A. Mackay, this conference attracted scholars from Africa, Europe, North America and Australasia. The publishing of these abstracts continues *Scholia*'s practice of publishing proceedings

¹ E.g., J. Hilton, 'Peoples of Azania', *Scholia* ns 2 (1993) 3-16.

² S. M. Burstein, 'The Debate over *Black Athena*' (pp. 3-16).

³ T. A. H. Wilkinson, 'The Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilisation?' (pp. 112-16).

⁴ M. Lambert, 'Afrocentrism and Freemasonry: (De)constructing Myths About Egypt' (pp. 117-20).

⁵ For information about subscribing to *Scholia Reviews* and *Scholia*'s World Wide Web site, see 'Retrieving *Scholia* Electronically' (p. 160).

⁶ E. V. George, 'Persuading a Feminine Audience? Gratuitous Invective Apostrophe in Juan Luis Vives' *On the Education of a Christian Woman* (pp. 94-111). See also M. del Henar Zamora Salamanca, 'Regarding a Verbal Form in the *Carmen de Herbis*' (pp. 91-93).

⁷ E.g., G. Guttilla, 'Situazioni catulliane e lucreziane nei *Carmi* di Paolino di Nola', forthcoming in *Scholia* ns 6 (1997).

from conferences hosted by the Department of Classics at the University.⁸ For interested readers of these abstracts, select papers from the *Epos and Logos* conference will be published by E. J. Brill in a volume to be edited by E. A. Mackay.

Scholia wishes to express its gratitude to the Classical Association of South Africa for sponsoring the B. X. de Wet Essay competition. The cash prize for the best student essay submitted in 1996-97 will be increased to R200.⁹ The competition is open to undergraduate students in Africa every year and to Honours students on the continent in even-numbered years.¹⁰ *Scholia* is presently sponsored not only by the Classical Association but also by the University of Natal and the Foundation for Education, Science and Technology. It is anticipated that from next year *Scholia* will no longer receive financial support from the Foundation owing to the likelihood that publication grants will no longer be available from this body.

Subscribers will note a slight rise in the price of *Scholia* commencing with ns Volume 6 (1997). This is to cover not only increased publishing and postage costs but also the annual increase in the length of *Scholia* from the inception of the new series in 1992 (Vol. 1).

Finally, the Editor would like to mention that articles and reviews are published in the volume of *Scholia* indicated in the formal letters of acceptance sent to contributors except when printing deadlines and space constraints necessitate that they be published in a subsequent volume of the journal.

William J. Dominik
Editor, *Scholia*

⁸ See the proceedings of the University of Natal Roman Studies Conference in *Scholia* ns 1 (1992) 130-37 and the proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Pacific Rim Roman Literature Seminar forthcoming in *Scholia* ns 6 (1997).

⁹ If no essay deemed to be of a suitable standard for publication in *Scholia* is submitted, then no prize will be awarded.

¹⁰ For additional information about the B. X. de Wet Essay, see p. 175.

THE DEBATE OVER *BLACK ATHENA*

Stanley M. Burstein

Department of History, California State University, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90032, USA

Abstract. *Black Athena* is easily the most controversial book on Greek history published in decades. In it Martin Bernal argues that nationalism and racism led Greek historians to reject the ancient view that cultural diffusion from Egypt and the Levant in the second millennium BC played a key role in the development of Greek civilization. While Professor Bernal's critique of modern Greek historiography has merit, conceptual and methodological flaws limit the value of his revisionist interpretation of Greek history.

Debates among ancient historians do not usually engage the interest of the general public in the United States.¹ The public notoriety that followed the publication in 1987 of the first volume of *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*, a revisionist study of the origins of Greek civilization, is a dramatic exception to that rule.² Indeed, *Black Athena* is unquestionably the most controversial work on Greek history to be published in America in decades. Sessions at the annual meetings of the American Philological Association, the American Research Center in Egypt, and the American Historical Association have been devoted to consideration of the work.³ Major scholarly journals have published what amount to 'round-table' discussions of *Black Athena* and the issues raised by it.⁴ Nor has the controversy remained confined to classicists and Egyptologists. Numerous articles and reviews in newspapers and magazines—some of them bearing emotionally charged titles such as 'Out of Egypt, Greece,' 'The African Origins of "Western Civ,"' and 'Not Out of Africa'!⁵—and even several television programs

¹ An earlier Norwegian version of this article has been published under the title 'Athena—svart eller kvit?' in O. Andersen and T. Hägg (edd.), *I Skyggen av Akropolis, Skrifter Utgitt av det Norske Institutt i Athen* (Bergen 1994) 25-43. This English version is published with the permission of the editors and publisher of *I Skyggen av Akropolis*.

² M. Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* 1 *The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985* (New Brunswick 1987).

³ The proceedings of the American Philological Association meeting were published in a special issue of the journal *Arethusa* entitled *The Challenge of 'Black Athena'* (Fall 1989).

⁴ Most notably the *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 3 (1990) 53-66, 83-110, 247-81 and the *Journal of Women's History* 4 (1993) 83-135.

⁵ S. Begley, 'Out of Egypt, Greece,' *Newsweek* (23 September 1991) 49f.; F. Brodhead, 'The African Origins of "Western Civ,"' *Radical America* 21.5 (September 1987) 29-37; and M. Lefkowitz, 'Not Out of Africa,' *The New Republic* (10 February 1992) 29-36.

have dealt with the work and its implications. Its author, Martin Bernal, grandson of the famous Egyptologist Sir Alan Gardiner and a Sinologist by training, has become a celebrity and a much sought-after public speaker.

Although only two of a projected four volumes have been published, the reasons for the exceptional interest and controversy provoked by *Black Athena* are clear. Simply stated, *Black Athena* represents both a fundamental indictment of and a challenge to Greek historians past and present. The stakes, it is claimed, are high, nothing less, in the author's words, than 'to lessen European cultural arrogance.'⁶ Such a goal has particular resonance in the United States.

Prejudice against people of African descent and their culture is one of the pervasive themes of American history. One important result of that unfortunate fact is that controversy about ancient Egypt and its relationship to later western culture has been a characteristic feature of the larger debate about the proper place of Afro-Americans in American society since the nineteenth century, with American Black intellectuals insisting that Egypt was an African civilization of fundamental importance in world history, while their critics claimed that Egyptian culture was the creation of 'creative' white immigrants to Northeast Africa.⁷ For many Afro-American intellectuals the significance of this debate is expressed in the title of a book little known outside the United States but widely read in the Afro-American community: *Stolen Legacy: Greek Philosophy is Stolen Egyptian Philosophy* by George G. M. James.⁸ Much of the unusually intense public interest in *Black Athena* results from the fact that its publication coincided with a renewal of interest in the United States in this long-standing controversy concerning the African character of Egyptian civilization, the extent of the Egyptian contribution to western civilization, and, most importantly, how these issues should be treated in American public schools.⁹

⁶ Bernal [2] 73.

⁷ D. D. Bruce Jr, 'Ancient Africa and the Early Black American Historians, 1883-1915,' *American Quarterly* 36 (1984) 684-99. Afro-American intellectuals have, in fact, criticized Bernal for his limited awareness of his Black predecessors; cf. J. H. Carruthers, 'Bernal's Critique of Black Champions of Ancient Egypt,' *Journal of Black Studies* 22 (1992) 459-76.

⁸ G. G. M. James, *Stolen Legacy: Greek Philosophy is Stolen Egyptian Philosophy* (New York 1954; rpt 1989). For a critical review of *Stolen Legacy* and its claims, together with an enlightening analysis of its connections to the Masonic tradition, see M. Lefkowitz, 'The Myth of a "Stolen Legacy,"' *Society* 31.3 (March/April 1994) 27-33.

⁹ The bibliography on this subject is enormous. The issues involved and the emotions raised by them are well illustrated by the title of the lead article in the 23 September 1991 issue of the news magazine *Newsweek*: 'Was Cleopatra Black?: Facts or Fantasies—A Debate Rages Over What to Teach Our Kids About Their Roots.'

The Challenge of Black Athena

Bernal lays out his indictment of traditional Greek historiography, the first phase of his ambitious project, in volume one of *Black Athena*, which bears the significant subtitle *The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985*.¹⁰ The main outlines of his challenge to academic Greek historiography are contained in volume two, *The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence*, which offers a revisionist reconstruction of the history of the Aegean in the second millennium BC based on a detailed critique of the evidence and methodology used by traditional Greek historians in writing that history.¹¹ Still to be published are two further volumes dealing with the linguistic evidence for Egyptian and Phoenician influence on the civilizations of the Aegean Bronze Age and Egyptian and Phoenician evidence in Greek myth and legend.

Although *Black Athena* is only half complete, the main points of Bernal's indictment are clear. Greek intellectuals tended, as he rightly insists, to explain many aspects of their culture as being the result of borrowing from the civilizations of the eastern Mediterranean, particularly those of Egypt and Phoenicia.¹² This theory, which Bernal calls the 'Ancient Model,' after being accepted by virtually all scholars from antiquity to the Enlightenment, abruptly fell from favor in the nineteenth century and was replaced by the 'Aryan Model,' which emphasized the decisive contribution of northern Indo-European speaking invaders to the creation of Greek culture. It is Bernal's contention that the 'Aryan Model' was adopted not because of perceived factual deficiencies in its predecessor, but because the 'Ancient Model's' emphasis on 'oriental' and 'African' influences on ancient Greece was no longer tolerable to scholars imbued with the romantic, nationalist and racist attitudes of twentieth-century European culture. Consequently, Bernal urges that scholars reject the 'Aryan Model' and replace it with what he calls the 'Modified Ancient Model,' which recognizes the Indo-European contribution to Greek culture, but retains the 'Ancient Model's' emphasis on the critical importance of the role of Phoenicia and Egypt in the formation of Greek civilization.

No history and critique of Greek historiography on so sweeping a scale has ever been attempted. Inevitably, given the broad strokes and vivid palette with which Bernal draws his picture of the course of European intellectual history, flaws are

¹⁰ Bernal [2].

¹¹ M. Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization 2: The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence* (New Brunswick 1991).

¹² Not all, however. For evidence of ancient criticism of this diffusionist interpretation of Greek culture, see P. Gordon, 'On *Black Athena*: Ancient Critiques of the "Ancient Model" of Greek History,' *CW* 87 (1993) 71f.

easy to find in the details of his massive study. So he underestimates the extent to which the 'Ancient Model' not only continued to be debated as a valid interpretation of the origins of Greek culture¹³ but even enjoyed a brief revival in the early twentieth century as a result of Sir Arthur Evans' discovery of the Minoan civilization on Crete with its close ties to Egypt.¹⁴ More surprisingly, he ignores the remarkable growth of popular and scholarly interest in Egypt that occurred in the decades immediately following the decipherment of hieroglyphics in the 1820s by Jean François Champollion, when the foundations of modern Egyptology were laid.¹⁵ Likewise, his view of cultural relations between Greeks and Egyptians in antiquity is unbalanced. Bernal correctly emphasizes the importance of Greek borrowings from Egypt, but he ignores the possibility of Greek influence on Egyptian thought, particularly in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The latter possibility is especially significant because alleged Hermetic influence on Platonic philosophy plays an important role in the argument of *Black Athena*.¹⁶ This said, the fact remains that there is considerable truth in much of the indictment leveled by Bernal and others at the past masters of Greek historiography.¹⁷ But what of the present?

Old ideas die hard. As late as the 1950s and 1960s attempts to establish significant connections between Greece, Egypt and the ancient Near East by the medical historians Robert O. Steuer and J. B. de C. M. Saunders, the American Semiticists Cyrus Gordon and Michael Astour, and the English classicist T. B. L.

¹³ Compare the review of nineteenth-century German scholarship on this subject by T. Hopfner, *Orient und griechische Philosophie* (Leipzig 1925) 82-89 and the interesting autobiographical comments on the treatment of these topics in early twentieth-century German higher education by P. O. Kristeller, 'Comment on *Black Athena*,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (1995) 125-27.

¹⁴ Compare the observation of D. G. Hogarth, *Ionia and the East* (New York 1909) 27 that 'the Aegean was open to, and overrun by, Nilotic influences long before the Hellenic period.'

¹⁵ For the wide interest in Egypt during the 1830s and 1840s, see J. S. Curl, *Egyptomania. The Egyptian Revival: A Recurring Theme in the History of Taste* (Manchester 1994) 169-205.

¹⁶ The essentially Egyptian character of the Hermetic Corpus is now generally admitted, cf E. Iversen, *Egyptian and Hermetic Doctrine* (Copenhagen 1984) and G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Cambridge 1986). A pioneering example of such a study is M. Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature in the International Context: A Study of Demotic Inscriptions* (Göttingen 1983).

¹⁷ Similar critiques were also offered at about the same time by W. Burkert (tr. M. E. Pinder and W. Burkert), *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge, Mass. 1992) 2-6 and M. E. Aubet (tr. M. Turton), *The Phoenicians and the West: Politics, Colonies and Trade* (Cambridge 1993) 17f.

Webster were all summarily dismissed.¹⁸ So hostile to such views were the times that as late as 1967 the distinguished English classical archaeologist R. M. Cook could assert in the prestigious *Journal of Hellenic Studies* with little fear of contradiction that 'for reasons of style there can have been no direct influence of Egyptian sculpture on Greek in the seventh century and . . . no Greek sculptor of that time shows any sign of having observed an Egyptian statue.'¹⁹ The then dominant view of Greek ideas concerning Egyptian influence in early Greece was clearly summed up in the title of the French scholar Christian Froidefond's detailed 1971 study of the classical Greek image of Egypt, *Le Mirage égyptien* ('*The Egyptian Mirage*').²⁰ Since 1971, however, scholarly views concerning relations between Greece and Egypt have changed significantly.

Ancient Greek historians claimed that numerous Greek intellectuals and artists, both legendary and historical, studied in Egypt. The fullest list is to be found in the work of the first-century BC historian Diodorus Siculus and includes Orpheus, Musaeus, Melampus, Daedalus, Homer, Lycurgus, Plato, Solon, Pythagoras, Eudoxus, Democritus and Oenopides (Diod. 1.96.2). Few contemporary scholars would accept the historicity of all these figures or of their Egyptian travels, but few also would deny all of them. More importantly, hardly any contemporary scholars would contest the fact of significant Egyptian influence on the formation of early Greek culture.

The most dramatic change has been the growing recognition of a significant Egyptian contribution to the development of Greek religion. Thus, in her important 1975 Sather Classical Lectures at the University of California, Berkeley, entitled *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*, the American classical archaeologist, Emily Vermeule, identified as borrowings from Egypt such familiar Greek ideas as:²¹ the weighing of the souls of the dead in scales; both the geography of the underworld and the figure of Charon, the ferryman of the dead; the concept of the blessed dead and their name; the *Makares*, that is, the *Maakherou*,²² the soul

¹⁸ R. O. Steuer and J. B. de C. M. Saunders, *Ancient Egyptian and Cnidian Medicine: The Relationship of their Aetiological Concepts of Disease* (Berkeley 1959); C. H. Gordon, 'Homer and the Bible,' *Hebrew Union Annual* 26 (1955) 1-66 and *The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations*² (New York 1965); M. C. Astour, *Hellenosemitica: An Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece* (Leiden 1967); and T. B. L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* (London 1958).

¹⁹ R. M. Cook, 'Origins of Greek Sculpture,' *JHS* 87 (1967) 25.

²⁰ C. Froidefond, *Le Mirage égyptien dans la littérature grecque d'Homère à Aristote* (Aix-en-Provence 1971).

²¹ E. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley 1979) 69-82.

²² This derivation is not, however, universally accepted; cf. R. H. Pierce, 'Egyptian Loan-Words in Ancient Greek,' *SO* 46 (1971) 105.

bird; and the playing of board games by the dead. The Swiss historian of Greek religion, Walter Burkert, has added to this list the idea of the life-giving fire that plays a prominent role in the charter myth of the Eleusinian mysteries.²³ Less far-reaching but similar changes have occurred in other areas of Greek studies. Examples are the Danish Egyptologist Eric Iversen's now generally accepted demonstration of the Egyptian origin of the archaic Greek sculptural canon of proportions,²⁴ as well as his establishment of the dependence of Hippocratic cranial surgery on Egyptian medical techniques that are documented for us in the *Edwin Smith Medical Papyrus*.²⁵ Even the study of Greek philosophy has been affected. So G. S. Kirk and his co-authors observe in their standard study of early Greek philosophy, *The Presocratic Philosophers*, that 'Thales was indebted to Egypt' for one of the central ideas of his cosmology, namely, that the earth floats upon a great sea.²⁶

Less dramatic but equally important discoveries have come from renewed scholarly investigation of the Mesopotamian contribution to Greek culture, the results of which are conveniently synthesized in Walter Burkert's path-breaking study, *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*.²⁷ At the same time, the exaggerated claims once commonly made for the purely Indo-European character of Greek culture have largely disappeared. Indeed, the distinguished Indo-Europeanist Jan Puhvel has pointed out that 'attempts to discern Indo-European structures in the wider reaches of Greek saga and literature . . . must be viewed with unrelenting caution.'²⁸ During the past two decades, therefore, the 'Aryan Model' has largely disappeared and an interpretation of Bronze Age Aegean history similar to Bernal's 'Modified Ancient Model' has become increasingly accepted by scholars studying the origins of classical Greek civilization. It is not surprising, therefore, that the initial reception of *Black Athena* and the first reviews of it by classicists tended to be respectful and

²³ W. Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Harvard 1987) 20f.

²⁴ E. Iversen, 'The Egyptian Origin of the Archaic Greek Canon,' *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Abt. Kairo)* 15 (1957) 134-47.

²⁵ E. Iversen, 'Wounds in the Head in Egyptian and Hippocratic Medicine,' *Studia Orientalia Ionani Pedersen* (Hauniae 1963) 163-71.

²⁶ G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven and M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers*² (Cambridge 1983) 92f.

²⁷ Burkert [17].

²⁸ J. Puhvel, 'The Indo-European Strain in Greek Myth,' in S. M. Burstein and L. A. Okin (edd.), *Panhellenica: Essays in Ancient History and Historiography in Honor of Truesdell S. Brown* (Lawrence 1980) 29.

even favorable.²⁹ When disagreement was expressed, it primarily concerned Bernal's views as to when and how this Egyptian and Phoenician influence was exercised, not the fact of the influence itself.

Controversy centered, in fact, on two points: first, Bernal's contention that Egyptian and Phoenician influence was exercised primarily through repeated invasion and colonization of Greece during the Bronze Age; secondly, his belief that evidence of such incursions survives in Greek legends concerning figures such as Danaus and Cadmus and in an extensive Egyptian and Semitic loan vocabulary in Greek. Bernal identifies in *Black Athena* four major periods of such Phoenician and Egyptian influence in the Aegean prior to the end of the Bronze Age: (1) the late third millennium BC, when Egyptian influence stimulated the emergence of palace culture on Crete and the development of irrigation agriculture in Boeotia; (2) the twentieth century BC, when the campaigns of Sesostri I and Sesostri III severely disrupted political and cultural conditions in the Caucasus, Anatolia, and the northern Balkans; (3) the late eighteenth century BC, when Hyksos dynasts established colonial kingdoms on Crete and on various sites on the Greek mainland including Mycenae; and (4) the fifteenth and fourteenth century BC, when Greece took advantage of the *pax Aegyptiaca* established by Thutmose III and his eighteenth dynasty successors to become a full participant in the cosmopolitan cultural world of the eastern Mediterranean basin.

A New Framework for Greek History

It is Bernal's contention that this reconstruction should replace the 'Aryan Model' as the basic framework for analyzing the origins of Greek civilization. A final judgement on the validity of his ambitious attempt to rewrite the history of the Aegean in the second millennium BC must await the publication of the remaining volumes of *Black Athena*, but its principal thesis, the possibility of significant Egyptian cultural influence on Greece during the Bronze Age, cannot simply be dismissed out of hand as it once might have been. Archaeological evidence of contact between Egypt, Minoan Crete, and Mycenaean Greece has accumulated steadily since the end of World War II and now includes such remarkable items as the list of Aegean place-names from Amenhotep III's mortuary temple at Kom el-Hetan—possibly the record of an Egyptian embassy to Mycenaean Greece³⁰—and

²⁹ Bernal has commented on this phenomenon without fully accounting for it; cf. M. Bernal, 'Black Athena and the APA,' *Arethusa* 22 (1989) 17-20.

³⁰ For the text and commentary on the Aegean place-name list from Kom el-Hetan, see E. Edel, *Die Ortsnamenlisten aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III, Bonner biblische Beiträge* 25 (Bonn 1966) 34-60. The evidence for relations between Greece and Egypt is collected and

fragments of bull-leaper and architectural frescoes executed in Minoan style recently discovered by the Austrian archaeologist Manfred Bietak at Tel el-Dab'a, the site of the Hyksos capital of Avaris.³¹ From the beginning it was clear that proper evaluation of the validity of this scheme would be difficult. How difficult is indicated by three facts that emerge from even a cursory analysis of Bernal's views contained in the first two volumes of *Black Athena*.

First, Bernal is clearly right to claim that the name Danaus represents a genuine memory of second millennium BC contact between Greece and Egypt, since it is almost certainly a reflex of *Tanaja*, the Egyptian name for the Aegean Sea and its inhabitants.³² Secondly, Walter Burkert's convincing demonstration that Homer's story of Odysseus' remarkable feat of shooting arrows through a line of axes in the *Odyssey* originated in New Kingdom royal ideology allows no doubt both that some Egyptian literary themes entered Mycenaean Greek culture and that at least one of them survived the collapse of Mycenaean civilization and the Dark Ages to reappear in Homeric epic.³³ Thirdly, and equally important, however, the same evidence that establishes the fact of Greco-Egyptian and Phoenician interaction in the second millennium BC also seems to exclude Bernal's view that that interaction and the concomitant influence of Egyptian and Phoenician culture on that of Mycenaean Greece resulted from Phoenician and, especially, Egyptian colonization of Greece.

The problems are fourfold. First, the decipherment of Linear B as Greek by Michael Ventris combined with the overwhelming archaeological evidence for essential continuity between Middle Helladic and Late Helladic culture strongly suggests that the administration of the Mycenaean kingdoms was Greek-speaking from the beginning. Secondly, although evidence such as the Aegean place-name list from Kom el-Hetan, the Minoan frescoes from Avaris, the depictions of Aegean tribute bearers in eighteenth dynasty Egyptian tombs,³⁴ and the recently published Amarna Painted Papyrus³⁵ confirm the existence of economic and probably also political and diplomatic contacts between Egypt and the Aegean in the middle second millennium BC, they also indicate that the Egyptians saw little difference

analyzed in P. W. Haider, *Griechenland-Nordafrika: Ihre Beziehungen zwischen 1500 und 600 v. Chr.* (Darmstadt 1988) 1-82.

³¹ M. Bietak, *Avaris: The Capital of the Hyksos* (London 1996) 73-81.

³² Haider [30] 9.

³³ W. Burkert, 'Von Amenophis II zur Bogenprobe des Odysseus,' *GB* 1 (1973) 69-78.

³⁴ The fullest recent treatment of the Aegean tribute bearer reliefs is S. Wachsmann, *Aegeans in the Theban Tombs* (Leuven 1987).

³⁵ L. Schofield and R. B. Parkinson, 'Of Helmets and Heretics: A Possible Egyptian Representation of Mycenaean Warriors on a Papyrus from El-Amarna,' *ABSA* 89 (1994) 157-70.

between the Mycenaean Greeks or their Minoan predecessors and the other non-Egyptian peoples with whom they came in contact. Indeed, the Kom el-Hetan text suggests that the Egyptians tended to assimilate the peoples of the Aegean to the more familiar populations of Syria since the captive figure determinative for the Aegean list is the same as that used for Syrian place-names. Thirdly, genuine Egyptian artifacts certainly did reach Mycenaean Greece. Some, such as the faience plaques with cartouches of Amenhotep III discovered at Mycenae during the past century, may even have been made in Greece by resident Egyptian craftsmen.³⁶ In addition, artistic and technical borrowings from Egypt, such as the use of Egyptianizing artistic themes and conventions and the production of ground stone vessels, are well documented features of Aegean culture. Equally important, however, these items did not come to Greece directly from Egypt, but indirectly through an intermediary, specifically, through the mediation of the Minoans,³⁷ just as in the first millennium BC the Phoenicians functioned as cultural intermediaries between Egypt and Greece prior to the actual settlement of Greeks in Egypt on a significant scale beginning in the seventh century BC.³⁸ Fourthly, unlike the case most nearly comparable to that posited by Bernal for Minoan Crete and Mycenaean Greece, namely, the ancient Sudan where Egyptian domination and colonization is both securely attested and detectable in virtually every aspect of the civilization of Kush and its various successor states, archaeological evidence for similarly massive Egyptian influence on the culture of either Bronze Age or Classical Greece is totally lacking. Over a century of study of Bronze Age Aegean culture has not revealed the sort of systematic resemblances to Egypt that characterize the material and intellectual culture of Napata or Meroe.³⁹

The tone of scholarly reviews changed noticeably, however, with the publication of the second volume of *Black Athena*, *The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence*, in 1991.⁴⁰ Reviews became much less sympathetic and scholars were more forthright in expressing their reservations concerning the theories

³⁶ This is suggested by the apparent Aegean origin of the lead used to make the glaze for these plaques; cf. E. Cline, 'An Unpublished Amenhotep III Faience Plaque from Mycenae,' *JAOS* 110 (1990) 210.

³⁷ Cf. S. Hood, *The Arts in Prehistoric Greece* (London 1978) 233-40.

³⁸ For the Phoenician origin of many so-called Egyptian objects found on archaic Greek sites, see V. Webb, *Archaic Greek Faience: Miniature Scent Bottles and Related Objects from East Greece 650-500 B.C.* (Warminster 1978).

³⁹ The standard introduction to the history and culture of the ancient Sudan is W. Y. Adams, *Nubia: Corridor to Africa* (Princeton 1977).

⁴⁰ Bernal [11].

propounded in *Black Athena*.⁴¹ The reasons for this change are clear. For the first time the details of Bernal's proposed revision of early Greek history snapped into sharp focus. So also did its problems.

Publication of volume two of *Black Athena* made acutely clear the conflict between Bernal's goal of writing a narrative account of political and cultural relations between the Aegean, Egypt and Phoenicia in the second millennium BC and one of the fundamental premises of contemporary archaeological thought, namely, that a narrative history cannot be written solely on the basis of archaeological evidence. The problem is well illustrated by Bernal's own admission that the presence of Egyptian objects at second millennium BC Minoan and Mycenaean sites can be explained equally satisfactorily by theories assuming direct or indirect contacts between Egypt and the Aegean. Only textual evidence can supply the data Bernal's project requires. Indeed, it has become increasingly clear that the success of *Black Athena* rests almost entirely on the validity of Bernal's belief that such evidence can be found in Greek accounts of the heroic age, precisely the texts whose evidentiary value has been subjected to the most intense scrutiny and found wanting by nineteenth- and twentieth-century classical scholarship. It is not surprising, therefore, that central to *Black Athena* is an attack on modern classical philology and its reliance on 'critical method,' which, Bernal claims, has allowed scholars to justify the systematic elimination of virtually all classical references to Egyptian and Near Eastern activity in the Aegean basin in the second millennium BC.

There is no doubt that many sins were committed during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the name of *Quellenforschung* and the sort of methodological skepticism that is associated in Greek history with the work of K. J. Beloch. Thus, Beloch's theory that the Phoenicians were a mythical eastern people named after Phoenix, a historicized solar deity, who were only identified with the inhabitants of the Levantine coast during the Archaic Period, is a sobering example of the excesses to which hypercriticism can lead.⁴² Unfortunately, Bernal's own treatment of classical sources in *Black Athena*, as exemplified by his use of the account of Sesostris' campaigns in Herodotus' *History of the Persian Wars* (Hdt.

⁴¹ Compare, for example, the reviews by the classicist L. A. Tritle in *LCM* 17 (1992) 81-96 and the Egyptologist L. H. Lesko in *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 24 (1994) 518-21.

⁴² K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² 1.2 (Strassburg 1913) 61f., 69-76. For recent proposed etymologies of the name Phoenix, see J.-Chr. Billigmeier, 'Origin of the Greek Word Phoinix,' *Talanta* 7-9 (1977) 1-4 and C. Vandersleyen, 'L'Étymologie de Phoinix, "Phénicien,"' in E. Lipinski (ed.), *Studia Phoenicia 5: Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the First Millennium B.C.* (Leuven 1987) 19-22. For a convenient survey of the current state of scholarship dealing with the Phoenician contact with the Greeks, see O. Negby, 'Early Phoenician Presence in the Mediterranean Islands: A Reappraisal,' *AJA* 96 (1992) 599-615.

2.102-06), unintentionally underscored the need for caution and the exercise of 'critical method' in the analysis of such texts.

Modern scholars have traditionally explained Herodotus' account of extensive campaigns in Asia and Europe by a king named Sesostriis as Egyptian propaganda intended to deflate the pretensions of the Persians, an interpretation that would seem to be confirmed by the subsequent revision of the story in the light of Alexander's conquests by the Hellenistic sources used by Diodorus (cf. Diod. 1.55.3) in the other principal account of Sesostriis' reign. Bernal, who identifies Sesostriis with the twelfth dynasty king Senwosre I (1962-1928 BC), argues that Herodotus' account is not only based on second millennium BC sources, but that it provides an explanation for a series of major cultural upheavals indicated by archaeological evidence to have occurred in Anatolia, the Caucasus, and the Balkans in the early second millennium BC.⁴³

That Greek accounts of Egypt contain material that is derived ultimately from second millennium BC Egyptian sources is not in doubt. Examples such as Ptolemy of Mendes' correct dating of the expulsion of the Hyksos to the reign of the early eighteenth dynasty king Ahmose⁴⁴ and Hecataeus of Abdera's use of inscriptions from the Ramesseum in his account of Ramses II⁴⁵ are sufficient evidence of that fact. The problem is not whether or not Herodotus used early sources, but that Bernal treats him solely as a reporter of Egyptian traditions, while Herodotus' own text strongly suggests that his share in the creation of his narrative was much greater than that.

Herodotus' account of Sesostriis is composed of two unequal sections: a summary of his Egyptian informant's account of Sesostriis' conquests in the Red Sea and on the 'mainland (ἡπείρου)' in 2.102 and an extended analysis of that account in 2.103-06. What Bernal ignores is the fact that the geographical details of Sesostriis' campaigns occur only in the second and analytical portion of Herodotus' account, which is characterized by frequent references to Herodotus' personal opinions (μοι

⁴³ Bernal finds support for his interpretation of the extent of Sesostriis' campaign in an inscription from Mit Rahina (ancient Memphis) dated to the early years of the reign of Amenemhet II (1929-1895 BC), which he claims documents Egyptian military and diplomatic activity as far away as western Anatolia (cf. Bernal [11] 230-34). This interpretation must be rejected, however, since it has been shown that from beginning to end the Asian expedition referred to in section M8 of the Mit Rahina inscription lasted no more than four months and, therefore, cannot have extended much further than some point in Syria (cf. H. Altenmüller and A. M. Moussa, 'Die Inschrift Amenemhet II aus dem Ptah-Tempel von Memphis. Ein Vorbericht,' *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 18 (1991) 35 and n. 24.

⁴⁴ F. Jacoby (ed.), *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (Leiden 1958) 611 F 1 (hereafter *FGrH*).

⁴⁵ *FGrH* 264 F 25.47.6-48.

δοκέει, 'it seems to me'; φαίνονται, 'they appear'; νοήσας, 'having thought'; μοι ἐν φροντίδι, 'in my opinion'), his own research (ἠρώμην ἀμφοτέρους, 'I asked both'), the limitations of his knowledge (οὐκ ἔχω . . . ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν, 'I cannot exactly say'); citations of evidence deemed by him to be both relevant (purported steles of Sesostriis and the practice of circumcision by Colchians) and irrelevant (physical characteristics of the Colchians); and the repeated use of the confirmatory conjunction γάρ ('for') at critical points in the discussion. The implications of these linguistic features are clear. Herodotus' account of Sesostriis' campaigns is not simply a report of what his Egyptian informants told him, but, like Bernal's own work, an interpretation of his sources based on Herodotus' own independent investigations.⁴⁶ And like all such interpretations, that of Herodotus is valid only to the extent that his inferences and the evidence on which they were based were both sound. For this reason, neither Herodotus nor Bernal's other classical sources can by themselves support the interpretative structure he has built on them. The same, unfortunately, is also true for the 'Revised Ancient Model,' which provides the conceptual framework for his project as a whole.

Part of the problem is the origin of the 'Revised Ancient Model' itself. Bernal refers to it as the ancient Greek theory of the origins of Greek civilization. In fact, however, no unified ancient Greek version of the theory exists. It is, instead, an artificial construct composed of three not completely compatible elements—Herodotus' theory of the Egyptian origins of Greek religion, stories connecting several Greek heroes with Egypt and the Near East, and claims that various Greek artists and intellectuals studied in Egypt—and the resulting tensions are readily apparent. Good examples are Bernal's attempt to 'save the phenomena' by arbitrarily abandoning the ancient chronology for Danaus' arrival in Greece because it cannot be reconciled with the known events of east Mediterranean history in the sixteenth century BC⁴⁷ and his equally arbitrary insistence on a mid-second millennium BC date for the Greek alphabet in order to save Cadmus' association with its introduction to Greece.⁴⁸ Still more serious is his failure to confront openly

⁴⁶ For this analysis see C. Obsomer, *Les Campagnes de Sésostris dans Hérodote: Essai d'interprétation du texte grec à la lumière des réalités égyptiennes* (Brussels 1989). Much less certain is his identification of the ultimate source of Herodotus' account as the so-called Semnah decree of year 16 of Senwosre III.

⁴⁷ Shifting the date back to the late eighteenth century BC compounds the problems since the overwhelmingly Syro-Palestinian character of the Hyksos finds from Tel el-Dab'a makes it doubtful they would have been effective transmitters of Egyptian culture to the Aegean; cf. E. C. M. van den Brink, *Tombs and Burial Customs at Tell el-Dab'a* (Vienna 1982) for the Syro-Palestinian character of the material at Tel el-Dab'a.

⁴⁸ Bernal argues this case more fully in M. Bernal, *Cadmean Letters: The Transmission of the Alphabet to the Aegean and Further West before 1400 B.C.* (Winona Lake 1990). The

the conflict between *Black Athena's* second millennium BC focus and the well attested Greek belief that the first millennium BC was the critical period for non-religious cultural borrowing from Egypt. At the root of the problem, however, is the limited explanatory power of the 'Revised Ancient Model' itself, as revealed in the first two volumes of *Black Athena*.

Bernal has repeatedly protested that he is not trying to maintain that 'Greece is like Egypt or the Levant,' but only to suggest that relations between Greece and Egypt were 'analogous to those between Vietnam, Korea, or Japan to China.'⁴⁹ That is an interesting and potentially illuminating analogy, one that emphasizes the importance of both donor and receiver cultures, and that is the problem. A successful diffusionist theory of cultural origins cannot be limited in its application, as the 'Revised Ancient Model' seems to be, to identifying the foreign origins of particular cultural phenomena. It must also analyze their function in their new cultural environment and the process by which they were adapted to it, and that the 'Revised Ancient Model' does not do. At the most it can pinpoint areas of agreement between Greek, Egyptian and Near Eastern civilizations, but it cannot account for the differences between the civilizations themselves. In concrete terms it can identify the Egyptian origin of the archaic Greek *kouros* statue-type, but it cannot explain why a Greek *kouros* is not an Egyptian statue. That requires a more dialectical theory of cultural diffusion than that provided by the 'Revised Ancient Model,' one that assigns equal weight to the contributions of both donor and recipient cultures. In this particular instance, it requires a theory that allows a significant role in the formulation of its explanations for culture specific factors, such as the archaic Greek obsession with the athlete as the ideal embodiment of maleness that the *kouros*-type expressed. The Greeks themselves would have agreed since they formulated the relationship between Greece and its east Mediterranean neighbors in a similar fashion. So the author of the pseudo-Platonic *Epinomos* observes in a famous passage that Greeks need not be disturbed by the fact that they borrowed scientific information and techniques from Egypt and Babylon since they improved whatever they took (987a-e).⁵⁰ Despite his obvious chauvinism, the author of this text—

kernel of truth in his position is the need for classicists to take seriously the Semiticists' insistence on the possibility of a date for the adaptation of the Phoenician alphabet to Greek nearer the beginning of the first millennium BC than the currently accepted eighth-century BC date.

⁴⁹ Bernal [29] 23.

⁵⁰ For example, Greek historians of mathematics emphasized that Greek mathematicians improved on what they had learned from the Egyptians by developing the system of demonstration and proof; cf. Procl. *In Euc.* 65-68. For an important analysis of the treatment of the history of science in *Black Athena* in general, see R. Palter, 'Black Athena, Afro-Centrism, and the History of Science,' *History of Science* 31 (1993) 227-87.

probably Philip of Opus—makes the same point: identifying the source from which a particular cultural trait has diffused is only the beginning of the story, not its end.

Conclusion

With two volumes still to be published, any definitive judgement concerning the significance of *Black Athena* and the controversy provoked by it would clearly be premature. Still, on the basis of the volumes so far published it is, I believe, fair to say that *Black Athena* is an important but flawed work. Its flaws make it unlikely that Bernal's hope that it would provide a new paradigm for the study of Greek history will be fulfilled. Indeed, new discoveries have already undermined important aspects of the reconstruction proposed in it. So at the same time that the spectacular discovery of fragments of Minoan bull-leaper frescoes at Tel el-Dab'a have eliminated once and for all doubts about the existence of close contact between Egypt and the Aegean in the second millennium BC, it also revealed the inadequacy of any one-sided analysis of that contact by raising the possibility of significant reciprocal Minoan influence on Egypt during the period of Hyksos rule.

The flaws of *Black Athena*, however, do not minimize the significance of Bernal's project for contemporary Greek historiography. Quite the contrary. To a remarkable degree Greek historiography has remained one of the last bastions of nineteenth-century 'scientific history,' with its empiricism and its obliviousness to the role of cultural forces in the identification of problems deemed appropriate for historical research and the establishment of the theoretical canons that guide the formulation of acceptable historical explanations. No such naïve view of Greek historiography can survive a reading of *Black Athena*. Equally important, Bernal has succeeded in putting the question of the origin of Greek civilization back on the historical agenda for the first time in decades. Moreover, he has renewed serious consideration of the role of diffusion in Greek history⁵¹ and the extent of the continuity between the civilizations of the Bronze Age Aegean and classical Greece. In short, *Black Athena* is a serious work that deals in a serious way with many of the principal issues of Aegean history in the second millennium BC, and as the intense public and scholarly debate already provoked by it indicates, it is a work that will give ancient historians much food for thought for many years to come.

⁵¹ The importance of this aspect of Bernal's work for the discipline of archaeology as a whole has been pointed out by B. G. Trigger, 'Brown Athena: A Postprocessual Goddess?,' *Current Anthropology* 33 (1992) 121-23.

STOICISM AND THE CHARACTER OF JASON IN THE *ARGONAUTICA* OF APOLLONIUS RHODIUS

Mary Frances Williams

2824 Monterey Street

San Mateo, California 94403, USA

Abstract. The issue of Jason's character in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* has attracted considerable controversy. Jason has been accused of being indecisive, passive and manipulative. However, Jason's behavior appears to be motivated by the same considerations that govern Stoic ethical thought. A Stoic interpretation of Jason reveals consistency in his actions, provides explanations for his decisions, and contributes to the unity of the epic. It also counters Jason's negative reputation by offering a philosophical basis for his actions.

No aspect of the *Argonautica* has attracted more scholarly attention during the past several decades than the question of Jason's character: his heroism or the lack of it.¹ Recent discussions by Hunter and Jackson suggest that the issue is still of interest to Apollonian scholars;² however, no resolution that professes to satisfy problems inherent in the text has been generally accepted. Is Jason a hero or is he not? Is he the only hero or one among many?³ Is he of epic type or does he represent the New Hellenistic Man? Is his treatment of his crew, of women in general, of Medea in particular, laudable? Is he cowardly, meek and uncertain,⁴ or is he self-assuredly restrained and rational? To these must be added another question: are the problems that scholars find with Jason's depiction designed by the author to make this character ultimately unappealing for readers, or are they not really problems at all in the context of Hellenistic thought?⁵ Inconsistency in narrative style, characterization, development of the literary tradition, and presentation of other themes, such as elements of ancient religion and myth, is a

¹ I thank R. J. Hankinson for kindly reading over an early draft of this article and preventing philosophical errors.

² R. Hunter, *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge 1993) 9f and "Short on Heroics": Jason in the *Argonautica*, *CQ* 38 (1988) 436f. summarize various critical views; S. B. Jackson, 'Apollonius' Jason: Human Being in an Epic Scenario,' *G&R* 39 (1992) 155-62.

³ J. Carspecken, 'Apollonius Rhodius and the Homeric Epic,' *YCIS* 13 (1952) 110-25.

⁴ Carspecken [3] 101; Hunter [2 (1993)] 9f.

⁵ C. Beye, 'Jason as Love Hero in Apollonios' *Argonautika*, *GRBS* 10 (1969) 34 finds Jason to be the hero within the narrative: 'It is the epic itself which in the face of the tradition is a distortion.'

common aspect of Apollonius' technique and has been defended as a 'deliberate shattering of received norms.'⁶ From this perspective, divergences in the depiction of Jason's character may be a product of the author's design and, far from expressing a lack of coherence, may instead serve a specific, albeit non-traditional, purpose. There is still room for new interpretations from different views that might reveal an unusual type of consistency within the epic.

In general, Jason has been considered to be the hero of the epic, although he is admittedly a hero with weaknesses and faults. He does share his authority on occasion, but no other character in the epic is both accepted as a leader and willing to assume command.⁷ He leads his expedition, speaks for his crew, and must undergo labors that are faced by no others. However, he has been criticized for his treatment of Hypsipyle and Medea, for his reliance on Medea,⁸ for his periodic bouts of 'indecision' (ἀμηχανία), for his crew's initial unanimous choice of Herakles as leader in preference to Jason, and for his lack of aggression. Beye, for example, declares that Jason is an unlikely candidate to be the hero of the epic: 'he is morally, spiritually and intellectually impotent, and perhaps a physical coward as well.'⁹ Hunter notes that the heroes of epic should be 'exemplars of moral and physical action' and that 'it is on this count above all that Apollonius' Jason is held to fail.'¹⁰ Hainsworth remarks:

We look to Jason expecting to find an Achilles or an Odysseus, and find a weak and colorless figure, at best a supple diplomat, overshadowed as a character by Medea. Even his courage is without conviction, for it will never do merely to assert that the hero is brave; his bravery must be demonstrated in action.¹¹

Others have gone so far as to deny the presence of traditional heroism within the epic and even argue that Medea, not Jason, is the true 'hero' of the poem.¹² Any interpretation of Jason's character must take these problems into account and should attempt to find a satisfactory resolution.

Jackson quite rightly points out that Apollonius' Jason is different from the heroes of Homeric epic, but the distinction that he draws between the Homeric epic figure and Jason as the representative of the 'regular man' who is more

⁶ Hunter [2 (1993)] 5.

⁷ F. Vian (ed.), *Apollonios de Rhodes: Argonautiques* 2 (Paris 1980) 32-38.

⁸ J. B. Hainsworth, *The Idea of Epic* (Berkeley 1991) 72.

⁹ Beye [5] 37.

¹⁰ Hunter [2 (1993)] 9f.

¹¹ Hainsworth [8] 72.

¹² Hainsworth [8] 67, 72, 75; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1 (Oxford 1972) 626.

'real' is perhaps overly simplistic.¹³ Apollonius takes his cue from Homer and draws heavily upon his predecessor no less in characterization than in other areas.¹⁴ The Homeric hero is a warrior who fights on behalf of his people, one who is constrained by convention to win glory on the battlefield. He is, to a certain extent, the product of a shame culture and considers external signs of his achievements (booty consisting of animals, women, or property; the respect of others; promotion to leadership) of paramount importance. He can be violent, impulsive, angry, or hesitant, quiet and poetic (like Achilles), or treacherous, devious, deceptive, eloquent and fundamentally motivated by justice (like Odysseus). But although his adventures and achievements extend beyond the bounds of probability, the Homeric hero's emotions and longings are quintessentially human; if not, they would not appeal to readers to the extent that they do today. Homeric heroes are unreal, yet they are very human.

The Jason who sails away upon a quest for a fleece that represents both property and glory is motivated to undertake his expedition in the first place because he has been shamefully treated and because he desires kingship. He is accepted by others as a leader, is able to give plausible and articulate speeches, and is able to act treacherously and to kill when necessary. This Jason is an ultimately Homeric figure. It is only when one looks beyond the broad outlines of tradition and examines Apollonius' Jason more closely that it becomes apparent that he departs from recognized convention. And when Jason differs, it is not because he no longer cares about the same things as a Homeric warrior: honor, glory, authority, achievement are still his goals. What is different about Jason is threefold: first, Jason does not choose the expedition solely in order to demonstrate his ἀρετή ('excellence') or to gain glory, but because he accepts the task that has been imposed on him by Pelias (*Arg.* 1.15-17),¹⁵ and so his desire for glory is mingled with awareness and acceptance of destiny. Achilles was completely motivated by honor throughout the *Iliad* and, as Hainsworth remarks, 'Achilles is made to acknowledge only two categorical imperatives: the duties of public honor and private friendship.'¹⁶ The choice that confronted Achilles between glory and long life presupposes that necessity is of less importance than the hero's choice in the *Iliad*. The *Argonautica*, on the other hand, downplays

¹³ S. Jackson [2] 155f. Hainsworth [8] 73 also notes that Jason does not dominate because he is 'a person, not a paragon.'

¹⁴ See Hunter [2 (1988)] 438-44 for numerous Homeric parallels. But Hunter [2 (1993)] 8-10 notes important areas of difference between the *Argonautica* and the Homeric epics.

¹⁵ Hunter [2 (1993)] 10; Hainsworth [8] 72, who says that the Golden Fleece is not a goal towards which all men strive, but a task set by Pelias and so is not traditional or epic.

¹⁶ Hainsworth [8] 39.

Jason's response to Pelias and any possible choice, and increases the prominence of necessity,¹⁷ even, as will be pointed out, at the expense of friendship and honor. Noteworthy also is Jason's lack of Homeric emotionalism, since the justified anger of Homeric warriors is one of their most conspicuous attributes. A final change consists of Jason's (or the author's) *philosophy* about the attainment of those traditional goals. The Homeric warrior and Jason share some of the same ends. However, they differ somewhat in the means to achieve those ends and they diverge radically in their underlying suppositions about life and about the individual's proper role and behavior within the universe. Jason is unlike the Homeric warrior in that he prefers rational planning and negotiation to warfare and because he frequently must decide what is appropriate not for himself but to further the plan of Zeus. Jason is not either a Homeric figure or a 'normal' man. Jason is motivated by considerations that correspond to aspects of Hellenistic philosophy and he moves through an epic that is to a great extent a construct of Hellenistic thought and that appears to be designed to illustrate aspects of Hellenistic philosophy. Therefore, instead of considering Jason as is standard, only in comparison with the Homeric, it would be more instructive to consider Jason also from the point of view of the Hellenistic. Jason acts in a manner that conforms for the most part to the teachings of Stoicism and he himself, despite the Homeric flavoring of the poem, is Homeric only where Homeric heroism and behavior coincide with Stoicism. This article will examine Jason's character in the poem from the perspective of a hypothetical Stoic basis to the poem, considering in several episodes first how Jason differs from the Homeric and then how these differences compare with Stoic thought.

The construction of the *Argonautica* is not so much Homeric as it is novelistic with respect to characterization. Most minor characters are included because they are part of the traditional myth, but they are developed in order to illustrate one human behavioral type. Not only do the heroes correspond to Lawall's four categories: men of brawn, skill, valor and piety,¹⁸ but they and other characters splinter off into sub-groups of attitude and action. Like a medieval allegory, some might be labeled Brutality, Anger, Impulsiveness, Arrogance, Lust, etc. They dance about Jason as foils, depicting what he is *not*. A few others, who display more positive traits such as courage and piety, function in the same manner, but they instead depict limited, laudable aspects of Jason's more complex character. Jason himself does not possess only one character trait: unlike all the others, he

¹⁷ This change may be a result of the influence of Aristotle, who said in the *Poetics* that poetry aims to state the sort of thing that would happen in accordance with probability or necessity (*Poetics* 1451a36-38, 1451b5-11).

¹⁸ G. Lawall, 'Apollonius' *Argonautica*: Jason as Anti-Hero,' *YCIS* 19 (1966) 123-48.

exemplifies many of the facets of a *nearly* Stoic wise man, one who is literally on the road to virtue. According to a hypothetical Stoic interpretation, Jason is the hero, the only human within the epic worthy of emulation and praise, and his character also explains the meaning of the epic: it is an illustration of this particular philosophy functioning in a dramatic setting. Stoic teachings, of course, were quite new at the time of the composition of Apollonius' epic, but the poet may well have been attracted by the novelty of the Stoa.¹⁹ Although the evidence for the presence of Stoics in Alexandria is rather shaky,²⁰ their impact on intellectual trends and writings in the Hellenistic period was considerable.²¹ This is attested by the Hellenistic poet Aratus, who is reported to have attached himself to the school of Zeno and who displays his Stoic outlook in his *Phaenomena*, of which Apollonius was aware. At the same time, elements of Stoic thought may be found in traditional Greek ethics, in Aristotle, Plato and poets such as Sophocles who are accepted influences upon the Alexandrians. Apollonius, in his position as Librarian at Alexandria and through his research, would have been familiar with intellectual movements in the Greek world, particularly those at Athens. The scholia indicate that the pre-Socratic philosophers are reflected in the *Argonautica*, and there is some evidence that all types of prose writing, particularly historical, influenced Apollonius. Extensive Stoic interest in grammar and language²² is likely to have attracted Apollonius' notice. It is important, then, to be aware of the possibility of a relationship between Stoicism and Apollonius. Since the Stoics were themselves fond of poetic allegory as a means of illustrating their principles, an allegorical interpretation (or composition) of an epic poem in Stoic terms would be in conformity with Stoic literary trends.²³ However, even if Apollonius were not deliberately injecting Stoic philosophy into his poem, those

¹⁹ It is difficult to separate the teachings of the Early Stoa from the Middle and Later ones because so little remains, but since I am speaking in only the most general terms, I occasionally lump them all together here. Clearly, however, only Zeno (c. 333-263 BC; founded Stoa c. 300), Cleanthes (c. 331-232 BC; succeeded Zeno 263) and Chrysippus (c. 280-c. 206 BC; succeeded Cleanthes 232), members of the Early Stoa, could have in any way influenced the poem. J. M. Rist, *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge 1969) 173f. endeavors to distinguish between the stages of Stoicism and provides a good analysis.

²⁰ Fraser [12] 481. Eratosthenes was influenced by the Stoics, but he was the successor of Apollonius at Alexandria.

²¹ Tarn declares: 'The philosophy of the Hellenistic world was the Stoa; all else was secondary' (W. W. Tarn and G. T. Griffith, *Hellenistic Civilization*³ [London 1952] 325).

²² A. A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy*² (Berkeley 1986) 112, 131f.

²³ M. Nussbaum, 'Poetry and the Passions: Two Stoic Views,' in J. Brunschwig and M. Nussbaum (edd.), *Passions and Perception: Studies in Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind* (Cambridge 1993) 97-149.

aspects of the *Argonautica* where Jason differs from the traditionally Homeric do appear to correspond to elements of Stoic teachings, perhaps even coincidentally. Therefore, it is essential to investigate the degree to which a Stoic interpretation fits the composition of the poem and uniformly explains questionable passages or divergences from Homer. This does not mean, however, that Apollonius intended the purpose of his epic to be either a treatise on philosophy or a wholly laudatory praise of the Stoical elements in the character of Jason. As Hunter notes, one of the compositional differences between the Homeric epics and the *Argonautica* is the increased self-referentiality and intrusion of the poet's voice, which serve to expand the distance between the heroic past and the time of the narrator.²⁴ One example of this is that the Apollonian narrative voice contains more moral judgements than the Homeric about the action in the epic. For example, in the poet's condemnation of the murder of Apsyrtus (*Arg.* 4.445-51) and in his account of the murders at Lemnos (l.609f., 616),²⁵ the poet's judgement comes into conflict with events recounted in the poem. In other words, a tension is created not only through the poet's use of the heroic and epic, and his opinion of it, but possibly also between the poet's narrative of events, which may be philosophically motivated, and his reaction to or judgement of them. Apollonius creates and expands ambiguities within his text and these increase the uncertainty about his own opinion of Jason.

Aspects of Jason's character suggest that he possesses Stoic principles. A Stoic is motivated by considerations of virtue: prudence, moderation, courage and justice. He can also consider glory, public speeches, health and wealth to be goods and might not shrink from achieving political success among his peers.²⁶ But these traditional attributes are tempered by the Stoic awareness of man's place in the universe. A Stoic desires above all to function in harmony with the universe, and in order to do this, he must be governed by reason in the same way as the universe is ruled by Divine Reason. A man perceives his surroundings and receives impulses as a result of his perceptions. A good Stoic is able accurately to size up his situation based upon his ability to obtain true perceptions. He must also govern and restrain his impulses so that he may act in the most appropriate manner in any given situation; that is, in accordance with Nature. And he must be

²⁴ Hunter [2 (1993)] 105.

²⁵ Hunter [2 (1993)] 111.

²⁶ Chrysippus (A. A. Long and D.N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (hereafter *LS*) [Cambridge 1987]) 66B = H. F. A. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* (hereafter *SVF*) 3 (Leipzig 1903) 698; Long [22] 113. Other Stoics considered health, wealth, etc. to be indifferent.

aware that the needs of his community take precedence over his own desires,²⁷ and that he himself is but an insignificant element in a divinely ordered universal plan, one that is governed by fate. A Stoic who wishes to act appropriately in a given situation must take into account perception of the appropriate based upon reason, self-control, courage, and respect for justice and community. Above all, he must accept fate and act in accordance with Nature.²⁸

Of course, understanding what is appropriate based upon perception is not always clear for anyone other than the sage. Theoretically, a Stoic might need to obtain more information before he is able to decide and act (or not act), either through prolonged thought or through advice from others. There could possibly be an interval between perception and response (although for the sage the time span presumably could be instantaneous). At any rate, if one uses a Stoic hypothesis to investigate the *Argonautica*, Jason's early periods of indecision, reflection and hesitation would be the natural outcome of his inclination to act rationally and appropriately, to consider thoroughly what would be best not just for himself but for his crew. Jason sometimes delays, until more information becomes available, before he makes his decisions. It has been noted that Jason differs in this from standard Homeric decision-making.²⁹ Although the heart of Achilles was divided when he pondered whether he should kill Agamemnon (*Il.* 1.188-94), this famous scene occurred at a moment of climactic quarrel between two warriors and Achilles was not only justified in his anger, but was aided in his decision-making by Athena herself. Jason's moments of indecision do not happen at rare and momentous occasions; they are instead frequent enough that they appear to comprise a consistent character trait (e.g., *Arg.* 1.460f., 1.1286-89, 2.885, 2.432, 4.1316). But Jason's actions in these cases, although they suggest that he is not a Stoic sage, are not shameful or worthy of condemnation. Caution is commended by later Stoic philosophers such as Epictetus, who declares that men should be confident about what the will cannot control, but cautious about what is within the power of the will to achieve (*Epict. Diss.* 2.1; *Cic. Off.* 1.18). In fact, it might even be virtuous not to respond: according to Cicero, 'the wise man withholds assent' (*LS* 69I = *Cic. Acad.* 2.103f.). Hesitation, almost to the point of passivity, is a natural, perhaps unavoidable and inevitable outcome of Stoic ethical thought, which promulgates the necessity of determining the

²⁷ N. White, 'The Basis of Stoic Ethics,' *HSPH* 83 (1979) 143-78.

²⁸ *Cic. Off.* 1.15-17; *LS* 55; *LS* 64A = *Cic. Fin.* 3.31; also *LS* 61C = *Plut. On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1034c-e; *LS* 59D = *Cic. Fin.* 3.17, 20-22; *Diog. Laert.* 7.87f.; Tarn and Griffith [21] 333f.

²⁹ T. Rosenmeyer, 'Apollonius Lyricus,' *SIFC* 10 (1992) 177-98, who, however, finds that fear impedes Jason's decision-making and that Jason is indecisive.

appropriate by rational thought and perception, but offers little guidance, other than the successful result, about what the appropriate *is*.

In the first book, Jason's request to an assembly of his crew that they choose a leader demonstrates his willingness to put his crew's opinions before his own desires (*Arg.* 1.327-40).³⁰ On that occasion Jason reminds his men that their return home and their voyage out are 'common to all' (ξυνός, ξυναί, 336f.). Again, upon arrival in Aea, Jason consults with the Argonauts, urging all to speak their minds (3.167-75). There also Jason tells his men that 'common [ξυνή, 3.173] is [their] task and common [ξυνοί, 173] their freedom of speech.' Throughout the epic Jason continues to consult with the Argonauts: even in the desert he gathers his men and tells them of the advice of the goddesses (4.1333-46). This concern for the opinions of the crew is one of the major differences between the Homeric epics and the *Argonautica*. As Hunter points out, Jason's continual consultation with his men is not Homeric: Odysseus usually preferred to act alone,³¹ and at times he refused even to listen to his men (*Od.* 9.224-28). Achilles withdrew from the army because of his anger at the Greeks and after the death of Patroclus he became in his grief completely isolated from all humanity.³² But in the *Argonautica*, Jason does not withdraw from the expedition when slighted in regard to leadership and he never acts in isolation; even in his contest he is aided by Medea. It is just such a change that most indicates the influence of Hellenistic philosophical thought. Zeno's ideal state had no minority ruling class: all men were fellow-citizens, a suggestion of a democratic social order.³³ The Stoics also taught that man is endowed with and develops a natural concern for his community (*oikeiosis*) and that the individual should submit to the good of the community.³⁴ This emphasis on the communal order perhaps explains Apollonius' substitution of the ambiguous word 'from the people' (δημόθεν, *Arg.* 1.7) for Pindar's 'from the steadings' (ἀπὸ σταθμῶν, *Pyth.* 4.113) at the very beginning of the epic when he describes Jason's background and origins.³⁵

³⁰ So Hunter [2 (1988)] 442f., who says that Jason has the appropriate qualities for leadership because he is not as isolated from the crew as Herakles is. C. Beye, *Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius* (Carbondale 1982) 84f., however, feels that Jason is embarrassed and lacks authority to hold center stage.

³¹ Hunter [2 (1988)] 439-41.

³² J. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad* (Chicago 1975) 107f.

³³ *LS* 67A = *SVF* 1 (Leipzig 1905) 262. The Stoics envisaged a world state (Tarn and Griffith [21] 331f.; Long [22] 205). But F. H. Sandbach, *The Stoics* (New York 1975) 25 says that this was not an organized state but rather the same rule of reason for the entire world.

³⁴ Sandbach [33] 34-37; White [27].

³⁵ Hunter [2 (1993)] 124 notes the change.

Such a word is appropriate if the poet wished to twist his epic into a more 'modern' atmosphere and to highlight social elements in Jason's character. The passage in book 1 where Jason assumes command again illustrates the same point, since Jason is 'elected' leader by consensus of all the Argonauts. In Homer, Jason would have automatically been the leader because he organized and initiated the expedition and because of his social standing; the whole idea of an election is remarkable. This passage also provides an example of Jason's extreme self-control. Despite any possible initial disappointment when Herakles is preferred, Jason accepts command as second choice without anger or recriminations and he is only too glad to have the endorsement of Herakles (*Arg.* 1.341ff.). Likewise, in the second book, at the Clashing Rocks, Jason puts his trust in his 'well-skilled' (1.105-107, 2.175) helmsman, Tiphys, perhaps rationally realizing that an expert seaman's guidance is more important for the *Argo* than his own need to display his superiority. Here again, the leader considers what is important for his crew and for the safety of them all, subordinating himself to others.

The Stoic emphasis on control of emotions fits into the *Argonautica* in an interesting way. Plato condemns poetry in the *Republic* because fiction encourages people to feel and to respond to the experience of others and because it contributes to increased emotionalism. He associates the Muse with pleasure rather than reasoning, saying that the poet destroys the rational part of a man, and he bans all poetry except hymns and praise of good men from his ideal state (*Republic* 604e-607a). The whole idea of a poem in which the guiding theme is reason gives a philosophical sanction to the verses while at the same time proclaiming that this is, indeed, a new type of poetry. Apollonius' innovative approach to epic poetry, in which the hymnic plays an important part, demonstrates a witty awareness and response to Plato's criticism of Homer and other poets, and it is accordingly appropriate that the philosophically influenced poet's hero exhibits rational self-control and a disinclination to respond to the emotions and sufferings of others. Even in the early parts of the epic, Jason is always characterized by a lack of anger or hasty decisions and by self-control. Jason advises his mother Alcimede not to grieve or weep for him, but to be strong and to be of good cheer (*Arg.* 1.295-305), and he advises others to endure in adversity. Although ἀμήχανος ('at a loss') is the term frequently used to describe his mental state, as, for example, when he is rebuked by Idas before the departure from Pagasae (460), his behavior is never revealed to be either inappropriate or unreasonable. On the contrary, the taunts of others serve only to place them in a bad light. Idas is drunk, rude and physical in contrast to Jason's studied calm

(462ff.);³⁶ Telamon and Aeëtes are angry and hasty. When Jason is taunted by Idas, he does not respond, refusing to give in to the same emotional displays as Idas exhibits. For Jason, it appears, calm self-awareness of his own uncertainty is preferable to angry and hasty denunciations. And it must be remembered that according to Chrysippus, the little faults like rudeness and anger, symptoms of irrational movements of the human soul, because they become habits and are harder to control, can be as dangerous to the moral character as larger faults.³⁷ Jason's refusal to give in to angry opponents like Idas, Telamon and Aeëtes marks him as superior in moral virtue. The focus of the scene, which tells the reader and the Argonauts little about what Jason is actually thinking,³⁸ emphasizes Jason's very act of deliberation and indicates that there is in this epic a new type of hero, one who is distinguished by his capacity for thought.

If Jason cannot be faulted for consultation with his crew, indecision, or lack of response, there still remains the charge of cowardice or weakness. But the only point at which Jason may appear to be cowardly is when he weeps as he sets sail (*Arg.* 1.534f.), a Homeric action without a good Homeric reason. Agamemnon, for example, in the *Iliad*, wept after he was defeated in battle and while, in despair, he advised the Greeks to return home (*Il.* 9.13f.). Odysseus wept when Circe informed him that he must visit the underworld (*Od.* 10.496-500).³⁹ Jason had not yet suffered any misfortunes that might cause him to act in this way. Jason, however, need not be criticized if he is considered from a non-Homeric perspective. He subsumes his own desires to the will of destiny and the gods: he at that moment does not want the voyage or the kingdom, but he is helpless to resist in the face of his awareness of what must happen. His 'humility' is in fact acceptance of that fate which is so integral to the epic: the same acceptance is found in book 3 when Jason resignedly agrees to Aeëtes' challenge because it is his destiny. Apollonius even presents the whole voyage as a product of fate, omitting in the beginning to supply Jason with a motive for undertaking it other than that of destiny.⁴⁰ Thus, the departure scene becomes an illustration of reasoned acceptance prevailing over the emotional desire of the weeping Jason.⁴¹

³⁶ Beye [30] 85f.

³⁷ Rist [19] 89f. and J. Annas, *Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind* (Berkeley 1992) 114.

³⁸ Hunter [2 (1993)] 19f.

³⁹ Hunter [2 (1988)] 438f. gives Homeric parallels in which heroes exhibit fear; Vian [7] 253, n.535; Beye [30] 88. Patroclus weeps in front of Achilles because of the defeat of the Greeks (*Il.* 16.2-4); Achilles grieves for the death of Patroclus (18.22-35).

⁴⁰ Beye [30] 81; Fraser [12] 625; *Arg.* 1.5-7, 411-16, 278f.

⁴¹ See also *SVF* 1.527 (from a hymn to Zeus): ὡς ἔψομαι γ' ἄοκνος ἢν δέ γε μὴ θέλω ('Thus I shall follow unshrinking; even if I do not wish it . . .').

Stoic, too, is this single motivation for the voyage: the goal of the fleece and the attainment of the kingdom are emphasized throughout the epic. Hunter remarks that 'the subordination of all else to this single obsessive end is a striking departure from the structural organization of the Homeric poems.'⁴² According to the Stoics, 'the good man always has a more comprehensive goal than the object which defines his particular action,' and possession of this ultimate goal, achieved by rational discrimination and effort, is 'consistent with virtuous behavior.'⁴³ Jason's striving for the Golden Fleece is not particularly Homeric, but it is Stoic.

Even Jason's test of his crew (*Arg.* 2.620ff.) must not be considered an anomaly but rather part of the overall design of the poem. Jason is aware that sometimes deception or some prodding of events may be necessary in order to help himself ascertain what the true facts of a situation are. After the passage through the Clashing Rocks, Jason *feigns* fear and uncertainty in order to 'test' his men's response (πειρώμενος, 2.638). In this way he is able to find out if his crew are anxious or fearful; a direct question might shame them into denying fears that their leader lacks. And he does find out: the men rally around him. But the episode is not to Jason's discredit: he has only *pretended* to feel cowardice and uncertainty; his actual character is unperturbed as his very rapid 'recovery' indicates. Jason's use of testing demonstrates his ability to reason and plan: it is an action frequently carried out by Odysseus, for which he is admired, and it is one of the reasons Odysseus obtains the help of Athena (*Od.* 6.120f., 9.175f., 13.201f., 13.335-38, 16.316-20). Jason, like Odysseus, has demonstrated his intelligence. Jason has acted appropriately, ascertained his situation, wisely and rationally tested his friends, and controlled his emotions. He can only be praised for his cleverness. What is more, his concomitant remarks about his concern for his crew are laudable in themselves. A similar scene takes place when the *Argo* loses its helmsman, Tiphys. In another assembly of the Argonauts (*Arg.* 2.879ff.), Ancaeus and Peleus assert that there will be a replacement. However, the 'uncertain' (ἀμυχανέων, 885) Jason responds that although potential helmsmen are all around him, they are too fearful and so the entire crew will fail and perish (885-93). Immediately four men offer their services and the ploy is successful. Jason is thus able, as Hunter points out, to avoid choosing someone who is unready or unwilling; he determines not only the most skilled but the most eager and is able to make the correct decision.⁴⁴ Both scenes serve to illustrate what

⁴² Hunter [2 (1988)] 440.

⁴³ Long [22] 194.

⁴⁴ Hunter [2 (1988)] 447f.

attributes make up a virtuous character: reason, caution, shrewdness, concern for the community of the crew.

I

The importance of fate and necessity in the epic is made explicitly clear in conjunction with passages dealing with Jason's character. In book 1, after Telamon rebukes Jason because Herakles, Polyphemus and Hylas are left behind, the sea god Glaucus appears from the depths and informs the Argonauts that it was because of the 'plan of Zeus' (Διὸς . . . βουλήν, *Arg.* 1.1315) and 'fate' (μοῖρ', 1317; cf. πέπρωται, 1322) that Herakles is not able to continue on with the *Argo*: he must instead fulfill his twelve labors; Polyphemus must found a city among the Mysians; and Hylas must become the husband of a stream-nymph (1317-25). Since the whole epic is composed with the perspective of the present day, that is, of the Hellenistic age, clearly in the forefront for the reader, and at the same time the present is combined with the mythical past so that present and past are in conjunction at almost all times, Glaucus' declaration takes on elevated importance because the reader knows that it is 'true.' That is, awareness of other legends in combination with the historical record would have made Hellenistic readers insist that Herakles must be left behind (this is Jason's epic, after all), that Polyphemus' city does in fact exist and should be founded, and that legends about Hylas are too important to be omitted from this complex story. The veracity given to Glaucus' pronouncement by the poet's recollection of history bolsters Glaucus' contention that fate determines all: things happen for a reason, a reason not clear to Telamon in the heat of the moment, but one that reveals itself over time. Zeus, like the author, thinks in terms of the big picture: centuries may be needed truly to understand the why and wherefore, but when one understands one can accept. Glaucus has explained the importance of submitting to fate, and as those of a divinity, his words carry special weight. According to the Stoics, the world is ordered by a single plan to which man's reason enables him to submit.⁴⁵ Since Glaucus' words embody Stoicism, the poet gives a special stamp of approval to this philosophy and this encourages a Stoic interpretation for the remainder of the passage.

It is only after Glaucus' appearance and words that Telamon is able to beg Jason's pardon, accusing himself of 'madness' and 'folly' (ἄσάμην, ἄφραδίησιν, *Arg.* 1.1332f.). Telamon asks Jason not to be angry, pleading that 'grief' (ἄχος, 1333) had overwhelmed him and forced him to utter arrogant and ungovernable words, and he admits his fault (1334f.). It must be noted that Jason,

⁴⁵ Sandbach [33] 35-38.

in response, refuses to become angry; however, he does agree with all that Telamon has said (1336-43). But he diplomatically adds that he is aware that Telamon was angry on behalf of his friend and hopes that Telamon would feel the same concern for him. The ideas expressed in the exchange are important. Telamon responded to impulses that were caused by his perception of a situation, but his response was inappropriate because he allowed grief to overcome him and he did not restrain himself through reason and objectively analyze events. His hasty words and his 'anger' (χόλος, 1289), which in the Homeric *epos* might be suited to an Achilles, are the marks of an ignorant man in this epic. Telamon's impulses were unable to be subjected to reason and so became passions (*LS* 65A, E = *Stob.* 2.88-91). Jason, on the other hand, differs from Telamon in two respects. First, he does not give way to his impulses. When the loss of his men is discovered, he silently reserves his judgement and controls his grief, although he, too, is bewildered and ἄτη ('bewilderment') eats away his heart (*Arg.* 1.1286-89). Then, when he is challenged by Telamon, he again displays the same emotional consistency, responding with calm, carefully chosen words (ἐπιφροδέως προσέειπεν, 1336). Also, Jason is fully aware of how Telamon has gone wrong and, as he reveals in his response, he is fully capable of instructing Telamon in Stoic principles. Jason agrees that it is not suitable to allow grief to cloud judgement or wrath to govern a man, and then he illustrates this fact through his own restrained and articulate behavior. Jason's words are neither angry nor uncontrolled, and he praises Telamon for not acting out of desire for profit (i.e., passion for indifferents; 1340-42). In addition, he displays his very fine sense of tact as well as his sense of clemency by not punishing Telamon for insubordination, but rather praising his loyalty and explicitly asking that the same may be shown towards himself. Jason tells Telamon that he did wrong, as he is aware, but he also reminds Telamon that he is a fine man. How could Telamon continue to be angry at this reasonable response? And why, indeed, should Telamon be punished or rebuked any further for his 'sickness of mind' (ἁσάμην, 1333) when education is what is needed? Weaker characters need someone wiser to show them the way (*LS* 661 = *Sen. Ep.* 94.2, 31, 50f.).⁴⁶ Telamon gives no further trouble in the epic: he is included by Jason among the leading men on several occasions, particularly when, as one of only two Argonauts, he accompanies Jason on the visit to Aeëtes (*Arg.* 3.196), and he is noted for his courage (515). His subsequent behavior is a fitting tribute to Jason's leadership skills.

Jason's advice to Telamon corresponds to that given by Hephaestus to

⁴⁶ Stoics such as Cleanthes, Chrysippus and Posidonius believed that virtue can be taught (*Diog. Laert.* 7.91).

Hera in book 1 of the *Iliad* (573-789). Hephaestus rebukes Hera for quarreling with Zeus, saying that strife between the two is sorry work (573f.), since it drives 'dissension' among the gods (κολῶν, 575). Hephaestus urges Hera to pleasure Zeus and to speak to him with 'gentle words' (μαλακοῖσιν, 582) rather than dispute with him. Hephaestus gives this advice because of Zeus' power, of which he reminds Hera, and he concludes by urging her to be of good cheer and to endure although she is sad, because he will not be able to aid her even though he is grieved (586-89). Hephaestus, like Jason, stresses the importance of persuasion, the control of emotion and anger, the avoidance of dissension among the community, his own inability to help the situation even though he is grieved about it, and the importance of endurance in adversity. In both situations, Zeus is acknowledged as the highest authority, one whose will controls all events. Apollonius, however, makes several major innovations. First, the setting and speakers have changed: no longer do gods on Olympus dispute and no longer is the conflict about whether Achilles shall receive honor in battle, but rather Jason and Telamon argue about whether the Argonauts should save their friends. The primacy given to friendship in the *Iliad*, either that of gods for heroes or of heroes for each other, is now gone, as is the importance of honor on the battlefield, since Jason rejects battle or even military exploration in order to save his friends.⁴⁷ Odysseus, indeed, brought back and tied up on his ship the three of his crew who preferred to remain with the Lotus-eaters (*Od.* 9.95-99); Jason is not willing even to search for his friends. Because of this Jason may be said to act in a non-traditional and non-Homeric manner, and like one who is influenced by trends in Stoic philosophy.⁴⁸ Furthermore, no longer is a specific decision of Zeus emphasized, but rather the priority of destiny as the guiding force throughout history comes to the fore,⁴⁹ and this attributing of all events to necessity is in itself a departure from the thought of the *Odyssey*, where Zeus says that men bring their misfortunes on themselves (*Od.* 1.32-43) and where Odysseus, Penelope and Halitherses blame the suitors for their deaths (22.413-16, 23.63-67, 24.456-62). Apollonius and Jason do not look at the specific or at one period in history, but instead emphasize the whole continuum of time and

⁴⁷ Agamemnon also rejects battle in *Iliad* 9, saying that it is the will of Zeus that Troy not fall. But he is rebuked by Diomedes for his lack of valor (16-49). This Homeric scene differs from that in the *Argonautica* in that priority is given to war and courage. Perhaps more similar is the instance in which Agamemnon declares that he is not to blame for insulting Achilles: Zeus took away his wits (19.78-144).

⁴⁸ The Stoics rarely dealt with friendship and when they did (e.g., Zeno [Diog. Laert. 7.33, Epict. 2.22]), they considered it to be possible only for the wise (J. Ferguson, *Moral Values in the Ancient World* [London 1958] 68-70).

⁴⁹ H. La Ville de Mirmont, *Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile* 2 (Paris 1894) 181, 184f.

human endeavor and the inability of man to struggle against fate.

Aptly enough, the poet ends book 1 with a recollection of how Polyphemus was destined to found a city among the Mysians, how Herakles returned to the labors of Eurystheus, and how he took pledges from the people of Chios so that they could continue to search for Hylas, as they continue to do 'even now' (*Arg.* 1.1354). Fate is mentioned at the beginning (the deaths of the sons of Boreas), middle and conclusion of the quarrel; the will of Zeus and the precepts of Jason are intertwined. In much the same way the lengthy prophecies of Phineus in the second book are completely fulfilled by the events of books 2 and 3. And, in case the reader is not clear about why various adventures come to pass, there are other reminders as well. When the heroes long for Herakles after the battle with the Bebrycians, the poet asserts that all was wrought by the will of Zeus (2.154). It is 'fate' that determines the death of Idmon (μόρον, 1.140; μοῖρα θεῶν χρειώ τε, 1.440; αἴση, 1.443; πέπρωται, 1.444; πότμον, 1.446; πεπρωμένη . . . μοῖρα, 2.815). Zeus himself sends the storm that wrecks the ship belonging to the sons of Phrixus (2.1098). The prophet Phineus, who is able to aid the Argonauts because he knows the 'sacred will of Zeus' (181f.), can predict the future that is knowable because determined. As Beye remarks, the inevitability of book 2, where all Phineus foretold comes true, illustrates the Stoic concept of Fate.⁵⁰ The primacy of Zeus and his connection with Fate goes beyond the traditional view of Zeus as leader of the Olympians in Homer and classical literature, and it is also a departure from the actual practice of Hellenistic cult at Alexandria where Dionysus was the leading god and Zeus is not well attested.⁵¹ It is more in keeping with the Stoic outlook expressed in such works as Cleanthes' 'Hymn to Zeus' and so contributes to the Stoic tone of the poem.⁵²

Perception and fate are intertwined themes in the episode that recounts the battle of Cyzicus. The *Argo*'s second arrival at Cyzicus is prompted by storm winds and the heroes are unwittingly and unknowingly carried back to the very place from which they have recently departed. The heroes 'do not notice' that it is the same island (οὐδέ τις . . . ἐπιφραδέως ἐνόησεν, *Arg.* 1.1021) and the Doliones do not 'clearly perceive' who the intruders are (οὐδ' . . . νημερτές ἐπήσαν, 1022f.). Since the Doliones think that they are being attacked, they

⁵⁰ Beye [30] 119. Cleanthes respected divination and prophecy (Cic. *N.D.* 2.13-15 = *SVF* 1.528).

⁵¹ La Ville de Mirmont [49] 214f. finds that the Zeus of the *Argonautica* is a solitary and sole ruler and is closer to the Ptolemies than to Homer. For the cult at Alexandria, Fraser [12] 194, 196f.

⁵² According to the Stoics, right reason is Nature and is Zeus (Diog. Laert. 7.88).

rush to preempt the invasion and cause a great battle to be fought. The king cannot escape his 'fate' (μόρον, 1030, μοῖραν, 1035) or his 'misfortune' (ἄτης, 1037), for, as the poet asserts, no man can escape the snare: it is not 'right' (θέμις, 1035f.). But the next morning, when they all perceive their mistake, 'grief' (ἄχος, 1054) overwhelms them.

The inclusion of a battle scene in the epic is, of course, traditional, but despite the Homeric language, the passage is in many ways non-Homeric. Warriors in the *Iliad* are constrained to fight on behalf of their communities, which in return bestow social status. These warriors place success above all else, but if they die, they are consoled by the thought that they died for something.⁵³ However, at Cyzicus, it is the king Cyzicus who fights and dies for his community, yet who perishes 'in vain' for no cause except a mistake. Jason, the 'hero,' fights for no other reason than that he is attacked at night by unknown assailants and cannot stop the battle. He gains no glory, only grief, from his victory, and it in no way helps to advance either his quest or the plot. The Homeric episode at Cyzicus represents not only the death of the eponymous king, but the death of the Homeric ideal, and the reader must look elsewhere than Homer for its meaning. The passage displays no actual Stoic behavior, but in its insistence on the power of fate, in its awareness of the importance of perception for correct behavior, and in its association between mistaken perception and emotion, it asserts that Stoicism is fundamental for understanding the meaning of the passage. In the *Iliad*, νοῦς means perception and recognition, or planning. According to Redfield, the word indicates the moment of grasping meaning, but it in itself does not mean reasoning.⁵⁴ This interesting distinction between perception/meaning and reason appears to be absent in Stoicism, since the Stoics considered that repeated impressions were linked to reasoning.⁵⁵ In the Cyzicus episode of the *Argonautica*, the Argonauts fail in their perception and so fail in their reasoning ability and respond inappropriately, to their cost.⁵⁶ The similarity in language (ἄτη, ἄχος, and μοῖρα) to the words chosen for the subsequent

⁵³ Redfield [32] 100f.

⁵⁴ Redfield [32] 176f.; also D. Claus, *Toward the Soul: An Inquiry Into the Meaning of Ψυχή Before Plato* (New Haven 1981) 19f.; J. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton 1983) 56f., 61; and B. Snell (tr. T. Rosenmeyer), *The Discovery of the Mind* (New York 1953) 12f.

⁵⁵ Annas [37] 71-87; Long [22] 124: 'The Stoics . . . did not confine the term "impression" to awareness.' According to Long [22] 123-25, repeated cognitive impressions give rise to general concepts that shape intelligence. For Chrysippus see *SVF* 2 (Leipzig 1903) 879, 885. Νοῦς with the meaning of 'seat of intelligence' is Euripidean (Claus [54] 56).

⁵⁶ See Annas [37] 71-87 and Long [22] 126-28 for assent to perception.

quarrel between Jason and Telamon suggests that the two passages should be compared. The implication is that emotion and grief in both situations is inappropriate, as it is inappropriate in all situations for the Stoics. It also suggests that Jason gradually becomes less susceptible to loss of mental control and to grief between Cyzicus and the appearance of Glaucus, because at Cyzicus he has learned that grief is pointless in the face of destiny.

2

When the Argonauts arrive at Lemnos, the queen Hypsipyle calls an assembly of women to decide what action to take. She calmly advises that the men graciously be given aid (*Arg.* 1.653-66) and her consultation with her people, her good advice, her urging that anyone with a better idea share it, and her prompt consideration of the words and requests of others mark her as a woman with some of Jason's qualities of reflection, speech and persuasion, and awareness of community. Hypsipyle's words and actions in the Lemnian assembly parallel those of Jason to his crew on several occasions, and her possession of calm eloquence indicates that she shares with Jason a similar self-restraint. Apollonius makes a point of distinguishing Hypsipyle from the other Lemnian women through her rationality, saying that when the Lemnian women killed their husbands, she alone spared her father and was not overcome with jealousy like the others (614-21). The poet describes the rest of the Lemnian women as wretched, insatiate with jealousy, fearful, speechless with dismay and fear, and like 'ravening Thyiades' (616-39). Since they rush about and lament the departure of the Argonauts (883), they might well be described as 'irrational' and 'frenzied,' and Hypsipyle, in contrast, as restrained.⁵⁷ Hypsipyle is thus the female counterpart of Jason in many respects and she stands out among her community, as Jason does among his, not through any ostentatious bravery or conspicuous heroism, but rather by more subtle leadership skills.

The meeting between Hypsipyle and Jason continues the same themes. When Hypsipyle sees Jason, she is attracted by his beauty, but she is still able to address him with 'winning' words (αἰμυλίοισιν, *Arg.* 1.792) and she does not allow either emotion or passion to cloud her judgement. Her lying account of the island's history is calm and eloquent, and she relies on persuasion to save herself and her people, just as Jason does in Aea. Hypsipyle's demeanor may be compared to that of Penelope in her confrontation with the suitors in the *Odyssey*. Penelope, who was also weak and defenseless, surrounded by stronger, more

⁵⁷ E. V. George, 'Poet and Characters in Apollonius Rhodius' Lemnian Episode,' *Hermes* 100 (1972) 53f. 56, 62.

violent men who had invaded her home, charmed the suitors with 'soft words' (μειλιχίοισι ἔπεσσι, *Od.* 18.282f.) and put them off by demanding gifts. Hypsipyle initially urges the Lemnian women to *give* gifts to the Argonauts so that the heroes might remain outside the town and not get to know the women too well (*Arg.* 1.657-63). Hypsipyle's change of mind, of course, indicates that she is not concerned about chastity, nor does she turn away the Argonauts, but her calm confrontation and her ability to extract the 'gifts' of the Argonauts themselves raise her to the level of Penelope's wisdom while highlighting her own contrasting willingness for love. Hypsipyle is answered with equal graciousness by Jason, and her offer to him to share sovereignty of the island is politely declined because of the priority of destiny. Both characters demonstrate an adherence to rationality, perception, persuasion,⁵⁸ planning and self-restraint, and in Jason's case there is also a submission to destiny and to the fulfillment of his overarching goal. The episode is characterized by a good-humored and diplomatic sparring between two rulers who may be considered to be equally Stoic. The emphasis on rationality and decision-making in the poem may even be extended to the wondrous cloak that Jason wears when he meets Hypsipyle (*Arg.* 1.721-67), although the cloak has a multiplicity of meanings within the context of the epic.⁵⁹ According to Seneca, putting on the right sort of clothes can be a good if the selection conforms to reason: 'so it is not elegant clothes which are a good in themselves, but the selection of elegant clothes, since the good is not in the thing but in the quality of the selection' (*LS* 64J = *Sen. Ep.* 92.11-13). Even though Seneca is a rather late source to apply to interpretation of the *Argonautica*, the centrality both of the cloak and of rationality in the Lemnos episode encourages an association between the two. Jason's conscious choice of his cloak helps to assure that his meeting with Hypsipyle is a diplomatic success.

Although desire does prevail for a time at Lemnos, Herakles reminds his fellow Argonauts that they are in pursuit of glory and precipitates their departure. Herakles' irritation with the heroes prevents possible excessive licentiousness and continues the focus on self-control, rationality and destiny in the passage. When the heroes prepare to depart, Hypsipyle and Jason do not become emotional, but politely say good-bye (*Arg.* 1.888ff.). Hypsipyle, although she weeps (δάκρυα χήτει ἰόντος, 887), retains her rationality, as is evidenced when she

⁵⁸ Long [22] 124f. notes that the Stoics considered reasoning and speaking to be one process and so gave great emphasis to speaking.

⁵⁹ Hunter [2 (1993)] 56-59. On one level Jason's cloak simply represents sexual allurements. R. Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford 1983) 144f. notes that elegant clothes were considered to contribute to sexual attraction and were even banned from festivals for Demeter.

tells Jason that he is welcome to return but she knows that neither of them wishes it. Jason in turn tells her that he hopes only to rule in his own land and adds that she should send any son of his to Greece. The episode is somewhat similar to the parting scene between Hector and Andromache in the *Iliad*, but there Andromache pleads with Hector to stay in the city and to look after his wife and child (*Il.* 6.407-32). Andromache, like Hypsipyle, has no father or mother living (413, 429f.) and she weeps as Hector departs (484). Jason, like Hector (488), leaves because it is his destiny. Yet Jason is not motivated by the need to display courage in battle, nor is he fearful of avoiding battle, as Hector is (440-65). Hypsipyle's lack of emotional urging for Jason to remain marks her as different from Andromache, and it is not Hypsipyle but Jason who mentions a possible child. Once again, the Homeric has been adapted and changed in a specific way in order to stress a new type of philosophical outlook. The Argonautic scene is marked by rationality, deliberation, an awareness of destiny, and a strong concern for self-protection. An implicit contrast is made between Hypsipyle's controlled eroticism and unrestrained emotion when the Lemnian men are accused of passion and mad infatuation by both Hypsipyle and the poet (*Arg.* 1.613, 803-05). No emotion is strong enough to cloud the judgement of either Jason or Hypsipyle; no Dido confuses this hero or herself. Desire reveals itself to be little more than a weapon rationally employed for mutual safety. There is no risk here that Jason will be subordinate to another and worthless to himself. Hypsipyle personifies a woman who is Stoic rather than Homeric: rational, self-controlled, articulate and without subordination to another.⁶⁰ And later, with Medea, Jason remembers his lesson, for no matter how emotional, demanding and threatening Medea may be, Jason always treats her exactly as if he were dealing with Hypsipyle. Medea's lack of self-control is of less importance than Jason's control: *he* does not succumb to emotion and is always aware of his situation. Rist remarks that if it is wrong to seduce a woman, it does not matter, in Stoic terms, what sort of woman she is or the consequences of the action, since all actions are the same.⁶¹ The alternative might be true, as well: if it is correct in certain circumstances to seduce a woman, then the particular type of woman does not matter.

3

Upon arrival in Aea, Jason circumspectly hides his crew and ship in the marsh and waits until dawn to go forth, mindful perhaps of the disaster at Cyzicus.

⁶⁰ Zeno in his *Republic* spoke of women being shared in common (*LS* 67B = Diog. Laert. 7.33, 131 = *SVF* 1.269).

⁶¹ Rist [19] 85f.

Jason first addresses the assembled heroes, reminding them that 'common is [their] task and common is freedom of speech for all,' and he urges his men to speak their minds (*Arg.* 3.173-75). The passage provides another instance of Jason's concern for the opinions of his crew and his attempt at democratic governance, and he only sets forth after the Argonauts approve his words (191f.). Jason declares that he will visit Aeëtes with four men and will attempt to 'test' him by careful words (πειρήσω δ' ἐπέεσσι, 179).⁶² Jason hopes, he says, to persuade Aeëtes so that they may achieve their goal by words, not violence. Since Jason's intention to test Aeëtes echoes his test of his crew at the Clashing Rocks and his emphasis on persuasive speech recalls his calm advice to Telamon, it is evident that the same principles of rationality, calculation, foresight, calmness and persuasion guide his actions in Aea. At the palace, Jason first allows the sons of Phrixus, the grandsons of Aeëtes, to speak on his behalf before he addresses Aeëtes himself. When Jason does speak, his calm words contrast with Aeëtes' overwhelming anger. Jason replies to Aeëtes with 'gentle words' (μειλιχίως, μειλιχίοισιν, 319, 385), restrains Argus (384), and 'flatters' Aeëtes (ὑποσσαινὼν ἀγανῇ ὀπί, 396). Clearly Jason proves himself to be a man of subtlety, persuasion, self-control and calculation. Although he is unsuccessful in his attempt to obtain the fleece by rational argument, he does avoid war, which he desired to do (3.185-90). Throughout the epic the avoidance of war plays a prominent part in Jason's strategic planning: when he is pursued by the Colchians, he prefers to negotiate with them so as to avoid battle (4.338-49, 395-409).⁶³

Jason's very approach and request for an object/prize correspond to some extent to the embassy of Odysseus, Ajax and Phoenix to Achilles in book 9 of the *Iliad*. There an attempt was made to persuade Achilles to return to the Greek side—to change his opinion and to benefit those he considered as insulters and enemies—both through verbal persuasion and the offering of gifts, 'with kindly gifts and soothing words' (δῶροισιν τ' ἀγανοίσιν ἔπεσσί τε μειλιχίοισι, *Il.* 9.113), which represent a combination of wealth and increased social status (225-306). Odysseus reminds Achilles that his father Peleus had advised him that 'gentle-mindedness is best' (φιλοφροσύνη, 256) and Odysseus urges Achilles to restrain his anger. Odysseus offers to Achilles Agamemnon's gifts, which include consideration as Agamemnon's son, fertile lands, and one of the daughters of

⁶² Again, Chrysippus says that a wise man will make public speeches (*LS* 66B = *SVF* 3.698).

⁶³ Jackson [2] 157. It should be noted that later Stoics, while not condemning war, asserted that the wise man is like Socrates: he neither fights nor allows anyone else to do so (*Epict. Diss.* 4.5.1-4).

Agamemnon himself (283-90). Acceptance of the gifts, however, would mean political and social submission for Achilles and so he cannot but refuse, since he places his honor before every other consideration. In the Jason/Aeëtes scene, Jason, the speaker, attempts with 'soothing' words (μειλιχίως, μειλιχίοισιν, *Arg.* 3.319, 385) to persuade a king to submit to his own authority through the surrender (rather than acceptance) of an object that likewise represents glory, kingship and wealth. Jason aims to fulfill his destiny, which will ultimately involve the attainment of his homeland and the acquisition of Aeëtes' daughter, Medea. Aeëtes, like Achilles, is unable to agree to what he perceives as an outrage, while Jason demonstrates the self-restraint and 'gentle-mindedness' that Achilles lacked. Jason, however, who is supposed to be the hero of the epic, does not display even an awareness of Aeëtes'/Achilles' concept of honor and he justifies his own actions solely by necessity. The passage is a good example of the degree to which the Hellenistic hero has changed in his philosophical outlook and behavior from the Homeric paradigm. The focus in the *Argonautica* passage is again on persuasion, rational decision-making and necessity, and it illustrates a climactic moment of rational choice with far greater brevity and cynicism than does the *Iliad* passage. One can sympathize with an Achilles who feels wronged and who appeals to honor; the coldness of Jason's rationality and his call upon destiny as his justification for action has less emotional appeal. This is apparent at the conclusion of the passage: when Aeëtes challenges Jason to undertake the labors instead of combat, Jason ponders what to do, speechless and uncertain (3.422f., 432), rather than impulsively answering. He then accepts with 'words of prudence' (κερδαλέοισιν, 426),⁶⁴ and cites his 'destiny' (μόρος, 429) and 'necessity' (ἀνάγκης, 430) as his reason for undertaking the task. Here again, rational deliberation, calm hesitation and necessity govern his response. Throughout the episode, Jason is governed by Stoic principles.

In his dealings with Medea, Jason is also always restrained by practical, rational considerations, and his promises to her are motivated by the needs of the moment rather than his own desires.⁶⁵ Jason at first declares only that he will make Medea famous and that he will always remember Medea if she helps him (3.990-96, 1079f.), a reward that does not impress her. He then invites her to come visit him in Greece someday and be his bride (1119-30). In contrast to Jason's calculation, Medea displays an emotional impulsiveness. It is Medea who at first sight of Jason loses her memory (290) and whose 'mind is distracted'

⁶⁴ So M. M. Gillies, *The Argonautica of Apollonius Book III* (Cambridge 1928) 50 ad 3.426; Vian [7] 33: 'avisé.'

⁶⁵ A. W. Bulloch, 'Apollonius Rhodius,' in P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Greek Literature* (Cambridge 1985) 595.

(ἀκηδείησι νόοιο, 298;⁶⁶ νόος, 446; νόον, 471).⁶⁷ Medea is the one who hopes that she might come to Greece one day before Jason suggests it (3.1111-17), who is impelled by desire and love to aid Jason, and who seeks out Jason in his camp at night and offers to help him obtain the fleece if he will take her with him (4.67ff.). Medea also later threatens Jason when he considers returning her to her brother in exchange for peace, since he and his men are outnumbered by enemies (338-49). In that episode, Jason quickly explains that his offer of peace is simply a trick to trap Apsyrtus (395-409); but his soothing words and explanation appear to be devised on the spot in response to her angry confrontation. It is Medea who, like Telamon, exhibits emotion and then apologizes for her outburst, saying that she was 'misguided by error' (ἁάσθην ἀμπλακίη, 412f.). Again, like Telamon, Medea must be instructed in calm rationality; and she is influenced by Jason's winning guile to such a degree that she suggests that murder is the preferable choice, even offering to help in return for her safety.

Although Jason does display some feelings in the epic, they usually may be classed as joy, watchfulness and wishing, the three good Stoic feelings (*LS* 65F = Diog. Laert. 7.116). Of these, joy (εὐπαθεία), which means delight, sociability and cheerfulness, perhaps best sums up Jason's attitude towards Medea. Jason, for example, 'rejoices' (κεχαρμένος, *Arg.* 3.1148; γήθειον, 4.93) when Medea offers to help him in the contest and to charm the serpent so that he may obtain the fleece.⁶⁸ Although the poet twice says that Jason feels desire for Medea, first when both Jason and Medea are said to be 'stirred by the winds of Eros' (3.971f.) and then when Eros steals over Jason at the tears of Medea (1077f.), this emotion on Jason's part is both fleeting and limited, a momentary joy occasioned by Medea's presence at their very first meeting. It is not expressed elsewhere in the epic and all other desire is Medea's. Medea, unlike Jason, generally exhibits the bad feelings of appetite, pleasure, fear and distress.⁶⁹ Medea tells Jason that she will kill herself from 'mad passion' (μαργοσύνησι, *Arg.* 4.375), speaking in 'seething wrath' (ἀναζείουσα χόλον, 391), and she curses Jason for considering abandoning her. Her actions and words are nearly

⁶⁶ The phrase is from Empedocles fr. 136.2 (H. Diels [ed.; rev. W. Kranz], *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* 2 [Berlin 1951]).

⁶⁷ The Euripidean meaning of νοῦς (Claus [54] 56) appears to be used by Apollonius.

⁶⁸ See also *Arg.* 1.350. The Stoics considered pleasure to be an indifferent (Annas [37] 112). Jason is also somewhat afraid of Medea (*Arg.* 3.394), but the force of the compound indicates that this fear is not excessive and so is not a passion and need not be avoided (Sandbach [33] 60f.).

⁶⁹ Diog. Laert. 7.110-14 = *SVF* 3.396, 400, 407, 412. Acting on the basis of emotion is considered to be bad by the Stoics (Annas [37] 106-08).

always unrestrained and passionate. This emotional behavior of Medea, traditionally found in the myth, was considered by the Stoics to be an important example of passion: Chrysippus even used the Medea of Euripides' play as an example of excessive emotion (πάθος),⁷⁰ which is contrasted with rationality. Apollonius appears to do the same: the restrained Jason 'flatters' (ὑποσσεῖν, *Arg.* 3.974, 4.410) Medea when he perceives her ἄτη ('recklessness') just as he does with Aeëtes. A distinction between rational speech and irrationality dominates the major scenes in Aea, and this contrast between Jason's rationality and the thoughtless emotion of others is pervasive throughout the epic. Jason, indeed, never promises any more than he must to get what he wants from the princess; and in all matters he is continuously and consistently pragmatic.⁷¹ Furthermore, Jason, as is praiseworthy in the context of Stoic ethics, never exhibits desire for Medea. A wise man, according to the Stoics, must not be 'subservient to another and worthless to himself' particularly in his relations with women (*LS* 66C = Seneca, *Letters* 116.5).

An inductive approach to the investigation of Jason's character reveals that Jason is driven by rationality, the subordination of emotion, self-control, awareness of necessity, a concern for decision-making, eloquence, and the desire to accomplish his ultimate goal. Since these elements also correspond to tenets of Stoic ethical philosophy, it is perhaps valid to conclude that Jason is quite similar to a Stoic in many respects. It is Stoicism's emphasis on the appropriate as being the most beneficial that provides the key to the interpretation of Jason. He is above all a character who acts in his own interest and in the interest of his community/crew. A philosophy that bases its definition of the moral good upon perception and fate can only with difficulty divest itself of a morally relativistic and deterministic system of values. This is a problem with which Stoicism struggled for centuries. Its resolution is clearly beyond Jason, who illustrates this struggle. Jason applies rational principles to important events in his life while disregarding more traditional ethics. Consequently, questions about whether it is correct to accept help from the mere woman Medea,⁷² or to succeed by magic

⁷⁰ M. Nussbaum [23] 99f.; C. Gill, 'Did Chrysippus Understand Medea?', *Phronesis* 28 (1983) 136-49; Diog. Laert. 7.180; Galen, *On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato* 4.2 = *SVF* 3.462.

⁷¹ Beye [5] interprets Jason as a 'love-hero' but although Jason succeeds with Medea by using desire, it is *her* desire for him.

⁷² Although Argus thinks that Jason will 'despise' (ὀνόσσει, *Arg.* 3.475) his suggestion to employ Medea's help, Jason does not hesitate and immediately accepts Argus' counsel, even though he afterwards says that he finds it pitiful to put his hope in women (3.487f.).

and theft, or to abandon fellow Argonauts are not issues that concern Jason, who is concerned only with the appropriate and considers all of these actions entirely correct in their contexts because they are successful. The end justifies the means, as long as the doer of the means possesses some dignity through virtue: a possible point of contact between the Hellenistic and the Homeric.

Of course, Jason is not perfect, but he does improve from a Stoic perspective in the course of the epic in that he becomes more rational, more Stoic. His indecision is confined primarily to the pre-fleece portions of the poem and especially to the initial stages of the voyage; and his infrequent expressions of feeling are also primarily found in books 1 and 2. But Jason gradually goes beyond concern as he develops a calm and controlled attitude in the course of his educational voyage of self-discovery. Jason is saddened and grieves for the death of Cyzicus, but these emotions are not repeated later in the epic, such as when he is confronted with the loss of Hylas, Herakles and Polyphemus (*Arg.* 1.1207ff.) or when the prophesied death of Idmon is fulfilled. Although Jason was glad to tarry with Hypsipyle in book 1 in order to indulge his desires, he has no such thoughts about Medea, bringing her along with him and then marrying her merely because he has no other choice. Here again, reason has replaced emotion. Likewise, at the Syrtis, when all the crew give up hope and Ancaeus declares that he is ready to die, Jason's words and emotions are hardly mentioned, except once. There Jason is said to be 'distracted' (ἀτυζόμενον, 4.1317) and he admits to being 'grieved' (ἀνιάζοντι, 3.1347), but this is only at the most extreme moment of danger, immediately before the appearance of the goddesses to him.⁷³ Elsewhere in the episode he presumably does not deign to admit his misery, since all anxiety is ascribed to the rest of the Argonauts.

In the early part of the epic Jason was willing to consider advice from others: prophets and seers, crew members and gods all proffer information at various moments. The traditional gods, too, must be propitiated and so sacrifices and altars are scattered throughout the first two books. But as Jason becomes more experienced at making his own decisions, advice, prayer and prophecy become of secondary importance or are performed by Orpheus and others, and Jason's solitary decisions become more frequent in the course of the return voyage. Likewise, as Jason demonstrates his ability to act in harmony with Nature by making rational and appropriate decisions, the gods no longer advise him as frequently: rather, they indicate their approval by literally pushing the *Argo* along. Nature acts in union with the *Argo*, at least as long as Jason is in concord with Nature and the Divine. Even in the Syrtis episode, rescue comes

⁷³ The goddesses accuse Jason of 'bewilderment' (ἀμυχάνη, *Arg.* 4.1318), which is not necessarily a pejorative term, as has been noted (Hunter [2 (1988)] 448).

about through divine aid in fulfillment of destiny. Jason gradually adopts (or attempts to adopt) the attributes of the wise man (*LS* 63M = Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 5.81f.:

It is a peculiar characteristic of the wise man that he does nothing which he could regret, nothing against his will, everything honourably, consistently, seriously, and rightly; that he anticipates nothing as if it were bound to happen, is shocked by nothing when it does happen under the impression that its happening is unexpected and strange, refers everything to his own judgement, stands by his decisions.

As Jason moves towards the end of his circular voyage (and the circle itself is suggestive of the Stoic insistence on the circular as representative of fate and destiny),⁷⁴ following in the footsteps of the Stoic paradigm Herakles, who is not yet himself either virtuous or immortal, his character gradually recedes in importance within the context of the poem. Jason becomes not just one of many characters, as Medea, Apsyrtus, the desert Nymphs and Apollo compete with him for attention, but in fact only a minor part of the last book of the epic.⁷⁵ As one scholar has remarked, 'many modern readers have found it . . . hard to accept Jason's virtual disappearance from large parts of Book 4.'⁷⁶ Yet this development may also be viewed as an integral part of the depiction of Jason's character. As he becomes more and more rational, more Stoic, more aware of his place in the universe, Jason becomes smaller and smaller while the outer world, the world of Nature, gradually seems to overwhelm him. The poet shifts his attention to landscape description: the desert, the Hesperides, the Danube come to the fore, while Jason's adventures are fewer than in the first two books. As Jason observes the increasing bizarreness of his surroundings, his ability to be shocked or astonished decreases in equal proportion. Even the restrained ending of the poem is a fitting conclusion to an adventure caused and achieved by fate and the gods, a poem whose Stoic human hero is Jason, but whose true purpose is to emphasize human and divine reason and the ethical complexities created by the elevation of the rational.

⁷⁴ Rist [19] 273f.

⁷⁵ F. Griffiths, 'Murder, Purification, and Cultural Formation in Aeschylus and Apollonius Rhodius,' *Helios* 17 (1990) 25-39, esp. 27, compares the theme of murder and pollution in the *Argonautica* and the *Oresteia* and notes that whereas Aeschylus' Furies are absorbed into Zeus' 'new dispensation,' in the epic the gods become more numerous and involved in book 4. However, he finds that Apollonius' shift of focus from Jason and Medea to the surrounding group parallels Aeschylus' change from individual (Orestes) to social planning (Athens).

⁷⁶ Hunter [2 (1993)] 5.

A MAGIC STELE IN DURBAN

E. A. Mackay

Department of Classics, University of Natal
Durban 4001

Abstract. In the Museum of Classical Archaeology, Durban a stone stele representing the child Horus' mastery over creatures that imply danger to humans and topped by the protective head of Bes is an example of an established type of magical amulet-stele, often (although not in this instance) featuring magical inscriptions.

Among a number of fragmentary representations of Harpocrates (the Greek name for Horus as a child) in the Museum of Classical Archaeology, University of Natal, Durban, is a miniature stele in dark-grey schist: figure 1, height 131 mm., width 62 mm.¹ Sculpted in fairly high relief is the naked, standing figure of Horus, his distinctive lock of hair projecting from his head to his right, as is customary when he is represented as a child. He stands on the backs of two rearing crocodiles with tails bent upwards at an unnatural angle. In his left hand he holds two undulating serpents, heads up and tails down, and from this hand also hangs an antelope, clutched by the horns; above the same fist is a scorpion, evidently held by its tail. In his right hand he holds another pair of serpents, a second scorpion, and below this fist a feline dangles, gripped by its tail. Above Horus is set a large head of Bes, the leonine dwarf-deity. The top of the latter's head is damaged and part of the right shoulder of the stele is missing. There is no evidence of any inscription. The prominence of the Bes head and the treatment of Horus' anatomy suggest a date in the late period (between 664 and 50 BC), and the stele is probably in fact Ptolemaic.²

This object conforms to a type of magic stele³ of a highly standardised

¹ L 1989.M.44; thanks are due to Gillian Berning who arranged the loan of this object (and many others) from the Local History Museum, Durban.

² The lack of detail, absence of inscription and general awkwardness of execution (especially in the pose of the crocodiles) seem to indicate a somewhat debased version of the standardised form (described below), an opinion supported by the fact that the stele was passed on by the Durban Local History Museum together with an assortment of objects of Egyptian provenience, including a number of terracotta representations of Harpocrates datable to the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.

³ Or *cippus* (the Latin word for 'stele'), as this type of stele is often called.

format.⁴ Despite the rather worn condition of the Durban stele, the basic forms of its figures are clear, and the various elements can thus readily be identified by comparison with some other, better preserved stelai that were in the first place more carefully executed with the inclusion of much more detail. An excellent example, dating from the third century BC, can be found in the Brooklyn Museum, New York,⁵ where the scaly hide and spiny tails of the crocodiles are clear identification features; the antelope (this time in Horus' right hand) is more delicately defined, and the feline (in the left hand) is recognisable as a maned lion. The four snakes rear menacingly from Horus' grip and the two outsize scorpions seem to scrabble with their many, jointed legs to pull their tails free from the god's capacious fists. Arranged around Horus are divine or magical figures: these include Osiris and Min in relief and other figures incised into the stone along with hieroglyphic inscriptions; to either side of Horus, in relief, is a papyrus stem (or column?), the one on the left supporting a falcon crowned with two feathers (Horus in another guise) while the one on the right is topped by a feather (Maat?); on a convex predella below the crocodiles is inscribed a three-line magical text.

Despite their overall uniformity, not all magical Horus stelai have precisely the same selection and distribution of elements; the Durban stele, for instance, has the lion and the antelope in Horus' right and left hands respectively (most examples have the animals the other way around), and the wooden stele in London,⁶ despite its larger size, offers a reduced collection of creatures with only one scorpion and a feline in Horus' right hand, two snakes and an antelope in his left; a single papyrus stem, on the left side of the stele, supports a falcon crowned with two feathers, and some evidence of incised inscriptions is preserved on the background as well as on the convex predella.

⁴ A catalogue of examples is given in the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (hereafter *LIMC*) 2 (Munich and Zürich 1981) 103: Bes 56, to which should be added a fragmentary example with the upper third missing: New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 98.2.652; Basel Market, H. A. C. Catalogue 1 (Basel 1989) 37 fig. 77; Durban, Museum of Classical Archaeology, University of Natal L 1989.M.44; and an unusual example in wood London, British Museum EA 60958, S. Quirke and J. Spencer (edd.) *The British Museum Book of Ancient Egypt* (London 1992) 84 fig. 60.

⁵ Brooklyn Museum 60.73 (*LIMC* 2 pl. 82: Bes 56 b), somewhat larger than the Durban example: approximately 250 mm. in height. Compare also the equally elaborate example in the New York Metropolitan Museum (see above, n. 4: height approximately 200 mm.), which presents the same arrangement of dangerous creatures as well as the falcon- and feather-topped papyrus stems, but lacks the relief figures of Osiris and Min; the inscription is positioned around the figures, not on a predella.

⁶ See above, n. 4: height 390 mm.

Horus, according to myth the son of Isis and Osiris, was from early times in Egypt depicted as a hawk-headed god (manifesting sometimes as a falcon); as such he played an important role in the series of events believed to take place immediately after death when the soul was judged.⁷ He was also the protective guardian of the pharaoh, who was believed to be his earthly incarnation,⁸ just as after death the pharaoh came to be identified with Osiris. Another guise, which grows in popularity and importance through the New Kingdom, is that of Horus as a child-god, usually depicted as a naked child of about eight to ten years, with the characteristic lock of hair prominent on the right side of his head; it was this aspect of the god that was developed in the Greco-Roman period into the infant deity Harpokrates, usually portrayed as a chubby baby with one finger in his mouth (a gesture often interpreted in antiquity and in later times as the ritual call for silence at the beginning of religious activity such as the sacrifice or the celebration of mysteries, but probably intended merely as an iconographic element denoting infancy).

Horus, who vanquished his father's enemy and murderer Seth, was widely regarded, along with his representative the Pharaoh, as the guardian of the fortunes of Egypt and, by a natural extension, of the fortunes of individuals; it is in this connection that the Horus stele seems to have been produced, for Horus was thought to be able to protect a person from harm of any kind. Horus on the stelai stands on the backs of the feared Nile crocodiles, signifying his mastery over them and, by symbolically holding a sampling of the denizens of the desert, indicates that they too have no power to harm him: this protection is to be extended to the user of the stele. The inclusion of the head of Bes adds a further safeguarding element, for Bes was in his own right a household protective deity, often called upon together with Tawaret (the hippopotamus goddess) for help in childbirth. Some stelai have inscriptions on the front or back,⁹ which indicate that they were thought of as magical amulets protecting the bearer especially against poison or other evil, and it was believed that liquid poured over such a stele would be charged with the magic force of the spells inscribed: those desirous of protection could drink the resulting potion or pour it over themselves, and it was

⁷ See, for example, the scene from Hunefer's *Book of the Dead* in which, after his heart is weighed against the feather of Maat, vindicated, he is introduced to Osiris by a falcon-headed Horus (Quirke and Spencer [4] 170f. fig. 130).

⁸ This is most spectacularly represented by the seated statue of Khephren with the Horus falcon embracing his head from behind with its wings: Cairo Museum cat. gén. 14, Fourth Dynasty, from Giza (E. L. B. Terrace and H. G. Fischer, *Treasures of the Cairo Museum from Predynastic to Roman Times* (London 1970) 41-44. There are later versions from the New Kingdom: Cairo cat. gén. 743, 42152.

⁹ So, for example, the fragmentary example in the Basel Market (see above, n. 4).

held to be particularly efficacious if applied to wounds.

Although the Durban stele lacks the inscriptions and additional figures, it nevertheless conforms to the standard type of magical stele and indeed includes all the essential details: Bes, Horus and the harmful creatures over which he has mastery. Its intended protective function is thus made clear.



Figure 1: Durban L 1989.M.44

STATIUS' HYPsipYLE: FOLLOWING IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE *AENEID*

S. Georgia Nugent

Office of the Associate Provost and Department of Classics,¹ Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA

Abstract. This article discusses Hypsipyle's narrative of the Lemnian massacre in Statius' *Thebaid*, focussing particularly on the reliability of Hypsipyle as a narrator and on the undecidability of her father Thoas' fate. In conclusion, it relates the ambiguous nature of Hypsipyle's relation to her father to the nature of Statius' relationship to his epic predecessor, Vergil.

In the midst of the narrative progress of the Theban legend, Statius' *Thebaid* suddenly halts for a 1700-line 'digression' occasioned by the Argives' chance meeting with Hypsipyle.² She relates to them her history as one of the Lemnian women, women who (with the exception of Hypsipyle herself, said to have clandestinely rescued her father) murdered their husbands, sons, and fathers *en masse* and subsequently attacked the Argonauts as well, when they arrived at the shores of Lemnos. Hypsipyle's narration alone occupies approximately 450 lines in Statius' text. By contrast, in the *Aeneid*, the speeches delivered by human female characters comprise approximately 380 lines of direct discourse in total.³ Hypsipyle's tale of the Lemnian massacre introduces a note of ambivalence in the epic's representation of females: if the women of Lesbos are powerful, they also use that power to murder the men of their island. Yet the fact that a woman takes over the narrative voice of the *Thebaid* for an entire book raises the question of the role and authority of women's speech within epic to a new level.⁴

¹ The author is Associate Provost and Lecturer in Classics.

² A shorter version of this article was delivered on 28 December 1996 at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association in New York, USA.

³ I base this figure on Gilbert Highet's accounting in *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid* (Princeton 1972) 327-37. For a very full typology of speeches in Statius' text, with helpful statistical data, see W. J. Dominik, *The Speeches in Statius' Thebaid* (Hildesheim 1994).

⁴ For an overview of the female characters in the *Thebaid*, see R. Lesueur, 'Les Femmes dans la *Thébaïde* de Stace,' in M. Woronoff (ed.), *L'Univers épique: Rencontres avec l'Antiquité classique* 2 (Paris 1992) 229-42. Overall, Lesueur is rather rigidly typological, emphasizing the women as sisters or daughters or wives, as Good or Bad; but, in the case of Hypsipyle, he (p. 236) recognizes the insufficiency of such categorization: 'Hypsipyle est plus complexe de caractère aussi: à la fois bienfaitrice et coupable, généreuse et imprudente. . . .' The importance of Hypsipyle's assuming the epic narrative voice is noted by J. Henderson, 'Statius' *Thebaid*: Form Premade,' *PCPhS* 37 (1991) 55. See now also W. J. Dominik, *The Mythic Voice of Statius: Power and Politics in the Thebaid* (Leiden 1994) 54-63. I have not had an opportunity to obtain the thesis of J.

The Vergilian Pre-Text

Hypsipyle's book-length narration inevitably invites comparison with the only similarly narrated episode in the *Aeneid*; namely, Aeneas' book-length evocation of the fall of Troy.⁵ But what has he to do with Hypsipyle or Hypsipyle with him? Nothing, we might at first be tempted to answer. Yet these two loquacious raconteurs keep intertwining in unexpected ways.

First, from the moment of their appearance to the potential audiences of their respective narratives, it is clear that they share that ontology peculiar to the heroic world, according to which the famous and infamous are lurking everywhere, incognito in our midst, just awaiting an opportunity to introduce themselves. In this invisible-ink universe, the stranger before us, when the catalyst of the correct name is applied, may suddenly become vividly legible as the living embodiment of a story we already know intimately, but will now be able to hear in his or her own words.⁶

Thus Hypsipyle, just like Aeneas, knows that the mere mention of her name provides her auditors with an implicit biography:⁷

Brown, 'Into the Woods: Narrative Studies in the *Thebaid* of Statius' (PhD diss. Cambridge 1994), which treats Hypsipyle extensively.

⁵ D. W. T. C. Vessey, *Statius and the Thebaid* (Cambridge 1973) 171 notes very briefly that Hypsipyle's narration 'contain[s] several echoes from the beginning of *Aeneid* 2' and (p. 176) 'inevitably calls to mind the even longer tale that Aeneas tells at Carthage,' but he does not pursue the comparison.

⁶ Well-known examples include the meeting of Glaucus and Diomedes in *Iliad* 6.119-236, Odysseus' appearance at the court of the Phaiacians in *Odyssey* 9.14-20, Oedipus' encounter with Theseus and the citizens of Colonus in the *Oedipus at Colonus* (203-24, 510-18), and Philoctetes' dismay that this standard form of recognition apparently does *not* obtain when he identifies himself to Neoptolemus in the *Philoctetes* (246-52). In the *Thebaid*, Polynices' self-introduction at the court of Adrastus has already provided a noteworthy variation on this pattern. For, in his desire to repress the name of his father, Polynices remarkably identifies himself by his mother's name alone. His auditors, of course, can readily supply the rest of his genealogy: '*... est genetrix Iocasta mihi. tum motus Adrastus / hospitiiis—agnovit enim—'quid nota recondis? / scimus,' ait, 'nec sic aversum fama Mycenis / volvit iter'*' ("Jocasta is my mother." Then Adrastus, moved to sympathy—for he recognized him—said, "Why hide what is well known? We know; rumor does not make its way so distant from Mycenae," *Theb.* 1.681-84).

⁷ For a careful reading of this opening of Hypsipyle's narrative 'digression,' see D. W. T. C. Vessey, 'Pierius Menti Calor Incidit: Statius' Epic Style,' *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.32.5 (1986) 2988-93. Vessey (p. 2993) oddly emphasizes the episode's digressive nature ('the *mora* may have no moral'), while in an earlier study he had stressed the connections of Hypsipyle's tale to the larger Theban narrative (D. W. T. C. Vessey, 'Notes on the Hypsipyle Episode in Statius, *Thebaid* 4-6,' *BICS* 17 [1970] 44-55). For a recent appreciation of the *non-*

illa ego nam . . .
 hoc memorasse sat est: claro generata Thoante
 servitium Hypsipyle vestri fero capta Lycurgi
 (Theb. 5.34, 38f.)

For I am that one . . .
 it is enough to tell this: sired by the famous Thoas
 I say I am the captive Hypsipyle, slave of your Lycurgus.

. . . coram, quem quaeritis, adsum,
 Troius Aeneas . . .
 (Aen. 1.595f.)
 . . . Right before you, that one, whom you seek,
 I am: Trojan Aeneas . . .

The revelation of such a figure's identity accordingly causes his or her respective interlocutors to sit up and take notice at once, marking him or her as a potential narrator of a superior stature, conferred by his or her extensive (usually tragic) experience:

advertere animos, maiorque et honora videri
 parque operi *tanto*
 (Theb. 5.40f.)

They turn their attention, and she seems greater
 and noble, and equal to such an act

obstipuit primo aspectu Sidonia Dido,
 casu deinde viri *tanto*
 (Aen. 1.613f.)

Sidonian Dido was awestruck, first at the appearance
 and then at such great misfortune [suffered by] the man

Simultaneously, the audience is filled with curiosity and a desire to hear the stories first-hand:⁸

. . . cunctis tunc noscere *casus* . . .
 'immo age . . .'
 (Theb. 5.41, 43)
 . . . They all conceived a desire to learn *the history* . . .
 'Come on then . . .'

digressive integral relations between Hypsipyle's narrative and its textual frame, see Dominik [4] 55f.

⁸ Vessey [7] 2993 calls 'Adrastus' exhortation' (*immo age . . .*, Theb. 5.43) 'an invitation to compose a poem.'

'quis te, nate dea, per tanta pericula casus
insequitur?
'immo age . . .'

(*Aen.* 1.615f., 753)

'What *history* of disaster, son of a goddess,
followed you?
'Come on then . . .'

The next step in this highly ritualized request for narrative⁹ is the speaker's acquiescence, albeit with reluctance:

' . . . immania vulnera, rector,
integrare iubes . . .'

(*Theb.* 5.29f.)

' . . . immense wounds, king,
you bid me to renew . . .'

'infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem . . .'

(*Aen.* 2.3)¹⁰

'unspeakable sorrow, queen, you bid me to renew . . .'

These examples begin to make clear the extent to which Vergil's text is deeply implicated in Hypsipyle's narration, which draws especially upon three major Vergilian episodes: Aeneas' narration to Dido of the fall of Troy (*Aen.* 2), Dido's tragic love affair with Aeneas (*Aen.* 4), and the incitement of the Trojan women to burn their ships (*Aen.* 5).¹¹ Yet the later text also re-configures Vergilian verbal and structural precedents. For example, Hypsipyle's narration of the night the Lemnian men were massacred entails both verbal and substantive parallels with Aeneas' narration to Dido in *Aeneid* 2 of the night Troy fell. But at the next turn in her tale, the landing of the Argonauts at Lemnos and their subsequent co-habitation with the Lemnian women, Hypsipyle's tale (as well as her position) bears more obvious similarities to that of Dido *vis-à-vis* Aeneas in

⁹ For thoughtful meditation on the relationships constituted among an audience, a singer, and a requested narrative, see G. Walsh, *Varieties of Enchantment: Early Greek Views of the Nature and Function of Poetry* (Chapel Hill 1984) 3-36.

¹⁰ These verbal parallels were also noted by L. Legras, *Étude sur la Thébàide de Stace* (Paris 1905) 61-70 in his consideration of the sources of the Hypsipyle episode.

¹¹ To lesser degrees, echoes of *Aeneid* 1 (especially Aeneas' encounter with Venus), the Sinon of *Aeneid* 2, and Andromache in *Aeneid* 3 are also heard. For particular attention to *Aeneid* 1 and 4, see C. Gruzelier, 'The Influence of Virgil's Dido on Staius' Portrayal of Hypsipyle,' *Prudentia* 26 (1994) 153-65.

Aeneid 4. Thus Statius intertwines resonances of both male and female, both speaker and hearer, both survivor and victim within this one female voice.

Hypsipyle's own characterization of the recollecting voice provides one of the most striking examples of Statius' complex appropriation of Vergilian text. The Statian formulation virtually reverses that of Aeneas, expressing an entirely different attitude toward such narration, as pleasing rather than pain-inducing: *dulce loqui miseris veteresque reducere questus* ('It is sweet for the wretched to speak and to rehearse past injuries,' *Theb.* 5.48).¹² Similarly, although Hypsipyle and Aeneas speak in syntactically similar patterns about the recitation of their respective tales, their lexical choices to describe that recitation are tellingly distinct:

'... immania vulnera, rector,
integrare iubes ...'

(*Theb.* 5.29f.)

'... immense wounds, king,
you bid me to renew ...'

'infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem ...'

(*Aen.* 2.3)

'unspeakable sorrow, queen, you bid me to renew ...'

Aeneas' *renovo* ('renew') connotes a repetition, a re-doing without difference, and without the distance that might entail learning. Vergil uses the verb only here (*Aen.* 2.3) and at the conclusion of *Aeneid* 2, in Aeneas' description of his re-entry into Troy in the attempt to find the lost Creusa again (2.750). *Renovo* thus frames *Aeneid* 2, the last night of Troy, the past to which—as Dido later learns in Book 4—Aeneas would return, even now, if he could (*Aen.* 4.340-44). *Renovare* is repetition, but without 'working through,' as one might put it in Freudian terms.

Hypsipyle's important formulation defies translation. Certainly, the 'wounds' in question are both 'huge' and 'horrible'—to be compared with the body of the baby Opheltes, which will become 'all one wound' (*Theb.* 5.598). But the action of *integrare* connotes significantly richer possibilities than Aeneas' *renovo* ('renew,' *Aen.* 2.3), entailing both 'to restore to a former condition,' and 'to make whole.' *Integrare vulnera* ('to renew wounds'), then, suggests both

¹² The significance of this assertion is thematized by the fact that its attribution in the text is not entirely clear. It may be spoken by the poet himself, by Adrastus, or even by Hypsipyle. See D. E. Hill (ed.), *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Libri XII* (Leiden 1983) ad 5.48.

re-opening and healing one's wounds. A unique usage, as Vessey notes.¹³ Yet the concept of a narrative that both 're-opens' and 'heals' old wounds, which is simultaneously traumatic and therapeutic, is not difficult to understand. In fact, Hypsipyle's response to Adrastus' request that she narrate her painful past uncannily prefigures 'the talking cure' that is the discourse of psychoanalysis.

If this is the case with Hypsipyle's narrative, what are the 'wounds' to be both re-opened and healed by her discourse? Here, it might be helpful to construe *integro* not so much as an innovation in the Statian text, but rather as a refusal, an avoidance of the unspoken *renovo*. Specifically, the well-known Vergilian *renovo* is displaced from the context of narration to other contexts of action. For although it is 'repressed' at this point, the verb does 'return' in Hypsipyle's text—and at two crucial junctures.

One is in the speech of Polyxo, the Lemnian matron who incites the other women to their deed (*Theb.* 5.102-29). The source of the women's anger is unfulfilled sexual desire for their husbands. Polyxo urges them on to the slaughter of the men by claiming that she has found a means by which love may be found again, renewed, on the island; the verb she uses is *renovare*: *inveni . . . viam . . . qua renovanda Venus* ('I have found a way for love to be renewed,' 5.109f.). The second return of *renovo* occurs after the arrival of the Argonauts, in Hypsipyle's allusion to her own maternity. Having been brought to bed against her will, she repeats or renews the name of her own father in that of her son: *duroque sub hospite mater / nomen avi renovo* ('[having been made] a mother by my harsh guest, I renew the name of the grandfather,' 464f.). This return of the name of the father is of particular interest because it represents a choice on Staius' part: while the fragmentary Euripidean *Hypsipyle* includes a son named Thoas, elsewhere the twins are named Euneos (invariably) and either Nebrophonos or Deipylos.¹⁴ In other words, *renovo* (denoting repetition) in Hypsipyle's narration is displaced from the *telling* of the story to the acts of *killing* (several generations of) fathers and *naming* (a succeeding generation of) sons. Under the mechanism of repression and return, these acts then would seem

¹³ Vessey [7] 2989.

¹⁴ At Hyginus 15 and 273, and Apollodorus 1.9.17.2, respectively. This naming contrasts as well with Hyginus' brief notice of the Lemnian women, which asserts that, when they gave birth, they named their children after their (i.e., the children's) fathers (*Lemniades autem quaecunque ex Argonautis conceperunt, eorum nomina filiis suis imposuerunt*, *Fabulae* 15.6). Cf. G. W. Bond, *Euripides: Hypsipyle* (Oxford 1963); Jessen, 'Hypsipyle,' in A. Pauly, G. Wissowa and W. Kroll (edd.), *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9.1 (Stuttgart 1914) 436-44.

to be the *vulnera*, the 'wounds,' which need to be both re-opened or renewed and healed, via Hypsipyle's act of narration.

Hypsipyle and the Name of the Father

When Hypsipyle's female voice takes up the epic narrative (to an unprecedented extent), what is not at all unprecedented for epic is the way in which both the content and the consequences of that narrative have to do with fathers and sons. Hypsipyle's tale has two immediate and quite tangible consequences. The first is the death of the baby Opheltes, which is caused by Hypsipyle's neglect of him during her recitation. So thoroughly is the child destroyed, in fact, that his entire body becomes one wound (*totumque in vulnere corpus*, 5.598). The ensuing complications that result from the child's death, however, include a second consequence as well, namely that, as in the plot of comedy or romance, Hypsipyle's own sons suddenly appear and are reunited with her (*Theb.* 5.710-30).

Hypsipyle herself, as she laments the death of Opheltes, explicitly articulates a clear relation between her Lemnian tale and its consequences:¹⁵

dum patrios casus famaeque exorsa retracto
ambitiosa meae . . .
exsolvi tibi, Lemne, nefas . . .

(*Theb.* 5.626-28)

While I rehearse again the fate of my fatherland,
and the rambling origin of my own fame . . .
I have paid to you, Lemnos, the crime I owed . . .

Her sense is that she owed a death to Lemnos and, according to this accounting, the death of a father and that of a child are fungible, equal in exchange value.

Note that this reading—Hypsipyle's own reading—of her tale presumes that there is a price to be paid for her *not* having killed her father, which may be exacted from the next generation.¹⁶ Yet the juxtaposition of this retributive economy with the second consequence of Hypsipyle's narration, namely her sudden recovery of Thoas and her other son, suggests simultaneously that there may be a *reward* for not killing the father, to be reaped in the form of the

¹⁵ As we saw killing and naming aligned through the use of the verb *renovo*, 'renew' (see above, pp. 49-51, esp. 50f.), so here killing and telling/narrating seem to be equated, for Hypsipyle.

¹⁶ The moral irony of Hypsipyle's situation at Lemnos ('She realizes she must flee to avoid being punished for her failure to murder.') is well emphasized by F. Ahl, 'Statius' Thebaid: A Reconsideration,' *ANRW* 2.32.5 (1986) 2886-88. Ahl stresses the *political* implications of innocence itself becoming a source of guilt and punishment.

appearance of his avatar. Whichever of these results we emphasize, Hypsipyle's narrative presents us with both repetition (in the deaths internal to the Lemnian narrative and the external death of Opheltus caused by the narrative) and difference (between one's own father and one's foster-son, between one Thoas and his namesake grandson). Central to every register of the tale, however, is the presence or absence of the father—or what Jacques Lacan might call 'the Name of the Father.'¹⁷

That Hypsipyle's story is fundamentally defined by the relation to the father is clear from the moment of first encounter with her. In an exchange with obvious resonances back to the *Aeneid*, Adrastus has addressed her as an unknown deity, and she demurs that she is by no means a goddess, though once at least she had a kingdom:

... et nobis regnum tamen et pater ingens—
sed quid ego haec ...

(*Theb.* 4.773f.)

... Yet I too had a kingdom and a great father—
but why do I go on like this ...

Both in the immediacy with which the 'great father' appears in her self-presentation and the immediacy with which the topic is suppressed—particularly marked here by aposiopesis—we seem to see a significant pattern. The very same pattern recurs early in the next book when Adrastus explicitly elicits Hypsipyle's narrative. The centrality of her paternal theme has not been lost on him—himself designated *pater Adrastus* ('father Adrastus,' 5.42) at this juncture—and he urges her to identify herself by asking: *o quaecumque es . . . dic age . . . dic quis et ille pater* ('whoever you are . . . come now and tell . . . tell also who that "father" is,' 20, 23, 25). She responds with a reference to the wounding associated with the name of the father: *immania vulnera . . . integrare iubes* ('immense wounds . . . you bid me to renew,' 29f.), and continues by repeating the pattern of both invoking and diverging from the topic of the father:

o pater! illa ego nam . . .
. . . illa . . . raptum quae sola parentem
occului. quid longa malis exordia necto?

(*Theb.* 5.34-36)

O my father! For I am that one . . .
. . . who alone stole away and hid her father.
But why do I weave this long preface to my woes?

¹⁷ For a discussion of Lacan's concept 'The Name of the Father,' see, e. g., E. Grose, *Jacques Lacan: A Feminist Introduction* (London/New York 1990) 47.

From these remarks it is clear that her self-identification rests entirely upon the famed rescue of her father, and also that it is a story she is both reluctant and eager to tell.

Two points about the dynamics of Hypsipyle's self-construction are noteworthy. First, her reputation depends significantly upon the Lemnian massacre: if the men of Lemnos had *not* been murdered, Hypsipyle would have no particular claim to fame. Second, that fame depends entirely upon her own self-presentation. Thoas, if not murdered, is at least effectively banished from Lemnos and from the text. We hear no voice of his, and it is only a vague 'rumor' (*Fama*, 5.486) that announces his preservation. The whole point of Hypsipyle's act depends upon its concealment from the other Lemnian women, so they are surely not its narrators. In fact, the only party to the act who *can* speak of it is Hypsipyle herself. And speak of it she does, not only in this lengthy narrative in response to Adrastus' direct questioning. Rather, we gradually learn that Hypsipyle's life and fame seem to consist largely in the narration of the same.

In her lamentation over the dead Opheltes we learn that she used incessantly to tell her story over to the baby. Ironically, the narrative that has now proven fatal to the poor child used earlier to be merely soporific, apparently serving as a kind of lullaby:

... quotiens tibi Lemnon et Argo
sueta loqui et longa somnum suadere querella
(5.615f.)

... How often I used to tell you about Lemnos and the Argo
and with that long complaint put you to sleep.¹⁸

Eventually, one gathers that this *longa querella* ('long complaint,' 5.616) may have become rather tiresome to the infant's parents as well, given the first reactions of both the father Lycurgus and the mother Eurydice. Here is Lycurgus, vowing in his grief-stricken rage to kill this absent-minded but loquacious nurse:

... vivitne? ...
ferte citi comites; faxo omnis fabula Lemni
et pater et tumidae generis mendacia sacri
exciderint!
(5.657-60)

... Is she still living? ...
Bring her here quickly, men.

¹⁸ Note here the self-reflexive quality of Hypsipyle's narration, as she tells of her own telling of her story, a characteristic that we shall see again below.

I'll knock out of her that whole tale of Lemnos
and her father and the puffed-up lies about her divine descent!

And Eurydice regrets that she ever trusted Hypsipyle's self-advertisement of her piety and entrusted her child to the Lemnian:

quidni ego? narrabat servatum fraude parentem
insontesque manus. en! quam feroce putemus
abiurasse sacrum et Lemni gentilibus unam
immunem furiis . . .

(*Theb.* 6.149-52)

But why shouldn't I? She was always telling about
her father—saved by deceit—and her innocent hands.
Look at her—we're supposed to believe she was the only one
to have abjured the savage oath, the only one free
from Lemnian fury . . .

Taciturnity has apparently not characterized Hypsipyle. Has truthfulness? Eurydice's formulation may set us to speculating about the possibility that (conceptually, if not grammatically) *fraude* ('by deceit') might modify *narrabat* ('telling') rather than *servatum* ('saved'): that Hypsipyle's deception might lie in the narration rather than the preservation of her father.

At this point, the question that begins to force itself upon us is: What really happened to Thoas?¹⁹ To survey the variant possibilities of the myth, one reasonable step is to turn to a reference tool like Roscher's mythological lexicon.²⁰ Doing so yields an interesting result, which seems to be symptomatic of the text we have as well, namely a certain ambiguity, coupled with an insistence on the lack of ambiguity. In the *Thebaid*, this surfaces in Hypsipyle's repeated insistence on her innocence, often formulated in syntactically convoluted sentences whose very difficulty in construction suggests some

¹⁹ The historian of Greek religion, Walter Burkert, returns many times to the complex of myths surrounding Lemnos, especially the Lemnian women and the arrival of the Argonauts (cf. W. Burkert, 'Jason, Hypsipyle, and New Fire at Lemnos: A Study in Myth and Ritual,' *CQ* 20 (1970) 1-16; 'The Lemnian Women,' in *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (University of California Press 1983) 190-96; *Greek Religion* (Oxford 1985) 61, 84, 167f.). In each instance, he stresses the arrival of the Argonauts as a return to normalcy, virtually the longed-for return of patriarchal order. Whether or not this characterization accurately assesses the varied ritual data Burkert collects, it certainly does not accord with the presentation of Hypsipyle as narrator, who tends to stress both violent and tragic aspects of the Argonauts' arrival and sojourn.

²⁰ W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig 1886-90).

difficulty in content.²¹ In Roscher we find the unequivocal statement that, despite variants in every other aspect of the tale, on the point of Hypsipyle's saving of her father, all versions are 'einmütig,' unanimous.²² Notwithstanding, the entry goes on to cite several variants, including Herodotus' straightforward statement that Thoas was killed along with the other Lemnian men (6.138). Our author dismisses these, however, with the proviso that they are merely accidental and should not be taken to signify any variation: 'so muss das keine Abweichung bedeuten.' This scholarly example of simultaneous assertion and denial seems to replicate a problem at the heart of Hypsipyle's own narration.

Thus mystified by the 'real' fate of Thoas, let us turn back to an examination of Hypsipyle's version of the narrative, which will eventually lead us back to the original question of the father, his fate, and his fame.

Interpenetration of the Martial and the Domestic on Lemnos

The background to the Lemnian massacre includes confusing and conflicting elements in Statius' text. The antecedents to the situation are presented in a strangely oblique way: since Venus is angered by the Lemnians' lack of reverence for her godhead, love deserts the island (5.70). There is no joy at night, no warm embrace; rather, hatred and anger and discord lie in the middle of the bed (5.72-74). We might assume from these descriptions, especially the latter, strife between the Lemnian men and women. Instead, there is absence. In fact, the Lemnian men are taking part in some form of engagement, but not with their wives—with the Thracians opposite their shores.

In other versions of the Lemnian massacre, such as that of Valerius Flaccus (*Argonautica* 2.72-433), an erotic motif explicitly enters in here, and indeed in some variants the women undertake their murders specifically in vengeance because their men, upon returning, have brought Thracian concubines with them (representing, as one commentator has put it, a kind of communal version of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*).²³ But why have the men sailed off in the first place? Again, in some versions, the rationale is quite explicitly sexual: the result of Venus' bad feelings is a bad smell infecting the Lemnian women, and

²¹ On the way in which syntactical contortion may mark psychically troubling or conflicted narrative material, see B. Simon, *Tragic Drama and the Family: Psychoanalytic Studies from Aeschylus to Beckett* (New Haven 1988) 8.

²² O. Immisch, 'Thoas,' in Roscher [20] 805.40.

²³ J. H. Mozley (tr.), *Valerius Flaccus* (Cambridge, Mass./London 1934) 80f. *ad Arg.* 2.109.

the men have specifically left in search of other sexual partners.²⁴

Statius, however, chooses to elide both the odorific and the erotic details of the Lemnian tale. In the *Thebaid*, the reason why the Lemnian men have sailed off to Thrace is quite vague. Hypsipyle relates that, while the Lemnian men have no interest in marital relations, they are intent upon (*cura viris*, 75) rooting out (*erueret*, 76) the Thracians, who are swollen up (*tumidos Thracas*, 75). Despite their homes, wives and children on the opposite shore, their objective in Thrace is 'sweeter' (*dulcius*, 78) to the Lemnian men. While this vague indication of the Lemnians' purpose in engaging the Thracians may mean (as it is translated in the Loeb edition): 'the men were bent on overthrowing the boastful Thracians,'²⁵ it is also true that, of the terms employed, *cura* ('concern'), *tumidus* ('swollen') and *dulcius* ('sweeter') may also be employed in the erotic semantic field, where they would suggest, respectively: desire, erection, and the experience of greater pleasure. What, exactly, are the men doing in Thrace?

It is worth noting in this context that the Thracians are proverbial, not for 'boastfulness,' but for lust, as Ovid makes clear in his discussion of the perverse desire of Tereus (a Thracian) for his sister-in-law, Philomela:

... sed et hunc innata libido
exstimulat, primumque genus regionibus illis
in venerem est. flagrat vitio gentisque suoque.
(*Met.* 6.458-60)

... but in addition, his native libido
stimulated him, for the people of that region are
particularly prone to erotic desire; he burned with
the vice of his race as well as that of his own nature.

If, in this tale, Thrace is the homeland of lust, we should recall that it is also perhaps best known as the homeland of the poet Orpheus. Turning again to Ovid for his rendition of the Orpheus myth, we may note two details particularly relevant to our text. The first is the Ovidian account that characterizes Orpheus not only as the greatest singer and the star-crossed lover whose quest for his beloved Eurydice fails, but also as the originator of homosexual love:

ille etiam Thracum populis fuit auctor amorem
in teneros transferre mares citraque iuventam
aetatis breve ver et primos carpere flores.
(*Met.* 10.83-85)

²⁴ For a comparative schema of variant versions of the Lemnian myth in Apollonius of Rhodes, Valerius Flaccus, and Statius, see Legras [10] 69-71 n.1.

²⁵ J. H. Mozley (tr.), *Statius* 2 (Cambridge, Mass./London 1928) 9.

He was the first to introduce this practice among the Thracians,
to direct love to tender males and to enjoy
the brief spring and first flowers, just before manhood.

The Lemnian massacre certainly provides reason to recall the result of this Orphic innovation; namely, murderous rage on the part of women who have been shunned sexually. In Orpheus' case, the women's rage results in the poet's dismemberment, yet also in his miraculous final moment—with the head of the decapitated poet carried, still singing, in the waters of the Hebrus:

membra iacent diversa locis, caput, Hebre, lyramque
excipis, et (mirum!) medio dum labitur amne,
flebile nescio quid queritur lyra, flebile lingua
murmurat exanimis, respondent flebile ripae.
(*Met.* 11.50-53)

His limbs were scattered in different places,
but the Hebrus received his lyre and his head.
And—a miracle—as it floated down the middle of the stream,
the lyre gave forth a mournful sound, the lifeless tongue murmured
a mournful tune, and the banks of the river resounded plaintively.

Not only the concerted violence of sex-starved women but also the head that in death still murmurs will have their counterparts at Lemnos.

To return, however, to the Lemnian men's activity in Thrace, even this seems oddly sensualized, for an account of military action:

dulcius Edonas hiemes Arctonque prementem
excipere, aut tandem tacita post proelia nocte
fractorum subitas torrentum audire ruinas.
(*Theb.* 5.78-80)

It was sweeter to them to experience Edonian winters
and the Northern clime bearing down upon them, or, finally,
after battles in the quiet night to hear the sudden
crashing of falling streams.

Putting together these bits of information, it appears that the erotic motive behind the Lemnian expedition, which Statius has elided in his account, remains implicit in the language Hypsipyle uses. It may even be the case that the traces of such language allude to the possibility of homo-erotic rather than hetero-erotic adventures.²⁶ Be that as it may, at the origin of Hypsipyle's narration, we already

²⁶ This possibility might help to explain the anomaly of the Lemnian women murdering all the men on the island and yet experiencing no punishment—indeed being rewarded, as it were, with

find the conflation of *eros* and battle that will mark the Lemnian tale throughout. Are the men absent to engage in combat or in more eroticized encounters? Are sexuality and violence, for the Lemnians, in fact distinguishable? The elusiveness of the Lemnian expedition does not clarify their distinction.

The next stage of Hypsipyle's narration, the matron Polyxo's arousal of the Lemnian women to action, leads again to a marked confusion of sexuality and violence. As will the later arrival of the Argonauts, this episode commences with supernatural meteorological conditions: thunder sounds four times from a clear sky in the middle of the day (*Theb.* 5.85-89). As if on cue, at this signal Polyxo bursts from her house into the streets of the city (90-92). Here, we may identify an erotic subtext in the fact that this frenzy commences precisely at noon, the hour at which women are considered most dangerous and sexually aggressive.²⁷ Certainly, we can identify a clear pre-text for the woman who acts to foment insurrection among other women in Vergil's portrayal of 'Beroe' (actually, Juno's messenger Iris in disguise) in *Aeneid* 5. Like the *longaeva* ('long-lived') Beroe (*Aen.* 5.620), Polyxo is characterized as *aeui matura* ('mature in age,' *Theb.* 5.90), despite the fact that her children are still young enough to be 'clinging to her side' (*haerebant*, 99). Polyxo's act is taken to be divinely inspired, as is 'Beroe's,' and the inflammatory speeches delivered by the two agitators have a number of verbal and structural parallels.²⁸

The overall structure of the case Polyxo presents is strikingly illogical. But we may now be in a position to see that it is illogical in a precisely *Lemnian* way. First, she recognizes explicitly that the women are longing for sexual relations,

new sexual partners and offspring. We may have to do here with a myth concerned to re-affirm heterosexual relations and institutions against the threat of deviance.

²⁷ While noon is a time of rest for shepherds and hunters (see A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik* [Heidelberg 1965] 60f.; T. Rosenmeyer, *The Green Cabinet* (Berkeley 1969) 88-90), this may simply represent 'an atmosphere of foreboding, the lull before the storm' (K. J. McKay, *The Poet at Play: Kallimachos, the Bath of Pallas* [Leiden 1962] 38). Noon is a time when deities are particularly likely to appear, and among them are female powers particularly apt to exercise vengeance against males who encounter them. Examples include the Empousa (*Schol. ad Ar. Ran.* 293); Hekate (Lucian *Philops.* 22-24); Athena, who strikes Teiresias blind (Callim. *Hymns* 5.70-82); and Artemis, who transforms Actaeon into a stag (*Ov. Met.* 3.144, *Fast.* 4.761). J. G. Frazer (ed. and tr.), *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Libri Sex* (London 1929) *ad Fast.* 4.761 notes the modern Greek belief that nymphs are especially active at the noon hour and malicious in inflicting punishment.

²⁸ Cf. Polyxo's reference to marriage torches (*ipsa faces*, 'I myself [will light] torches,' *Theb.* 5.138) with Beroe's reference to torches for burning the ships (*deus ipse faces*, 'the god himself [provides] the torches,' *Aen.* 5.640). Note too that the women on Lemnos share a single fury (*furor omnibus idem*, 'all shared the same fury,' *Theb.* 5.148), as those on Sicily share a single voice (*vox omnibus una*, 'all shared the same voice,' *Aen.* 5.616).

unwilling to allow their youthful beauty and their fertile years to go to waste (5.106-08). Gleeefully, she proclaims that she has a solution: *inveni, promitto, viam . . . qua renovanda Venus* ('I promise I have found a way for love to be renewed,' 5.109f.). Her solution to erotic problems, however, turns out to be like Shakespeare's solution for legal troubles: 'First thing we do, let's kill all the men.'²⁹ Later, it is true, she will add that Venus has assured her that new and better unions will be forthcoming.³⁰ But her original exhortation omits this crucial detail entirely, and therefore takes the form of an argument that love will somehow be 'renewed' by the sword.

What follows on Lemnos serves, in a shocking way, to bear out this peculiar conception. Concomitantly with Polyxo's peroration, the Lemnian men return to the island to celebrate a night of triumph, in every way. They offer sacrificial victims at the altars, feast, drink, and tell stories (5.174-89). In all of this, of course, they resemble the doomed Trojans of *Aeneid* 2, celebrating in ignorance on the night Troy will fall. Furthermore, Venus has arranged that on this fateful evening, the Lemnians will also succumb to erotic desire:

... dederat mites Cytherea suprema
nocte viros longoque brevem post tempore pacem
nequiquam et miseros perituro adflaverat igni.
(5.192-94)

... Cytherea had made the men gentle on that last night
and, after a long time, had given a brief, futile moment of peace
and had breathed into the wretched men a flame about to die.

In this, they recall that other night of feasting in the *Aeneid*, when Dido takes in with Aeneas' tale of Troy's fall the flame of love that will destroy her. When this fore-'play,' as Hypsipyle calls it, comes to an end (*ludoque licenti / fit modus*, 'there is an end to wanton play,' 195f.), the slaughter begins.

Hypsipyle as Agent?

One striking characteristic of Hypsipyle's narration is the way in which she occupies a variable position, between observer of and participant in the events she narrates, particularly the killing of the Lemnian men. For although she is

²⁹ Cf. Shakespeare, *Henry VI*, part 2 4.2: 'The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers.'

³⁰ In the view of D. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford 1993) 375f., this is the single instance in the *Thebaid* of a traditional Olympian having 'a decisively guiding role in the action.' He notes that Statius mediates this role through the voice of Hypsipyle, hypothesizing that this marks her as a traditional, 'old-fashioned narrator,' in contrast to Statius' own poetic practice.

clearly one of the Lemnian women whose tale she narrates, Hypsipyle's narrative voice vacillates between including herself within the tale by the use of first-person plural forms (what *we* did) and distancing herself from the action, by the use of third-person forms (what *they* did). Her choices in this matter are not predicated upon a simple need for expository variation, but upon a desire to position herself in a particular way *vis-à-vis* the narrative actions she relates.³¹

Following her prefatory exposition, which introduces, as in a prologue, both the locale of Lemnos and the background to the situation, Hypsipyle's first finite reference to the Lemnian women immediately introduces an opposition between herself and them:

*illae autem tristes—nam me tunc libera curis
virginitas annique tegunt . . .*

(*Theb.* 5.81f.)

But the troubled women—for my carefree
virginity and youth sheltered me . . .

The formulation *illae autem . . . nam me* ('but the . . . women . . . for . . . me') functions here precisely like a Greek μέν . . . δέ construction and establishes a clear distinction between the (narrated) others and the (narrating) self. Throughout the section in which she describes the planning and execution of the Lemnian massacre, Hypsipyle consistently excludes herself from the action by the use of third-person verbs to describe the women's acts, *despite the fact* that her own participation is tacitly acknowledged at the origin of the proceedings in the appearance of one first-person plural form: *huc propere stipamur et ordine nullo / congestae* ('hastily and in disorder we were all herded together to this place,' 5.101f.).³²

A particularly striking instance of her effort to maintain for her narrative voice both the authority of autopsy and the innocence of non-participation is the description of the women's bloody oath of conspiracy. Here the active third-person forms: *sanxere fidem* ('they pledged their faith,' 155), *accingunt sese* ('they armed themselves,' 160), *pectora . . . perfringunt* ('they shattered his chest,' 161f.), and *nefas . . . coniurant* ('they swore a nefarious oath,' 162f.) are

³¹ This indeterminate or perhaps opportunistic stance toward the events of one's narration may find a parallel in Aeneas' oddly detached and sometimes voyeuristic account of the fall of Troy. Such a parallel would be particularly charged if, as F. Ahl, 'Homer, Vergil, and Complex Narrative,' *ICS* 14 (1989) 1-31 has argued, Aeneas' rhetoric in *Aeneid* 2 is designed to disguise or revise his role in the events of the tale.

³² Lesueur [4] 238 shrewdly notes that, in the course of her narration, it will serve to Hypsipyle's advantage to exaggerate the violence and furor of the others.

followed by Hypsipyle's passive presence at this spectacle, rendered appropriately distanced and dispassionate by the highly mediated form of a dative participle of a verb of perception: *talia cernenti mihi* ('such things—to me, looking on,' 164). While others actively swore and murdered, she was a mere pronominal and perceptual bystander. In fact, throughout the episode of the killings, Hypsipyle's *only* first-person acts are visual: *vidi* ('I saw,' 223) and *conspexi* ('I spied,' 238).

After the disappearance of the father, however, Hypsipyle emerges for the first time as a genuine agent. The terms in which she describes both the mock funeral of her father and her own accession to the throne express vigorous action (even if, grammatically, some have deponent forms) entirely unlike her earlier self-characterizations: *ipsa quoque . . . molior* ('I myself also build,' 314), *inicio* ('I hurl,' 315), *adsto ense / cruentato* ('I stand with bloodied sword,' 316f.), *plango* ('I lament,' 318), *precor* ('I pray,' 319), *accessi* ('I consented,' 323), and finally *subeo . . . imperium* ('I take up supreme power,' 324f.).

Subsequent to this transformation, Hypsipyle does not distinguish herself from the other women, though the father's rescue would set her uniquely apart from the others. During the later episode of the Argo's arrival, she participates actively along with them in the attack upon the ship: *nos . . . ratae* ('we thought,' 347f.), *scandimus* ('we climb,' 352), *nos quoque . . . tela . . . spargimus* ('we also hurl spears,' 376-80), *nostro petitur . . . arcu* ('it is attacked by our bow,' 380), *instamus iactu telorum* ('we attack with a volley of spears,' 385). Only at the moment when she describes the women's 'spirits softening' (*deriguere animi*, 396) and their gender-appropriate behavior returning (*rediit in pectora sexus*, 'their sex returned to their breasts,' 397) does she seem once again to distance herself from them, perhaps foreshadowing the distinction she will shortly make between the sexual alliances of the other women with the Argonauts and her own relations with Jason.

Thus we see a marked change in Hypsipyle's verbal choices after the 'exit' of Thoas. Let us focus in more closely on the actual dynamics of Thoas' disappearance or rescue. In seeking an answer to the question, 'What really happened to Thoas?' we need to examine in greater detail Hypsipyle's narration of the Lemnian women's uprising.

Love and Death on Lemnos

At one point in her story, Hypsipyle hesitates and delivers a version of the classic bardic formula 'Where should I begin?' (*Theb.* 5.206f.), which the epic poet traditionally uses to signal both the wealth of potential material available and also

his (or, in this case, her) complete control over the possibilities of narrative.³³ The death Hypsipyle decides to narrate, presumably from the mass of bodies among which she had to choose (*scelerum de mille figuris*, 'from a thousand shapes of crime,' 206) will stand paradigmatically for them all.³⁴

This quintessentially Lemnian tale begins with the 'bold' (*temeraria*, 207) Gorge standing over her husband, as he snores in a drunken sleep. What, precisely, she is doing is a little difficult to ascertain. Presumably, she is trying to locate a vital spot in which to wound him, for she is exploring in his garments in some way (*vulnera disiecta rimatur veste*, 'she feels for the wound in his open clothing,' 210) when he awakens.³⁵ Half-awake, and presumably still half-drunk, his immediate response is to embrace his wife (*hostem / occupat amplexu*, 'he takes the enemy in his embrace,' 212f.). At this moment of fatal encounter between husband and wife, the text seems poised precariously between murder and rape. In the extraordinary sequel, 'as quickly' (*nec segnius*, 213) as he had grabbed her, she responds: she 'stabs through his body from behind, until the tip of the sword touches her own breast' (*pone adigit costas, donec sua pectora ferro / tangeret*, 214f.). As he dies, his head falls back, still wearing an amorous (*blandus*, 216) expression, and he is still seeking Gorge with trembling eyes and a soft murmur, still clasping her around the neck (*et murmure Gorgen / quaerit et indigno non solvit brachia collo*, 216f.).

The erotic and the violent are here so intertwined as to be inseparable. If there is a conflation of murder with rape, so also is there a reversal of sexual roles, with the aroused male pierced from behind by the murderous female, while she is clasped in his obviously amorous embrace. If his intention upon waking partakes of an impulse to rape, yet his attributes at death are described in a vocabulary equally suitable to non-violent eroticism. Even the physical roles of the warrior who actively stabs and the victim who passively receives the wound in his or her own breast are inextricably intertwined. Finally, should we inquire what, specifically, Gorge was seeking with her sword in her husband's dishevelled robes? Did she intend to castrate him and end by penetrating him *a tergo* ('from the rear') instead? Is this the ultimate Lemnian encounter, an embrace in which sexual pleasure is indistinguishable from death, in which love-

³³ See A. Ford, *Homer: The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca 1992) 67-79.

³⁴ For a similar reading of this Lemnian moment ('wives hugging their men onto their blades in bed') see Henderson [4] 56 and esp. n. 155.

³⁵ Cf. *Aen.* 11.747-49: *tum summa ipsius ab hasta / defringit ferrum et partis rimatur apertas, / qua vulnus letale ferat* ('Then he broke off the iron tip of the enemy's spear and groped for an open place where he could deliver a fatal wound.').

making and wounding become perfect analogues of one another?³⁶ The fact that this is the one encounter Hypsipyle has chosen out as a paradigm may provide insight as to why her relation to Jason might, in her account, appear at one point under the description of rape, at another under that of romance.

For the rest, Hypsipyle limits her account of the Lemnian slaughter to a catalogue of several brief (though vivid) vignettes of deaths perpetrated by the women of her own family. These cover most of the spectrum of possible familial relations between the women and their victims, including mother/foster-son, mother/son, and sister/brother. We should note that, included among the deaths she mentions are those of her own half-brothers and the young man to whom she is betrothed, Gyas.³⁷ Their deaths are thereby accounted for, but with no action on Hypsipyle's part—except their narration. The death at which her catalogue halts, however, is a daughter/father killing. The sight of this last patricide in fact provides the pretext for her decision to seek her own father and, as her narrative details, to contrive his rescue.

The tale is gruesome—she encounters Alcimede carrying the severed head of her father—a head still murmuring! (236-38). Upon seeing this horror, Hypsipyle explicitly identifies with the crime: *meus ille Thoas, mea dira videri / dextra mihi!* ('He seemed my own Thoas, her hand my own dread right hand,' 239f.). Immediately, she turns away. Actually, the text specifically says that suddenly she found herself in her father's bedroom. Arrived there, she commences to tell her father the tale that in fact she has just narrated in our text: *trepido scelus ordine pando / quis dolor, unde animi* ('I set forth the crime in a jumbled way, what was the women's complaint, where they got the will,' 244f.).³⁸ Textual echoes of *Aeneid* 2 are particularly strong in this passage.³⁹ Not only is Hypsipyle's situation similar to that of Aeneas attempting to rescue his father Anchises from a doomed city, but the text includes specific reminiscences: the father's house is set apart from the city (*Aen.* 2.299f., *Theb.* 5.242f.), parent and child journey together through a city under siege (*Aen.* 2.725ff., *Theb.*

³⁶ Lesueur [4] 237 notes that 'les légendes thébaines présentent deux types de violence: l'une politique et guerrière, l'autre sexuelle.' Yet he (p. 236) also maintains that the Lemnian narrative of Book 5 'est sans rapport avec l'action principale' of the epic.

³⁷ Note Hypsipyle's allusion to him with the phrase, *timebam quem desponsa* ('my betrothed, who awed me,' *Theb.* 5.222f.). Given the Lemnian relations between spouses, it is unlikely that Mozley's coy 'of whom I stood in awe' captures the nature of this relationship (cf. Mozley [25] 19).

³⁸ Here, once again, we have Hypsipyle self-consciously alluding to her own narration or indeed re-narrating her narrative.

³⁹ Cf. D. W. T. C. Vessey, 'Notes on the Hypsipyle episode in Statius, *Thebaid* 4-6,' *BICS* 17 (1970) 47.

5.248ff.), yielding a kind of cinematic collage of horror and destruction, and so forth.

As Hypsipyle and her father make their way through the city, suddenly Bacchus—father of the father—appears to them with a rescue plan. In Statius' version, the result is that Hypsipyle shuts her father in a box of some sort (*curvo robore clausum*, 'enclosed in curved timber,' 287) and sets him out on the water. We may speculate on whether this is indeed a boat, for of course this sequence transpires before the arrival at Lemnos of the 'first' boat, the Argo.⁴⁰ It is perhaps more useful to connect the motif of Thoas' departure with that exemplified in the Perseus/Danae legend. In a reversal of roles in that mythic pattern, here it is the daughter who puts the father in a box and sends him out to sea. Yet, as in the case of the child Perseus (or of the Biblical child Moses or others), we may expect the narrative pattern that the father cast in a box and set out on the waters will also—in some form—return.⁴¹

Before considering the form that the return of the father takes in Statius' text, let us follow Hypsipyle's own return to the city. Having sent her father off, she is now split (*dividor*, 293), but she makes her way back to the father's house. In order not to be found out by the other Lemnian women, she builds a (presumably fake) funeral pyre, tossing her father's effects—sword and clothing—onto it. Dido's reaction to the departure of Aeneas clearly echoes through the passage. But Hypsipyle's act includes a rather puzzling detail. I alluded to it earlier: having built the funeral pyre, Hypsipyle stands beside it, bloodied sword in hand (*adsto / ense cruentato*, 316f.). How, one wonders, did she acquire this instrument? Whose sword is it? (She has just thrown her father's on the pyre.) And, even more important, whose blood is it? The text tells us nothing; in fact, it becomes quite convoluted at this point, as Hypsipyle protests her innocence in clauses jumbled together as clumsily as is the pyre she has hastily assembled (*confusis ignibus*, 'with confused fires,' 316).⁴² Only the

⁴⁰ This aspect of the Lemnian myth involves a problem of origins that would delight the heart of a Derridean scholar. Is Thoas then put out in a ship before the first ship? Furthermore, how did the Lemnian men transport themselves to Thrace before the appearance of the first ship? Origins recede. . . . (I am grateful to Daniel Mendelsohn for discussing this problem with me.)

⁴¹ As W. Burkert, 'Jason, Hypsipyle and New Fire at Lemnos: A Study in Myth and Ritual,' *CQ* 20 (1970) 8, states laconically, '*Apompê* and *adventus* correspond.' I want to thank William Levitan for his extremely helpful thoughts on the implications of this mythical pattern as well as for his broader insights on this episode.

⁴² This poor fire-building technique, by the way, *has* troubled textual critics, while Hypsipyle's brandishing of a bloodied sword has not. Cf. L. Håkanson, *Statius' Thebaid: Critical and Exegetical Remarks* (Lund 1973) 30f.

conclusion is clear: that she accedes, however reluctantly, however guiltily, however confusedly, to her father's *imperium* ('kingdom').

Hypsipyle as Marital Partner (?)

Throughout Hypsipyle's text, the mother is absent. As far as we know, there has been no queen on Lemnos. Thus, with Hypsipyle's accession to the throne, she takes the place of her father, but also by becoming queen she, structurally, takes the place of the (absent) wife of the king. This recognition may help to explain her insistence that, unlike the other Lemnian women (who were sexually attracted to the Argonauts), she alone was raped, with no desire to become Jason's wife. If we understand that Hypsipyle is at least in some symbolic sense wedded to the absent/dead father/king, we have a clearer rationale for both her own representation of her liaison with Jason as rape, *culpa, crimen*, ('fault' or 'crime') and for the text's assimilation of this union to the uneasy union of Aeneas and Dido (herself ambivalent about betraying the ashes of the dead Sychaeus).

Here once more Hypsipyle's narration stands in an ambivalent relation to the text of the *Aeneid*. If, on the intertextual level, this acceptance of the heroic adventurer into the queen's realm and bed corresponds to the fourth book of the *Aeneid*, yet in its most important details the narrative diverges from—indeed reverses—the predecessor text. Most explicitly, the Dido who laments that, as Aeneas deserts her, she has no hope even of the consolation of 'a little Aeneas,' a child who might play in her halls and call to mind the image of his father (*Aen.* 4.328-30) is here replaced by a Hypsipyle who, as a result of Jason's arrival, gives birth not to one but to two sons (*enitor geminos*, 'I bore twins,' *Theb.* 5.464). This birth, however, is by no means tinged with the sentiment of Dido's wistful longing. Hypsipyle makes it exceedingly clear that her maternity was against her will, the result of coercion by the intruder Jason, 'harsh guest' in her bed as well as her realm:

nec non ipsa tamen thalami monimenta coacti⁴³

enitor geminos, duroque sub hospite mater . . .

(*Theb.* 5.463f.)

nor did I myself not give birth to twins—reminders

of a forced marriage bed—made a mother under a harsh guest . . .

⁴³ For *coactus* ('forced') of constrained sexual intercourse, cf. Adrastus' narration of Apollo's union with Psamanthe (the Coroebus tale, 1.578). Note that Atalanta too considers her pregnancy with Parthenopaeus to have been the result of rape (9.570f).

But in addition, Hypsipyle's perspective on her union with Jason also evidently distinguishes her from the other Lemnian women in her account, whom she describes as freely (if tragically) entering into erotic and emotional relations with the Argonauts, with no hint of coercion or even reluctance. She alone was subjected to rape; the others succumbed to love:

(*Theb.* 5.445f., 448f.)

they opened wide their doors to the newcomers . . .

The credibility of this version, however, seems to be called into question by the surprising language of her subsequent thoughts upon the Argo's departure:

(Theb. 5.472-74)

Oh how I wish he had sailed smoothly past my shores,
that man who cares nothing for his own pledges of the heart,
for promised faith . . .

⁴⁴ The relations between this passage and *Aeneid* 4 are dense and intricate in their shared vocabulary of *eros* and compulsion: *culpa* ('fault,' 353; cf. *Aen.* 4.19, 172), *cura* ('care,' 456; cf. *Aen.* 4.1, 521, 531), *vincla* ('bonds,' 457; cf. *Aen.* 4.59), etc. Yet, if Hypsipyle identifies with the victimized Dido, so does her language echo that of the Aeneas who perceives himself as the victim: *non sponte . . . taedas / attigerim* ('against my will I took up the wedding torch,' *Theb.* 5.455f.) cannot but recall *Italiam non sponte sequor* ('against my will I pursue Italy,' *Aen.* 4.361). Cf. Gruzelier [11] 161f.

The terms *pignora cordi* ('pledges of the heart') and *promissa fides* ('promised faith') belong semantically to the realm of the betrayal of erotic trust, not to coerced sexual domination. Has Statius' text somehow been unintentionally infected here by a stray intertextual echo of Vergil's Dido (*Aen.* 4), Catullus' Ariadne (*Carm.* 64), or even the Hypsipyle of Ovid's *Heroides* 6? Or does this inconsistency in Hypsipyle's representation of her situation perform a specific function in the text, to suggest that we call into question her reliability as a narrator?

This sharp discrepancy recalls the earlier pattern of distinction between the use of the first and third persons that characterized Hypsipyle's account of the Lemnian massacre. We may wonder: if this inconsistency in her self-presentation suggests that Hypsipyle's role with her Argonaut lover may not have been so distinct from that of the other Lemnian women, what then of her role in the massacre of the Lemnian men? The oath by which Hypsipyle avows her unwillingness to marry takes a surprising form: *cineres furiasque meorum* ('by the ashes and the furies of my own,' 454). Of course, the use of *meorum* ('my own') may refer to a more or less extended family; but if Hypsipyle herself—by refraining from killing her father—did not participate in the Lemnian crime, what ashes and furies is she alluding to here? As in her lack of sexual desire for Jason, so also—and most dramatically—in her rescue of her father, Hypsipyle's behavior (on her own account) is to be contrasted absolutely with that of the other Lemnian women. If we entertain some doubts about the complete reliability of her own narrative account, however, then, like the nature of Hypsipyle's erotic relations with Jason, so the disposition of her father Thoas may remain uncertain.

The Return of the Father

Immediately following the departure of Jason on the Argo, with a complete lack of motivation or transition striking even in this narrative, the father Thoas does in a sense return to Lemnos. Specifically, he returns as *Fama* (*Theb.* 5.486)—a 'rumor' that reaches the island (in an entirely unspecified way) that Thoas is alive and well and living on Chios. We might note here that Jason's most salient characteristic, as Hypsipyle speaks of him, is his undeniable *fama* (*certe stat fama remotis gentibus*, 'his reputation stands firm, even among distant peoples,' 474). More importantly, however, the narration of Thoas' *fama*—as we learn at several points—is precisely the way in which Hypsipyle herself keeps the father Thoas alive. By repetition she renews both his fame and her own. In this complex of relations, I believe, we can see why Statius' Theban epic 'digresses' for Hypsipyle's book-long narration of the Lemnian massacre and its aftermath.

I suggest that, ultimately, the point of Hypsipyle's narration is this: to tell

the story of the father. And telling that story inevitably raises the question 'What happened to the father?' I am *not* suggesting that the answer is 'The narrator killed him.' But nor is it 'The narrator preserved/saved him.' Rather, the point of the narrative lies in the very problematization of the question itself, the very undecidability of the issue. Hypsipyle's narrative, like the language of the unconscious, employs various forms of condensation, displacement, repetition, and repression to suggest many more possibilities concerning the father than those it expresses on the surface. In her decision to *integrare* ('renew') the *immania vulnera* ('enormous wounds') that characterize the story of the father, the narrator Hypsipyle does preserve, but also eliminates, replaces, and reproduces the father all at once.

In my view, this narrative enables the poet to dramatize *in parvo* ('in small compass') the larger question of the relation to the father, which is relevant *both* to the tale of Oedipal Thebes with which it intersects *and* to the project of Statius *vis-à-vis* the poetic father, Vergil. That dramatization will inevitably be marked by ambivalence and follow a circular path back to the point of origin. In philological terms, we might formulate this nexus of relations, detours, and returns in terms of *Quellenforschung*, taking note of both *imitatio* ('imitation') and *variatio* ('variation'). In Bloomian criticism, we would speak of the belated poet's need to produce a strong mis-reading of the precursor poet. In Freudian theory, as I have tried to indicate, we might treat Hypsipyle's narrative as an analytic discourse, clearly showing the return of the repressed, as well as features like transference and resistance. Whichever theoretical paradigm we choose, however, it is clear that the narrative represents more than an irrelevant or superfluous 'digression.'

It seems appropriate to conclude with a return, specifically to Statius' relationship to Vergil. My reading has implicitly suggested an identification between the female narrator Hypsipyle and the poet himself.⁴⁵ In recent studies, several critics have proposed a congruence between the voice of the poet and the voice of the woman in the poetic text.⁴⁶ I suggest that Statius' text may indeed give us reasons for attending particularly to its feminine discourse. Presumably,

⁴⁵ In his understanding of Dante's reading of Statius, W. Wetherbee, 'Dante and the *Thebaid* of Statius,' in *Lectura Dantis Newberryana* 1 (1988) 86, has introduced the tentative suggestion that, on ethical grounds, Dante may posit an identity between Hypsipyle and Statius: 'I would suggest that Statius, as embodied in the *Thebaid*, is for Dante a kind of Hypsipyle.'

⁴⁶ J. DeJean, *Fictions of Sappho 1546-1937* (Chicago 1989) 60-78; M. Suzuki, *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic* (Ithaca 1989) 17. See also S. Spence, *Rhetorics of Reason and Desire: Vergil, Augustine, and the Troubadours* (Ithaca 1988) 22-51.

such a thought would not greatly have surprised the poet's contemporary, Juvenal, who alludes to Statius' epic as *carmen amicae* / *Thebaidos* ('the song of his girlfriend, Thebais,' 7.82f.). While it is true that Juvenal's satiric voice is particularly fond of feminizing the objects of its scorn, in this instance, it may also pick out something significant about Statius' text.⁴⁷

Let us consider Statius' own statement of his work's relation to Vergil's *Aeneid*. The poet concludes his *Thebaid* with a valediction addressed to the poem itself. This ten-line epilogue consists primarily of a statement of poetic confidence and self-advertisement of the familiar type most aptly epitomized by Horace's proverbial *exegi monumentum aere perennius* ('I have erected a monument more lasting than bronze,' *Odes* 3.30.1). Less familiar, however—indeed, unique—is Statius' penultimate sentiment, a direct exhortation to his completed epic to follow in the path of the *Aeneid*, but at a respectful distance:

vive, precor; nec tu divinam Aeneida tempta,
sed longe sequere et vestigia semper adora.
(*Theb.* 12.816f.)

Live on, I pray; yet do not try to rival the divine *Aeneid*,
but follow at a distance and worship its footsteps.

This is perhaps the most explicit intertextual reference in Latin epic, inviting us as readers to juxtapose at every moment this self-proclaimed epigonal text against the touchstone of the master, Vergil. But no; the specific text echoed here leads us to configure the relation between the two epics differently: not in fact as master and apprentice, but virtually as husband and wife.

For the traces of Statius' text following adoringly in the footsteps of Vergil's:

sed longe sequere et vestigia semper adora.
(12.817)
but follow at a distance and worship its footsteps.

lead us back to the faithful Creusa of the *Aeneid*, obediently trailing behind her husband:

... et longe servet vestigia coniunx.
(*Aen.* 2.711)⁴⁸

⁴⁷ See J. Henderson, 'Satire Writes "Woman": *Gendersong*,' *PCPhS* 215 (1989) 50-80.

⁴⁸ This characterization seems specific to the *Thebaid*, however; elsewhere, in the *Silvae*, Statius does designate Vergil the master: *Maroneique sedens in margine templi/ sumo animum et*

... and let my wife stay in my footsteps at a distance.

This figure of Statius' *Thebaid* as the female trailing faithfully behind the footsteps of the predecessor, at once self-effacing and highly self-conscious, may serve as an apt representation, not only for Hypsipyle's ambivalent relation to her father, but also for the poet Statius' relation to his poetic father.

Feeney's appreciative reading of the *Thebaid* argues that Statius' own belatedness in the epic tradition, because so freely and self-consciously acknowledged, becomes itself the basis for 'an astonishing exercise of resilient originality.'⁴⁹ That is, far from down-playing or attempting to minimize his massive indebtedness to his predecessors, Statius in fact foregrounds it. Through analysis of several episodes, Feeney reveals a poet so thoroughly aware of his dependence upon the tradition that he does not hesitate to say, in effect, 'We all know how this bit goes; just hum along with me' Yet that very fluency in the inherited language of epic enables the poet to say new things.⁵⁰

If this view of Statius' relation to the poetic father(s) is correct, it does indeed bear comparison to the dynamics of Hypsipyle's narration. For it is clear from the very beginning (*o pater! illa ego nam . . . / illa, . . . raptum quae sola parentem / ocului*, 'Oh, father! For I am that one . . . that woman who, alone, concealed the father I had snatched [from death], 5.34-36) that the tale she tells depends upon the father. Yet, in many senses, it depends precisely upon his absence—from the heap of male corpses, from the island of Lemnos, from the textual space itself. It is this very absence that empowers Hypsipyle to make the father's story, which is in fact her own story, present. She would have no narrative without him; but she would have no narrative with him; and somehow these truths, taken together, enable this female narrator to tell a story uniquely hers (while also, inevitably, that of the father).

magni tumulis adcanto magistri ('sitting at the edge of Vergil's shrine I summon my courage and sing at the tomb of the great master,' *Silv.* 4.4.54f.).

⁴⁹ Feeney [30] 339.

⁵⁰ In his study of the Hypsipyle episode, in relation to Statius' models, Vessey [39] 48 concludes 'These elements were forged into something new, independent and effective, not merely as an isolated digression but also within the totality of the Theban epic.'

TONGUE IN CHEEK FOR 243 LINES? THE QUESTION OF JUVENAL'S SINCERITY IN HIS SEVENTH SATIRE

Peter Tennant

Department of Classics, University of Natal
Pietermaritzburg 3201

Abstract. It has been argued that Juvenal's apparent support for poets and other intellectuals in their need for patronage is ambivalent and undercut by ironic deflation. This paper questions the validity of such a viewpoint and maintains that Juvenal's sole purpose is a bitter indictment of the wealthy for their failure to provide meaningful support. The plight of intellectuals is thus portrayed in a sympathetic rather than cynically mocking manner.

'When [Juvenal] wrote Book I, he was derisively unsympathetic towards serious poetry; now he thinks of it as a noble aspiration which deserves encouragement. He said then that it was a useless occupation, and added that the results bored him to death. Now he admires the poet who pawns his overcoat and dishes to keep him alive while finishing his tragedy, and he expresses kindness for the poet laureate Statius who had to write ballet-scenarios in order to pay the grocer's bill.' So wrote Highet,¹ who, in the words of Wiesen,² 'neatly sidesteps the problem by simply assuming a change of heart' on Juvenal's part. After being so maligned in the first satire,³ the more conventional poets of Juvenal's day might well have approached the seventh satire in a decidedly cynical frame of mind.

Rejecting the likelihood of a sudden change of attitude by Juvenal when he came to compose the seventh satire, Wiesen suggests that 'we may discover that Juvenal has not really altered his opinion at all and that beneath the superficial sympathy of *Satire 7* he has concealed a scorn and hostility that contradicts the

¹ G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford 1954) 107.

² D. Wiesen, 'Juvenal and the Intellectuals', *Hermes* 101 (1973) 465 n. 1.

³ An aggressive and mocking attitude is evident at the outset: *semper ego auditor tantum? numquamne reponam / vexatus totiens rauci Theseide Cordi? / inpune ergo mihi recitaverit ille togatas, / hic elegos?* . . . ('Must I always be a listener only, and never hit back, / although so often assailed by the hoarse Theseid of Cordus? / Never to obtain revenge when X has read me his comedies, / Y his elegies? . . .', *Sat.* 1.1-4) All translations of Juvenal's *Satires* (except for several isolated words and phrases) are taken from N. Rudd (tr.), *Juvenal: The Satires* (Oxford 1991).

apparent thesis of the poem'.⁴ In a more recent study, Braund sees the combination of a new element of sympathy for the plight of the intellectuals with the familiar hostility of earlier satires as indicative of a change in *persona* and approach: 'The speaker's attitude is ambivalent. This double-edged and ambivalent treatment of the intellectuals is the first manifestation of Juvenal's new technique of irony with its double point of view'.⁵ With reference to the opening twelve lines of the satire, Braund⁶ maintains that the apparent sympathy for the plight of poets, who have been reduced to menial positions, is undercut by a 'few dissonant notes': the fact that the poets consider it neither *foedum* ('unseemly') nor *turpe* ('disgraceful') to become auctioneers is indicative of a loss of all moral sensibility; the juxtaposition of the 'elevated and aloof world of poetry' with the 'harsh and mundane world of reality' incongruously 'reduces the Muse to a beggar, interested only in money'; and the inclusion of lofty-sounding tragedies on mythological themes in the auctioneer's junk is an indication of how worthless and trashy such poetry is.⁷ Braund goes on to assert that the entire poem is pervaded by this double point of view and that many statements, which on the surface are favourable to the intellectuals, are 'invariably intermingled with or followed by words, phrases and ideas which conflict with that sympathy'.⁸

The argument that Juvenal is being deliberately ambiguous in his treatment of poets and other intellectuals who depend on the patronage⁹ of wealthy benefactors cannot go unchallenged, even if one runs the risk of appearing not only to be insensitive to a newly found subtlety in Juvenal's satirical method but also to be content with taking him at face value. For it seems to me that Juvenal's

⁴ Wiesen [2] 465.

⁵ S. H. Braund, *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires* (Oxford 1988) 29f. See also A. Hardie, 'Juvenal and the Condition of Letters: The Seventh Satire', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 6 (1990) 158-60.

⁶ Braund [5] 30.

⁷ Braund [5] 30 quotes Wiesen [2] 469: 'If Juvenal were sympathising frankly and unambiguously with talented writers forced by grim necessity to auction off their excellent but unsaleable works, these poems would hardly form the climax in a list of second-hand junk'. Compare also N. Rudd, *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry* (Cambridge 1976) 90f.: 'A particularly dense effect is obtained when lofty tragedies with noble old titles are included in a pile of secondhand junk'.

⁸ Braund [5] 31.

⁹ P. White, 'Amicitia and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome', *JRS* 68 (1978) 74-92 cautions against importing anachronistic notions of 'literary patronage' into a context that was essentially one of *amicitia* and asserts (p. 78) that 'there is little or nothing which singles out poets from their companions who are not poets'.

central purpose in this satire is an unequivocal and forthright condemnation of the failure of the rich to use their wealth to nurture poetry and other intellectual pursuits; when Juvenal portrays the actual condition of contemporary writers, lawyers and teachers, this is not an exercise in ironic deflation and an undercutting of his apparent sympathy for their plight, but rather a bitter indictment of those whose selfish greed is directly responsible for the malaise. In other words, this satire represents an extension (albeit in a suitably modulated form) of Juvenal's *ira* and *indignatio* into another area of life, where the wealthy nobility is guilty—yet again—of failing in its duty.

But how is one to reconcile Juvenal's ostensibly mocking dismissal of contemporary poetry in the first satire, in particular,¹⁰ with his role as champion of poets and other intellectuals in the seventh satire? Friedländer made a general observation that is pertinent here: he noted that 'it probably hardly ever occurred to Juvenal to try to avoid altogether language that might be inconsistent with that of some other satire; he seems to always have to have kept steadily before him *just the immediate effect that he sought to produce*' (my italics).¹¹ Friedländer cites examples of such inconsistencies, such as Laronia's defence of female athletes at 2.53 (*luctantur paucae, comedunt colyphia paucae*, 'few of us wrestle; few of us feed on fighters' meat') and the contradictory question at 6.246f. (*endromidas Tyrias et femineum ceroma / quis nescit?*, 'purple tracksuits, and mud from the ring where women wrestle, are familiar sights').¹² Now it may be objected that this and other examples of contradictory attitudes

¹⁰ There is a similar jibe at *Augusto recitantes mense poetas* ('poets reading their work in August') in *Sat.* 3.9.

¹¹ L. Friedländer (tr. J. Martyn) *Essays on Juvenal* (Amsterdam 1969) 40.

¹² Compare also *Sat.* 3.49 (where Umbricius asks: *quis nunc diligitur nisi conscius?*, 'Who, these days, inspires affection except an accomplice?') with *Sat.* 9.96 (where Naevolus says: *qui modo secretum commiserat ardet et odit, / tamquam prodiderim, quidquid scio*, 'The man who has recently told me his secret is angry and hates me. / He suspects I've given away what I know.'). Juvenal also exploits religion to good effect: e.g., in *Sat.* 6 he extols the simple piety of Numa's time (342ff.) in contrast to the foul desecration of the Bona Dea rites, described in the preceding lines; yet he adopts a very different manner (humorously, of course) when he berates Mars (and Romulus) for not reacting in anger at the shocking perversion of the marriage of a Salian priest to another man (2.126-32). Similarly he draws on the mythology of the 'Golden Age' in his lament for the decline of chastity (6.1ff.), yet he makes no secret of his scepticism about traditions relating to the Underworld at the end of *Sat.* 2. Furthermore, contradictions may occur within the *same* poem: e.g., in *Sat.* 15 he mocks the Egyptians for abstaining from leeks and onions for religious reasons (9-11) but speaks approvingly of Pythagoras who also refused to eat certain vegetables on principle (171-74)—on which contradiction see E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London 1980, 34f.; see also 13.181-92, 247-49.

are of less significance than the weightier question of his attitude towards writers and other intellectuals, who occupy such a prominent position at the beginning of the first satire and in the seventh satire as whole. Nonetheless, it can be argued that, in his justification of his choice of *genre* in the first satire, Juvenal deliberately and humorously¹³ contrived a vigorous and 'iconoclastic' attack on contemporary poets and their work as a *captatio benevolentiae*, and that his remarks there should not be taken as a reliable indication of his position with regard to the broader and more serious issue of the plight of intellectuals *in general*, which he addresses in the seventh satire. Furthermore, Juvenal was not unique in basing his defence of satire on a ridiculing of the tedious irrelevance and artificiality of the mythological themes that dominated contemporary poetry. Juvenal's acknowledged model, Lucilius, himself mocked writers of epic and tragedy for their fantastic subject matter and high-flown style;¹⁴ so, too, did the satirist Persius (1.30-35, 104-06). Juvenal was in fact exploiting something of a satiric convention.¹⁵ Furthermore, Juvenal's aversion to public recitals by long-winded poets is something shared by Horace (*Serm.* 1.4.74-78) and Persius (1.13ff., 79ff.) alike. It can be argued, therefore, that the conventional nature of these elements of Juvenal's *apologia*, together with the fact that he was clearly intent upon creating a lively and arresting introduction to the first satire, should make one wary of assuming that the ridicule there has a necessary bearing on his attitude towards the predicament of writers—especially poets—in the seventh satire. In other words, the immediate context and objective were probably decisive in shaping both the tone and content of the satirical attack at the beginning of *Satire 1*;¹⁶ this did not preclude a sympathetic treatment of the more serious issue of the plight of writers, whose creativity was being stifled by the lack of adequate patronage.

¹³ On Juvenal's tone here see the remarks of E. J. Kenney, 'The First Satire of Juvenal', *PCPhS* 8 (1962) 30. Juvenal's audience would no doubt have enjoyed, too, the wry humour of Umbricius' complaint about *mille pericula saevae / urbis et Augusto recitantes mense poetas* ('the countless threats of a savage city, / not to speak of poets reading their work in August', 3.8f.).

¹⁴ See the discussion by N. Rudd, *The Satires of Horace*, Cambridge 1966, 108-10.

¹⁵ Horace, on the other hand, was far more deferential towards the practitioners of the 'higher' forms of poetry, as opposed to his 'humbler' *genre* of satire, and even stated (perhaps rather disingenuously) that he would not presume to snatch satire's crown from Lucilius' head (*Serm.* 1.4.39-44; 1.10.40-49).

¹⁶ Thus, in the fifth satire, Juvenal's exasperated criticism of Trebius' gullibility is a dramatically effective way of throwing the character and behaviour of the despicable patron into sharper relief and should not be viewed as a contradiction of his sympathy for the clients' miserable lot, as expressed, for example, in *Sat.* 1.132-34.

To what extent, then, can Juvenal be defended against the charge that his attitude towards intellectuals in the seventh satire is ambivalent, and that what appears to be sincere sympathy on his part is undercut by ironic deflation? I propose to concentrate on some features of Juvenal's treatment of the plight of the two groups of intellectuals with whom he begins and concludes his poem: the *poetae* ('poets') and the *grammatici* ('teachers').

The precise identity of the *Caesar* mentioned in the opening line is largely irrelevant;¹⁷ more important are the emphasis on the fact that the emperor is the only person recently to have shown concern for writers and the brevity of the compliment to the emperor concerned (in comparison with the space devoted to the miserable plight of the intellectuals). The emphatic juxtapositioning of the words *tantum* ('only', 1) and *solus* ('alone', 2) raises the question: why have *other* wealthy and traditional patrons not given the necessary encouragement and support? (This point is reiterated in lines 22f.: *si qua aliunde putas rerum speranda tuarum / praesidia*, 'if you expect support for your fortunes from anywhere else'). The compliment to the emperor is immediately overshadowed by a vivid description of the desperate plight of *celebres notique poetae* ('distinguished and famous poets', 3). It is significant that Juvenal describes the indigent poets as 'distinguished and famous', a clear indication that he does not have in mind the hack poets whom he ridicules in the introduction to the first satire; the early reference to the 'dejected Muses' (2) shows that he is addressing a considerably weightier subject than his self-serving mockery of trite poetic themes in his first satire. The seriousness of the decline in the fortunes and status of writers is brought home forcefully by the fourth line, in which the *celebres notique poetae* are depicted trying their hands at lowly and demeaning occupations. The word *temptarent* ('tried', 5) suggests an effort at least by the poets to make a living and thus indicates a measure of sympathy and understanding on Juvenal's part.¹⁸ I would therefore disagree with Braund's assertion that 'the fact that the poets think it *nec foedum . . . nec turpe* ('neither unseemly nor disgraceful', 5) to become auctioneers suggests that they have lost all moral sensibility';¹⁹ the point is that, if starvation (*esuriens*, 'in search of a

¹⁷ The reference is most likely to Hadrian. For a full discussion of the problem see Rudd [7] 84-89. See also Hardie [5] 179 and n. 143, where there is a brief survey of the main contributions to the debate.

¹⁸ Wiesen [2] 469, intent upon reading irony into the word *temptarent* ('tried'), asks in an aside: 'Did they fail at this too?' So, too, Braund [5] 55: '*temptarent* (5) begins to cast doubt on the poets with its hint that they meet with failure even in such a menial role'.

¹⁹ Braund [5] 30; cf. Wiesen [2] 469. Hardie [5] 169f. makes the puzzling assertion that 'at 3ff., the poets reject fame (*celebres notique*, 3), the traditional aspiration of the aristocratic Greek poet, for the obscurity, but warmth and profit, of the bath-house keeper or baker'. To

meal', 7)²⁰ forces the Muse herself to 'leave the vales of Aganippe and head for the auction-rooms', should her protégés be derided for turning to a comparable occupation in order to survive? Braund maintains that sympathy for the poets is 'wiped away' by incongruities: first, in the idea that a metaphysical or superhuman being (i.e., the Muse) can experience hunger; secondly, in the idea that the vales of Aganippe and the Roman auction halls are both places in the same plane and category and between which it is possible to move. It is indeed the very *incongruity* of these images that makes them so effective; but, far from alienating the audience's sympathy, it is more likely to have impressed on them the extent to which poets and their art had been degraded by poverty.²¹ Satire can be enhanced by imaginative—even startling—imagery.

From line 22 onwards Juvenal becomes wholly absorbed in the dereliction of their duties by wealthy patrons. Throughout this passage (22-29), Juvenal shows his indignation at the futility of poetic endeavour in the absence of financial support—for that is the crux of the matter, as the prosaic *praesidia* ('support', 23) emphasises.²² He expresses his indignation in his utterly cynical advice to the self-deluding poet and in his portrayal of the way in which the art of poetry has in effect been reduced to futile privation and drudgery:

si qua aliunde putas rerum speranda tuarum
praesidia atque ideo croceae membrana tabellae

attribute any enthusiasm to the poets' enforced involvement in what Juvenal later describes as *indignum laborem* ('demeaning labour', 17) would make nonsense of the obvious intention of this passage, an intention that Hardie [5] 170 alludes to as a possibility: 'Juvenal may intend a contrast between the fame of the poets and the social *infamia* of their adopted activities'.

²⁰ Braund [5] 30 says that the Muse is reduced to a beggar '*interested only in money*' (my emphasis). This inference detracts from the element of sympathy and is unwarranted: the Muse is *starving*, which hardly suggests that mere cash is her objective. Likewise, I see no justification for Wiesen's remark [2] 469: 'Perhaps the Muse in her straits had become a *meretrix* ["harlot"]'.

²¹ Similarly, when Juvenal imagines the inhabitants of the Underworld 'purifying' themselves upon the arrival in their midst of the soul of a noble pervert (*Sat.* 2.153-58), is that bizarre image more likely to have offended than entertained his audience?

²² P. White, 'Positions for Poets', in B. Gold (ed.), *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (Austin 1982) 50-66, draws attention to the mercenary expectations evident amongst poets of the Silver Age and points out (p. 61) that 'this attitude would be entirely consistent with the new money-mindedness observable in other careers during this period'. It is unlikely that poets during any period could expect to earn a living from their writings *per se* (see White [9] 86f.), but the 'patronage' of a supportive *amicus*, one imagines, could afford material benefits in a variety of ways apart from direct monetary 'handouts'. Juvenal himself provides a good example when he complains that the *reges* ('lordships') are too mean to pay for the hire of benches and seats for a recital (*Sat.* 7.45-47).

impletur, lignorum aliquid posce ocius et quae
 componis dona Veneris, Telesine, marito,
 aut clude et positos tinea pertunde libellos.
 frange miser calamum vigilataque proelia dele,
 qui facis in parva sublimia carmina cella,
 ut dignus venias hederis et imagine macra

(Sat. 7.22-29)

But if you expect support for your fortunes from anywhere else,
 and, in that hope, are filling your pages of yellow parchment—
 quick, Telesinus, go and obtain some kindling wood,
 and then present your poetic creations to Venus' husband,
 or close your books and lay them aside for the tunnelling worm.
 Break your pen, poor fellow, destroy those sleepless battles,
 you who are fashioning lofty poems in your tiny attic,
 with the aim of winning a garland of ivy and a famished bust.

Yet the cynicism that pervades this passage does not call into question Juvenal's sympathy for his fellow poets, whose desperate plight has already been vividly portrayed in lines 3-16. The focus, ultimately, is not an ironic exposé of the intrinsic worthlessness of Telesinus' poetry but on the *cause* of the crisis affecting him and other poets. The attack on the aristocracy for its greed and selfish neglect of the *diserti* ('intellectuals') is too sustained and single-minded throughout the satire to suggest that Juvenal would have undermined his seriousness at the outset by denigrating the very people whose plight gave rise to his attack.

Line 30 marks the beginning of the real attack on the *dives avarus* ('miserly magnate'), whose dereliction of duty was hinted at earlier (*si qua aliunde putas . . . praesidia*, 'if you expect support from anywhere else', 22f.). The hollow trappings of recognition—an ivy garland and an emaciated bust—represent the sum total of the rich man's contribution to the welfare of the poet:

spes nulla ulterior; didicit iam dives avarus
 tantum admirari, tantum laudare disertos,
 ut pueri Iunonis avem.²³

(Sat. 7.30-32)

²³ Braund [5] 33f. cites this line as an example of ironic undercutting: 'No *direct* criticism of the intellectuals is made. But their case is undermined by the suggestion that their aim in life is *ut dignus venias hederis et imagine macra* ('with the aim of winning a garland of ivy and a famished bust', 29) and by the many other less than flattering visions with which the poem abounds . . .'. I think that this misses the point: Juvenal is making the sardonic observation that the poet can expect *nothing more substantial* from the *dives avarus*—in other words, *financial support*; that is made clear by the very next sentence: *spes nulla ulterior* ('there is no hope beyond that'). It is not the poet's ambition that is being criticised but the meanness of the 'patrons'.

There is no hope beyond that. The miserly magnate has learned
to admire and praise accomplished writers—and do nothing about it,
like children with Juno’s bird.

It is as if the poet has become a mere object for the momentary entertainment of onlookers, a notion aptly conveyed by the picture of children gawking at a peacock. Juvenal then reflects on the cruel reality that the prospect of embarking on an alternative career is becoming increasingly remote:

sed defluit aetas
et pelagi patiens et cassidis atque ligonis
(*Sat.* 7.32f.)

Meanwhile the time of life is passing,
which could put up with the sea, the spade, and the helmet.

The ensuing mood of cynical disillusionment is vividly portrayed in the next couplet:

taedia tunc subeunt animos, tunc seque suamque
Terpsichoren odit facunda et nuda senectus
(*Sat.* 7.34f.)

Then weariness enters the heart, and age, with its literary skill
and without a rag to its back, curses itself and its Muse.

Wiesen comments that ‘the reader may perhaps sense a fellow-feeling for failed poets that could arise from Juvenal’s own bitter experience’,²⁴ while Rudd remarks that ‘the section ends on a more subdued note’.²⁵ I should say that ‘poignant’ would be a more apt description of the tone of these lines and that they reflect a very real empathy on Juvenal’s part; this empathy is not an isolated occurrence in the poem. Whether or not Juvenal is drawing on his own experience here, it is a remarkably sensitive evocation of the feeling of weary disillusionment that manifests itself in a complete loss of self-esteem and in a turning against the very source of inspiration on which the poet thought he could depend. The sense of wasted talent and inevitable destitution is made all the more poignant by focusing on a man too old to contemplate an alternative career.

The first thirty-five lines of the poem—and particularly the last four lines of that section—are meant to arouse sympathy for the impoverished poets and hostility against the neglectful and selfish patrons. The overriding concern of this satire is the ‘bread and butter’ issue of the intellectual’s access to enough money

²⁴ Wiesen [2] 472. See also the comments of Hardie [5] 153.

²⁵ Rudd [7] 94.

to secure the *otium* necessary for the promotion of his art. If this point is not recognised, then one runs the risk of misconstruing the intention of Juvenal's repeated focus on the intellectual's most basic requirements, as demonstrated, for example, by Wiesen's comment on lines 66-71: 'Again Juvenal interrupts the poet's grand illusions and drags him back to reality by reminding him of his basic physical needs'.²⁶ It is precisely the non-fulfilment of those basic needs that is stifling artistic creativity. This sense of futility and frustration is the focus of more detailed treatment in lines 48-52:

nos tamen hoc agimus tenuique in pulvere sulcos
ducimus et litus sterili versamus aratro.
nam si discedas, laqueo tenet ambitiosum
[consuetudo mali, tenet insanabile multos]²⁷
scribendi cacoethes et aegro in corde senescit.

We still keep at it, however, driving furrows along
the powdery dust, and turning the shore with our barren plough.
For if you try to break free, you are held in a noose by the craving
to excel as a writer, which becomes a chronic disease in your heart.

The metaphor in the first two lines is not original,²⁸ but is highly appropriate in its symbolism of wasted effort. Juvenal's handling of the image is effective: not only is the 'barrenness' of present literary patronage stressed by the conglomeration of words like *tenui* ('powdery'), *pulvere* ('dust'), *litus* ('shore') and *sterili* ('barren'), but it is precisely Juvenal's identification with his fellow poets (48f.) that negates any attempt to read into these lines a denigration of contemporary poetry *per se*.²⁹ The compulsion to write is not something easily forsaken: the craving for excellence is like a noose about the neck or—worse still—an incurable disease 'grows old' in one's sick heart.³⁰ Far from arousing feelings of

²⁶ Wiesen [2] 475.

²⁷ Missing from the Leiden manuscript and almost certainly a gloss. See Courtney [12] 356f.

²⁸ See J. Ferguson, *Juvenal: The Satires* (New York 1979) 220; Courtney [12] 356, Braund [5] 210. The thought underlying the passage has much in common with one of Martial's epigrams (1.107) and would seem to have been inspired directly by it (note, too, that both Juvenal and Martial use Horace and Vergil as *exempla*).

²⁹ Wiesen [2] 474 argues that '... Juvenal makes not the slightest effort to argue that the poetry of his time is rich with a merit that deserves, but is independent of, material rewards. On the contrary, he surrounds poetry with the image of sterility and sickness ...'.

³⁰ *Senescit* ('grows old', 52) echoes *senectus* ('old age') in line 35 and may well provide another insight into Juvenal's own feelings. Certainly, lines 53ff. seem to come 'from the

disgust against poets and their art,³¹ these startling metaphors³² give expression to the pitiful dilemma of poets who persevere against all odds. Likewise, when Juvenal states that he cannot point out but only 'feel' the existence of a *vates egregius* ('peerless poet'), he does not intend this as mere disparagement of the poets of his day (himself included, as line 48 would imply),³³ but is addressing a far more serious issue and one directly pertinent to the central theme of the poem: neither a Horace nor a Vergil would have risen to the heights that they did in the absence of adequate support from their patrons; the *dives avarus* of Juvenal's day was in effect preventing the flowering of such talent. Wiesen actually recognises the possibility that 'Juvenal might claim that he cannot find a great talent because no writer has the ease and comfort to polish his art to high excellence', but diminishes its significance by concentrating on what he perceives to be Juvenal's characteristic shiftiness and elusiveness, in particular the way in which he 'ridicules by parody what he seems to admire' and the way in which he 'interrupts the poet's grand illusions and drags him back to reality by reminding him of his basic needs'.³⁴ Wiesen, however, resorts to parody as an

heart'. W. S. Anderson, *Essays on Roman Satire* (Princeton 1982) 286, who has warned about the dangers of the 'biographical method', notes: 'In Satire 7 the speaker avoids speaking about himself, and yet a certain impression of his person penetrates the introduction'. That impression is certainly quite pronounced in the present passage.

³¹ Wiesen [2] 475 asks: 'But if poetry is a kind of mental cancer, then why should society reward its victims?' Similarly, Braund [5] 58: 'The fierce images of disease and degeneration (*cacoethes*, *aegro*, *senescit*) do not argue for his honorification by society but evoke an unsettling image of the poet as a leper of society'. Such interpretations fail to acknowledge that Juvenal is more likely to be depicting the dilemma of the committed but utterly frustrated artist in suitably painful and discordant imagery, and that this sad state of affairs is not the fault of the suffering poet but of the neglectful patron.

³² Braund [5] 40 recognises the 'novel and unparalleled' vocabulary used in the metaphor *scribendi cacoethes* ('an itch to write'), but does not allow this to deter her from asserting that 'it probably sounded clichéd'.

³³ Wiesen [2] 475 asks: 'Would not the writers whom Juvenal is supposedly defending here object to their champion's statement that he cannot point to a more than ordinary and trivial poet?' (cf. Braund [5] 58). This is to shift attention away from the main point—the absence of a contemporary 'Horace' or 'Vergil' because of inadequate patronage. Juvenal is talking about truly outstanding talent, and it would be strange if his contemporaries would really have felt aggrieved at the obvious truth of his assessment. Braund's comment ('But the alternative—that there are no contemporary poets worthy of patronage—is present with equal force') misses the point: Juvenal is not implying that such poets are *unworthy* of patronage, but that the *lack* of patronage has prevented the development of a *vates egregius*. That the latent talent exists is implied by line 56: *hunc, qualem nequeo monstrare sed sentio* ('the sort of man I cannot point to but only feel').

³⁴ Wiesen [2] 475.

explanation, because he cannot accept the simple thesis that Juvenal is accentuating the miserliness of the rich 'patrons' by exposing their failure to help their supposed protégés with their most ordinary requirements.³⁵ It is indeed remarkable to what basic and mundane factors Juvenal *does* attribute the malaise: the *vates egregius* can realise his potential only if his mind is 'freed from anxiety and bitterness' (*anxietate carens animus . . . omnis acerbi / impatiens*, 57f.) and if he enjoys a harmonious relationship with the creative forces of poetic inspiration (*cupidus silvarum aptusque bibendis / fontibus Aeonidum*, '[a mind] that loves the woods and is worthy to drink from the Muses' fountain');³⁶ and this state of mind is directly dependent upon financial security:

... neque enim cantare sub antro
 Pierio thyrsumque potest contingere maesta
 paupertas atque aeris inops, quo nocte dieque
 corpus eget. . . .
 (Sat. 7.59-62)

... whereas disconsolate Hardship
 cannot sing in a Pierian grotto or grasp the thyrsus,
 for she lacks the money which, day and night,
 the body requires. . . .

Juvenal employs here the familiar technique of juxtaposing the sublime and the mundane in order to stress the direct relationship between the poet's physical well-being and his creativity; this is exemplified by the humorous picture of Horace poetising on a full stomach: *satur est cum dicit Horatius 'euhoe'* ('Horace's stomach is full when he cries "all hail!"', 62). The essential seriousness of Juvenal's argument is confirmed by the following passage, in which freedom from anxiety (*anxietate carens animus*, 'a mind released from anxiety', 57) is stressed as a prerequisite for single-minded devotion to creativity:

quis locus ingenio, nisi cum se carmine solo
 vexant et dominis Cirrhae Nysaeque feruntur
 pectora vestra duas non admittentia curas?
 (Sat. 7.63-65)

³⁵ Rudd [7] 96 recognises the importance of the contrast: 'After these noble lines [sc. 53-59] Juvenal introduces a jarring note—deliberately, because he is moving back down to the practical point of his argument' (Rudd then quotes lines 59-62).

³⁶ This is the antithesis of the state of mind portrayed in lines 34f.: *taedia tunc subeunt animos, tunc seque suamque / Terpsichoren odit facunda et nuda senectus* ('Then weariness enters the heart, and age, with its literary skill / and without a rag to its back, curses itself and its Muse.').

Where can genius find room, except in the heart that trembles
at song alone, and is carried away by the lords of Cirrha
and Nysa, excluding all but that one compulsive concern?

Not content with this, Juvenal reiterates his argument with reference to Vergil himself; again he employs a similar technique:

magnae mentis opus nec de lodice paranda
attonitae currus et equos faciesque deorum
aspicere et qualis Rutulum confundat Erinys.
nam si Vergilio puer et tolerabile dasset
hospitium, caderent omnes a crinibus hydri,
surda nihil gemeret grave bucina.

(Sat. 7.66-71)

It calls for a lofty soul, that is not disturbed by the thought
of buying a blanket, to behold horses and chariots and the sight
of gods and the terrible face of the Fury as she crazed the Rutulian.
If Vergil had been without a slave-boy and decent lodgings,
the snakes would have dropped from her hair; and her trumpet,
bereft of sound, would have blared forth no menacing note.³⁷

The stultifying effect of the lack of material support on the level of creativity is strikingly symbolised by the imaginary enfeeblement of one of Vergil's most powerful images. Furthermore, Juvenal again makes it clear that the support expected of a concerned patron is actually very modest: all that the great Vergil needed was a *tolerabile hospitium* ('decent lodgings') and a *puer* ('slave-boy'). Juvenal's empathy with the suffering poet is revealed again in the following lines:

poscimus ut sit
non minor antiquo Rubrenus Lappa coturno,
cuius et alveolos et laenam pignerat Atreus?

(Sat. 7.71-73)

So how can we ask
that Rubrenus Lappa should rise to the heights of the ancient buskin,
when his Atreus pawns his coat, along with his cup and saucer?

It is difficult to believe that Juvenal is being anything other than sympathetic towards Rubrenus or that his *Atreus* is meant to invite ridicule.³⁷ The question

³⁷ Wiesen [2] 476 comments: 'Even if poor Rubrenus Lappa had not been forced to pawn his trays and cloak to write his *Atreus*, he still would have produced only another inflated mythological poem'. See also Braund [5] 59. Yet there is nothing in this passage to suggest that Juvenal is ridiculing Rubrenus' work; on the contrary, his aim is to arouse sympathy

forms an apt conclusion to a section in which Juvenal has focused on the disturbing facts that (a) his age has produced no *vates egregius* (like Horace or Vergil) and (b) that this malaise is *not* the fault of the poets themselves but of the *dives avarus*. It is also appropriate that Juvenal immediately gives an example of the type of 'patron' whose meanness and selfishness are frustrating the efforts of writers like Rubrenus:

non habet infelix Numitor quod mittat amico,
 Quintillae quod donet habet, nec defuit illi
 unde emeret multa pascendum carne leonem
 iam domitum; constat leviori belua sumptu
 nimirum et capiunt plus intestina poetae

(Sat. 7.74-78)

Impoverished Numitor has nothing to give his client; he does have enough for gifts to Quintilla; nor did he lack the funds to buy a lion (already tamed), who had to be fed with masses of meat. I suppose a beast is less expensive, and it takes so very much more to fill a poet's guts.

Juvenal persists with the theme that what poets require from their patrons is substantial support (i.e., money), and that the trappings of recognition and praise (as described in lines 29-32) are not enough. The uselessness of fame alone is vividly illustrated by the cameo of Statius, who enjoys a popularity bordering on adulation; yet he is merely a source of titillation exploited for momentary pleasure. Courtney is correct when he observes that Statius is compelled to prostitute his talent³⁸; the degradation is complete when Statius is forced to assume the role of pimp and sell the 'virgin Agave' to Paris. However, Juvenal's purpose is not to hold Statius up to ridicule:³⁹ like the *celebres notique poetae* (3), who have to resort to bath-houses and bakeries in order to survive, he too is compelled to demean himself and his art. The alternative is put quite bluntly: if he doesn't pander to the tastes of the masses, he starves (*esurit*, 87). Juvenal proceeds to exploit the embarrassing fact that some poets now have to abandon their traditional patrons and turn to a source of patronage as unsavoury as the world of theatre, because that is where the real power and influence reside.

(*poscimus ut?* . . . , 'do we demand that? . . .') for the poet in his thwarted efforts to rise to greater heights.

³⁸ Courtney [12] 360.

³⁹ Anderson [30] 285 goes so far as to talk of 'patent affection' on Juvenal's part. On the other hand, Helmbold and O'Neill, 'The Form and Purpose of Juvenal's Seventh Satire', *CPh* 54 (1959) 102f. argue that the 'Caesar' named in the first line of the satire is Domitian, who was the patron of Statius, and accordingly interpret the passage as hostile towards the poet.

However, he does not allow the unpalatable truth about the plight of such poets to distract his audience from the real target of his contempt. Lines 93-97 (like lines 8-12, 71-73 and 86f.) make a point of exonerating the unfortunate writers:

haut tamen inideas vati quem pulpita pascunt.
quis tibi Maecenas, quis nunc erit aut Proculeius
aut Fabius, quis Cotta iterum, quis Lentulus alter?
tum par ingenio pretium, tunc utile multis
pallere et vinum toto nescire Decembri.

But you shouldn’t resent a bard who wins his bread from the stage.
Who will be a Maecenas today? Who Proculeius?
Who a Fabius, or a second Lentulus, or another Cotta?
Genius then was fairly rewarded. A pallor brought profit
to many, and so did abjuring wine for the whole of December.

The dominant issue in this passage is that of rewarding talent and dedication fairly, and this is restated in the very next sentence: *vester porro labor fecundior, historiarum / scriptores?*, ‘Next I address the writers of history: what about *your* work? Is it any more fruitful?’ (98f.). One cannot, therefore, minimise the importance of the main thrust of Juvenal’s argument by asserting instead—as Wiesen does—that Juvenal ‘leaves the reader with the idea that the essence of being a poet is the possession of a pallid face and the practice of grim abstemiousness at holiday time’.⁴⁰

The *grammatici* are the lowest paid and most shabbily treated of the intellectuals engaged in the public domain, and thus provide the climax to Juvenal’s indictment of the rich ‘patrons’ who exploit them. The latter—even more so than the *rhetoires* (‘teachers of public speaking’)—fulfil the important role of being *in loco parentis*, and thus give particular relevance to the sentiments expressed in lines 207-10:

di maiorum umbris tenuem et sine pondere terram
spirantisque crocos et in urna perpetuum ver,
qui praeceptorem sancti voluere parentis
esse loco.

God grant that the earth lie soft and light on the shades of our forebears,
that fragrant crocus may bloom on their urn in eternal spring.
They believed no less respect was due to a teacher
than to a parent.

⁴⁰ Wiesen [2] 478; cf. Braund [5] 60.

The portrayal of the *grammaticus* is both emotive and sympathetic, while the anger and contempt directed at those responsible for his debasement are more pronounced than anywhere else in the satire. The *grammaticus* is paid even less than the *rheto*r (215f.). To make matters worse, he (like the lawyer at 122f.) suffers the additional humiliation of having to forfeit some of it to the *paedagogus* ('pupil's attendant') and to the *dispensator* ('cashier', 218f.); the extent of this humiliation is emphasised by the comparison to the petty and demeaning haggling of a pedlar over a mat or blanket (220f.). The debasement of the role of the *grammaticus* is reflected by the nature of the environment in which he is expected to work: cramped, dark and malodorous. The image of the soiled and soot-encrusted copies of Horace and Vergil (226f.) is a most effective symbol of that debasement. As if that is not enough, the teacher's humiliation is exacerbated by having to take legal action to secure payment. Throughout this passage, of course, Juvenal is using exaggeration for dramatic effect; but there can be no doubt that his intention is to arouse sympathy for the lot of the down-trodden *grammaticus*. Braund remarks that the comparison of the *grammaticus* with a huckster is 'degrading, with its incongruous mixture of the intellectual and the mundane'.⁴¹ Exactly, yet this does not imply that the *grammaticus* himself is to be held responsible for that degradation and that Juvenal is therefore undercutting sympathy for his plight; if the picture of a stained Horace and a blackened Vergil is 'irreverent', it is surely not a reflection on the attitude or capability of the *grammaticus* himself. Any teacher who has had the dubious pleasure of distributing grubby and defaced texts of Shakespeare to a class of recalcitrant schoolchildren will testify to that!

That the *grammaticus* cannot be held responsible for the situation he finds himself in is shown even more clearly by the contempt for the parents for their unreasonable and pedantic expectations of the teacher (229-36): his grammar must be faultless and he must be ready to answer the most obscure literary questions—even when he's heading for the public baths. Both Wiesen and Braund regard the pedantic knowledge that the *grammaticus* is expected to expound as an indictment of himself and his profession.⁴² Yet this is to ignore the fact that Juvenal leaves the reader in no doubt that such pedantry is insisted upon by the parents themselves; *they* are the ones who impose the *saevae leges*

⁴¹ Braund [5] 66.

⁴² Wiesen [2] 482: 'Such ludicrous examples of exaggerated obscurity illustrate Juvenal's opinion of the pedantic material treated in the school of the *grammaticus*'; Braund [5] 67: 'The bombardment of increasingly pedantic, futile and obscure questions, impossible to answer and absurd to ask, not only exposes the fatuity of the parents but also debases the profession of the *grammaticus*. People who spend their time on such absurdities deserve all they get'.

('stricter standards', 229) to which the teacher is bound to conform; it is *they* who expect the teacher's encyclopaedic knowledge to be at their beck and call at the most inappropriate times and places. The picture that Juvenal presents of the hapless *grammaticus*, trapped between the unreasonable expectations and the disrespect of his 'customers', is very reminiscent of the dilemma of the *rhetor*, described in lines 150ff. Yet the position of the *grammaticus* is even more invidious than the latter's, and Juvenal's attack on the parents becomes more bitter and sarcastic: he is expected to mould the children's characters and to become in reality a father to the group (*pater ipsius coetus*', 240). Juvenal is exposing not only the arrogance of the parents' expectations—together with the implication that they are shirking their own responsibilities—but also their ignorance of the squalid reality that their own children represent to the teacher:

... ne turpia ludant,
ne faciant vicibus, non est leve tot puerorum
observare manus oculosque in fine trementis
(*Sat.* 7.239-41)

... to stop them playing indecent tricks
and doing it to each other. With so many pupils, it's hard
to watch the hurried movements of hand and eye at a climax.

Few passages in Juvenal can match this for withering contempt;⁴³ the concluding couplet not only intensifies the condemnation of the parents' arrogance and ignorance but also returns to the central theme of the satire: the grossly inadequate remuneration that the intellectuals receive from the rich:

'haec' inquit 'cura; sed cum se verterit annus,
accipe, victori populus quod postulat, aurum'.
(*Sat.* 7.242f)

'These are your duties', he says. 'But at the end of the session,
you'll get as much cash as the crowd demands for a winning fighter.'

As Courtney observes, 'thus brains are dragged down to the level of brawn ... and the *grammaticus* gets in a year what a gladiator gets for a single success'.⁴⁴ In his description of the plight of the *grammatici*, Juvenal is unequivocal in presenting them as the down-trodden and exploited victims of the rich; the latter,

⁴³ Wiesen [2] 482 is still intent upon implicating the *grammaticus* in the blame for the malaise affecting his profession: 'The gross obscenity that concludes the list of the teacher's duties seems to sum for Juvenal the ugliness of his life and the stupidity of his work'.

⁴⁴ Courtney [12] 380. A victorious gladiator was paid 500 sesterces if *auctoratus* ('hired out') or 400 if a slave by the *editor* ('producer').

on the other hand, are characterised as arrogant, insensitive and mean, an impression strongly reinforced by the tone and substance of the concluding pronouncement. To claim, therefore, as Braund does, that 'it is hard to have unalloyed sympathy with the *grammaticus*' and that the adverse comparison with the pay of the victor 'may seem to be no more than poetic justice'⁴⁵ is entirely unconvincing.

Throughout this satire Juvenal has presented the debasement of the intellectuals as the consequence of impoverishment, and this in turn is to be attributed primarily to the selfishness of the rich. When Juvenal says that he cannot point out a single contemporary poet of extraordinary talent or describes the tedious irrelevance of the subjects taught by the *rhetor* and the *grammaticus*, he makes it abundantly clear that he does not hold the practitioners responsible; on the contrary, they are sympathetically portrayed as the unfortunate victims of poverty through circumstances beyond their control. If Juvenal had really been intent upon denigrating poets and other intellectuals, he would not have focused on the destructive role of the *dives avarus* with such vigour and consistency. The prominence of this theme alone militates against theories that impute an almost schizophrenic vacillation on Juvenal's part between sympathy and ironic deflation.

⁴⁵ Braund [5] 68.

LUCAN'S MARBLE GARDENS: JUVENAL, *SATIRE* 7.79F.

Michele Valerie Ronnick

Department of Greek and Latin Languages and Literatures, Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202, USA

Abstract. While there is a tone of irony and sarcasm in the phrase *in hortis marmoreis* (Juv. *Sat.* 7.79f.) vis-à-vis a contented Lucan basking in wealth and literary renown, the words also allude to Lucan's grave, *cepotaphia* and the marble carvings of vegetal design that adorned Roman tombstones and sarcophagi.

contentus fama iaceat Lucanus in hortis
marmoreis . . .

(Juv. *Sat.* 7.79f.)

Content with his reputation
Lucan may lie in gardens made of marble . . .

The commentary concerning these lines has up to now been of a similar nature. Duff simply notes that gardens were 'adorned with statues.'¹ Courtney says that *marmoreis* ('made of marble,' 80) was meant 'sarcastically, as if statues covered all the grass in his [Lucan's] *horti* ["gardens"]' and points to Lucan's 'inherited wealth' as the source.² Ferguson terms this 'a brilliantly ironical phrase—all marble, no green.'³ Clearly, Courtney and Ferguson are correct in regard to their observations about irony and sarcasm, but I here suggest an additional interpretation, a deeper meaning based upon intentional double entendre.

In this section of the satire, Juvenal has joined Lucan with two other men, Saleius Bassus and Serranus (*at Serrano tenuique Saleio*, 'but for Serranus and slender Saleius,' 80). The trio is an appropriate grouping because each member wrote epic poetry, and each one died in his youth. Of the three young men, Lucan alone achieved a reputation equal to his own wealth. Bassus seems to have been subsidized by Vespasian, and the 'thin' Serranus died deeply in debt.⁴ Juvenal's over-all point, therefore, is to reveal the hollow nature of literary glory, especially if it comes without material reward.

¹ J. D. Duff (ed.), *Juvenal: Satires* (Cambridge 1970) 269.

² E. Courtney (ed.), *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London 1980) 359.

³ J. Ferguson (ed.), *Juvenal: The Satires* (New York 1979) 222.

⁴ On Bassus see Tac. *Dial.* 9. On Serranus see Mart. 4.37. On the two men together see Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.89f.

Thus Lucan could certainly lie content with his fame in his marble-studded gardens, as he probably did during his lifetime. But what is to preclude us from viewing these 'marble gardens' as a grave or graveyard which was decorated not only with marble carvings of vegetal and floral design but also with actual plantings?⁵ Funeral gardens adjoined to tombs are known to us today from several marble plans found in Italy.⁶ Petronius' *Satyricon* provides us with an example of such, as Trimalchio describes his own funeral monument around which he wants *omne genus enim poma . . . et vinearum largiter* ('every kind of fruit in fact and plenty of vines,' *Sat.* 71.7). As for the verb *iaceo* ('to lie prostrate'), its meanings include 'dead,' the sense it has in Juvenal's tenth satire (*iacuit Catilina cadavere toto*, 'Catiline lay prostrate with his body intact,' 10.288). More evidence is supplied by the ninth century Montepessulanus Pithoeanus (P), a manuscript, according to Duff, with 'no rival in merit.'⁷ There we find the reading *taceat* ('he may be silent'), not *iaceat* ('he may lie').⁸ 'Silent' certainly suggests 'dead.'

In this way Juvenal can point out the fleetingness of life and the inequities of the hunt for literary success using evidence of Lucan's own age. Unable to fit the cumbersome word *cepotaphia* ('garden tombs') into the meter of his poetry, Juvenal created *hortis marmoreis* ('gardens made of marble').⁹ Thus Lucan, satisfied with his own fame, lies, silent perhaps as P suggests, in his own tomb, in *hortis marmoreis*, a phrase whose sarcastic irony cuts both ways.

⁵ I am grateful to an anonymous referee for suggesting that I bring up the idea that the image of the 'marble gardens' includes both real and artificial floral and vegetal designs.

⁶ J. M. C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (Ithaca 1971) 98f.

⁷ Duff [1] xlv.

⁸ Duff [1] 44.

⁹ On the term *cepotaphia* and its use in inscriptions, consult Toynbee [6] 94-100. See also the comments on *cepotaphia* of M. S. Smith (ed.), *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis* (Oxford 1975) 196f. I am grateful to the same anonymous referee for pointing this note out to me.

REGARDING A VERBAL FORM IN THE *CARMEN DE HERBIS*

Maria del Henar Zamora Salamanca

Department of Greek Philology, University of Valladolid
Valladolid 47003, Spain

Abstract. The form $\alpha\rho\omega$, which is in the archetype of the poem that deals with the magic-medicinal powers of plants (179), known as the *Carmen de Herbis*, written between the second and third centuries AD, should be understood as $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega$, second person aorist imperative of the verb $\acute{\alpha}\rho\nu\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, not as a future of the verb $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega$.

Περὶ βοτανῶν, better known as the *Carmen de Herbis* or the *Carmen de Viribus Herbarum*, is an interesting anonymous fragment of a Greek didactic poem that was written between the second and third centuries AD. Each of the sixteen chapters that have been preserved deals with the magic-medicinal powers of one plant. A very simple tradition has handed the text down to us:¹ all the preserved copies depend upon the oldest one, which is the archetype; this can be found in the codex *Vindobonensis Med. Gr.* fol. 388r-392r, which was written at the beginning of the sixth century AD.²

Line 179 (the first line of chapter 14) reads: Μῶλυ δὲ ῥιζοτομισθὲν ἄρῳ πρὸς φάρμακα λυγρὰ. The form ἄρῳ ($\alpha\rho\omega$ in the archetype) is deserving of our attention. Observe that the α - occupies the second short of the third foot of the hexameter; however, this α - should be long, because it comes from the contraction of $\alpha\epsilon$, the hiatus in the stem of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega$; in view of this, it appears that the form does not belong to the paradigm of this verb but rather is from the future or aorist stem of the verb $\acute{\alpha}\rho\nu\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$. It is unsurprising that the stems $\alpha\rho$ - of the verbs $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega$ and $\acute{\alpha}\rho\nu\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, with long and short respectively, were confused when it was not possible to mark a difference between the syllabic quantities. Note, for instance, the confusion produced in the manuscript tradition of Sophocles' *Ajax* 75, where the form of the middle voice $\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\iota$ ³ was mistakenly revised by other

¹ A list of the copies, ten in all, is to be found in E. Heitsch, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Andromachos, Markellos von Side und Zum Carmen de Viribus Herbarum* (Göttingen 1963) 45.

² Cf. R. Barbour, *Greek Literary Hands* (Oxford 1981) 1. This is a famous codex because it also contains the *Materia Medica* of Dioscorides.

³ This form has been restored from Hesychius; cf. the 'Appendix' in R. C. Jebb (ed.), *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments 7: The Ajax* (Cambridge 1896).

hands that changed it first into ὀρηῖς and later on into ὀρεῖς.⁴

The short quantity of the alpha, therefore, shows that the form in the archetype, αρω, belongs to the paradigm of ἄρνυμαι. Although this verb is not often used with the meaning of ‘catching’ something material like a plant—in fact, this would be the only case in the extant fragment of the *Carmen*: the rest are forms of the paradigm αἶρω (as noted below)—the most usual meaning of ἄρνυμαι is ‘to obtain’, ‘to get’, ‘to take’ and there are some examples in which its direct object is not an abstract noun.⁵ It is therefore perfectly acceptable to use ἄρνυμαι to express the idea of ‘getting’ or ‘managing to have’ a plant, the Homeric μῶλυ, which is referred to in this chapter of the *Carmen*.

From a morphological point of view, it is obvious that a form in -ω cannot belong to the paradigm of ἄρνυμαι because this verb is deponent. That the omega is an incorrect graph is not difficult to show. Observe that the *Carmen* has been written with the usual structures of this type of didactic composition where a learned person, speaking in the first person, teaches his student, who is the subject of all the verbal forms in the second person singular. Consequently most of the chapters begin with the ‘teacher’ exhorting the ‘lad’ to pay attention and to look at the plant that he goes on to explain: λάμβανε (52, 196), αἶρειν ἐπιβάλλεο (74, 128), δίζεο (140), φράζεο (105), αἶρε (24, 40) and αἶρειν (121).⁶ Only the ninth chapter (114) begins with two verbal forms of the intended future in the first person: νῦν δ’ ἦτοι ἐρέω μάλ’ ἀριφραδὲς οὐδέ σε κεύσω, but their presence undoubtedly makes sense within the structure of the poem. Most editors, failing to heed the short quantity of the alpha, read the form αρω as the first person future of αἶρω; however, when considering the other chapters of the poem, it is apparent that the form αρω at the beginning of the fourteenth chapter should be taken as a *second* person imperative. This line of reasoning

⁴ It must be pointed out that in J. Bailly’s dictionary (rev. L. Séchan and P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Grec-Français*²⁶ [Paris 1950]) this same form has been used as evidence of a future of the verb αἶρω with short α.

⁵ Cf. Liddell, H. G. and Scott, R. (edd.; rev. H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie), *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford 1968) or F. Rodríguez Adrados (ed.), *Diccionario Griego Español* (Madrid 1980) s.v. ἄρνυμαι: τὴν [a prisoner] ἄρετ’ ἐκ Τενέδοιο γέρων (*Il.* 11.625); οὐδ’ ἄν νηῦς . . . ἄχθος ἄροιτο (*Il.* 20.247); ἔν’ οἴκαδε κέρδος ἄρηαι (*Hes. Op.* 632); λέχος ἄρνυσο νεώτερον (*Sapph.* 121); etc.

⁶ The archetype has a gap at the beginning of the fifth chapter, which prevents us from knowing the first line. Nevertheless, according to line 55, which reads ‘to the works of the illustrious Afrodita’, one might suppose that this chapter also began with an exhortation encouraging readers to collect the artemisia (the plant described) for use as an aphrodisiac.

must have been the one followed by the copyist of the codex *A*,⁷ whose labour in general is very thoughtfully carried out,⁸ as he emends the form of the archetype by turning it into ὄρεϊς. Although he also makes the mistake of thinking that it belongs to αἶρω and although no logical explanation of the graphic confusion of -ω and -εις can be found, he is correct in supposing that in the original there should have been a second person. Bearing this in mind and remembering that the form αρω of the archetype must belong to ἄρνυμαι on account of the short α, it seems likely that the grapheme ω hides ου and therefore that the original form would have been ὄροῦ. The substitution of ω for ου (and vice versa) is common in the papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods.⁹ In the *Carmen* from the Viennese Codex this is not the only example: Hermann takes ως in line 185 to be the masculine plural accusative of the relative.¹⁰ In fact, apart from many morphosyntactic mistakes, the errors present in the reading of the *Vindobonensis* show to a large extent the phonetic evolution of the koine in its late period. Thus there are countless examples of iotacism and itacism, confusion in the indication of vocalic quantity, monophthongisations, etc.

So I propose that the form αρω of the archetype must be understood as ὄροῦ, second person singular of the aorist middle imperative of ἄρνυμαι. Finally, note that aorist imperatives in the poem do not reveal a different tone from those of the present: μίσγε (198) as opposed to μῖξον (34), σύγχριε (35) to χρῖσαι (199), λαμβανέτω (135) to ἀποπτυσάτω (137) and, now, αἶρε (24, 40) to ὄροῦ (179) are nothing more than morphological variants used in an attempt to obtain the best adjustment to the metre.

⁷ Monasterii Lavrae, Athous 1885-Ω75, fol. 238-42, which was written in the twelfth century.

⁸ The copyist of the codex *A* tries to rectify what he thinks are errors and mistakes of the model, such as επιβαλλοειο (128) for ἐπιβάλλεο, συμβαλλον (18) for σύμβαλον, κοπτομαινη (33) for κοπτομένη, αιμα τεοισκιρωθεν (33) for αἷμα δ' ἐπισκιρρωθέν, etc. But the copyist's careful work sometimes leads him astray from the original text: νῦν δὴ τὴν ἱερὴν μάλ' ἀριφραδὲς ὦδε τ' ἐνεῖπω (114) is his interpretation of what has been written in the *Vindobonensis* as νυνδητοιερωμαλαρειφραδεσουδεσε-νευσω, that is to say, νῦν δ' ἦτοι ἐρέω μάλ' ἀριφραδὲς οὐδέ σε κεύσω; cf. Heitsch [1] 46f.

⁹ Cf. F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* I (Milan 1976) 208f.

¹⁰ The correction is also extended almost to the entire line, which has been totally corrupted.

**PERSUADING A FEMININE AUDIENCE?
GRATUITOUS INVECTIVE APOSTROPHE
IN JUAN LUIS VIVES'
ON THE EDUCATION OF A CHRISTIAN WOMAN**

Edward V. George

Department of Classical and Modern Languages and Literatures, Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas 79409, USA

Abstract. Juan Luis Vives' treatise on educating women discloses liberal use of a harsh device here labelled the 'gratuitous invective apostrophe,' which assumes, with or without warrant, the edified female's guilt. The occurrences of this device, which abandons the diplomacy that commonly characterizes Vives' other persuasive pieces and his rhetorical theory, bear interpretation as admonitions supplied to male and female preceptors, who can supplement persuasion of women with compulsion.

Juan Luis Vives, the expatriate Spanish humanist of the early sixteenth century and sometime colleague of Erasmus, produced a series of works on rhetoric, notably the *De Consultatione* (*On Giving Advice*) of 1523, the *De Ratione Dicendi* (*On the Art of Speaking*) of 1533, and portions of his treatise *De Disciplinis* (*On the Academic Disciplines*) of 1531.¹ He is also well known as the author of *On the Education of a Christian Woman* (*De Institutione Feminae Christianae*; hereafter *DIFC*).² Printed in 1523 and reissued in at least forty editions and translations before 1600,³ it is an extensive lifetime guide for feminine behavior from cradle to widowhood.

There are, then, *prima facie* reasons to presume that the *DIFC* is an opportunity to observe Vives' techniques for persuading women. This opportunity would need exploiting; for even though some of his best rhetorical

¹ I am indebted to *Scholia*'s editorial advisor, Bernhard Kytzler, and to Charles Fantazzi for their numerous helpful comments. Dr Fantazzi also generously shared with me the manuscript of his forthcoming bilingual edition, complete with an index of sources, of the *DIFC* in the Selected Works series of Vives published by E. J. Brill. I also benefited from conversations with David Larmour and with various attenders at the 1994 conference at Texas Tech University on Golden Age Spanish Poetry.

² The *DIFC* is in vol. 4, pp. 65-301 of G. Majansius (ed.), *Juan Luis Vives: Opera Omnia* (Valencia 1782-90); hereafter *VOO*. Citations of *VOO* are by volume and page number, with punctuation and orthography adapted. For clarity I occasionally cite the *DIFC* by book and chapter. Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own.

³ R. Kelso, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance* (Urbana 1956) 72.

advice deals with *decorum*, including adaptation to a particular audience,⁴ and even though like his contemporaries he regards women as a class with special characteristics,⁵ Vives only barely discusses women as a distinctive audience in his rhetorical theory.

But the expectation that the *DIFC* can be used in this way is complicated by the diversity of readerships envisioned by the composer. Among them are: the dedicatee, Katharine of Aragon, whose virtues Vives says the *DIFC* will mirror (*VOO* 4.69); Katharine's seven-year-old daughter Mary Tudor, the supposed primary beneficiary, whom Vives advises to read the volume;⁶ the virgins, married women, and widows to whom the three books of precepts are respectively directed;⁷ and finally, a more general audience of guides and directors of women. This last group is implied in the literary form of the *DIFC*, which alternates freely between passages obviously meant for the eyes of the girl or woman to be edified, and prescriptions to be read by the female's mentor, whether feminine or masculine. For more specific evidence of an assumed male component to the readership of the *DIFC*, we can resort to the introductory epistle to Vives' *De Officio Mariti*, on the duties of a husband, the male-directed counterpart to the second book of the *DIFC*, which appeared six years later (1529). There (*VOO* 4.302) Vives acknowledges to his male dedicatee that he had included in the *DIFC* material equally applicable to men and women, not anticipating that there would be a demand for a new volume for men. It is to men's enthusiasm for the *DIFC* that he responds in producing the *De Officio Mariti*. And finally, it is hard to imagine the considerable popularity suggested by the proliferation of editions of the *DIFC* without positing a male audience of purchasers. Thus in the process of dealing with the *DIFC* as a source text for Vives' persuasive practices with females, we need to consider the extent to which the envisioned audience of the work is indeed female.

⁴ See D. P. Abbott, 'Juan Luis Vives: Tradition and Innovation in Renaissance Rhetoric,' *Central States Speech Journal* 37 (1986) 193-203, esp. 199.

⁵ Women cannot be counted on to exercise discrimination in their reading (*VOO* 4.89); they cannot easily keep a single objective in mind when pursuing a line of thought (4.118); they are weaker in both body and spirit (4.373); etc.

⁶ *Leget haec monita mea Maria filia tua* ('Let Mary, your daughter, read these admonitions of mine,' *VOO* 4.69), counsels Vives to Katharine.

⁷ Although one book is aimed primarily at each of these classes, all women are expected to profit from reading the entire work (*VOO* 4.66).

1

One frequent and highly visible rhetorical device, which I call the gratuitous invective, the main topic of this study, offers a touchstone in the attempt to answer this question. By means of this device, Vives contrives to place the female reader-to-be-edified in the role of a guilty party, whether or not she merits such treatment. What follows is an analysis of the gratuitous invective in the *DIFC*, its origins, use, and impact, the questions it raises about the implied readership, the ways in which it unveils some of Vives' attitudes, and its implications in the panorama of Vivesian rhetoric.

Two essential characteristics define these gratuitous invectives. First, they contain second person addresses to the reader.⁸ In this respect they modify the fundamentally non-dramatic texture of the *DIFC*, composed of third-person statements such as, 'Parental indulgence which affords unhindered licence to pursue a thousand vices is a considerable obstacle to children' (*VOO* 4.73), and so forth. Secondly, the device exhibits, at greater or lesser length, a pair of linked movements. In the first we find an emotionally neutral attitude toward the reader, or an element such as a conditional sentence that raises the mere possibility of guilt on the reader's part. In the second, the passage switches into *assuming* the reader's guilt in some measure, employing second person indicatives or imperatives aimed at the reader. For example:

Si tu non aliter loqueris quam meretrix, qua fronte uti te pudicam esse credam postulas? 'Non vidisti,' inquis, 'me cubantem cum viro; nec meretricem vidi.' Sed quod argumentum in omni natura usurpamus, non vis in te valere, ut de internis per externa iudicemus? Postulas ut aquam contineri credam in dolio, ex quo video vinum profluere?

(*VOO* 4.134)

If you talk just like a prostitute, how can you be so brazen as to insist that I consider you chaste? 'Well,' you say to me, 'you haven't seen me sleeping with a man, and I haven't seen a prostitute.' But aren't you then wanting to be exempt from a proof that we employ universally, that one judges the inner reality by appearances? Are you insisting that I should assume there is water in a jar from which I see wine pouring out?

The passage begins with a non-committal conditional sentence, continues with a universal statement about the validity of a particular type of argument, and then climaxes with a series of indicatives (*inquis*, *vis*, *postulas*), which put pressure on

⁸ Of course, not all the second person addresses in the *DIFC* need to be impassioned. Vives often slips into second person imperatives or hortatory subjunctives that do not carry special emotional weight in the sense I identify here. See below, p. 101, Table 1, Category C.

the reader to contend with the impression that she is already at fault. Blunt derogatory epithets of the kind seen here often figure in the device.

In another example (*DIFC* 1.13), Vives warns young women against the enticements of suitors in the heat of passion:

Non magis audiendus amans quam incantator aut veneficus; aggreditur hic suavis ac blandus, et primum omnium puellam laudat, captum se dicit eius forma . . . vocat te formosam, venustam, ingeniosam, facundam, nobilem; et forsán nihil horum es, sed tu illa mendacia libenter audis: stulta, putas te videri talem, cum non sis? Sed fac esse; num etiam prudentem adiecit? Num pudicam? . . . Quid inde? Periturum, nisi potiatur. . . . Quod si perit, quanto consultius est tibi perire illum quam te?

(*VOO* 4.148)

You should give a lover no more of a hearing than an enchanter or poisoner. A lover's approach is sweet and seductive; right away he compliments the girl, confesses that her beauty has captivated him . . . ; he calls you lovely, ravishing, clever, eloquent, noble. Perhaps you are none of these things, but you are eager to listen to the lies. You blockhead! Do you think you can appear to be all these things which you are not? Or let us even grant the truth of such declarations: did he add 'circumspect'? 'chaste'? What next? (he avows) that he will perish unless he wins you. Suppose he does! Better that he should perish than you!

Non audiendus [est], 'should not be listened to,' is a general directive. The lover is at first non-specific: his addressee is merely *puellam* ('a girl'). But then *te* ('you') becomes the object of the present tense verb *vocat*, and the quickly ensuing second person verbs (*es*, *audis*, *putas*, *sis*) confirm the extent to which Vives has freed himself to make his assumed reader the suitor's dimwitted target. The applicability of the word 'perhaps' (*forsán*) is at first ambiguous; it may or may not render hypothetical the notion 'you are eager to listen.' However the assumed reader at once becomes *stulta* ('a blockhead'), the ambiguity is removed, and the reader is left to contend with the imputation of guilt.

As for its origin, the gratuitous invective of course calls to mind the rhetorical figure apostrophe, which Quintilian (a favorite authority of Vives) cites as follows:

Aversus . . . a iudice sermo, qui dicitur ἀποστροφή, mire movet, sive adversarios invadimus: 'Quid enim tuus ille, Tubero, in acie Pharsalica?' sive ad invocationem aliquam convertimur: 'Vos enim iam ego, Albani tumuli atque luci'; sive ad invidiosam implorationem: 'O leges Porciae legesque Semproniae!'⁹

(*Inst.* 9.2.38)

⁹ Tr. H. E. Butler, *Quintilian* 1-4 (Cambridge, Mass./London 1963).

Apostrophe . . . which consists in the diversion of our address from the judge, is wonderfully stirring, whether we attack our adversary as in the passage, 'What was that sword of yours, Tubero, doing in the field of Pharsalus?' or turn to make some invocation such as, 'For I appeal to you, hills and groves of Alba,' or to entreaty that will bring odium on our opponents, as in the cry, 'O Porcian and Sempronian Laws.'

It can have a pathetic effect on the ordinary public, observes Lausberg, as it constitutes the expression of an emotion that cannot be directed through the normal channels of communication between speaker and audience.¹⁰ In Quintilian's terms, the gratuitous invective assigns the accused reader the role of 'adversary' (e.g., Tubero in Quintilian's example), in itself an interesting commentary on Vives' attitude toward the females to be instructed; and the pointed personal involvement into which the writer thereby draws the reader can create the pathetic effect to which Lausberg refers.

But by the evidence of his own citations of earlier literature, Vives found the gratuitous invective tactic in the practice of the Church Fathers, not in classical rhetorical theory. The use of the second person may be traced to patristic epistolary style. For instance, in cautioning widows about second marriages Vives quotes the following passage from a letter of Jerome to his follower Furia, a widowed mother:

'Parvulos meos quis erudiet? et vernulas quis educabit?' Et hanc, pro nefas! causam opponunt matrimonii, quae vel sola debuit nuptias impedire: superducit mater filiis non nutricium sed hostem, non parentem sed tyrannum. . . . Quid obtendis patrimonium? Quid superbiam servulorum? Confitere turpitudinem: nulla idcirco maritum ducit ut cum marito non dormiat; aut si certe libido non stimulat, quae tanta insania est, in morem scortorum prostituere castitatem ut augeantur divitiae? . . . Si habes liberos, nuptias quid requiris? Si non habes, quare expertam non metuis sterilitatem, et rem incertam certo praefers pudori?

(VOO 4.298: cf. Jerome, *Epist.* 54.15 = PL 22.557f)

'Who will rear my little children, who will train my young home-servants?' How disgusting! They offer as an excuse for marriage the very thing which should have prevented them from marrying: a mother takes on for her children not a stepfather but an enemy, not a parent but a tyrant. . . . Why do you offer the need to protect your inheritance as an excuse? Or the arrogance of your servants? Own up to your shame. No one marries a man without intending to sleep with him. Or even if lust is not the motive, what kind of madness is this, to throw away your chastity just like a whore to add to your wealth? . . . If you have children, what do you need a marriage for? If not, why don't you dread

¹⁰ H. Lausberg (tr. J. P. Riesco), *Manual de retórica literaria: Fundamentos de una ciencia de la literatura* 2 (Madrid 1983) 193.

the sterility you have already proven, now choosing a doubtful advantage at the price of a definite sacrifice of your virtue?

The third person verb *opponunt* gives way to the second person (*obtendis, confitere*) and Furia, a woman of good repute, is implicitly numbered among those guilty of lust.

Other examples quoted from the Fathers are found in homiletic pieces.¹¹ But the gratuitous invective device may be most naturally linked to the epistolary form, where second person verbs arise out of the basic one-to-one relationship between the sender and the receiver, even if the audience ultimately expected is wider than the receiver alone.

Vives makes occasional gestures at further subdividing the envisioned audience by distinguishing between the virtuous and the wicked among readers to be enlightened. He warns, for example, that frivolous young men and women who might see the work but disdain his precepts will not trouble him (*VOO* 4.67). He also says, in the introductory letter to Katharine:

Sanctas feminas leviter tantum officii sui admonui; ceteras interdum paullo castigavi acrius, quod viderim documenta sola parum proficere in iis, quae ducenti reluctantur, et invitae fere trahendae sunt quo oportet; idcirco apertius quandoque sum locutus, ut foeditatem morum suorum ipsae velut in tabella depictam intuentes, erubescerent et desinerent erubescenda facere. Simul bonae tum se ab illis vitiis procul abesse gauderent, tum darent operam ut longius etiam recederent, maluique, iuxta Hieronymi consilium, verecundia parumper quam causa periclitari.

(*VOO* 4.68)

I have gently reminded saintly women of their duty. The others I have chastened sometimes a little more harshly, for I have observed that simple instruction does little good for people who resist a guide; they need to be dragged in the right direction practically against their will. Therefore I have sometimes spoken quite frankly, to make them see their polluted morals as in a painting, and to embarrass them into ceasing their embarrassing ways. Simultaneously, good women would feel happy to be clear of those vices and take steps to distance themselves from them even further. I have followed Jerome's advice in choosing to take risks with my readers' feelings, rather than with the success of my case.

Yet with two striking exceptions, one of which we shall encounter shortly, the author generally does not signal exactly when he is addressing saintly women and

¹¹ Cf., e.g., *VOO* 4.112, from Cyprian, *Hab. Virg.* 7.9-11, *PL* 4.458-62, and the quote from John Chrysostom in *Ad Tim.* 2.9 *Hom.* 8, *PG* 62.541, at *VOO* 4.230f.. Here, as elsewhere, I am grateful to Charles Fantazzi for providing direction to Vives' sources.

when he talks to those others in need of reproof.¹² Further, the last citation above, taken together with his expectation that little Mary will read the treatise (VOO 4.69), shows that Vives wants even decent women to pay attention to his assaults upon the corrupt. An observation from the *De Officio Mariti* is pertinent: 'Seneca was right to hold that "A prudent person levies punishment not for offenses already committed, but rather for the prevention of (future) offenses; for what is past cannot be revoked, but what is in the future can be kept from happening"' (*recte Seneca, qui 'neminem prudentem' ait 'punire quia peccatum sit, sed ne peccetur; revocari enim praeterita non posse, futura prohiberi,' VOO 4.402, quoting Sen. De Ira 1.19.7*). Vives' infliction, via the gratuitous invective, of proleptic discomfort on virtuous female readers who *might* go astray is in keeping with this sentiment. Thus the good female readers are virtually as vulnerable to the accusations in the gratuitous invectives as are the wicked.

A survey of the pattern of incidence of the gratuitous invectives in the *DIFC*, and for comparison the *De Officio Mariti*, tells more about how Vives means to employ the device (see Tables 1 and 2). In the 232 Majansius pages of the *DIFC* I identify forty-six examples.¹³ I designate thirty-one of these as type A (clearcut, full-fledged invective apostrophes) and fifteen as Type B (apostrophes susceptible to interpretation as invectives).

As for the *DIFC*, in one instance the target of the apostrophe is the young girl's guardian; in two others, a combination of the girl and another party; while in the other forty-three, the gratuitous invective is aimed at the girl or woman to be educated. By contrast the ten specimens (seven Type A, three Type B) in the 114 pages of the *De Officio Mariti*, directed at the male reader, are as a group shorter and milder in accusatory tone than those in the *DIFC*, and concentrated at the beginning (eight in the first four out of twelve chapters). Meanwhile, the far greater incidence of *non*-invective second person addresses in the *De Officio Mariti* than in the *DIFC* (cf. Table 1, Category C) bespeaks a search by the author for a more intimate relationship with the reader of that work than with the reader of the *DIFC*.

Invective apostrophes in the *DIFC* show a peculiar pattern of clustering. Twenty-five of them occur in book 1, for those not yet married; twenty-two of

¹² VOO 4.102 (see below, p. 104); also see VOO 4.262 where, in mid-frenzy over the horrors of overindulgence toward children, Vives uncharacteristically catches himself and cautions, 'You shall weep and mourn—most of you, that is, for I do not speak of everyone' (*fletis et lugetis plurimae [nam non de omnibus loquor]*).

¹³ Enumerating the 'gratuitous invectives' in particular, and second person references in general, occasionally entails arbitrariness when two or more cases occur in quick succession. My practice has been to fuse them into a single instance if they build closely on the same thought but to separate them if a clear switch to third person verbs intervenes.

those twenty-five occur either in chapter 8, with its fervent outburst on cosmetics, or later (see Table 2). That leaves nineteen for book 2, the married woman's book, and just two for book 3, addressed to widows. In general, then, the younger and less experienced the audience, the more liberally Vives uses this quasi-accusatory tactic.

Table 1

SECOND PERSON ADDRESSES IN *DE INSTITUTIONE FEMINAE CHRISTIANAE* AND *DE OFFICIO MARITI*

SUMMARY

CATEGORY	<i>DIFC</i> 1	<i>DIFC</i> 2	<i>DIFC</i> 3	<i>DIFC</i> Total	<i>DOM</i> ¹⁴
No. of Pages (Majansius' ed.)	102	108	22	232	114
A. Clearcut Gratuitous Second Person Invectives ('Type A')	19	11	1	31	7
B. Second Person Addresses with Possible Invective Overtones ('Type B')	6	8	1	15	3
TOTAL: TYPES A AND B	25	19	2	46	10
C. Second Person Addresses with No Invective Overtones	20	31	1	52	66

Table 2

OCCURRENCE OF GRATUITOUS INVECTIVE APOSTROPHES IN VIVES' *DE INSTITUTIONE FEMINAE CHRISTIANAE* AND *DE OFFICIO MARITI*

(Books divided by chapters; concluding numbers in parentheses = total no. of gratuitous invectives per chapter divided by Type A and Type B)

De Institutione Feminae Christianae

Book 1. Those Not Yet Married

1. On the rearing of the young girl (*De educatione virginis infantis*; 2 pp.) (0/0)
2. On the rest of infancy (*De reliqua infantia*; 2 pp.) (0/0)

¹⁴ *DOM* = *De Officio Mariti*.

3. On the first lessons (*De primis exercitamentis*; 4 pp.) (0/0)
4. On schooling for girls (*De doctrina puellarum*; 8 pp.) (0/1)
5. Writers to avoid and to read (*Qui non legendi scriptores, qui legendi*; 5 pp.) (0/1)
6. On virginity (*De virginitate*; 6 pp.) (1/0)
7. How a virgin should comport herself physically (*Quomodo virgo corpus tractabit*; 6 pp.) (0/0)
8. On adornments (*De ornamentis*; 13 1/2 pp.) (7/0)
9. On the virgin's solitude (*De solitudine virginis*; 5 1/2 pp.) (0/0)
10. On a woman's virtues and the examples that she should imitate (*De virtutibus feminae, et exemplis quae imitetur*; 7 1/2 pp.) (1/0)
11. How she is to behave in public (*Quomodo foris aget*; 12 pp.) (2/0)
12. On dancing (*De saltationibus*; 4 pp.) (0/0)
13. On love affairs (*De amoribus*; 8 1/2 pp.) (3/1)
14. On a virgin's love (*De amore virginis*; 2 pp.) (0/0)
15. On seeking a husband (*De quaerendo sponso*; 17 pp.) (5/3)

Book 2. Wives

1. On marriage (*De coniugio*; 2pp.) (0/0)
2. Considerations for one about to marry (*Quid cogitare debeat quae nubit*; 4 pp.) (0/1)
3. Two most important things for a married woman (*Duo maxima in muliere coniugata*; 5 pp.) (1/0)
4. How to treat a husband. (*Quomodo se erga maritum habebit*; 22 pp.) (3/0)
5. On harmony between spouses (*De concordia coniugum*; 12 pp.) (0: uncharacteristically, one directed at a male reader.)
6. Correct private relationships with the husband (*Quomodo privatim se cum marito habere debet*; 6 pp.) (0/0)
7. On jealousy (*De zelotypia*; 5 pp.) (0/0)
8. On adornments (*De ornamentis*; 6 pp.) (0/3)
9. In public (*De publico*; 10 pp.) (1/3)
10. Behavior at home (*Quomodo agendum domi*; 10 pp.) (0/0)
11. On children and the problems they occasion (*De liberis, et quae circa illos cura*; 16 pp.) (3/0)
12. On remarried women and stepmothers (*De bis nuptis, et novercis*; 3 pp.) (2/0)
13. How to deal with relations by blood and marriage (*Quomodo se geret cum consanguineis et affinibus*; 3 pp.) (1/0)
14. How to treat married children and their spouses (*Quomodo cum filio aut filia coniugata, cum genero et nuru*; 3 pp.) (0/0)
15. On an older matron (*De matrefamilias provectoris aetatis*; 2 pp.) (0/0)

Book 3. Widows

1. On the widow's grief (*De luctu viduarum*; 5 pp.) (1/0)
2. On the husband's funeral (*De funere mariti*; 3 pp.) (0/0)
3. On the husband's memory (*De memoria mariti*; 2 pp.) (0/0)

4. On the widow's continence and honorable behavior (*De continentiae et honestate viduae*; 3 pp.) (0/0)
5. Comportment at home (*Quomodo agendum domi*; 2 pp.) (0/0)
6. Comportment in public (*Quomodo foris*; 3 pp.) (0/0)
7. On second marriages (*De secundis nuptiis*; 4 pp.) (0/1)

De Officio Mariti

- (Untitled section; 11 pp.) (0/0)
1. On choosing a wife (*De eligenda uxore*; 30 pp.) (1/2)
 2. On approaching marriage (*De accessu ad coniugium*; 17 pp.) (0/0)
 3. On disciplining the woman (*De disciplina feminae*; 22 pp.) (1/0)
 4. On the home (*De domo*; 5 pp.) (0/1)
 5. On external affairs (*De externis*; 4 pp.) (0/0)
 6. On attire (*De cultu*; 6 pp.) (1/0)
 7. When the husband is away (*De absentia mariti*; 1 p.) (0/0)
 8. On correction and punishment (*De reprehensione et castigatione*; 7 pp.) (1/0)
 9. On development in the marriage (*De progressu in coniugio*; 5 pp.) (0/0)
 10. The benefits of mutual conjugal love (*Quas utilitates affert amor coniugum mutuus*; 3 pp.) (0/0)
 11. On childless wives (*De iis quae non habent liberos*; 1 p.) (0/0)
 12. On the older wife (*De uxore natu grandiore*; 3 pp.) (0/0)

In the first seven chapters of book 1 Vives makes only three brief and scattered uses of the gratuitous invective (pp. 78, 86, 94), out of a scant nine second person addresses of any kind to the reader. Chapter 8, however, on cosmetics, jewelry, and clothing, commands our attention not only for its sudden volley of seven gratuitous invectives, but for other reasons as well. For excepting chapter 15 on choosing a mate, it is the longest chapter of book 1, and longer than the chapters on such apparently more important subjects as childhood education, choice of reading material, and virginity. The best explanation for this fact is, I think, more than simply that Vives is irrationally compulsive about the topic. Adornment has to do with sense impressions, to which Vives elsewhere attaches great weight. For instance, he asserts in the later *De Ratione Dicendi* that emotions are midway between mind and physical senses, but more closely conjoined with the latter; the sensible rouses our emotions more quickly than does the conceptual, for which reason enthralling images are better than dialectical reasoning for kindling emotions (*VOO* 2.166).¹⁵ The emotional focus in the *DIFC* on adornment is, then, merely Vives' homage to the power, in this

¹⁵ E. V. George, 'Rhetoric in Vives,' in A. Mestre (ed.), *Ioannis Lodovici Vivis Valentini Opera Omnia I: Volumen Introductorio* (Valencia 1992) 162f.

case deeply dangerous, of sense impressions that women might use to control or influence others' responses. 'All corporeal things are signs of incorporeal realities' (*Res omnes corporales incorporalium sunt signa*, VOO 4.233, in *DIFC* 2.8), cautions Vives in his remarks to wives in book 2 on adornment; this remark indicates the root of his distress. It comes as no surprise to the reader of *DIFC* 1.8 that elsewhere, when seeking an effective image for mankind's inability to behold poetically expressed truth undisguised, Vives resorted to the picture of *Veritas Fucata*, 'Truth Personified and Hidden under a Veil of Cosmetics,' the title of two short pieces he produced in 1514 and 1522.¹⁶

It is true that this curious chapter 1.8 opens with a striking programmatic comment, which mitigates while not completely removing the gratuitous tinge on the assault. Here, more explicitly than anywhere else in the *DIFC*, Vives consciously divides his audience, asserting that he is about to address the slow-witted (and by implication morally compromised) rather than the astute readers. The chapter begins:

Dici non potest quantum inter hunc cultum ornatumque feminarum intersit, et eum quem sancti omnes auctores uno ore praescribunt feminae baptizatae . . . explicatius sunt dicenda nonnulla, iis praesertim quibus multa sunt verba facienda priusquam velint exaudire; et persequar separatim et configam singulas earum insanias.

(VOO 4.102)

Words cannot describe how vast is the gulf between this way that women dress and adorn themselves, and the program unanimously recommended for baptized women by all the sacred writers. [Peter and Paul have had their say, but] I must cover a few matters in more detail, especially for those who need long explication before they choose to pay attention. I will track down and skewer each of their mad delusions one by one.

As *DIFC* 1.8 is aimed specifically at the non-saintly (or at least unintelligent) portion of the audience, it might lead us to believe that Vives has carefully limited the readership to which he imputes guilt.¹⁷ But instances strung out through the chapter may occur at such a distance from the introductory caution that the reader will be liable to forget that the caution occurred. Furthermore, subsequent chapters, not focused on so specific an audience, show

¹⁶ Cf. VOO 2.517-31, 7.101-08, and the recent critical edition of the first *Veritas Fucata* by C. Fantazzi in C. Mattheussen *et al.* (edd.), *J. L. Vives: Early Writings* (Leiden 1987) 59-83.

¹⁷ In fact, Vives may be signaling the conclusion of this targeted section of his text when he says, at 114: *Ergo mea virgo non fucabit faciem, sed mundabit* ('And so my young woman will not make her face up, but will wash it clean').

that here in 1.8 Vives is merely preparing the way for more indiscriminate use of these gratuitous invectives. In 1.9 and following, Vives chooses topics that allow him to revisit, often with a more caustic tone, matters covered in the first seven chapters, where gratuitous invectives were quite rare. The discussion in chapter 6 of virginity, for example (pp. 90-96), shows only one mildly accusatory gratuitous invective. But when we pass the critical eighth chapter and revisit the topic in chapter 10, with a catalogue of past heroic paragons of chastity, Vives exhibits another biting transition from third to second person, and this time the audience is indiscriminate:

haec omnia castitatis exempla in ecclesia leguntur, et audet impudica mulier eo venire? Nec exhorret in coetum virginum lupanar inferre, suoque vultu sanctissimos inquinare oculos, suis vocibus tenerrimos auditus polluere? Nefaria mulier, tu vel Catharinam, vel Agnetem, vel Barbaram sonare audes, et sacra nomina impurissimo ore contaminare? Tu te aliquo ex illis nominibus insignis, et similis videri vis nomine, cuius es moribus inimica?

(VOO 4.128)

All these examples of chastity are read out in church: does an unchaste woman dare to enter there? Does she not shrink in horror from mixing the brothel with the company of virgins, defiling their most chaste eyes with her face, contaminating their tender ears with her words? Wicked woman! How dare you utter the names of Katharine, or Agnes, or Barbara, polluting these sacred names with your filthy mouth! You yourself are honored with the name of one of them: do you desire to resemble, in that regard, a person whose morals you resist?

We observe the same pattern: *leguntur*, *audet*, *exhorret*, third person, reference neutral; then *nefaria mulier*, *tu*, *audes*, *vis*, switching to second. The reader is now by inference the party under accusation.

Vives adopts the antagonistic tone of the gratuitous invective with increasing freedom as the book proceeds. A variation occurs in chapter 13, 'On Love Affairs':

Ex congressibus colloquiisque cum viris amores nascuntur, inter voluptates enim, convivia, saltationes . . . regnum exercent Venus et . . . Cupido . . . O miseram puellam, si capta ex coetu illo discedis! Quanto praestitisset mansisse domi, aut fregisse crus corporis, quam crus mentis!

(VOO 4.145)

From gatherings and conversations with men come love affairs, for Venus and Cupid rule over pleasures, banquets, dances. . . . Poor girl, if you come away from such an event ensnared! How much better if you had stayed home, or broken a leg of your body, rather than of your mind!

Here the non-committal condition *si discedis* ('if you come away') is followed by the contrary to fact *quanto praestitisset* ('how much better it would have been'), an expression that presumes that the disaster has occurred. Further gratuitous invectives occur in the chapter. And this topic of partygoing, like that of virginity, had gotten a softer treatment prior to the inflammatory chapter 8, in chapter 7, on the management of a young girl's body (VOO 4.96f., 101).

A pair of gratuitous invectives occurring in *DIFC* 2.11, where Vives expands on the folly of desiring children, merits special attention. Kelso speculates that the passage was a means of 'providing thoughts to comfort [Katharine] specially, as well as all other women in her predicament'; for the distress of Katharine's long failure to provide King Henry with an heir 'was nearing its climax in divorce.'¹⁸ But the brusqueness of the gratuitous invectives makes it doubtful that Vives was attempting consolation:

Vis mater fieri? Quorsum? An ut mundum augeas? Quasi vero infrequens futurus sit, nisi ipsa unum atque alterum animalculum pepereris, et addideris messibus Siculis et Aegyptiis unam spiculam, ad summam duas . . . at, videre cupis liberos ex te natos; num alii erunt quam ceteri?

(VOO 4.254)

You wish to become a mother? Why? To increase the world population? As if people will be scarce if you don't undertake to produce a little animal or two, and add to the harvest fields of Sicily and Egypt one ear, or at the outside a second. . . . You wish to see offspring of your womb; do you really think they will be any different from all the rest?

O ingrata mulier, quae non agnoscis quantum a Deo acceperis beneficium, quod . . . non pepereris . . . quae ergo non paris, vide ne in maritum reiicias sterilitatis tuae culpam; in te forsan est vitium, quae es vel natura vel Dei voluntate sterilitatis damnata.

(VOO 4.255)

Ungrateful woman! You know not the richness of the heavenly blessing of childlessness. . . . And so, you who have no children, beware of shifting the blame for your barrenness onto your husband; perhaps the fault is within yourself, who are condemned to sterility by nature or by God's will.

Vives proceeds to treat it as a widely accepted fact that in such cases the woman, not the man, is commonly at fault; and somewhat contradictorily, he regards the childless woman simultaneously as blessed and condemned. While not as aggressive as some of the gratuitous invectives in book 1, these instances in 2.11 still typify the habit of assigning blame that we have seen earlier.

¹⁸ Kelso [3] 117.

Two more examples of the gratuitous invective in 1.8 amplify Vives' fear of the power of sense impressions.

Principio de fuco: in quo equidem audire pervelim quid spectet virgo, cum cerussa et purpurisso se illinit: si sic placere sibi, demens est; quid enim carius aut gratius cuique, quam unusquisque per se sibi? Si viris, scelestis; unicum habes sponsum Christum; ei ut placeas, animum orna virtutibus, et formosissimus te deosculabitur. At sponsum quaeris virum, et ei conciliari studes fuco. Primum docebo quam fatue, deinde quam impie. . . .

(VOO 4.102f.)

First, cosmetics. I should very much like to hear what is our young woman's objective when she smears herself with white lead and purple dye. If for self-gratification, she is out of her mind: what is more cherished or gratifying than any person to himself or herself? If to please men, a criminal! You have one spouse, Christ. Aim to please him: bedeck your soul with virtues, and he in all his beauty will bestow kisses on you. But no: you are hunting for a husband, and hoping to win him with cosmetics. I will demonstrate first how foolish, then how impious [is your behavior]. . . .

The passage opens with the target females in the emotionally more indistinct third person. Then comes the adjective *scelestis*, etymologically 'criminal,' which may be either third person or second. Then the indicative verbs arrive: *habes* ('you have'), *studes* ('you hope,' 'you desire'). Following this instance the gratuitous invectives recur (pp. 103f., 106), strengthening the image of the reader as already under indictment:

Si aliter nuptura non es nisi dealbata et rubicata, satius est numquam nubere quam offenso Christo nubere, et viro dementi nubere cui plus placitura est cerussa quam tu ipsa. Quid enim de eiusmodi viro sperare potes, cui plus aridet alba crustula quam proba femina?

(VOO 4.104)

If you will not find a husband save through whitening and rouge, it is better to stay single than marry with offense to Christ, and marry a lunatic who will get more pleasure from white lead than from you yourself. What good can you expect from a man whom a chalky layer gratifies more than does a woman of principle?

Again, the opening conditional construction is non-committal. Shortly afterward, the indicative *potes*, 'can you,' treats the reader's actions and intentions as fact. Again, through a syntactical insinuation, the reader winds up being presumed guilty.

2

Males require the mastery of rhetorical embellishment, because they must learn techniques to rouse or subdue the emotions of those depraved people in the community who will not be swayed by mere reason. But the tunnel vision of the *DIFC*, which has virtually no room for participation in public affairs handled by such women as Margaret of Austria, or even Katharine herself and (for the future) her daughter Mary, systematically excludes females from arenas where persuasion is a needed gift. In a famous passage on women's education Vives declares that women need rectitude and wisdom but not eloquence, although it is no cause for blame if a woman does somehow become articulate (*VOO* 4.84). Personal appearance, alongside public conversation, is thereby left as the principal remaining sense-related avenue through which women might exercise influence; and public conversation is systematically discouraged. 'That woman shows the greatest fluency who blushes all over when addressing men, comes unglued, and finds herself at a loss for words. What singular, what supremely efficacious eloquence!' (*Illa demum erit mihi femina facundissima, cui, cum verba erunt ad viros facienda, rubor toto ore suffundetur, turbabitur animus, et verba non suppetent: o eloquentiam hanc singularem et efficacissimam!*, *VOO* 4.137) A woman should maintain silence as boldly as a man would speak, and will thereby defend her innocence. To illustrate the point Vives offers the case of a Roman boy suspected of sexual impropriety, who when brought to the rostra merely 'fixed his eyes downward, and by his steadfast silence proved his innocence to the populace more convincingly than the best speakers could have done with long and meticulous orations' (*Puerum quendam, tradunt rerum scriptores, productum in rostra populi Romani super causa pudicitiae, defixis in terram oculis et pertinacissimo silentio pudicitiam suam vehementius populo commendasse, quam longis et accuratis orationibus disertissimi oratores*, *VOO* 4.137; cf. Val. Max. 6.1.7). Inoperative here is the Vivesian dictum that responsible and virtuous men's need for rhetorical skill is directly proportional to the incidence of moral corruption, a dictum buttressed by the awareness that 'no way of life or activity whatsoever, whether public, private, domestic, external, with friend or enemy or foe or superior or inferior or peer, can do without discourse; discourse is the cause of the greatest goods and evils' (*Nulla omnino vitae ratio atque actio carere potest sermone, publica, privata, domi, foris, cum amico, cum inimico, cum hoste, cum maiore, cum minore, cum pari; is est maximorum et bonorum et malorum causa*, *De Tradendis Disciplinis* 4.3; *VOO* 6.357). Unlike men, who are not only entitled but obligated to influence people's emotions by the devices of rhetoric, women are proving their foolishness, risking their souls, and endangering others by improving their appearance, which is the

main communication medium needing to be controlled after the interdiction of eloquence. And for women the avoidance of verbal communication devices best permits the manifestation of innocence. Women are thus subject to a regimen that inverts the principle Vives asserts elsewhere, that goodness and eloquence have no necessary connection (*De Causis Corruptarum Artium* 4.2: VOO 6.158); for females, goodness *is* eloquence, and attempts at verbal eloquence will only conceal goodness.¹⁹

How, then, does the gratuitous invective echo, amplify, or contradict the precepts in Vives’ rhetorical works? Since so much of the *DIFC* is preoccupied with praising virtue and condemning vice, Vives’ theoretical views of that matter are pertinent.

Sunt in animo vitia et virtutes: in illa tamquam contra hostes pugnandum, pro his vero tamquam amicissimis. In utroque opus est oratione accurata et nervosa, acriore tamen adversum vitia quam pro virtutibus, ut maiore vi est opus ad revellenda²⁰ mala quam ad bona inducenda. . . . Tametsi habenda est sui et audientium ratio. . . . Haec quidem non cum castigantur vitia ut malos emendemus, sed cum invehimur in adversarium: nam correctioni competit *gravitas* orationis, *et moderatio*, et ea omnia per quae auctoritas vel paratur vel conservatur.²¹ (emphases mine)

(*De Ratione Dicendi* 2; VOO 2.183f.)

In the soul are found vices and virtues. We must fight against the former as against enemies, and defend the latter as dear friends. In both cases we must choose language that is accurate and vigorous, and more harsh against vice than on behalf of virtue, since uprooting vice requires more brute force than does implanting virtue. . . . Still, one must take account of oneself and the audience. [Harsh excess which offends readers’ sensibilities] is in order not when we censure faults in order to improve the evildoers, but when we mount an attack on an antagonist. For *gravity* of discourse, *moderation*, and every quality that engenders or sustains our influence befit the practice of correction.

The coupling of *gravitas* and *moderatio* also occurs in the *De Officio Mariti* in the chapter on how a husband is to correct and chastise his spouse.

¹⁹ Cf. George [15] 147. Two of the invectives in *DIFC* 1.11 are used to demonstrate that either discourse or silence by a woman in public promises to be equally fatal to her reputation (129, 134; cf. also 136). In ch. 13 the woman is deluded about the fair image she thinks the men have of her (148; see above, p. 97).

²⁰ Majansius [2] 184 prints *revellanda*.

²¹ At VOO 4.107, Vives makes a pertinent division in discussing appearance: *decet virum ornatus gravitatis, feminam honestatis* (‘A man’s dress should convey the impression of gravity; a woman’s, of virtue.’).

reprehendendum est non impetu, sed iudicio, nec praefervide, sed sensim et subfrigide; efficacior est eiusmodi reprehensio; quam venerabiliorem reddit species quaedam *gravitatis et moderati animi*, cum tu non tam concitatione animi tui videris eo impulsus, quam improbatione delicti. . . . (emphasis mine)

(VOO 4.405)

You should correct not with hostile assault, but with discretion; not in a heat of passion, but gradually and coolly. That type of correction is more effective. An impression of *gravity and controlled emotion*, which makes you appear motivated not by a stirred-up heart but by indignation over the offense, will increase respect for your admonitions.

In other words, attacking an enemy is one matter; pointing out faults in hopes of correction is another, more restrained enterprise. In the gratuitous invectives of the *DIFC*, the discourse possesses *gravitas*, if gravity means seriousness. However, it would be hard to ascribe *moderatio* to these passages, with their visions of readerly criminality that for younger people might have been calculated to inspire a variety of terror. Perhaps Vives' seven-chapter delay in the use of heavy invective assault in *DIFC* 1 is his idea of proceeding *sensim*, gradually.

At any rate, the gratuitous invective does not come across as a device for persuading so much as intimidating the female target. What, then, has become of Vives the theoretician of rhetoric who believes so firmly in the power of the persuasive word, the man ready to find the milder approach when his purpose is to correct rather than simply to damn?

Our earlier remarks about an envisioned audience including male and female guardians provide an avenue to understanding this problem. If we accept that young women are in the charge of guardians who can use force if instruction fails, and if we take it that one of the purposes of the *DIFC* is to provide material that guardians, male or female, can use to intimidate the wards at their mercy, we may see a reason for Vives' rather careless way of assaulting indiscriminately the character of his younger female readers. In this view the gratuitous invective makes sense. Maintenance of the young female reader's goodwill is only one of the influences that will lead to the desired outcomes; there are other sources of control, such as compulsion. The guardian, better equipped by Vives with cautionary material—and rhetorical devices!—for meeting his or her responsibilities, can do the rest. In this interpretation, gratuitous invectives can be moments in the *DIFC* when females are rather an indirect readership; they are the ultimate recipients, so to speak, of lines that Vives is feeding to their mentors.

There is also another element in Vives' rhetorical writings that may be seen at work here, overriding the counsel of moderation. In the *De Consultatione*, Vives says without elaboration that an advisor must consider whether the advisee is his inferior, superior, or equal (VOO 2.240f.). The *De*

Ratione Dicendi goes further, under the heading of *decorum*, in commenting on how to make use of the distinction:

In relatione est comparatio personarum, maior, minor, par in re omni, sanguine, eruditione, virtute, aetate, robore, dignitate, rebus gestis. . . . Maior ad minorem potissimum respiciet in res, neglectius cetera, ut cum pater dicit ad filium, magister ad discipulum, herus ad servum; par ad parem accuratius; multo vero et accuratius et officiosius minor ad maiorem. . . .

(*VOO* 2.177)

In relationships consider the comparison of personages, whether greater or lesser or equal, and this in every respect: blood, learning, virtue, age, strength, dignity, accomplishments. . . . A greater person addressing a lesser will focus particularly on the topic, and can afford to be careless about other considerations, as when a father speaks to his son, a teacher to students, a master to his servant. When speaking to a peer, it is necessary to be more conscientious. An underling must adopt much more care and formality when talking to a superior.

The use of the father/son and teacher/student examples indicates that Vives is not restricting his comments here to formal, public relationships. Further, when the *De Consultatione* alludes to the superior-inferior relationship, it lists 'wife, children, servants, relatives committed to our care' (*VOO* 2.240) as sample inferiors. To those remarks in his rhetorical treatises, then, we may add the evidence of the gratuitous invective in the *DIFC*, where diplomacy is often the last quality in evidence. To paraphrase Vives' own words cited earlier (*VOO* 4.68, in the letter to Katharine), he will take the liberty of sacrificing his hearers' sensibilities before he sacrifices his message.

Two circumstances evoke particularly vehement use of the gratuitous invective in the *DIFC*: youthfulness of girls to be instructed and the ominous specter of charming feminine appearance. While Vives' theoretical advice to use greater freedom in dealing with inferiors accounts partly for the phenomenon, the remarkably tactless employment of these invectives calls for broader explanation, and may also be traceable to reliance on the male or female mentor's powers of constraint as a complement to, or even a substitute for, the female trainee's good will. Vives uses this technique to effect a fusion between the impersonal, universal character of purely theoretical discourse and the immediacy that comes from individualizing the reader. Following the clue of Vives' own recognized emphasis on *decorum*, we have uncovered an addendum to his theory of rhetoric: women, especially young women, may be dealt with by quite harsh means, including gratuitous intimations of guilt, in confidence that for the management of this constituency persuasion is not the last resort.

REVIEW ARTICLES

Scholia publishes solicited and occasionally unsolicited review articles. Review articles to be considered for publication should be directed to the Reviews Editor, *Scholia*.

THE AFRO-ASIATIC ROOTS OF CLASSICAL CIVILISATION?

Mary R. Lefkowitz and Guy Maclean Rogers (edd.), *Black Athena Revisited*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996. Pp. xxii + 522. ISBN 0-8078-2246-9. US\$55.00.

Toby A. H. Wilkinson
Christ's College
Cambridge CB2 3BU, England

In the latter half of the twentieth century, no other book on the ancient world has created as much of a storm as Martin Bernal's *Black Athena*.¹ Since the publication of the first volume in 1987, nearly seventy reviews, articles and films have appeared discussing the book, its goals, methods and hypotheses. Responses to Bernal's second volume published in 1991 (two more are promised) have added to the enormous literature surrounding the work.

Black Athena Revisited represents a collection of scholarly responses to Bernal's first two volumes. Some of the contributions have already appeared elsewhere as review articles; others were specially written for this volume. Between an introductory paper by Mary Lefkowitz and a summarising conclusion by Guy MacLean Rogers, the volume comprises eighteen papers by experts from the United States, the United Kingdom and Italy. As befits a book as wide-ranging in its scope as *Black Athena*, the contributors to *Black Athena Revisited* are drawn from an impressive variety of academic fields. The papers are arranged in seven broad categories, each addressing a particular aspect of Bernal's work: Egypt, race, the Near East, linguistics, science, Greece and historiography. It is a testament to the impact of *Black Athena* that so many distinguished contributors have combined to review the work and its implications for past and present scholarship of the ancient Mediterranean world.

In her introduction, 'Ancient History, Modern Myths' (pp. 3-23), Mary Lefkowitz examines both the history of western classical scholarship and the ancient

¹ M. Bernal, *Black Athena. The Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilization 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985* (London 1987); *Black Athena. The Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilization 2: The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence* (New Brunswick 1991).

Greeks' own myths about their origins. Bernal's central charges in *Black Athena* are (1) that ancient Greek civilisation was massively influenced by Egypt and Phoenicia and (2) that eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholars deliberately obscured the Afro-Asiatic roots of classical civilisation for reasons of racism and anti-Semitism. Equally, perhaps more, controversial is Bernal's claim that the ancient Egyptians were black Africans, a theory that gives *Black Athena* its title and that has made the book a *cause célèbre* amongst Afrocentric ancient historians. These important questions are tackled head-on by the individual papers that form the body of *Black Athena Revisited*. Lefkowitz casts her own severe doubts—'to speak of the ancient (or modern) Egyptians as "black" is misleading in the extreme' (p. 21)—but also makes the crucial point, echoed by other contributors, that Afrocentrists, 'in the process of claiming Greek history as their own . . . will miss an opportunity to learn about real Africa and its own achievements and civilizations' (p. 21).

John Baines offers an Egyptologist's perspective in his paper 'On the Aims and Methods of *Black Athena*' (pp. 27-48). Bernal's insistence on the significance of Egypt for the development of Greek civilisation means that his limited use of the Egyptological evidence seriously weakens his argument. In this and other areas, and in common with the other contributors to the volume, Baines expresses grave reservations about Bernal's scholarly methods. Two quotations will suffice to illustrate the point: 'Bernal's reluctance to engage with ancient Near Eastern civilizations on their own terms leads to bizarre interpretations' (p. 45); 'his concern with race also leads him to adopt models of ancient ethnicity that are both inappropriate to the materials studied and ethically somewhat distasteful' (p. 46). A second Egyptologist of renown, David O'Connor, takes a more conciliatory tone towards Bernal, but is no less critical in his conclusions. 'Egypt and Greece: The Bronze Age Evidence' (pp. 49-61) concentrates on the textual evidence for relations between Egypt and the eastern Mediterranean during Egypt's Middle and New Kingdoms. Middle Kingdom connections with the Aegean seem to have been rather loose and sporadic; the New Kingdom data, although suggesting a degree of contact, 'do not imply the substantial cultural impact of Egypt upon the Aegean required by Bernal's theory' (p. 60). O'Connor points out that years of fieldwork in the Aegean have failed to produce any evidence for an Egyptian colonisation. In conclusion, Bernal's arguments are 'unpersuasive, so far as the Egyptian evidence . . . is concerned' (p. 61). Frank Yurco provides a broad but detailed assessment of the Egyptian evidence so central to Bernal's theories ('*Black Athena: An Egyptological Review*' [pp. 62-100]). In his downplaying of the role of Mesopotamian cultural influences in the formation of Egyptian civilisation, Yurco is out of step with the most recent Egyptological opinion. Likewise, Yurco's statement that the Middle Kingdom Mit Rahina inscription 'does attest an Egyptian-ruled Asiatic empire' (p. 73) contradicts the usual interpretation of this important monument (as given by O'Connor on p. 54). Yurco also accepts rather more of Bernal's arguments, describing his claims for Egyptian influence on the Greek world as 'in essence reasonable' (p. 95). Nonetheless, Yurco is keen to emphasise the difference between trade and rule: the presence of Egyptian and Hyksos artefacts on Crete attests to the former, not the latter.

For the Afrocentrists who have seized upon *Black Athena*, the issue of race—more particularly, the race of the ancient Egyptians—lies at the heart of Bernal's work. *Black Athena Revisited* includes three papers on this subject: 'Ancient Egyptians and the Issue of Race' by Kathryn Bard (pp. 103-11); 'Bernal's "Blacks" and the Afrocentrists' by Frank Snowden (pp. 112-28); and the contribution by C. Loring Brace *et al.*, 'Clines and Clusters Versus "Race": A Test in Ancient Egypt and the Case of a Death on the Nile' (pp. 129-64). Bard assesses the representational and linguistic evidence from ancient Egypt, both of which distinguish the Egyptians from their southern sub-Saharan neighbours. Bard stresses that 'Egyptians were . . . neither black nor white as races are conceived of today' (p. 104). Moreover, 'to state categorically that ancient Egypt was either a black—or a white—civilization is to promote a misconception with racist undertones' (p. 111). This aspect of Bernal's argument is picked up by many of the contributors to *Black Athena Revisited* and emerges as one of the central criticisms of his work. Indeed, in the conclusion to the volume, the editors call upon Bernal 'to reject publicly, explicitly, and unambiguously any theories of history which conflate race and culture' (p. 453). Snowden accuses Bernal of misusing the ancient evidence relating to ethnic or colour terminology. He warns 'substituting fiction for fact is a disservice to blacks' (p. 127). Echoing Lefkowitz's opening remarks, he points to the important achievements of Nubia, 'a black African culture of enormous influence and power' (p. 121), ironically neglected by Afrocentrists in their emphasis on ancient Egypt. C. Loring Brace *et al.* present the results of a detailed scientific examination of ancient Egyptian cranial material. Comparisons between the cranial morphology of Egyptians and other populations indicate that the former have 'nothing whatsoever in common with Sub-Saharan Africans' (p. 145). Although their evidence refutes Bernal's identification of the Egyptians as black Africans, the authors deplore the very attempt to categorise the ancient Egyptians by modern concepts of race. Not only did the race concept not exist in ancient Egypt, but also 'it has neither biological nor social justification' (p. 162).

Particular scorn is poured upon Bernal and his 'unscholarly methods' (p. 167) in 'The Legacy of *Black Athena*' by the ancient Near Eastern specialist Sarah Morris (pp. 167-74). She deplores *Black Athena*'s 'cumbersome detours . . . and . . . labored misunderstandings' (p. 167) and regrets that Bernal has 'only contributed to an avalanche of radical propaganda without basis in fact' (p. 174). In particular, Morris argues, Bernal's emphasis on ancient Egypt has blinded him to the strong connections between Crete and the Levant, connections that were 'more critical to long-term developments' (p. 169). Echoing the concerns of Lefkowitz and Snowden, Morris asks 'Why does African America need Egypt, more than it does the magnificent cultures of the West African coast, to legitimize its past and present?' (p. 171).

A central plank of Bernal's argument is his assertion that the Greek language shows massive Egyptian and Semitic borrowing. In their detailed yet highly readable paper, 'Word Games' (pp. 177-205), Jay Jasanoff and Alan Nussbaum expose the vast majority of Bernal's proposed etymologies as false. Thus, two leading authorities on Greek language demonstrate the emptiness of *Black Athena*'s linguistic arguments, adding that 'in relation to Bernal's overall project, the linguistic evidence is worse

than unhelpful' (p. 201).

The longest chapter in *Black Athena Revisited* is Robert Palter's 'Black Athena, Afrocentrism, and the History of Science' (pp. 209-66). This contribution examines the scientific achievements of the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians and Greeks in the fields of astronomy, mathematics and medicine. Comparison of the three civilisations shows Babylonian astronomy to have been far more advanced than Egyptian, whilst in the field of mathematics 'it is difficult to see how the peak Egyptian achievements . . . could ever have led to Greek mathematics' (p. 255). Finally, a number of fundamental differences between Egyptian and Greek medicine lead Palter to question the proposed influence of Egypt on Greece in this field too. The conclusion must be that Greek science probably owed as much, if not more, to Babylon as it did to Egypt.

The claims of *Black Athena* have shaken three fields of study in particular: Egyptology, classics and historiography. The final two collections of papers in *Black Athena Revisited* represent the response of the last two disciplines to Bernal's arguments. The Greek perspective is expressed in three papers by Emily Vermeule ('The World Turned Upside Down' [pp. 269-79]), John Coleman ('Did Egypt Shape the Glory that was Greece?' [pp. 280-302]) and Lawrence Tritle ('Black Athena: Vision or Dream of Greek Origins?' [pp. 303-30]). Arguing that 'no one has ever doubted the Greek debt to Egypt and the East' (p. 272), Vermeule's paper has the character of a polemic against Bernal. She criticises 'the constant perversion of facts in Bernal's second volume' (p. 273), and lambasts the work as 'a whirling confusion of half-digested reading, bold linguistic supposition, and preconceived dogma' (p. 277). Coleman provides a calmer assessment of the evidence for Greek origins; his conclusions are no less dismissive of Bernal's claims. There is not a shred of historical, archaeological or linguistic evidence for a Hyksos invasion and colonisation of Greece in the second millennium BC, while Bernal's uncritical interpretation of Greek myth as historical fact ignores 'the generally accepted tenets of rational analysis' (p. 292). Tritle castigates Bernal for his 'simplistic' use of ancient sources and points to a serious weakness in his 'Revised Ancient Model': although *Black Athena* argues for massive Egyptian influence on early Greek civilisation, 'Bernal never pauses to consider the essentially isolationist nature of the ancient Egyptians' (p. 320). As Baines has already pointed out, Bernal's misunderstandings of Egyptian civilisation do great damage to his argument.

Perhaps *Black Athena*'s gravest contention is that classicists and ancient historians in the West deliberately obscured the Afro-Asiatic origins of Greek civilisation, driven by motives of racism and anti-Semitism. This is an immensely damaging accusation for western scholarship as a whole, and no fewer than six papers reply to Bernal's withering criticism of western historiography. Edith Hall, in the volume's most charitable response to *Black Athena* ('When Is a Myth Not a Myth?: Bernal's "Ancient Model"' [pp. 333-48]), believes that 'we . . . cannot dismiss Bernal's book out of hand' (p. 335). However, she argues that *Black Athena* demonstrates an unsophisticated approach to myth, and confuses subjective and objective ethnicity: 'There is a world of difference between saying that the Greeks were descendants of Egyptians and Phoenicians, and saying that the Greeks *thought*

that they were descended from Egyptians and Phoenicians' (p. 336). In his second contribution to *Black Athena Revisited*, 'Eighteenth-century Historiography in *Black Athena*' (pp. 349-402), Robert Palter points to 'fundamental errors in [Bernal's] understanding of eighteenth-century political, social, and cultural history' (p. 350). Bernal is charged with wilfully misreading eighteenth-century writers, labelling them all as racists, and ignoring the ambivalence and variety in their attitudes towards Greece and Egypt. Palter, then, accuses Bernal of deliberate selectivity in his scholarship, citing his 'all too frequent failure to mention crucial facts whose existence would be embarrassing or inconvenient for him to acknowledge' (pp. 389f.). Bernal's methodology comes under further attack (if further were needed) from Mario Liverani ('The Bathwater and the Baby' [pp. 421-27]), who characterises *Black Athena* as 'politically disruptive and historically regressive' (p. 424). Robert Norton offers a specialist paper, 'The Tyranny of Germany over Greece?: Bernal, Herder, and the German appropriation of Greece' (pp. 403-10), in which he discusses the views of the German writer Herder. Once again, Bernal is charged with misrepresentation. Richard Jenkyns assesses nineteenth-century scholarship in 'Bernal and the Nineteenth Century' (pp. 411-20): classicists and historians of the period were certainly not blameless in their hidden political agendas, but neither were they as uniformly racist as Bernal paints them. This is also the conclusion of Guy MacLean Rogers in the last paper of the volume, 'Multiculturalism and the Foundations of Western Civilization' (pp. 428-43). In the greatest of ironies, *Black Athena's* emphasis upon race and ethnic origins unwittingly returns 'to the nineteenth-century style of "race"-bound and ethnocentric historiography that Bernal himself... has so rightly questioned' (p. 440).

If two points—of sadness and hope—emerge most clearly from the critical responses to *Black Athena* contained in this book, they are the following: on the one hand, the self-defeating argument of Bernal's work, which 'succumbs to exactly the Eurocentrism it was written to combat' (p. 452); on the other hand, the forceful belief that 'the ancient cultures of Africa and the Near East do not need to be the founders of the West to be worthy of global interest and study; they are intrinsically interesting' (p. 442).

Black Athena Revisited is an immensely stimulating volume, offering a collection of insightful articles by experts from a diversity of disciplines. In this respect, Bernal has undoubtedly done archaeologists and ancient historians a great service, forcing 'would-be critics to expand their horizons far beyond their areas of expertise' (p. 294). Bernal's central hypotheses are universally rejected, although the papers in *Black Athena Revisited* vary in tone from the polemical to the constructively critical. While one or two come across as little more than extended attacks on Bernal and his methods—perilously approaching character assassination in one instance—other papers are veritable gold-mines of the best of contemporary scholarship. All contributors agree on the fundamental shortcomings of Bernal's work, yet all have seen the need to respond to one of the most controversial and challenging academic enterprises of this century. With parts three and four of Bernal's *magnum opus* promised in the near future, one thing is certain: *Black Athena* will be revisited many more times before the debate subsides.

**AFROCENTRISM AND FREEMASONRY:
(DE)CONSTRUCTING MYTHS ABOUT EGYPT**

Mary Lefkowitz, *Not Out of Africa: How Afrocentrism Became an Excuse to Teach Myth as History*. New York: Harper-Collins, 1996. Pp. xvii + 222, incl. 4 illustrations. ISBN 0-465-09837-1. US\$24.00.

Michael Lambert

Department of Classics, University of Natal
Pietermaritzburg 3201

The contribution of Mary Lefkowitz to the Afrocentric debate and the historiography of antiquity is well known for its clear-headed, analytical precision and for its passionate rejection of the hypothesis that a great deal of the glory that was Greece was stolen from the African Egyptians. In *Not Out of Africa* Lefkowitz sets out to tackle the notion, current amongst many adherents of the post-modern approach to history, that there is no ascertainable historical 'truth' in the slippery rhetoric of historical texts, but that there are many truths, appropriated by those engaging with the texts in different contexts. Afrocentric historiography thus rewrites the past from an African or African-American perspective in an attempt to empower its readers with pride in what are reclaimed (from European historiography) as the glories of black cultural achievement. Historiography becomes the tool of cultural politics and, argues Lefkowitz, 'everyone should be aware that there are real dangers in allowing history to be rewritten, even for culturally useful purposes' (p. 8). Lefkowitz focuses on the founding fathers of the Afrocentric approach to the historiography of classical antiquity, in particular George James, whose *Stolen Legacy*¹ has been so influential in shaping the views of extremist Afrocentrists, such as the inimitable Yosef A. A. ben-Jochannan, whose public lectures seem such a dangerous combination of racist hysteria and transparently shabby scholarship, exposed in a rather kindly way by Lefkowitz. The author probes the origins of Afrocentrism in African-American historiography and interestingly demonstrates how the views of Marcus Mosiah Garvey, the founder of the Universal Negro Improvement Association, were shaped by the following kind of claim made by black Masonry: 'So out of Egypt and through the black man, the world gains its first knowledge of the worship of the deity and the cultivation of science . . . The Negroes [were] the founders of arts, sciences, and other forms of culture instead of being only hewers of wood and drawers of water' (cited in Lefkowitz on p. 130). The influential work of the Senegalese author, Cheikh Anta

¹ G. James, *Stolen Legacy: Greek Philosophy is Stolen Egyptian Philosophy* (New York 1954).

Diop, *Civilization or Barbarism* is also critically examined.²

Common to the above historiographical tradition is not only an uncritical dependence on the works of Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus (used extensively by Martin Bernal as well, in order to construct his hypothesis in *Black Athena*,³ but also, as Lefkowitz demonstrates, a tendency to use Greek myth as historical evidence. The myth of Danaus, for example, has been extensively used to illustrate Egyptian colonisation of Greece (the ubiquitous Hyksos on the move again?); however, with the aid of a family tree (p. 19), Lefkowitz reminds us that Danaus was the descendant of Io, daughter of Inachus of Argos, who wandered from Greece to Egypt, tormented by the jealous Hera. Thus, if anything, Danaus and his daughters were returning Greek exiles, not colonising Egyptians. Furthermore, there is simply no archaeological proof of an invasion of Greece by Egyptians in the second millennium BCE. There are undeniably many references in Herodotus and Diodorus to Egyptian influence on various aspects of Greek culture, but Lefkowitz is at pains to deconstruct these authors and show that Greek writers, in their efforts to establish direct links with an obviously older and very impressive culture, presented a very Hellenised portrait of Egypt, filtered through the very sort of ethnocentric gaze the Afrocentrists employ. This is especially evident in, for example, Herodotus' use of Greek names for Egyptian deities: 'the real and important distinctions [between ancient Egyptian and Greek religion] are further obscured', argues Lefkowitz, 'by the Greek practice of calling other peoples' gods by the names of Greek gods' (p.67).

Of particular interest is Lefkowitz's intricate 'Quellenforschung', which demonstrates most convincingly that the ideas of James and Garvey were grounded in the Egyptology of Freemasonry,⁴ which was in turn moulded by the essentially fictitious account of Egypt and its non-existent 'Mystery System', described in the Abbé Terrasson's *Sethos*, published in 1731.⁵ Both Mozart and his librettist Schikaneder were Masons who had read Terrasson; *The Magic Flute* thus abounds with the kinds of symbols and motifs characteristic of this essentially European construct of Egypt. The fact that black Masonry and the founding fathers of Afrocentrism have been perpetuating a 'wholly European Egypt, as imagined by Greek and Roman writers, and further elaborated in 18th century France' (p. 126) is not without irony. Some of the more radical claims of the Afrocentrist tradition, such as the *fact* that Socrates and Cleopatra were black and that Aristotle slunk around

² C. A. Diop (edd. H. I. Salemsen and M. de Jager; tr. Y.-L. M. Ngemi), *Civilization or Barbarism: An Authentic Anthropology* (New York 1991).

³ M. Bernal, *Black Athena. The Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilization 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985* (London 1987); *Black Athena. The Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilization 2: The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence* (New Brunswick 1991).

⁴ Garvey is cited by Lefkowitz on pp. 207f.

⁵ J. Terrasson (tr. T. Lediard), *Life of Sethos Taken from Private Memoirs of the Ancient Egyptians* (London 1732).

Egypt (in the wake of Alexander the Great), pilfering African ideas from the library at Alexandria (not yet built), are handled by Lefkowitz with a cool empiricism: the evidence is carefully dissected and shown to be shaky or non-existent. Apropos the case of Cleopatra's black ancestors, for example, Lefkowitz comments: 'The principal reason why classical scholars do not talk about Cleopatra's black ancestors is that no one knows that Cleopatra's grandmother was an Egyptian, or whether she was black, because *no one knows anything about Cleopatra's grandmother* (p. 47). Of course, there remains the possibility (acknowledged by Lefkowitz) that Cleopatra may have had black ancestors, but this is not a proven historical fact and should not be propagated as such.

All of this would seem like the proverbial tempest in an academic teacup, if it were not for the fact that the Afrocentrist view of antiquity is being taught in some American universities as if it were the 'truth'. Here Lefkowitz is especially interesting, as she considers the purpose of such courses within the wider contexts of academic freedom and freedom of speech. Lefkowitz clearly believes that there are many possible interpretations of the truth (no one would deny that history can never be written without some bias), but refuses to accept that propaganda and myth (or that which is patently untrue) should be taught as truth, even if for the sake of cultural empowerment. Freedom of speech gives one the right to claim that Aristotle stole his philosophy from Egypt, but does academic freedom give one the same right to teach this opinion in the classroom, as if it were fact? Lefkowitz clearly believes not: 'Academic freedom and tenure are not intended to protect the expression of uninformed or frivolous opinions' (p.165). Such questions lead Lefkowitz to discuss the purpose of universities in her final chapter.

Because of the confusion about the purpose of the university (do we enforce social justice, or do we disseminate knowledge?), we have reached the point where academic discourse is impossible, at least in certain quarters, because the achievement of social goals, such as diversity, has been allowed to transcend the need for valid evidence. But once we accept the idea that instead of truth, there are many truths, or different ethnic truths, we cannot hope to have an intellectual community (pp. 174f.). Once one asserts as fact that Aristotle stole his philosophy from Egypt and conceals the evidence that proves the contrary, one cannot, believes Lefkowitz, have scientific or even social scientific discourse or a community or a university.

Perhaps because Lefkowitz deals with the views of extreme Afrocentrists who, because of racist attitudes, peddle patent untruths (such as the thefts of Aristotle from the non-existent library at Alexandria), she has a clear notion of what she understands by the truth. It is clearly not 'point of view', for she believes that one can have a diversity of 'points of view', but not a diversity of 'truths' (p.162). The notion of diversity cannot be extended to truth which, for Lefkowitz, seems to mean something like 'known facts'. However, what are the 'known facts', when one deals with something as elusive as the influence of one culture on another? Take the hypothesis that ancient Greek civilisation was influenced by the civilisation of ancient Egypt. Turn to the literary sources, such as Herodotus, Diodorus and Plutarch. This category of evidence undeniably suggests that many aspects of Greek civilisation were

influenced by ancient Egypt; it appears to be a 'known fact' to the authors concerned. However, we are not to believe this, as none of these writers knew Egyptian and in any case they conceived of Egypt in Hellenic terms. Our disbelief of this evidence is shaped by the notion that ancient historians worked within a context that shaped what they considered to be the 'truth'. Lefkowitz's 'deconstruction' of these Greek writers is surely moulded by the intellectual milieu in which she is writing: the late twentieth century with its attendant notion of the dangers inherent in essentialising the 'truth'. The artistic record (for example, aspects of Minoan art such as the Ayia Triadha sarcophagus and archaic Greek sculpture) suggests considerable Egyptian influence; the archaeological and linguistic records (despite Bernal's ingenious and at times disastrous etymological games), on the other hand, suggest that the influence was minimal. What are the 'known facts'? That the Greeks stole their civilisation from Africa? Obviously not. That there was some influence over many centuries? Perhaps, but this has to be debated, and the context and intention of the interpreter of or claimant to the 'truth' (Lefkowitz included) have to be considered. We may well have to come to the same conclusion Lefkowitz reached about Cleopatra's grandmother: we do not know the 'truth', but such a conclusion seems possible only if one believes that in certain areas of cultural history there are no 'known facts'.

There is no doubt, however, that Lefkowitz's work can make a crucial contribution to the broader Eurocentric-Afrocentric debate presently taking place in many South African universities. After years of apartheid historiography, many of our students are keenly aware of myth and propaganda disguised as history and are eager to discover what they conceive of as a truly African historiography. Lefkowitz's exposé of the excesses of the Afrocentrist view of antiquity comes as a timely reminder that ethnocentric historiography, whether written by Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus or George James, can be horribly blinkered and for political or cultural purposes can distort the evidence that exists or make claims on the basis of what does not exist. For those of us who teach classics in universities in Africa where, I trust, Mary Lefkowitz's book will feature alongside those of Diop and Bernal in courses where the historiography of antiquity is debated, *Not Out of Africa* is essential reading.

POLYMORPHIC SEXUALITY

Eva Cantarella (tr. C. O. Cuilleain), *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*, New Haven Yale University Press, 1992. Pp xii + 284. ISBN 0-300-05924-8. US\$13.00.

Eva Stehle

Department of Classics, University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742, USA

This book traverses all of Graeco-Roman antiquity and touches on Jewish culture in giving an overview of attitudes toward sexuality, mainly male same-sex

coupling, and of men's experience of sexual relations with other men. The overall thesis is that male-male sex had very different roles in Greece and Rome, that the later Roman view (at least from Catullus onward) is an amalgam of Greek and Roman views as the Romans absorbed the forms of Greek culture; that neither culture condemned active male homosexual acts, although the Romans detested male 'passivity' in sexual encounters, and that the condemnation of homosexual practice *per se* comes from Jewish culture and was transported by Christianity into a pagan culture already grown increasingly oriented toward marriage and chastity. There are eight chapters, four each on Greece and Rome, plus a conclusion. The four Greek chapters cover the 'beginnings', the classical period (in Athens, inevitably), philosophical views, and women. The Roman chapters are more of a historical sequence: the early Republic, the late Republic and Augustan period, the Empire, then finally Jewish attitudes toward same-sex intercourse as the ultimate source of change in Graeco-Roman sexual regulation.

Obviously, only the broad lineaments of cultural attitudes over such space and time could be drawn in 284 pages. Other questions besides the status and nature of male-male sexual activity are adumbrated. There are a few pages on female same-sex relations in Greece and in Rome and another few on the consequences for women of men's involvement with men, but exploration of complexity or variability in attitudes at any one moment is ruled out. Cantarella relies extensively on earlier scholarship, notably that of K. J. Dover and Paul Veyne, to define the subject as well as to describe cultural formations, and so no new ground is opened up to scholarly cultivation. The Greek Hellenistic period is not treated (except for a few poems from the *Palatine Anthology*); we go from fourth-century Athens to Rome. On the Roman side the sequence of laws and edicts and the relevant court decisions, both Republican and Imperial, provide the spine of the treatment. Apart from these Roman culture is represented by poets (especially Catullus, Tibullus, Martial, Juvenal) and by gossip about Caesar and Augustus. Toward the end, Cantarella's opposition to John Boswell and Michel Foucault emerges—to Boswell in describing the early Christian view of homosexuality, but to Foucault, oddly, only in the conclusion, although Cantarella's reconstruction of the problems addressed by fourth-century Greek thinking about male sexuality contrasts strongly with his thesis that an ethic of self-control grew up from a sexually unconstrained (for men) Athenian culture.

The book proposes both to reveal men's experience and to show the change in outlook shaping their experience over time. On the one hand the general movement it recounts of increasing permissiveness in the range of acceptable male-male sexual relationships in Greece and Rome separately, followed by disapprobation and finally legal sanctions against all same-sex activity in the late Empire seems right. On the other hand I find the lineaments of each culture so reductively sketched as to be not even a caricature but a cartoon. Blunt generalisations from some prominent texts may be enough to plot large changes over long periods of time, but they are inadequate to illuminate the range of experiences at a given juncture. Since the level on which the book seems to make its case is so general, I shall concentrate on pointing out what I think are fundamental problems with the description of particular cultural formations.

I shall focus mainly on chapter 2, 'The Classical Age', because that is the material that I know best and that is the basis on which Cantarella's description of Roman difference rests.

My difficulty is with Cantarella's dogmatic and uninquiring approach. Analysis, in the sense of careful examination of the meanings of words, of the aim of various discourses, of the interactions of sexual behaviour with other aspects of social life, we do not get. Evidence is not examined but deployed, often familiar evidence to reductive ends. In chapter 2, paederasty emerges as monolithic, pervasive but rule-bound. All the social tensions documented by Dover and Foucault and highlighted by David Cohen have disappeared. Norms, law, and behaviour are collapsed together: boys should test their lovers before yielding, various laws abetted them in doing so, and that is what well-brought-up boys did. This reductionism does allow Cantarella to focus on the social demands made on boys as they matured. They were expected to change roles several times, from passive homosexual relations to active ones to relations with women. She points out that men may have moved with strain from a congenial role to an uncongenial one. But this observation is not followed up by any attempt to set out the actual range of acceptable adult male behaviour at Athens. Hints in Aristotle that some did not make the first transition are not brought to bear.

Likewise, there is no effort to test her central idea that paederasty at Athens was educational. The (very problematic) initiation hypothesis for the origin of Greek paederasty and the assertion of Pausanias in Plato's *Symposium* (unreliable: see below) suffice to win her endorsement.¹ Yet if one looks for positive confirmation that paederasty was a central educational institution at Athens the evidence is fugitive indeed. Cantarella explains the fact that lovers are kept out of schools and gymnasias, that *paidagogoi* shield boys from older men's attentions, as an effort to ensure that boys choose lovers well. Lovers' behaviour, according to Pausanias, does not sound educational: flattery, perjury, sleeping in doorways. On the other hand, the Alkibiades of the *Symposium*, who thinks he will get wisdom poured into him by Sokrates, never has a clue about *what* Sokrates is trying to teach him by ignoring his seductive moves; he does not even conclude that he gave in too easily, which on Cantarella's model would be the obvious lesson. One might deduce that training by precept and example was not the standard pattern in *erastes-eromenos* relations at Athens. If its educational value was a rhetorical justification for paederasty that also served as a brake on men's expectations, the overall effect might be similar to what Cantarella perceives: a system that dictates who is expected to do what when—but we would understand the need for obfuscation better.

Cantarella, like others, does not try to account for scenes like the one in the opening of Plato's *Charmides*, in which a whole throng of 'lovers' dogs Charmides, pushing and jeering. The model of couples still controls discussions to such an extent

¹ Cantarella does refer to the *Erotika* attributed to Demosthenes, but there is no demonstrable notion of the boy's yielding. Χαρίζεσθαι and the like are not used. The boy should ὁμιλεῖν ('associate') with his lover if he renounces asking for anything disgraceful. Sex seems to be ruled out.

that the aspect of sheer public display in homoerotic pursuit goes unaccounted for. Citation of evidence follows the same pattern. For instance, Cantarella paraphrases *Iliad* 24.128-30 as follows (pp. 9f.): 'Achilles, says Thetis, must carry on living, and having forgotten Patroclus he must take a wife "as is proper"'. The lines (128-31) actually say, 'My child, how long, mourning and grieving, will you eat out your heart, remembering neither food nor sex (εὐνη)? For you will not live long, but already death and strong fate stand near you.' Thetis could not possibly tell Achilles to get a wife, for she knows that he is about to die, and in a context in which κλέος is so important she would no more tell him to 'forget' Patroklos. This is not an isolated mistake; the reader cannot trust Cantarella's paraphrases of ancient authors.² The problem is that Cantarella focuses on the sexual possibilities in a literary scene (or any writing) to the exclusion of all other aspects, so that statements nonsensical in context are extracted from the words.

The same failure to attend to context or pragmatics means that passages are often flattened out, treated as straightforward descriptions of behaviour when they have quite other rhetorical goals. Pausanias's speech in Plato's *Symposium* is taken as 'an explicit piece of evidence, which makes it hard to imagine that boys were forever engaged in the pointless game of diehard resistance imagined by some scholars.' (p. 20). Cantarella does not tell the reader that Pausanias is pushing for lifelong homosexual attachments that are to begin at the moment when a boy conventionally ceases to be attractive—hardly a statement of the norm! Nor does she remark that dramatically this is the speech of a lover to a company that includes his over-age beloved (Agathon). It is crafted as a seduction, not a sociology treatise. The weaseling distortion of Athenian ideas can be tracked to the second *nomos* on voluntary slavery for the sake of self-improvement. While this may pass as a reference to apprentices and disciples, extending the idea to lover-beloved attachments is chicanery. Other cultural issues, such as competition and preserving one's reputation and the problem of shame that is almost ubiquitous in Greek discussions of pederasty outside love poetry, are not factored into Cantarella's description of the experience of male same-sex relations. When Cantarella must labour to find hints that support her thesis or torture them out of recalcitrant texts she does not ask why. Chronology is left vague. Words like 'sex', 'love', 'degeneracy', 'passivity' are used unreflectively as though ancient experience were a calque of ours (assuming that we agree on what these words mean!) and unnoticed value judgments no hindrance to understanding.

In chapter 3, Cantarella pays more attention to context because she wants to discount apparent opposition to male same-sex intercourse in Plato, Xenophon, and Aristotle. She argues that these authors contrast eroticism with reproductive sex and

² Other examples: *Frogs* 57-59 is taken to be Dionysos' admission of desire for Kleisthenes (45); Aristotle *Pol.* 1272a (not 1972) does *not* condone male-male liaisons on Crete (68) but defers consideration of their moral status; Octavian's epigram on refusing Fulvia is taken to imply his morality (160), ignoring the reason that he gives ('... my prick is dearer to me than life itself'); Catullus 93 is mistranslated so as to say the opposite of what it does say (157; it is also misquoted: *audeo* for *studeo*).

accept only the latter as legitimate; they make no comparison of homosexual and heterosexual relations. The pages on Aristotle (pp. 68f.) confuse and distort his meaning. Cantarella reports that according to Aristotle, 'those who love other men "by nature" (*physei*) are not immoral.' True, but only because Aristotle places them outside the human arena in which morality is relevant (*EN* 1148b). The new praise of marriage in these authors she attributes to reaction to the Peloponnesian War, for the moral decay caused by the war and the plague included loss of the ethical dimension of paederasty and extension of male-male liaisons beyond what was acceptable (for which the evidence is Aristophanes' description of most Athenians as passive partners). The need for a higher birth rate after the loss of so many young people also added pressure. Cantarella does not compare her view that traditional morality was lost with Foucault's interpretation, perhaps because she denies that male-male sexuality is the issue in these texts.

Chapter 4 includes a section on Sappho derived from Bruno Gentili. The pages on the impact of paederasty on women are interesting. Boys, she says, were not a real threat to wives' position because the two occupied such different places in the social system. Emotionally, who knows? The chapter ends by calling attention to some of the debates over the relative merits of boys and women found in literature of the imperial period. Cantarella describes the debate in Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe and Kleitophon* as a draw without mentioning that it is embedded in a novel that valorises romantic heterosexual love. The section on Rome begins (ch. 5) by connecting male sexuality with the will to dominate. Slave boys are therefore fit objects of attention but freeborn Roman boys are not. With the infiltration of Greek culture men began to 'love' boys and to pursue citizen boys, as poetry shows. But without the framework of educational paederasty there was no basis for mutual respect. Boys became spoiled (though not so badly as emancipated women [p. 149]) and no natural term set an end to relationships. Untraditional configurations of male-male coupling spread; despite its violation of Roman character more and more men began to find the passive position satisfying. Caesar, virile yet alleged to have played the 'woman' once, legitimised it. In this cultural context Cantarella places the development of Roman law on the subject.

The discussion of Roman legal developments that winds through the four Roman chapters is the most interesting feature of the book, as befits Cantarella's area of expertise. The material is not nearly so well known as the literary texts, so non-specialists can benefit from having the issues and problems set out. Cantarella believes that the Republican *lex Scatinia* (as she prefers to spell it) and a praetor's edict served until the third century AD, when a series of ever harsher imperial prescriptions culminated in Justinian's decree of the death penalty for all same-sex sexual activity. The *lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis* was not concerned with same-sex behaviour; the shift in official attitude is thus well into the Christian period. I am not sure that the law was responding to the 'unstoppable spread' (p. 155) of 'passive' male behaviour. 'The facts show that real Roman males are getting rarer and rarer' (p. 154), but the 'facts' are the assertions of Martial and Juvenal. Real concern was concentrated, it seems from the legal reaction, in the fourth and fifth centuries AD, by which time any spread must long since have occurred. On the other hand, the emperors' slow efforts

to move toward Judaeo-Christian morality from a different pagan construction of sexual virtue must be at least part of the explanation.

The Italian version of the book came out in 1988. There has been a great deal done on these issues since, overtaking Cantarella's attempt at an overview. References to the books of John Winkler, David Halperin, David Cohen and to *Before Sexuality* have been inserted into the bibliography; they contain more nuanced accounts of Greek practice than Cantarella offers.³ For ideologically savvy 'thick description' of Roman material one should look to Maud Gleason's essay in *Before Sexuality* and especially to Amy Richlin's outstanding essay on Roman 'homosexuality' in response to Foucault.⁴ She gives a much more satisfactory description of the interrelations of practice, attitude, and law. The book contains a bibliography and an index. The translation is smooth and usually idiomatic, the text free of typographical errors. There are a few mistakes: the names Rissman and Hallett are spelled incorrectly in the notes; some numbers in the references are wrong; and not all works cited in the notes are in the bibliography.

THE CHALLENGE OF TIME: ROME'S PAST AND OVID'S PRESENT

Carole E. Newlands, *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995. Pp. xiv + 254. ISBN 0-8014-3080-1. US\$35.00.

Anne Gosling

Department of Classics, University of Natal
Durban 4041

The flurry of scholarly activity that has been directed in the last few years at Ovid's previously neglected or disparaged *Fasti* has included numerous attempts to define and characterise the work. Few critics accept it solely as what its title suggests it should be, a poetic account of the Roman religious year; along with its religious and historical aspects, its elegiac character, generic instability, the sincerity of its

³ J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (London 1989); D. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays in Greek Love* (New York 1989); D. Cohen, *Law, Sexuality and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in the Classical Age* (Cambridge 1991); D. Halperin, J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin (edd.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World* (Princeton 1990).

⁴ M. Gleason, 'The Semiotics of Gender: Physiognomy and Self-Fashioning in the Second Century C.E.' in Halperin, Winkler and Zeitlin [3] 389-415; A. Richlin, 'Not Before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law against Love between Men', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3 (1993) 523-73.

panegyric and its Augustanism have received detailed attention.¹ Carole Newlands' opening sentence in *Playing with Time* adds an important rider to the familiar canon (p. 1): 'Ovid's *Fasti* is centrally about Roman religion, Roman history and legend, Roman monuments *and Roman character*' (italics mine). She frequently points up a triangular tension, at times a conflict, between traditional ideas of what constitutes 'Romanness' and the historical and the Augustan realities. Ultimately, while Newlands says much that is valid and constructive about the nature and character of Ovid's *Fasti*, she leads the reader (rightly, in this reviewer's opinion) to the conclusion that the work defies categorisation and definition; regularly recurring key words in her study are 'open-endedness' and 'ludic quality'. Her line of enquiry is clearly enunciated on page 1: 'In its acute observation of the process by which Republican myths and institutions were appropriated to serve a new dynastic system of government, Ovid's *Fasti* gives sophisticated, contemporary voice to the anxieties of a society in a period of experiment, negotiation and unresolved tensions.' There is little, however, to indicate how the *Fasti* was received by contemporary readers, or whether Ovid himself conceived of the work as speaking for them, and Newlands' concern in this book is essentially with the poet's voice, so that it is Ovid's anxieties that her readings reveal; by her closing sentence she has moved away from 'the anxieties of . . . society' to 'Ovid's deep-seated ambivalence towards an ideological system that his poem both celebrates and resists' (p. 236).

In the 'Introduction: The Problem of Ovid's *Fasti*' (pp. 1-26) Newlands gives a concise overview of recent scholarly work and offers a brief statement of her own position on issues that have occupied critics. She stresses that she will treat the poem as a unitary whole, that it is to be read as multivalent and open-ended, and that it consequently challenges the Augustan emphasis on harmony and progress toward a new Golden Age. Chapter 1, 'Stellar Connections' (pp. 27-50) investigates Ovid's exploitation of the astronomical aspects of the calendar to incorporate non-Roman material, Greek myths connected with the stars. The double meaning of *signa* ('constellations' and 'military standards') is important, Newlands argues, for Ovid's thematic opposition between *Caesaris aras* and *Caesaris arma* (*Fasti* 1.13). Elegiac in theme and diction, the star myths link Ovid's earlier erotic poetry with the new direction in which he is taking elegy, in which the theme is essentially the celebration of peace and rejection of war, along with a sense of opposition between intellectual ideals and the values of the public sphere.

In chapter 2, 'Narrator and Interlocutors in Ovid's *Fasti*' (pp. 51-86), Newlands embarks on a theme that runs throughout her book: Ovid's use of his own didactic narratorial persona and his other informants to destabilise his poem. First, the exploration of the Roman past brings to light aspects that are less than commendable, and the multiplicity of explanations can afford unexpected or irreverent

¹ For an overview of the preoccupations and trends of scholarship in the field, see E. Fantham, 'Recent Readings of Ovid's *Fasti*', *CPh* 90 (1995) 367, where the importance of the intersection of literary and archaeological and historical studies for understanding the work's 'cultural context' is duly stressed.

interpretations. Secondly, the unreliability of his interlocutors increases as the work progresses. Thirdly, Ovid casts doubt on the feasibility of his own poetic project. Comparison with the *praeceptor* of the *Ars Amatoria* reveals an equally witty but less confident instructor. Chapter 3, 'The Temple of Mars Ultor' (pp. 87-123) takes issue with the notion that Ovid's description of the temple in 5.552-98 accords with Augustan ideology by calling attention to the selectivity of Ovid's description, and the limitations imposed by its presentation from the perspective of soldiers (Mars and Octavian). Considering book 5 as a whole, Newlands notes the opposition between the gaiety of the *Floralia* and the seriousness of the military themes, between the female and male principle, and between the ancient Roman and Augustan deities. Into this thematic tension Ovid inserts a number of star myths, with their elegiac view of war as destructive and wasteful. As in previous chapters, Newlands demonstrates by study of context and allusion that a passage which seems in isolation to glorify military conquest is capable of a different construction.

Unlike earlier critics, who regard the *Fasti* as at best incomplete and at worst an unstructured hotch-potch, Newlands works from the premise that the books we have 'should be regarded as a coherent poetic unit' (p. 6), 'a planned structure that reflects a general movement from optimism to disillusionment' (p. 18). In chapter 4, 'Priapus Revisited' (pp. 124-45) she argues this case by examining the problematic role of Vesta: on the one hand emblem of chastity and avenger of Caesar's murder, but at the same time victim of Priapus' attempted lechery, in a doublet of a salacious tale in book 1. Where most critics have seen the version in book 6 as a failed joke that would probably have been excised during the process of revision, Newlands suggests a deliberate parallelism (reinforced, she argues, by other negative mirrorings of book 1 in book 6) in which the apparent failure of the narration underlines the increasingly emphasised irreconcilability of Augustan themes and Ovidian elegiac.

Chapter 5, 'The Silence of Lucretia' (pp. 146-74), offers a reading of the story told in 2.685-852 as Ovid's first engagement with issues that become prominent in books 5 and 6, 'the authority of the poet and of history'; Lucretia's story shows how 'individual suffering and individual speech become absorbed and altered by a political ideology committed to an exemplary view of the past' (p. 146). Ovid's presentation of her in elegiac terms poses an antithesis between her world and the masculine world of war and politics, and whereas in Livy her suicide is intended as an inspiration for political change, and she is powerfully articulate, in Ovid she is practically voiceless, and her suicide is her personal response to violation. Newlands notes that the story of Lucretia forms the climax of a series of tales dealing with 'the relationship between crime and the presence or absence of speech', and that it is part of a series of rape narratives that are thematically concerned 'with violence and its transmutation into the insignia of power' (p. 155).

Underlying the term *dies fasti* is a sense of when it was or was not lawful to speak. In chapter 6, 'Portraits of the Artist' (pp. 175-208), Newlands maintains that issues of freedom of speech, which concerned Ovid in his later years and in exile, are

implicit in the poem's title.² Newlands offers readings of the first and last star myths told in the *Fasti* (Arion, 2.79-118, and Aesculapius, 6.733-62), which affirm the supremacy of poetic creativity and of the arts of healing in the pacific elegiac programme; but she paints the progress from the Arion to the Aesculapius myth as yet another facet in the poetic design by which the *Fasti* moves from confidence to pessimism.

Chapter 7, 'The Ending of Ovid's *Fasti*' (pp. 209-36), offers a dense reading of the passage celebrating the restoration of the temple of Hercules Musarum (6.795-812).³ His temple epitomised the Augustan ideal, for it commemorated military success and celebrated the arts, and Newlands is at pains to demonstrate the potentiality for a *prima facie* reading of the ending of book 6 as panegyric. Like Ovid himself, however, she routinely constructs a plausible text only to reveal a sub-text that subjects it to rigorous and destabilising interrogation. Here she brings into play historical and prosopographical details that point to telling omissions and selectivity on Ovid's part, both in relation to the earlier history of the temple and to the complexity and tensions of relationships in and around the imperial family in his own day. Along with these go allusions to Ovid's poetic predecessors, which reinforce both the pre-eminence of poetry in his design and the impression of intended closure of his deliberately unfinished work. And finally Ovid distances himself by voicing the panegyric through Clio. His presentation of the Muse of history as not particularly authoritative casts doubt, Newlands maintains, on every aspect of the *Fasti*'s exploration of the past.

It would be simplistic to suggest that Newlands directs us to a reading of the poem as unequivocally critical of Augustan ideology, but her very insistence on open-endedness, by repeatedly exposing the possibility of critical interpretation, emphasises Ovid's misgivings rather than his support. So does her focus on his undermining of his own and his informants' narratorial authority and on his increasing pessimism. Her views are carefully and persuasively argued, but there is a single-mindedness to her own approach that at times leads her to 'protest too much'. In consequence, she sometimes neglects the possibility that Ovid's contemporary readers were not all as obsessed with underlying inferences as we are at the end of a century that has been dominated by totalitarianism and the concomitant necessity for dissembling in artistic resistance to political oppression; and, further, her central points tend to be frequently repeated (there is an unusually bad instance on pages 233f., where the phrase 'teases us with images of completion and incompletion' occurs twice in the space of seven lines).

Occasionally Newlands' eagerness to further her argument leads to

² Here Newlands calls attention to D. Feeney, 'Si Licet et Fas Est: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate', in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda* (Bristol 1993) 1-25.

³ Some of the material appears also in Newlands' contribution 'The Ending of Ovid's *Fasti*', in A. J. Boyle (ed.), *Roman Literature and Ideology: Ramus Essays for J. P. Sullivan* (Bendigo 1995) 129-43.

inconsistencies, as in her treatment of the Arion narrative of 2.79-118. Newlands rightly sees Arion as the paradigmatic elegiac poet and the myth as a programmatic assertion of the *Fasti*'s elegiac devotion to peace. But she goes too far in claiming that Ovid 'in a departure from his normal procedure' (p. 179) refers at the beginning of the *aition* to another story about the dolphin that implicates the creature *occultis . . . in amoribus* (81) and in asserting that Ovid thereby rejects the love themes that 'were the staple of his earlier elegies'. In fact there is no 'departure from his usual procedure'; Newlands herself elsewhere (e.g., p. 59) underlines Ovid's destabilising or subversive (or perhaps just Alexandrian?) propensity to introduce variant aetiologies. And in chapter 1 she argues that Ovid used the star myths as a means to introduce erotic themes into the calendar material (pp. 31f.): 'The myths also play a key role in articulating the generic ideals of the *Fasti*, for they commonly deal with the familiar themes of erotic elegy . . .'. Further, Newlands overworks the link between the Arion story and that of Aesculapius in 6.733-62. Certainly both are connected with restoration to life, and with Apollo, the one emphasising Apollo's creative and poetic aspect, the other his healing powers. Like poetic creativity, healing is central to the pacific themes of the poem. But Newlands' reading of the Aesculapius story connects it with the silencing of the artist's voice and the problem of free speech and patronage. The link breaks down when we remember that Arion is not in fact denied free speech; it is the granting of an opportunity to sing that in fact saves him.

Newlands makes much of dissonances between the popular folk elements of religion and the official establishment version of Augustan ideology (e.g., in her reading of the three views of Vesta in 6.249-472, which she calls 'basically incompatible' [p. 132]). But the Augustan re-writing of so much of Roman religion and mythology did not replace tradition, and ancient societies were tolerant of inconsistencies in their mythologies; likewise, there must have been many levels of belief and commitment. Have we any evidence that the existence of conflicting versions would have troubled Ovid's readers as much as it troubles us?—and therefore that his frequent presentation of conflicting versions is intended to make the reader question the authority of the narrator or the text and thence to cast doubt on the Augustan representation? Similarly, how are we to read Ovidian wit? What seems to us inappropriate levity in serious contexts may have been quite acceptable to his ancient readers. (By way of comparison, while modern critics differ in the degree to which they regard Horatian or Propertian combination of public and private themes, encomium and drinking parties, as 'anti-Augustan' there is little evidence that contemporaries found them offensive.) Although—as Newlands herself stresses—Augustus had become less tolerant in his latter years, we can only suspect, not prove, that he would have objected to poetic wit and irony directed at his 'programme'. Despite her emphasis on the ludic quality of the poem Newlands does not deal satisfactorily with the wit, let alone the genial good humour and sheer fun of much of the *Fasti*.⁴

⁴ A surprising omission from her otherwise comprehensive bibliography is L. Winniczuk, 'Humour and Wit in Ovid's *Fasti*', *Eos* 52 (1974) 93-104.

Newlands makes illuminating use of Ovid's intertextual allusiveness in eliciting the several levels of meaning in his narration. Even so, there is perhaps still more work to be done on the compositional and intertextual relationships both between the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* and the exile poetry (she herself allows that some readers might feel that 'the *Fasti* in its truncated state emblemizes the exiled Ovid's own personal rupture with Rome's past . . .' [p. 236]).⁵ There are a couple of errors and quibbles to be noted. On page 27 'relgion' for 'religion'; on page 215 'combines' for 'combined'. 'The Augustan mythographer Hyginus' (p. 29) is perhaps not so securely Augustan as to pass without a footnote, while in the index (p. 252) Ovid's friend is listed as 'Fabius, P. Maximus' although he was not P(ublius) but—as rightly given in the body of the text—Paullus.

These few demurrals notwithstanding, this is a careful, perceptive and thoroughly readable study of the *Fasti*. Newlands' detailed reading of passages draws not only on poetic aspects like sensitivity to tensions of genre and content and to Ovidian allusiveness and irony, but also on relevant archaeological, historical and prosopographical material. To say that she has benefited greatly from recent critical approaches that have given new depth to literary analysis on the one hand by increased appreciation of the import of intertextual allusion and on the other by awareness of the impact of the social, cultural and political context in which a work was composed⁶ is in no way to deny Newlands' own originality. One of the strengths of her book is her awareness of context, in two senses: both the historical context in which Ovid was writing and the actual arrangement of material in a series of sections or a whole book of the *Fasti* are shown to affect the surface meaning of passages and invite variant, even contradictory, interpretations. Few studies of the work have taken it seriously as a coherent whole; Newlands' decision to treat it as such (despite giving too little weight to the non-narrative in comparison with the narrative sections) opens up a wealth of interconnections and results in thought-provoking readings, particularly in her studies of Lucretia and of book 6. This is a book that should be in every university library and on the shelves of every teacher of Ovid. Even the tendency to repetitiveness has the advantage that sections are sufficiently self-contained to be appreciated by undergraduates working perhaps on short sections of the poem, and the book could well be as useful to the student beginning to read Ovid as it will be to the specialist.

⁵ Compare the study of Ovid's dissembling of failing poetic powers in *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* in another recent book, which uses intertextuality even more intensively than Newlands does: G. D. Williams, *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry* (Cambridge 1994).

⁶ See above, n. 1.

PERFORMANCE POLITICS AND LANGUAGE IN IMPERIAL ROME

Shadi Bartsch, *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994. Pp. vi + 309. ISBN 0-674-00357-8. US\$44.95/UK£29.95.

William J. Dominik

Department of Classics, University of Natal
Durban 4041

Literary critics are accustomed to considering the often ambiguous position of writers in modern Africa, the Americas and the former East European block who have composed their works in a climate of political repression and whose literary output is subject to official scrutiny. This usually takes the form of examining how writers employ various rhetorical stratagems to criticise and express their disapproval of and opposition to regimes. Most classical scholars writing about the literature of first- and early second-century Rome reject the idea that its authors could have utilised some of the same verbal strategies as modern writers to comment critically upon the Julio-Claudian, Flavian and Trajanic dynasties. In recent years, however, several monographs have appeared that explore how literary artists were able to express their views in the oppressive political environment of imperial Rome.¹ In *Actors in the Audience*, Bartsch approaches the problem by proposing two models to describe how writers and subjects adjusted to the loss of political freedom and expression under the principate. The first descriptive model, 'theatricality', accounts for the manner in which Nero and his subjects, especially members of the senatorial class, acted out roles in interacting with each other; the second model, 'doublespeak', describes how imperial writers communicated their feelings under oppressive regimes by subverting their texts and raising a suspicion that the real meaning was other than what the literal meaning indicated.

The theatrical aspects of Nero's regime and the paradigm of acting that characterises the interaction between the *princeps* and his subjects is the focus of the first two chapters. To imperial writers, particularly Tacitus, Neronian Rome was a stage on which drama and politics were inextricably linked. According to Bartsch (ch. 1), the performances of Nero prompted his audiences to stage their responses in dramatic form as a means of reflecting upon the nature of power and of responding to the way in which it was exercised by the emperor. Audiences in the theatre were compelled to express, or 'act out', their appreciation of Nero's on-stage performances as a *citharoedus* and an actor. Members of the senatorial class were solicited or forced

¹ See especially V. Rudich, *Political Dissidence under Nero: The Price of Dissimulation* (London 1993), who develops a model of dissident behaviour for exploring the politics of the Neronian age.

to act with Nero on stage. The responses of audiences to Nero's performances are described by Suetonius and Dio Cassius in terms that recall the roles of actors. This role-playing extended to events off-stage in the emperor's dealings with his subjects, especially the senatorial class, in the political sphere. The interaction between the *princeps* and his subjects took the form of role-playing in which Nero determined the script to be followed by the 'actors in the audience'. Nero commanded approval and adulation from his wider audience at Rome. Nero, then, made Rome his stage; performance politics became his *modus operandi*. The theatrical overtones of Tacitus' *Annals* 13-16 are especially apparent. Neronian politics is self-conscious theatre and is represented in dramatic terms. The theatrical paradigm provides an analytical frame for exploring Tacitus' treatment of, for instance, Nero's reaction to the murder of Britannicus, the suicide of Julius Montanus, and his murder of Agrippina.

Bartsch considers (ch. 2) the extent to which there was a link between Nero's actions and his dramatic roles. Nero played the parts of such mythical characters as Alcmeon, Orestes, Oedipus, Thyestes and Hercules, roles that enacted on-stage crimes that he was reputed to have committed off-stage. Bartsch points out how Suetonius rearranges the order of events by reporting first Nero's acting role, then the murder of his mother, and then the graffiti that likened Nero to the mythical matricides, a reordering that can perhaps be explained by a desire of the biographer to encourage readers to make associations between Nero and his roles more readily. While Nero dramatised on-stage crimes that had been performed in real life, condemned criminals assumed the roles of such mythological figures as Icarus, Orpheus and Hercules in acting out their real deaths. Life and drama were closely intertwined in the Neronian age.

After her discussion of Neronian theatricality, Bartsch turns (ch. 3) to the use of doublespeak (her term for 'ambiguity'), which for the imperial writer was a method of criticising a regime and staying alive, while for the audience it became a way of discerning the insincerity of the writer. She focuses on how a writer's use of language can suggest opposing or contradictory interpretations to its different audiences and on the active role of the audience in detecting an author's subtext. The meaning that the author intends the audience to perceive is not the opposite of what is literally stated, as in irony, but rather a concealed meaning that lies beneath the surface. This ambiguity and obscurity of expression was necessary in a period when any direct expression of dissent could be construed as a personal attack upon the *princeps*. Quintilian suggested that an audience of the first century would have been especially sensitive to social and political undercurrents of the time when he observes that they would not have been slow to grasp the unfavourable implications of a veiled passage (*Inst. Or.* 8.3.47). This emphasis on the role of the audience in detecting criticism represented a change from the way that actors or authors of plays directly commented on political affairs in the republic (cf. Cic. *Sest.* 118ff., *Att.* 2.19; Suet. *Iul.* 84).

Probably the most challenging part of Bartsch's book is her practical illustration of the role of doublespeak in imperial literature (ch. 4). For this Bartsch selects Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus* and Juvenal's seventh *Satire*, works that have been the subject of much critical debate regarding the degree of sincerity and irony

that should be attributed to them. The emphasis in this practical treatment of texts is on the author's subversion of his own text through the use of doublespeak. Bartsch's concern in the *Dialogus* is with the seemingly contradictory positions adopted by Maternus in his two speeches. In his first speech (11-13) Maternus expresses his preference for poetry, especially political drama (with its anti-imperial rhetoric), over contemporary oratory, which was dominated by men greedy for financial gain and power (i.e., the notorious *delatores*); in his second speech (36-41) he contends that a decline in eloquence can be attributed to the lack of political turmoil under the peaceful rule of Vespasian. Although Bartsch believes the contradictions can be partly explained by the different aims of each of his speeches, she maintains the first speech is an indication that the praise of Vespasian's regime in the second speech should be read as criticism.

Bartsch argues (ch. 4) that Tacitus deliberately subverts the meaning of his own words not by employing irony, which deceives no one, but by using doublespeak to suggest a hidden meaning to opponents of the regime. She may be right in arguing that doublespeak, or ambiguity, is a (better) way of reconciling the apparent contradictions in the speeches of Maternus. But she overstates her case in attempting to distinguish between doublespeak, which conveys one meaning to the emperor and a different meaning to his opponents, and irony, which she claims is powerless to deceive, since in most critical uses of the term 'irony' there is the sense of dissembling or concealing what is actually the case. Sometimes the use of irony by a writer is complex, especially when the meaning may be subtly qualified: an ironic statement can mean less or more rather than simply the opposite of what it suggests, and unravelling its sub-surface meaning may ultimately prove elusive. Much the same potential for misinterpretation by imperial authorities lies with writers who use irony as with those who employ ambiguity.

Juvenal's seventh *Satire* commences by promising a reinvigoration of the arts under the patronage of Caesar but ultimately reveals a picture of severe neglect and second-rate literary productions. Bartsch argues (ch. 4) that the apparent compliment to the emperor is undermined by Juvenal's representation of Statius, Paris and Quintilian as examples of the corrupt nature of imperial patronage in its source and its results (rather than an example of the effects of the absence of such patronage). In treating Statius, for example, she asserts that he is 'much like Quintilian, fellow crony and flatterer; and . . . Statius must have appeared a symbol of the prostitution of letters to Domitian's regime' (p. 270 n. 118). Bartsch greatly overestimates Domitian's subvention of Statius and suggests (wrongly in my view) that the poet was a supporter of the regime. In *Satire* 7.82-87 Juvenal insists that Statius would have starved if he had not sold his *Agave* to the *pantomimus* Paris, despite the immense popularity of his recitations of the *Thebaid*. While Statius almost certainly was not indigent, it seems clear that his popularity did not result in imperial acceptance or financial independence. Judging by his expressions of gratitude to Domitian, Statius appears to have been the object of the emperor's generosity on only a few occasions, namely, when the emperor provided him with a water supply on his Alban estate (*Silv.* 3.1.61-64), ensured his victory in the Alban festival (3.5.28-31; 4.2.63-67), and invited him to

a banquet at the imperial palace (4.2.5-10; cf. 4 *pr.* 6f.). Statius stresses that the imperial invitation (in March AD 90) was his first (4.2.5f.) and the favour 'a long time after' (4.2.64) his Alban victory (probably in AD 95). These few imperial favours actually suggest the meagreness of imperial patronage rather than its substantiality, a point that is confirmed by Juvenal's description of Statius' grim financial plight.

Juvenal's portrayal of Statius seems consistent with the pervasive message elsewhere in the seventh *Satire* that literary artists have been disgracefully deprived of meaningful patronage. It is the *lack* of imperial patronage, rather than any representation of its corrupt workings, that undermines the apparent compliment to the emperor. Bartsch cites (ch. 4) Statius' flattery of Domitian's military exploits in *Thebaid* 1.17ff. as a typical instance of panegyric composed in exchange for imperial patronage, but this praise is undermined by contemporary suggestions of Domitian's partially (un)successful campaigns against the Germans and Dacians (*Theb.* 1.19; cf. *Tac. Agr.* 39.1; *Pliny Pan.* 16.3f.; *Suet. Dom.* 6.1) and his unmilitary demeanour (*Silv.* 1.1.25-27; cf. *Suet. Dom.* 19). Bartsch could have strengthened her argument by pointing out that Statius is yet another imperial writer whose poetry reveals a 'double voice', since he utilises many of the same strategies as Tacitus and Juvenal to undermine his praise of Domitian. Bartsch's paradigm of doublespeak, however, actually does help in the end to make sense of *Satire* 7: the optimism and praise of the emperor at the beginning of the poem must be viewed in terms of the grim reality that prevails in the second half.

The imperial audience's determination of meaning led to disclaimers by writers that their texts contained any covert meaning and should be read with this intention or idea in mind. One such example was Pliny (ch. 5), who in his *Panegyricus* took care to assure Trajan that his *laudes Traiani* should not be construed to mean exactly the opposite of their literal meaning (3.4f.). Elsewhere Pliny observes that prior to Trajan imperial panegyric was immensely unpopular for its insincerity (*Ep.* 3.18.7). While Pliny's (e.g., *Pan.* 1.1) and Tacitus' *laudes* (e.g., *Agr.* 3.1; *Hist.* 1.1) are not unlike those composed by poets to Domitian, Pliny urges that his own praises of the emperor are to be interpreted differently from previous imperial panegyric (i.e., literally rather than ironically). Bartsch argues (epilogue) that Pliny tried to show that the public and hidden meanings of his praise of Trajan were the same, but since audiences of the first and early second century were accustomed to looking for veiled criticism in the form of superficial flattery, the audience is faced with the difficulty of whether or not to take Pliny's disclaimer seriously. At the least the uncertainty of interpretation would still leave the possibility that Pliny's praise of Trajan should be interpreted in the customary (i.e., anti-imperial) manner by an audience.

Bartsch believes (ch. 5) that Pliny's apparent attempt to convince his audience that his praise of Trajan has no other possible interpretation, that it does not indicate a meaning opposite to its literal meaning, is an attempt to establish himself as the arbiter of meaning, which renders him 'the E. D. Hirsch of the ancient world' (p. 191). This jibe against Hirsch is unjustified, since his emphasis on the determinacy of verbal meaning allows for ambiguity and multiple possibilities of meaning (much like the models Bartsch proposes) and acknowledges that complete certainty as to a text's

meaning can never be attained; moreover, the significance of a text to Hirsch, which is what enlivens and makes it resonant for different audiences, is indeterminate and ever changing.²

Who will *not* like *Actors in the Audience*? Primarily classicists who do not believe that literature of the first and early second century was heavily political or that writers attempted to communicate their disapproval of regimes through a variety of stylistic and rhetorical devices. Even those critics who favour her methodology (as I do) will disagree with some aspects of her approach and interpretations. But this sophisticated book is essential reading for scholars who have an interest in how writers (and their audiences) function in an age of political oppression. Its main contribution lies in the emphasis it places upon the political context in the reading and interpretation of literary texts, a quality often lacking in scholarship of the imperial period.

² E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven 1967); *The Aims of Interpretation* (Chicago 1976).

REVIEWS

Scholia publishes solicited and unsolicited short reviews. Short reviews to be considered for publication should be directed to the Reviews Editor, *Scholia*.

T. P. Wiseman, *Historiography and Imagination: Eight Essays on Roman Culture*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1994. Pp. xiv + 167, incl. 5 half-tone illustrations, 1 line illustration and 2 maps. ISBN 0-85989-422-3. UK£13.95.

Making conjectures is an unavoidable part of being a classicist. Those who delve into the murky depths of early Roman history have to become quite adept at it. For anyone daunted by such an occupational hazard, this collection of essays is a most comforting and encouraging *vade mecum*. As the author states in his introduction, 'imagination, controlled by evidence and argument, is the first necessity if our understanding of the past is ever to be improved' (p. xiii). Wiseman amply demonstrates how profitable it can be to apply one's imagination—sometimes quite boldly—to historical topics that are clouded either by a dearth of evidence or by unquestioned assumptions.

The value of this approach is particularly well illustrated in the first two essays: 'The Origins of Roman Historiography' (pp. 1-22) and 'Roman Legend and Oral Tradition' (pp. 23-36).¹ Wiseman puts forward cogent arguments for believing that 'the supposed documentary origin of Rome's historiography is not the *whole* story; it is not the story at all' (p. 1). The common assumption that the writings of all second-century BC historians were as dry and succinct as the pontiffs' chronicle is open to serious question (Cato, for one, at the beginning of book 4 of the *Origines*, explicitly distanced himself from that source). Rome's historical tradition, he argues, grew not so much from the annalistic chronicles as from the realm of dramatic performance (and his model of 'history from dramatic fiction' [p. 5]) is well illustrated by the dramatic structure and quasi-fictional character of the great legends of regal and early-republican Rome). This process did not begin with the literary innovations of Livius Andronicus in the third century BC, but considerably earlier: first, in the context of the Greek-style *symposion* (the adoption of which by the native aristocracies of central Italy in the eighth and seventh centuries BC is best evidenced by archaeological finds a mere eleven miles from the site of Rome), and secondly, in the context of public festivals (particularly the *ludi Romani*, which, as Wiseman argues, probably included Etruscan-inspired dramatic performances from the inception of the festival in the sixth century BC). Rome did not develop in cultural isolation and Wiseman rightly stresses the considerable body of evidence that 'suggests a community open from the

¹ The latter essay is a review of J. N. Bremmer and N. M. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography* (London 1987), which appeared in *JRS* 79 (1989) 129-37.

beginning to influences from the Greek as well as the Etruscan world' (p. 21). It was against such a background that in his earlier review of Bremmer and Horsfall's book Wiseman questioned—with an impressive collation of evidence—the assumptions that (1) in archaic Rome Greek cultural influences were insignificant and (2) that the transmission of Rome's 'historical' tradition was necessarily literate. In the latter case, Wiseman shows that we should rid ourselves of the notion that the essentially aristocratic *carmina convivalia* provided the only pre-literary vehicle for myth; in particular, the contributions of the performing arts in the sixth and fifth centuries and of the popular story-teller should not be underestimated.

In the third essay, 'Monuments and the Roman Annalists' (pp. 37-48), Wiseman argues how, in two instances, the historiographical tradition relating to the 260s BC might have been influenced by the misinterpretation of monumental evidence. The first concerns Suetonius' mention of a *statua diademata*, set up by a Claudius at Forum Appi. Wiseman believes that this represents a hostile and retrospective attribution—probably in the 50s or 40s BC—of regal insignia to a member of a family renowned for its *superbia*. The likelihood that such an attribution was an anachronism is the strongest argument in favour of Wiseman's contention that 'the *statua diademata* at Forum Appi is not a historical but a historiographical phenomenon' (p. 44). While there is much that remains speculative (including the identity of the Claudius involved), Wiseman's imaginative detective work here is intriguing, if not completely persuasive in all its details. Much the same may be said for his second topic, where he speculates that the destruction of a monument commemorating the achievements of M. Fulvius Flaccus made it easier for a hostile historian to deprive the latter of his glory and to transfer it to Decius Mus and Appius Caudex. The complexity of Wiseman's arguments in this essay resolves into a succinct and elegant conclusion: 'When a historian attacked the record of such deeds, by attributing them to others or turning them into criminal acts . . . that was simply the equivalent of defacing or destroying the physical monument of a rival *triumphator*. Glory could be preserved in words as well as in stone or bronze, and attacked as effectively by the pen as by the pickaxe' (p. 48).

In the fourth essay, 'Lucretius, Catiline, and the Survival of Prophecy' (pp. 49-67), Wiseman employs the evidence of two hitherto neglected passages to challenge the widely held belief that ritual and not moral behaviour was the only concern of the Roman gods. Citing Lucretius 1.62-71, in which the poet belittles the frightening predictions of the *vates*, he argues that 'the very vehemence of Lucretius' polemic is evidence for their impact' (p. 53), thus demonstrating both the gods' power to urge virtuous behaviour and the intelligible role of the *vates* ('prophet') in Roman society. The second passage, from Dionysius of Halicarnassus (5.54.1-3), is supposedly about an event in the tenth year of the Republic, 'but in reality a thinly disguised piece of contemporary history' (p. 56 [clearly an episode modelled on the Catilinarian conspiracy]); and Wiseman sees in the term *mantis*, as used by Dionysius, 'the same arbiters of moral and religious orthodoxy against whom Lucretius directed his contempt and indignation' (p. 56). Wiseman warns against viewing the Lucretian *vates* as identical to the Augustan concept of the 'inspired poet', the latter (he argues) going

back no further than Varro. The evidence for the prominent role still played by *manteis* in late-republican Rome is, as Wiseman proceeds to demonstrate, 'surprisingly plentiful' (p. 58); and he concludes that 'if Lucretius' diatribe and the story of the repentant conspirators . . . do indeed accurately represent their idiom, the prophets in the Forum in the first century BC were a conservative force, preaching traditional piety enforced by threats of punishment in Hades' (p. 66).

In similar vein, the next essay, 'Satyrs in Rome? The Background to Horace's *Ars Poetica*' (pp. 68-85), challenges another generally held assumption: despite Horace's explicit reference (*Ars P.* 234f.) to his being a *satyrorum scriptor*, there is no real evidence for satyric drama at Rome. Diomedes clearly equates *fabulae Atellanae* with the Greek *satyrica*, but notes that the characters in the former are not satyrs but 'Oscan characters'. Wiseman, however, remains sceptical about such an equivalence and prefers to take at face value references to the composition of 'satyric comedies' and 'satyr-plays' by Sulla and L. Pomponius, even though the latter was best known as a writer of *Atellanae*. He later concludes (p. 82) that 'Roman satyr-plays did exist after all—largely, no doubt, in generically contaminated forms like "satyric comedy" . . . and "satyric mime" . . . but there is certainly no reason to suppose that they were *fabulae Atellanae*'. (There is, however, an interesting reference in Horace, *Satirae* 1.5.54-61 to an Oscan buffoon who is described as *equi . . . feri similem*. More to the point, the left side of his 'hairy brow' is disfigured by an ugly scar, suggesting that he has been deprived of a horn that once grew there. Do we have here the notion of a peculiarly Italian satyr? It is tempting to see this as a corroboration of Diomedes' equation of the indigenous *fabulae Atellanae* to Greek satyr-plays). Wiseman endeavours to support his thesis by gathering an impressive array of circumstantial evidence that points clearly to a familiarity in Rome with satyrs, if not with satyr-plays, from at least the late sixth century onwards (e.g., satyrs portrayed in red-figure vase painting and antefixes in the form of satyrs' faces provide 'concrete' evidence of this); and other evidence shows that this familiarity did not end with the suppression of the Bacchanalian cult in the second century BC. Having established beyond doubt that satyrs and Dionysiac themes could not have been strange to the Romans, Wiseman embarks upon an imaginative survey of Ovidian themes (e.g., the *Lupercalia* with 'the quasi-satyr Faunus'), which he believes are characterised by satyr-play motifs. This is a particularly entertaining and challenging discussion and, in typically 'iconoclastic' style, Wiseman concludes by questioning whether Diomedes was really mistaken in claiming that 'satire is named after satyrs' since some satyric drama was certainly satirical.

In 'The Necessary Lesson' (pp. 86-89),² Wiseman extols the universal importance and relevance of Cicero's contribution: 'a political career which for all its failings and compromises stood for the rule of law against the rule of force, and a literary corpus that effectively defined our civilisation's concepts of *humanitas* and the

² A review of C. Habicht, *Cicero the Politician* (Baltimore 1990) and P. MacKendrick, *The Philosophical Books of Cicero* (London 1989), which appeared in *TLS* (15-21 June 1990) 647f.

liberal values' (p. 89). The penultimate essay, 'Who was Crassicus Pansa?' (pp. 90-97), brings into focus yet again the themes of Greek cultural influence and the theatre.

It is appropriate that this collection should end with an essay in which Wiseman depends on an especially vivid use of the imagination: '*Conspicui Postes Tectaque Digna Deo*: The Public Image of Aristocratic and Imperial Houses in the Late Republic and Early Empire' (pp. 98-115). Wiseman describes it as 'an attempt to "read the city" by imagining the visual impact of the great houses of the late-republican elite, and the Augustan complex on the Palatine that developed into the imperial palace' (p. xiii). It is the latter that makes the focal point of this very interesting discussion: Vergil, in his description of Latinus' palace, refers significantly to *augusta moenia* ('majestic battlements', *Aen.* 7.153) and *tectum augustum ingens* ('a huge, majestic building', 176). Wiseman believes that Servius was correct in seeing this as an allusion to the Palatine complex and not to the *Forum Augustum*, which would have been 'chronologically impossible' (p. 101). However, the problem is to reconcile Augustus' 'deliberately modest' private quarters with the notion of a 'palatial' structure. The solution, in Wiseman's view, is to imagine what impression it would have made from the outside. Guided by Vergil, Ovid and Martial, he skilfully elucidates the changing topography of the imperial complexes on the Palatine, showing how successive *principes* engineered the positioning of their monumental entrances for maximum visual impact. This increasing quest for glory manifested itself in 'a direct line of development from the private houses of the republican *principes civitatis*, their *vestibula* hung with triumphal trophies, to the grandiose palaces of Nero and Domitian' (p. 114).

All of the essays in this collection are characterised by Wiseman's enviable ability to collate a wide variety of pertinent evidence and by his readiness to put forward interpretations that often demand a reappraisal of preconceived notions. Seldom does he give one cause to suspect that his imaginative reconstructions are at variance with the evidence or quite beyond the bounds of likelihood or possibility. Any such scepticism is rendered insignificant by the encouragement to be gained from his bold yet controlled handling of obscure and complex issues.

Peter Tennant

University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg

Brian Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge, and the Ethics of Interpretation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1996. Pp. x + 463. ISBN 0-674-05276-5. UK£25.50.

The general aim of the book, as stated in the introduction (pp. 1-20), is to examine Augustine's attempt to develop a theory of reading as an ascetic rather than an aesthetic programme. Augustine proposes reading, the author argues from the outset, as a means to achieve a measure of moral self-reform and consequently as a prerequisite for obtaining salvific knowledge. In the introduction Stock provides a very helpful overview of some of the issues involved in Augustine's approach to reading

that will be touched on in the rest of the book, particularly in part 2 (pp. 123-278). These include Augustine's theory of signs and the importance he attaches to writing as opposed to spoken discourse, as well as the special role played by the will and memory. The author also maps out the trajectory of Augustine's progress as a reader in *Confessions* 1-9, the main topic of part 1 (pp. 21-122) of the book.

In chapter 1, 'Learning to Read' (pp. 23-42), the author devotes his attention to Augustine's account of the first phases of self-reform, which involved his acquisition of speech as an infant followed by memorisation of the skills of reading and writing. Through the reading and recall of biblical texts, the young Augustine is able to create a 'plan for living' (p. 29) capable of resisting the attractions of sensory perception, and thus to achieve moral improvement. Stock traces this new type of reading experience, which is related to conversion (in this case to pagan philosophy), to Augustine's discovery of Cicero and his reading of the *Hortensius*. This new type of reading is illumination in the sense that the reader actually participates in the mind of the author, which is implanted in the text that he is reading.

In chapter 2, 'Intellectual Horizons' (pp. 43-74), Stock examines the role of Manichaeism, Ambrose, and Neoplatonism in Augustine's narrative of his progress as a reader in the *Confessions*. The possibility of logical and textual criticism initially attracted Augustine to Manichaeism, but he eventually became disillusioned with the movement's unsophisticated approach to interpretation. His declining interest in Manichaeism went hand in hand with the realisation of the importance of the reading and interpretation of biblical texts to spiritual progress. Stock attributes to the influence of the Bishop of Milan Augustine's interest in the distinction between the spirit and the letter of the text, which he saw as a parallel to the inner and the outer self. Since texts and selves are linked, it becomes possible to create a new self through exegesis and interpretation. To Augustine, self-improvement thus became the 'living out of a story whose meaning he inwardly understood before it was translated into action' (p. 55). Augustine also learnt from Ambrose the value of silent reading as a means of turning from the world to the inner life, from the literal to the spiritual sense of the text. As far as Augustine's indebtedness to Neoplatonism is concerned, Stock points to the distinction between meaning in the reader and in the text, relating it to the Neoplatonic separation of the thinking mind from the object of thought.

Augustine's treatment of three personal narratives in book 8 of the *Confessions*, beginning with the story of Alypius and ending with an account of his own conversion, is the subject of chapter 3, 'Reading and Conversion' (pp. 75-111). Stock convincingly argues that Augustine recounts these stories to demonstrate the role of reading as an agency of change. Some of the author's quite ingenuous conclusions do, however, require further debate. With regard to the first story, for example, to what extent should the fact that Augustine apparently forgot about his intention to correct Alypius be seen as 'a silent, critical commentary on the narrative in which he has already played a part' (p. 81)?

Chapter 4, 'From Cassiciacum to Ostia' (pp. 112-22), is devoted to Augustine's description of oral reading in book 9 of the *Confessions* and to the manner in which the communion of minds anticipates the blessed life. As he reads aloud in the garden

of Verecundus' villa at Cassiciacum, Augustine approaches reading as an ascetic exercise and attempts to attain the permanent message of the text (the *Psalms*). Through memory, parallels are established between the text that he is reading and the narrative of the life that he once led. In the process, his past experience is transformed. In the course of their conversation before the window of their hostel in Ostia, Augustine and Monica ascend beyond all corporeal things (including the senses) to the realm of pure mind.

In part 2 of the book, titled 'Ethics of Interpretation', the author examines the role of language in Augustine's theory of reading (chs. 6 and 7) before turning to specific topics such as memory, time, self-knowledge, and the pursuit of wisdom (chs. 8 and 9). In chapter 5, 'Beginnings' (pp. 125-37), Stock by way of introduction briefly looks at some of the issues related to reading that Augustine discusses in his letters and dialogues written in the period following his resignation from the chair of rhetoric at Milan in 386. These include reading as a spiritual exercise, the importance of both scripture and memory in a programme of self-improvement, and the acquisition of higher knowledge through intellectual ascent. The major part of chapter 6, 'Speaking and Reading' (pp. 138-73), is focused on Augustine's theory of signs and signification. The merit of Stock's approach to this topic, which has already been the subject of extensive scholarly attention, lies in his attempt to integrate it within Augustine's theory of reading and to relate it to his programme of spiritual progress. Important in this regard is the emphasis on the value of both signs (as the means of gaining knowledge from scripture) and enlightenment (as the means of gaining knowledge from within) in the learning process. The distinction parallels that between the overt (or carnal) and the covert (or spiritual) senses of the biblical text. True understanding of a word is not prompted by the expression of the word, but is rather the result of divine enlightenment. Signs are only useful in conveying guidelines for what is taught within. Self-reform occurs when individuals attempt spiritual ascent through their understanding of selected texts.

In chapter 7, 'Toward Theory' (pp. 174-206), Stock turns his attention to the *De Catechizandis Rudibus* and the *De Doctrina Christiana*, the two works in which in his view Augustine has most clearly outlined his theory of reading. At issue in Augustine's approach to reading in these two works as well as in the *De Utilitate Credendi* is the problem of reception, which arises from the inadequacy of signs. The solution is the creation of an emotional union between the speaker (or text) and hearer (or reader) in the course of which the latter constructs the narrative of a permanent life of the spirit by rewriting, so to speak, his life already lived. The reading of the biblical text is not an end in itself, but rather enables the reader to acquire salvific knowledge, that is, to enjoy God. But scripture consists of verbal signs (literal as well as figurative), which are ambiguous. The ambiguity of figurative signs involves either the meaning in the reader or the meaning in the text. Augustine approaches the problem by relating the improvable spirit in the reader with the spiritual sense of scripture. It is by eliminating the ambiguity in the text that the reader is able to change.

In chapter 8, 'Memory, Self-Reform, and Time' (pp. 207-42) and chapter 9, 'The Self' (pp. 243-78), Stock concludes his discussion of Augustine's theory of

reading by examining topics such as memory, reform, time and the concept of self, primarily within the context of *Confessions* 10-13 and *De Trinitate* 8-15. Particular importance is attached to memory, which may enforce habitual patterns of behaviour in the reader and thus become an impediment to self-improvement. However, memory can play a positive role in this process if it is used to create habits that are spiritual and interior by recording and making accessible the beneficial knowledge that is to be found in scripture. Stock also points to the importance of time in Augustine's theory of reading. Time, personal narrative and self-improvement are closely linked. Since our lives unfold in moments, we must be fully present for those moments in order to achieve the potential of our personal narratives, which have been set up through the spiritual reading of scripture. Mental representations, the proof of the mind's existence and the role of memory in the pursuit of wisdom as they relate to the problems of reading and interpretation in the *De Trinitate*, are the subject of the final chapter of the book (ch. 9). Reading, according to Augustine, Stock notes, is not an end in itself but a means through which the reader is able to obtain a better understanding of the self and of God in the act of contemplation as a post-reading experience. It is through reading, Augustine seems to argue in the *De Trinitate*, that we proceed from the outer words (in scripture) to the inner words that are the imperfect images in man of the original Word of God. Through careful study of scripture we may eventually attain the highest level of understanding. After discussing his theory on mind and knowledge and on the relationships of these aspects to self-improvement in the *De Trinitate*, Stock concludes by outlining Augustine's views on the role of memory in enabling the reader to remember, understand and love God.

Through a comprehensive study of the primary sources and skilful textual analysis, Stock has succeeded in producing a remarkable piece of scholarship and a very welcome contribution to both Augustinian studies and the history of literary theory that opens up some exciting new avenues for future research.

André F. Basson

Rand Afrikaans University

Gian Biagio Conte (tr. Joseph B. Solodow; rev. Don Fowler and Glenn W. Most), *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994. Pp. xxxiii + 827. ISBN 0-8018-4638-2. UK£45.00.

By any reckoning this is a remarkable book. It is 827 pages in length and covers the history of Latin literature from the beginnings to the fifth century AD. Its only comparable rival in English is the second volume of the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*¹ and that is of course the product of many hands. It is the book's very remarkableness that makes it a problem for a reviewer. A person with the

¹ E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* 2: *Latin Literature* (Cambridge 1982).

learning to match Conte's and with sufficient space at her/his disposal could well write a thorough review of the entire work. I have neither. I think it best then to concentrate on Conte's treatment of the poetry of the first centuries BC and AD. This is the area with which I am most familiar and probably the area of greatest interest to Latinists. So this review will be limited to 'Part Two: The Late Republic', 'Part Three: The Age of Augustus', and 'Part Four: The Early Empire'.

For Conte the period of the late republic is 'The Age of Caesar'. From a literary, though not political, point of view this is perhaps a surprising judgement. In fact, however, Conte assigns primacy of place to Catullus and greatest space to Cicero. Conte's discussions are alert to theoretical complexities (he is aware, for example, of the dangers of biographical readings of Catullus and of the risks of posing too sharp a division between the short and longer poems), alive to textual nuance (as in his discussions of Catullus 5 and of the features of Lucretius' style) and of larger issues (see his treatment of the sublime in Lucretius). On the Augustans, Conte has fascinating things to say for, at least from my own perspective, he combines advanced theoretical awareness with interpretations which, in the English-speaking world at least, would have to be rated as fairly conservative. Thus Conte is rightly sceptical of the identification of Tityrus with Vergil in *Eclogue* 1 (p. 267), but views the same poem as containing 'homage to Octavian' (p. 266). The *Aeneid*, of course, is the field of great controversy in current criticism and here Conte is unambiguously conservative, treating the ancient grammarians' view of the *Aeneid's* purpose as twofold, 'to imitate Homer and praise Augustus' as a 'reasonable simplification' (p. 276). Thus Conte distinguishes three levels of Homeric transformation: the *Aeneid* as contamination of the Homeric poems, as continuation and as repetition. It is the latter that is most important and here Conte sees Aeneas in this new *Iliad* as containing within himself the 'victorious Achilles and especially Odysseus' (p. 277). That Aeneas is the new Achilles seems undeniable; that he is the new Odysseus in books 7-12, given the paucity of Odyssean references in the final books of the epic (as can be seen from Knauer's tables), requires more evidence. But despite his adherence to a traditional interpretation of the *Aeneid* as a whole, Conte's interpretation of the poem's final scene is radical: 'Turnus is a proud hero, but now he is also *subiectus*. The choice is difficult. Aeneas kills him only because at that crucial moment the sight of Pallas' sword-belt overwhelms him in a fit of deadly anger. Thus in the final scene of the story the pious Aeneas resembles the terrifying Achilles who takes his revenge upon Hector. The *Iliad*, however, ends with a pitying Achilles who finds himself no different from Priam' (p. 284). But where does this leave Anchises' injunction, the basis upon which Rome's empire is to be built: *parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* (*Aen.* 6.853)?

What then of that characteristic Augustan genre, love elegy? Conte begins by noting the distinctively subjective (i.e., autobiographical) character of Roman elegy. On the other hand, Conte is aware of the dangers of autobiographical criticism. He rightly prefers to speak of 'an elegiac world, with conventional roles and behaviours, and of an ethical principle belonging to it, an ideology associated with its founding values' (pp. 322f.). He treats the *seruitium amoris* as characteristic of the genre. This

might well be doubted. It is characteristic of Propertius; whether it is central to Tibullus and Ovid is another question. He notes the opposition between elegiac and traditional values, but then claims that elegy 'in fact reclaims them by transferring them into its own world, and it does this while remaining their prisoner' (p. 323). By this he means that, although the focus of elegy is never respectable women, the poet tends to figure his relationship with his mistress as a conjugal one. Conte has little to say about Tibullus. He is clearly one of those who prefer Propertius. Propertian values, the rejection of *mos maiorum* and of commitment to *otium*, and love's slavery, Conte links with his choice of the elegiac genre. Conte accepts that Propertius gradually succumbed to imperial pressure, treating 4.6, for example, as 'solemn' (p. 336) where others might see parody or even humour.

To the other great Augustan master, Ovid, Conte seems curiously unsympathetic. Conte acknowledges the innovative nature of Ovid's aesthetic (p. 342), but regards the *Amores* as banal (p. 343), while his marginal note declares the *Heroides* monotonous (p. 348). On the other hand, the discussion of the reader's role in the *Heroides* is superb. When it comes to the *Ars Amatoria* Conte seems to take Ovid's assertions that his poem is not directed at married women at face value when there is so much evidence to the contrary. As with the *Aeneid*, Conte views the *Metamorphoses* as Ovid's way of meeting 'the needs of the nation and Augustus' (p. 351). Thus Conte takes Ovid's '*Aeneid*' seriously rather than seeing it as a device for telling the same kind of story as before while evading the great Augustan myth. In the same way Ovid avoids narrating the great events of Roman history. On the other hand, Conte's treatment of the *Fasti* is wholly otherwise: 'it is the *Romanitas* conveyed by the calendar that is attacked and decentralized' (p. 356). Unfortunately Conte has little to say about *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*.

It is a similar story when we move on to the Neronians and Flavians. Conte has little to say on Senecan tragedy and what he says disappoints. Here the approach is reductive, for all the plays are viewed as presenting the defeat of *logos* and the spread of evil. Conte has virtually nothing to say about individual plays. His views seem unaffected by the recent revival of interest in Senecan tragedy in the English-speaking world. The account of Lucan is far more stimulating. Conte treats Lucan as anti-Vergil and his poem as an anti-*Aeneid*. He views *Pharsalia* as 'an indignant denunciation of fratricidal war, of the subversion of all moral values, and of the arrival of the kingdom of injustice' (p. 443). His remarks on the characterisation of Caesar and Pompey (especially Pompey, whom he regards as 'a sort of Aeneas whom destiny opposes' [p. 447]) are astute, as are his remarks on Lucan's stylistic excess. In my view (probably a minority one), the main weakness in Conte's discussion of *Pharsalia* is the fact that he subscribes to the sincerity of Lucan's praise of Nero in book 1. He defends that position by claiming that (a) there is no sharp division between a 'first' and a 'second' Lucan (p. 445) and that (b) 'in the remainder of the poem Lucan's pessimism grows far more radical and comes closer to a consistent darkness of conception' (p. 445). To me this looks like self-contradiction, but this blemish (and I acknowledge that most will not think it so) in no way diminishes the value of Conte's discussion of Lucan's great poem. Indeed, as with Bramble's contribution to the *Cambridge History of*

Classical Literature, it is a pleasure to read so enthusiastic an account of *Pharsalia* in a work of this kind. Conte's discussion of the Flavian epic poets is disappointingly brief. Statius' *Thebaid*, generally acknowledged as the most important, gets two and a half pages and that includes nearly a page of summary. Conte suggests that the *Thebaid*, like the *Aeneid*, should be divided into Odyssean and Iliadic sections. The parallel misleads in so far as Statius does not explicitly evoke the reader's recollections of Homer as Vergil does. True, books 7 to 12 are characterised by war, but books 1 to 6 better illustrate absence of movement and delay (three years actually elapse before the Argives begin to move) rather than wandering. Conte has important things to say about the poem's unity and treatment of the gods, but fails to consider whether Statius' decision to treat the civil war, when Rome had so recently endured yet another outbreak of fratricidal strife, had political implications. He also ignores important parallels between Theseus and the Theban royal family.

What then are we to make of this book and its treatment of what most will regard as the central period of Latin literature? That one person can treat such varied works with an almost unfailing sympathy, with such accuracy and tact, is itself extraordinary. On the other hand, while most will applaud Conte's critical sophistication, some will be disappointed by the conservative nature of many of his interpretations.

Peter Davis

University of Tasmania

R. Rehm, *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994. Pp. xviii + 246. ISBN 0-691-03369-2. US\$29.95/UK£25.00.

The seemingly diverse events of marriage and death, with their respective ceremonials, intermingle in the drama of many historical periods, as well as in opera. Rush Rehm's illuminating book proceeds from the recognition that the idea of 'marriage to death' occurs as a theme of varying degrees of emphasis in several Greek tragedies. By 'marriage to death' the author understands the conception by dramatic characters of their deaths either in terms of a marriage to a loved one already dead or as a union with Hades, where the god of the Underworld substitutes for a living bride or groom (p. 4). The author examines the dramatic effects achieved by the juxtaposition of wedding and funeral rituals in eight individual plays: Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, Sophocles' *Antigone* and *Trachiniae* and Euripides' *Alcestis*, *Medea*, *Supplices*, *Helen* and *Troades*.¹ The book sets out to show that the representation of wedding and funeral rites in these tragedies does not offer experiences of stability to the audience but, because the two rituals have been conflated and confused, unsettles

¹ Rehm omits analysis of Aesch. *Supp.* and Eur. *IA* from his study but directs the reader to several discussions in which other scholars have examined the intermingling of nuptial and death rituals in these plays.

the spectators and compels them to question accepted norms. By exploring the notion of 'marriage to death', the author aims at achieving a better 'interpretive purchase' (p. 9) on particular tragedies and at gaining a clearer comprehension of how they worked on their original audiences.

The first two chapters contextualise the argument by detailing both nuptial and funerary rituals as practised in Athens and their artistic representation in order to demonstrate their influence on the tragedians. Chapter 1, 'Fifth-century Marriage and Funeral Rites' (pp. 11-29), summarises actual wedding and funeral practices. Illustrations taken from vase-paintings delineate various steps in the process that made up a Greek wedding or funeral. A number of common features in the two rituals are noted, for example, the offering of a lock of hair, the ritual bathing and adornment of both bride and corpse, a journey to a new 'home' escorted by torchbearers and relatives, gift-giving and a concluding banquet. Chapter 2, 'Weddings and Funerals: The Visual Record' (pp. 30-42), expatiates on the depiction of weddings and funerals in the visual arts, exploring the 'iconographic shorthand' (p. 30) utilised by the ancient artist to portray nuptial and funeral scenes. Supported by appropriate illustrations, the author shows that funerary reliefs and vases often depict gestures and objects associated also with wedding motifs.

Chapter 3, 'The Bride Unveiled: Marriage to Death in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*' (pp. 43-58), shows how the commingling of marriage and death imagery and ritual in the experience of Klytaimnestra, Cassandra, Iphigeneia and Helen underlines the 'complex weave of ritual perversion' (p. 43) in the *Oresteia*. Through the betrayal of their respective marriages, both Helen and Klytaimnestra are conductors of death: Helen brings death to countless Trojans and Greeks, while Klytaimnestra kills her own husband. The sacrificial murders of Iphigeneia and Cassandra are presented by Aeschylus amid bridal motifs. A valuable aspect of this chapter is the attention drawn by the author's line of inquiry to the parallels between Iphigeneia and Cassandra.

Two chapters examine 'marriage to death' in Sophocles. Chapter 4, 'The Bride and Groom of Death: Sophocles' *Antigone*' (pp. 59-71), focuses on the motif of Antigone as 'bride of Hades'. Antigone's determination to perform burial rites for Polyneikes in defiance of Kreon's decree results in her 'marriage to death', with the conflation of nuptial and funeral rituals marking her last appearance. In chapter 5, 'From Death Bed to Marriage Bed: Sophocles' *Trachiniae*' (pp. 72-83), the interplay between weddings and funerals is shown to be so close that the one rite appears to beget the other. Deianeira's desire to protect her marriage leads to Herakles' death and her own suicide; the agonised Herakles reveals his afflicted body in a manner reminiscent of a bride's unveiling of herself to her bridegroom; while the play ends with the departure of Herakles staged so as to anticipate his funeral and with forward references to the wedding of Hyllos and Iole.

The remaining chapters probe the resonances of 'marriage to death' in Euripidean drama. The pervasiveness of the interplay of wedding and funeral rituals in the *Alcestis* is demonstrated in chapter 6, 'The Bride from the Grave: Euripides' *Alcestis*' (pp. 84-96). Rehm argues that this interaction prompts the audience to form new attitudes towards marriage in which the wife, though an 'outsider', is regarded as

integral to the οἶκος and in which the conjugal bond is valued over the ties of kinship. He also discerns important correspondences between 'the male bond of ξενία and the male-female bond of marriage' (p. 94) whereby the preservation of the οἶκος of Admetos is achieved by the admission into it of two 'outsiders', Herakles and Alkestis.

Parts of chapter 7, 'Torching the Marriage: Euripides' *Medea*' (pp. 97-109), repeat material that appeared in the author's earlier article.² He argues that Medea's perversion of wedding and funeral practices exposes the limitations of the social structures familiar to the audience. Chapter 8, 'Following Persephone: Euripides' *Supplikes* and *Helen*' (pp. 110-27), likewise contains some published passages, this time from the author's previous book.³ Rehm contends that the Demeter-Persephone story, with its associations of death with marriage, forms the mythical paradigm for several aspects of the action of the two plays. The concluding chapter, 'War Brides and War Dead: Euripides' *Troades*' (pp. 128-35), attempts to demonstrate how the study of the interweaving of wedding and funeral motifs communicates 'the theatrical power of one of the greatest antiwar plays ever written' (p. 128) to modern audiences.

A brief conclusion draws together the results of the author's studies. He argues that the extensive participation of women in nuptial and funeral ceremonies accounts for the prominence of female characters in tragedy, whereby women are used by the playwrights to challenge the male values of fifth-century Athens and 'emerge as the vehicles of change and renewal' (p. 136).

The provision of three brief appendices (on the precise timing of the ritual unveiling of the bride, on the authenticity of *Medea* 1056-80, and on the exemplification in the *Medea* of the heroic ideal of helping friends and harming enemies) avoids cluttering the text or notes with the minute discussion of disputed issues. The book is furnished with notes to each chapter, a glossary of Greek technical terms relating to weddings and funerals, a full bibliography and an index. It is designed to be accessible to as wide a readership as possible, with quotations from the plays invariably given in English translation alone and only occasionally followed by the actual Greek text. The transliteration of individual words alerts the Greekless reader to the importance of key terms and word clusters.

Although the English text is virtually free from misprints (but Pippen on p. 203 should read Pippin), some slips have been made in the citation of Greek (as in the quotation of Soph. *Trach.* 834 on p. 77) or in the transliteration of Greek words (e.g., *ekhenguan* on p. 12 should read *ekhenguon*, and *agchisteia* on p. 161 n. 48 and p. 217 should be *anchisteia*) Rehm employs a system of transliteration designed as a guide to pronunciation for the Greekless reader, but the two examples quoted above show that his rendition of the Greek letter *chi* is inconsistent. A frequent fault is the failure to restore the acute accent of a word cited from the text but quoted singly or placed at the end of a phrase in the body of the discussion. It seems that the individual words or

² R. Rehm, 'Medea and the Logos of the Heroic', *Eranos* 87 (1989) 97-115.

³ R. Rehm, *Greek Tragic Theatre* (London 1992).

phrases quoted by the author have been lifted straight from the complete text, without his being aware that the position of a word determines whether its accent is grave or acute. If Greek is to be cited, it should be reproduced correctly in all respects.

As the author himself acknowledges, many of the observations he has made on the dramatic impact of the tragic representation of marriages and funerals are not new. Nevertheless, his detailed scrutiny of these eight plays has yielded a worthwhile product, which merits a place in any bibliography relating to ancient gender or theatre studies. The introductory chapters offer a useful overview of Greek wedding and funeral practices for social historians, while students of Greek tragedy will find their understanding of individual plays enhanced by the author's exploration of the treatment of wedding and death rituals by the tragedians.

Margaret R. Mezzabotta

University of Cape Town

Marinus A. Wes, *Classics in Russia 1700-1855: Between Two Bronze Horsemen*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992. Pp. viii + 368. ISBN 90-04-09664-7. Gld165/US\$94.29.

The author, a distinguished ancient historian and *Wissenschaftshistoriker*, is one of the very few western classical scholars who really controls Russian. I do not mean that he can read Russian books. He can also read unpublished eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Russian documents; that is, he controls and can exploit archival material. His book on early Rostovtzeff is not only of permanent value because of the unique information it therefore contains. It is written in English prose that often exceeds what one finds in native speakers.¹ This book, an English translation with expanded documentation of an earlier (1991) Dutch original, is more *Rezeptionsgeschichte* than *Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. Not less important but a different field. It documents Russia's discovery of pagan Greece and Rome. What had happened in Western Europe during the Renaissance only occurred after 1700 in Russia. Through the discovery of ancient Greece and Rome, Russia, beginning with Emperor Peter the Great, first entered Gorbachev's 'Common House of Europe'. Wes presents the growth of the classical tradition in Russia as 'an aspect of the history of Russia's orientation to Western Europe in general' (p. 4). It is a journey from Byzantium to Athens and Rome. The story reminds us that classics is more than emending Manilius and as part of the intellectual and even political history of the West provides the best argument for its survival as an academic discipline in this banalistic age. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*. I am incompetent to judge Wes' contribution here. I have learned much from his thoughtful chapters on Pushkin, Gogol and Ivan Goncharov whose *Oblomov* gave Wilamowitz's son his name. None of this is unimportant but generally of more concern to Slavists than to classicists.

¹ See Marinus A. Wes, *Michael Rostovtzeff, Historian in Exile: Russian Roots in an American Context* (Stuttgart 1990) with the reviews of W. M. Calder III, *BMCR* 2 (1991) 156-62 and B. D. Shaw, 'Under Russian Eyes', *JRS* 82 (1992) 216-28.

Danish, Dutch or Swiss classical scholarship historically has been far more influential upon the progress of knowledge within the field than has Russian. Europeans could not read Russian. Russians too rarely wrote in Latin as Poles still do. The situation was unexpectedly similar to the United States'. There were no research libraries and many young Russians took doctorates in Germany. Hence much is a list of unfamiliar names with brief biographical data and notes to Russian sources. All useful but tangential. Normally classical scholars consult only two sorts of Russian publications: (a) editions of Greek inscriptions found on Russian soil (e.g., Latyshev's corpus) and (b) catalogues of art collections such as the red-figure Attic vases of the Hermitage by A. A. Peredólskaye, which foolish nationalism prevented from being published in French in the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*. Even important excavation reports are rare.

No classical scholar comparable to August Boeckh or Gottfried Hermann or to Richard Porson arose in Russia between 1700 and 1855. Rostovtzeff, by far the most widely known Russian classical scholar and himself driven into exile from his own country, would be born in 1870. Nor were resident Germans of the calibre of August Nauck or Lucian Mueller yet there. These were men whose work could not be ignored no matter where they lived. Their careers will be chronicled in the promised second volume (1855-1995). The most important chapter here for classicists is 'Diamonds for Scholarship: The Birth of *Altphilologie* in Russia' (pp. 68-127). There are remarks on J. G. Ernesti, but Wes stresses the role of Göttingen (there was no university at Berlin before 1809) and especially C. G. Heyne,² the teacher of F. A. Wolf. The most important figure by far in the book for classicists is Christian Friedrich Matthaei (1744-1811), student of Ernesti at Leipzig. Why?

Certainly the greatest single contribution to classical scholarship that emerged from Russia during the period treated by Wes was the discovery of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, first published by D. Ruhnken in 1780-82. Ruhnken had purchased the MS Leidensis BPG 33H from Christian Friedrich Matthaei. Unfortunately Wes is vague precisely where precision is needed. He writes 'Matthaei sent him [sc. Ruhnken] a copy of the manuscript of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (the only surviving manuscript of this hymn) . . .' (p. 77). His source may be J. E. Sandys: 'a transcript'.³ But it was not a copy. It was the *codex Mosquensis* itself that Matthaei sold Ruhnken.⁴ The controversy concerns whether Matthaei himself had first purchased the codex from the Moscow Imperial Archive and legally exported it or whether he stole it. Wilamowitz is clear.⁵ It was *gestohlen*. His view presumably derives from O. von Gebhardt, which is accepted implicitly by N. J. Richardson and

² Add to p. 87 n. 32: N. Kamp *et al.*, *Der Vormann der Georgia Augusta: Christian Gottlob Heyne zum 250* (Göttingen 1980).

³ J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* 2 (Cambridge 1921) 460.

⁴ T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday and E. E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford 1936) xviii and P. S. Breuning, *De Hymnorum Homericorum Memoria* (Utrecht 1929) 53-58.

⁵ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Geschichte der Philologie*³ (Leipzig 1959) 40.

others.⁶ Wes considers the allegation 'ill-based' (p. 77 n. 16). But he provides no evidence for the honesty of Matthaei other than that the Russians would not have gone to such trouble to lure a thief back. *Cras credam*. The whole matter deserves more careful investigation. I should have liked far more too on Matthaei's publication of the forged Sophocles, *Clytemnestra*, in 1805. We are given only the most tantalising details (pp. 68, 80, 103, 125). Was Matthaei taken in by a Byzantine composition or was he himself the forger? K. L. Struve in 1807 'conclusively demonstrated that Matthaei's *Clytemnestra* could not possibly be by Sophocles' (p. 125).⁷ By whom did Struve think it was? Radt on Sophocles fr. 334f. is mute. Indeed a monograph on Matthaei would be welcomed. He was a complex man of great intelligence who made a permanent contribution. He deserves more attention. This is just one fascinating detail in a consistently stimulating book. I urge reading it.

William M. Calder III

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Theodore Ziolkowski, *Virgil and the Moderns*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993. Pp. xv + 274. ISBN 0-691-03248-3. US\$35.00.

Here we are presented with a book that will provide all of us with brilliant quotations for the rest of the millennium. The best of them concerns a famous professor who advises the author of what is to become an important book not to submit it as a doctoral thesis for the following reason: 'The standards of a D.Litt. are purely academic and bear no relation to the cultural value of a work' (p. 131). What a golden word of wisdom! Where else does one find such a poignant clarification of the antagonism between 'purely academic' standards and 'cultural values'? It was Sir Maurice Bowra who made it clear to Jackson Knight where the place of his *Roman Virgil* was—and where not.

The second best quotation is the opening sentence of the preface: 'Virgil is too important to be left to the classicists' (p. ix). Not to confuse any of his readers, Ziolkowski goes on to clarify immediately that he intends no disrespect for classical scholars and that he rather feels that the general public would suffer an inestimable loss if Vergil were left to the classicists or to the 'canon' (p. ix). As he goes on to prove, the Roman poet provides 'the patterns, the images, the values, the very words that inform many central works of American, English, French, German, Italian and other literatures of the twentieth century' (p. x).

⁶ O. von Gebhardt, 'Christian Friedrich Matthaei und seine Sammlung griechischer Handschriften', *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 15 (1898) 393-420, 441-58; N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974) 66.

⁷ C. L. Struve (ed.), *Sophoclis, ut Volunt, Clytemnestrae Fragmentum: Post Editionem Mosquensem Principem Edi Curavit, Notis Adiectis* (Riga 1807).

Who, then, are the intended readers? Paradoxically enough, the classicists. Who else, if not they, are able to master the *quatre langues* that are used throughout the book? Already the motto (*Mis noches están llenas de Virgilio*) is Spanish, taken from Jorge Luis Borges' *Al idioma alemán*, and it is only eight pages later that this line is *en passant* translated into English. Further down, in addition to Spanish, the reader will also use his French, German, Italian and Afrikaans to savour the flavour of all the subtleties in the translations compared, be it Paul Valéry versus Publius Maro or Rudolf Alexander Schroeder versus Theodor Haecker. Thus he will be introduced to the delicacies of the French Bucoliasts, the German Millennialists, the Italian Hermeticists and the Modern British Georgicists. He will face the proto-fascist Vergil and the proto-Christian Vergil, study the *Annus Mirabilis Virgilianus* and meet *Aeneas Americanus*. Then there are 'The Case of T. S. Eliot' (pp. 119-29) and 'The Case of Hermann Broch' (pp. 203-22). And there is much much more: on the ancient *vitae*, on the bimillennial celebrations, on 'The Roman Analogy in Modern Thought' and on 'Virgil in a Post-Virgilian Age'. The breadth of the panorama is breath-taking, the thesaurus of information overwhelming.

The structure strikes me as logical but uneven. The seven chapters of the work proceed (after an introduction and a chapter on 'Ideological Lives') from the Continent (where Italy has nine pages and Germany twelve) to Britain (forty-seven pages) and the New World (forty-eight pages); finally, there is a chapter on '*Virgil Redivivus*' and a 'Conclusion'. But it is not quantity that is important but quality, and here Ziolkowski meets the highest standards. The way he explains Ungaretti or Broch in their relation to Vergil is exemplary. His elucidations on the bimillennial frenzy in the thirties are eye-openers of singular clarity. And as a whole the book is the best presentation of Vergilianism in our time: there is nothing to match it.

The mass of detailed information is impressive. Obviously, there is a lot of information based on the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. Some restrictions become evident. The 'Moderns' of the title relate to literature only; there is no word on paintings or sculptures, on the visual arts or on music. Neither Raffaello nor Berlioz is mentioned. And these 'Moderns' and their activities are not followed further than to around the end of the middle third of this century. To put the matter more precisely: the book is based on the bimillennium of Vergil's birth, but it neglects entirely the bimillennium of Vergil's death. It is on the latter occasion that Werner Suerbaum has given an informative report in which he discusses no less than 16 expositions in Italy, Germany and London.¹ Interestingly enough, the title of the first of these is '*Bamberg: Virgil 2000 Jahre. Rezeption in Literatur, Musik und Kunst*', whereas the last reads '*Wolfenbuetteler Kunstverein: Virgil Aeneis Buch II Vers 708ff. Der Mensch ist ein Fluechtling auf der Erde*'. It becomes evident that attention to the arts and to music as well as a focus on the celebrations of 1981-82 would have yielded a more interesting and wider spectrum.

¹ W. Suerbaum, 'Publikationen zu Vergilausstellungen', *Gnomon* 56 (1984) 208-28.

One should not complain, however, about what is missing but rather should enjoy what is at hand: a masterful overview of Vergil's so-called 'influence' or, if you like, *Nachleben* from the ancient *vitae* to Hermann Broch's *Der Tod des Virgil*. For the Middle Ages we still have Comparetti's *Virgilio nel Medioevo*, recently supplemented by Fabio Stok in an important article.² Ziolkowski's book provides many insights into the ancient poet's followers in our time, some of them doubtful *personae*, some of them great creators; it also provides a deepened understanding of how 'The Classical Tradition' works in this century.

Bernhard Kytzler

University of Natal, Durban

Nazarena Valenza Mele (ed.), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Museo Nazionale di Napoli: Raccolta Cumana*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Pp. 57, incl. 80 black-and-white plates and 17 figures. ISBN 88-7062-899-X. L450 000.

Among the integral collections that go to make up the ancient art treasures of the National Museum of Naples is the Cumae Collection (*Raccolta Cumana*) consisting of material from the excavations of Leopoldo di Borbone at Cumae in 1852 and 1857; this was presented to the Museum in 1861 by Prince Eugenio di Savoia-Carignano. A major part of the collection is the pottery, first catalogued by H. Heydemann.¹ Following this E. Gabrici, in his monograph on Cumae,² included some discussion of the dating significance of the Cumae pottery, which, as he suggested, showed that the necropolis in which it was found was in use in the late archaic period. Otherwise the collection has not been specifically published until now.

The present fascicule of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* (hereafter *CVA*) catalogues and illustrates from the *Raccolta Cumana* the Attic black-figure pottery (including a number painted on white ground) along with a pair of lekythoi decorated in Six technique and a pair of lekythoi painted in the white-ground technique; a logical additional inclusion is the well-known Ilioupersis Iekanis lid attributed to the C Painter,³ which was excavated at Cumae in 1908, though of course produced in Athens much earlier in the archaic period (c. 580-70 BC) than the *Raccolta Cumana* pottery.

The volume opens with an introduction summarising the history of the *Raccolta Cumana* (p. 5), followed by an extensive list of bibliographical references (pp. 9-11) that supports the Harvard system of referencing in the discussions of the individual

² Fabio Stok, 'Virgil Between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance', *The International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 1.2 (1994) 15-22.

¹ H. Heydemann, *Die Vasensammlungen der Museo Nazionale zu Neapel* (Berlin 1872).

² E. Gabrici, *Monumenti Antichi dei Lincei* 22 (Rome 1913).

³ J. D. Beazley, *Attic Black-figure Vase-painters* (Oxford 1956) 58, 119 (hereafter *ABV*).

artefacts. The catalogue (pp. 13-53), the indices (catalogue number cross-references to the *Raccolta Cumana* inventory and the Heydemann catalogue [p. 54]; subject index [pp. 55f.]; index of painters, groups and classes [p. 57]) and 80 photographic plates are bound into a volume instead of the folio presentation traditional to *CVA* fascicules. While clearly this is more practical for libraries, which are after all the main purchasers of the *CVA*, it is an irritating if minor obstacle to scholarly consultation in that one cannot have the photograph and its description before one's eyes together, and comparisons are less easy to pursue.

The photographic coverage of the vases is generally quite good, although the black-and-white contrast in the plates could have been improved so as better to illustrate the distribution of added red and white; however in this respect the catalogue descriptions do provide the necessary support. In other respects the photographic detail is for the most part clear, especially since for the more significant vases (the column kraters, the amphorae, some pelikae and the larger hydriae) close-up details of the figures at the sides of the scenes are included. One surprising exception is the unattributed dinos (inv. 86375, pl. 17) where the Amazonomachy on the mouth is represented only in one fairly small, greyish picture of the entire circle in contrast to the excellent coverage of the C Painter's lekanis lid (inv. 132642, pll. 1-3), admittedly a work of considerably better quality and interest. Despite these criticisms, this volume largely succeeds in one of the *CVA*'s aims of making pictures of a wide range of vases accessible to vase-painting researchers. Even the poorer quality pieces are for the most part given a more extensive coverage than has often been the case in earlier publications of collections, a recent trend that hopefully will move scholars away from the tendency to develop theories on the basis of the comparatively small selection of 'received' vase-scenes that have enjoyed something of an academic illustrative monopoly in the past century.

One field of vase research that will not be well served by this most recent fascicule is the analysis of shape and potting. It is a pity that no profiles of even the larger vases are included: in such an otherwise comprehensive publication, if full profiles cannot be provided, then at least the upper profile of lip and neck down to the lower handle root and the lower profile up to the top of the rays would allow useful potting comparisons to be made.⁴ Even the photographs have not been taken with potting research in mind, for they are uniformly angled from a little above the vase with resulting distortion of proportions. In this respect Hansjorg Bloesch's advice should be followed: 'Usable pictures are obtained if: (a) the lens is on the same level as the greatest diameter of the vase (as is suggested by E. Homann-Wedeking) and (b) the distance measures six times the largest dimension (height or width)'.⁵

⁴ A good (if arbitrarily selected) example here is the extremely useful set of amphora profiles appended to H. Hoffmann, D. von Bothmer and P. Truitt (edd.), *CVA Boston Museum of Fine Arts* fasc. 1 (Mainz 1973).

⁵ H. Bloesch, 'Stout and Slender in the Late Archaic Period', *JHS* 71 (1951) 29 n. 2.

The descriptions that accompany the plates are brief and certainly could have provided more detail in the technical information: *CVA* publications of vases are commonly the only published source of information on vase measurements and other details that do not show up on standard photographs and so ideally as many data as possible should be provided. This should include measurements of height, mouth, foot and greatest diameter (and given that most vases are asymmetrical to a greater or lesser extent, this should in each case be stated either to be the greatest measurement or to be a measurement at a given point such as the diameter at right-angles to the handles). No greatest diameters are included and although the foot diameter is provided for all other pieces in the catalogue, it is omitted for four amphorae: one Type B amphora (inv. 86319, pll. 18f.), two neck-amphorae (inv. 86320, pll. 21f. and inv. 86322, pll. 23f.) and a panathenaic prize-amphora (inv. 86333, pll. 39f.). Otherwise the descriptions of the scenes are clear, the discussions sound and well supported by references to comparanda, although the reviewer would have liked more discussion of attributions; J. D. Beazley, from the acknowledged profundity of his experience, could state an attribution with certainty and without explanation and have it accepted, but since few scholars today can aspire to his insight, a less oracular style of offering attributions is appropriate. Where an attribution has been made previously by someone other than the author, this should be acknowledged in brackets after the attribution; where it is the author's own, it should be motivated with references to characteristics of the painter or group as exemplified on specified vases. It must be allowed, however, that the attributions offered in this fascicule are (to the reviewer's eye, at least) well founded.

A strong feature of this fascicule is its presentation of inscriptions; the scattered lettering characteristic of the Leagros Group, for instance, is faithfully represented diagrammatically on a 1:1 scale (p. 32), and graffiti are similarly represented 1:1, with references where relevant to Johnston's landmark study.⁶ Most underfoot graffiti are placed within a circle so as to indicate the position on the foot, but in a few cases this has inexplicably been omitted.

Some confusion may arise from the various systems of catalogue numbers associated with the *Raccolta Cumana*. In this fascicule each vase is identified at the beginning of its entry by its inventory number (e.g., for the panathenaic prize-amphora attributed to the Achilles Painter [pll. 39f.], this is inv. 86333) followed by a *Raccolta Cumana* reference in brackets (e.g., R.C. 18); this latter number is the original number of the item in the collection and is different from the catalogue number assigned by Heydemann (e.g., 184); however, Beazley in *ABV* (since followed by many other scholars) used the Heydemann catalogue numbers as his identification preceded by the collection indicator RC; thus for the panathenaic amphora referred to above, Beazley cites it as Naples RC 184 (*ABV* 409,3), making it clear in his *Collections Index* (p. 766) that he is using the Heydemann number. In future, scholars

⁶ A. W. Johnston, *Trademarks on Greek Vases* (Warminster 1979).

would be well advised to use the inventory numbers along with an *ABV* reference to avoid perpetuating the confusion.

In the preface P. E. Arias explains that the author of this fascicule, Nazarena Valenza Mele, died before its completion, a fact that must certainly account for some of the minor flaws of presentation noted below; nevertheless, at the risk of seeming carping and insensitive, a reviewer has an obligation to include such criticisms, in this case of the work as published rather than of the author's intentions. Although this reviewer did not set out specifically to check the referencing in the bibliographical notes appended to most vase entries, a few of the references in the bibliographical notes appended to most vase entries are wrong. The following list, while in no sense definitive, offers some of the more striking errors. The nature of these errors, which involve the most basic tools of the discipline, does not inspire confidence in the other references. Page 14, in reference to plate 1 (the C Painter's lekanis lid): *Develop.* 21-25, should read 24-25; page 26, in reference to plate 30 (amphora, inv. 86351): *Develop.* 190, should read *Para* 190; page 30, in reference to plate 39 (panathenaic amphora, inv. 86333): *Add[2]* 52, should read 106; page 36, in reference to plate 49, 3-4 (white-ground oenochoe, inv. 86357): *Add[2]* 409.3 should be deleted, as this vase is not included in *Add[2]*; and page 42, in reference to plate 57, 4-6 (lekythos, inv. 86345): *Develop.* 230, should read *Para* 230.⁷

Despite the flaws noted above, this publication of the Raccolta Cumana's black-figure vases and associated pieces must be given due acknowledgement. For scholars seeking photographs of and information on the decoration of individual vases it will no doubt prove adequate, and the presentation of a virtually intact excavation collection of known provenance will certainly support the current trend to investigate patterns of export and subsequent use of Attic vases in addition to the more traditional details of their production.

E. A. Mackay

University of Natal, Durban

⁷ The abbreviations refer as follows: *Develop.*: J. D. Beazley, *The Development of Attic Black-figure* (Berkeley 1951); T. H. Carpenter (ed.), *Add[2]*: Beazley *Addenda. Additional References to ABV, ARV[2] and Paralipomena*² (Oxford 1989); and *Para*: J. D. Beazley, *Paralipomena: Additions to Attic Black-figure Vase-painters and Attic Red-figure Vase-painters* (Oxford 1971).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Books for review should be sent to the Reviews Editor, Scholia.

Ronnie Ancona, *Time and the Erotic in Horace's Odes*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1994. Pp. xii + 186. ISBN 0-8223-1476-2. US\$39.95.

R. Bracht Branham and Daniel Kinney (trr.), *Petronius: Satyricon*. Berkeley: University of California Press and London: Orion Press, 1996. Pp. xxxvi + 185. ISBN 0-520-20599-5. US\$28.00.

Eva Cantarella (tr. C. O. Cuiileain), *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992. Pp. xii + 284. ISBN 0-300-05924-8. US\$13.00.

Gian Biagio Conte (tr. Joseph B. Solodow; rev. Don Fowler and Glenn W. Most), *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994. Pp. xxxiii + 827. ISBN 0-8018-4638-2. UK£45.00.

Alessandra Coppola, *Archaiologia e propaganda*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Pp. 214. ISBN 88-7062-925-2. No price supplied.

B. R. Coria, *Limites de la retórica clásica*. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1995. Pp. 124. ISBN 968-36-4465-1. No price supplied.

Sylviane Estiot (ed.), *Ripostiglio della Venèra. Aureliano 2.1: Commune di Verona, Musei e Gallerie d'Arte*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Pp. 270, incl. 56 black-and-white plates. ISBN 88-7062-892-2. L250 000.

Richard J. Evans, *Gaius Marius: A Political Biography*. Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1994. Pp. xiv + 247. ISBN 0-86981-850-3. R136.90.

G. P. Goold (ed. and tr.), *Chariton: Callirhoe*. London and Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995. Pp. viii + 425. ISBN 0-674-99530-9. UK£11.95.

Stephen Halliwell, W. H. Fyfe and Doreen C. Innes (edd. and trr.), *Aristotle: Poetics. Longinus: On the Sublime. Demetrius: On Style*. London and Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995. Pp. 533. ISBN 0-674-99563-5. UK£11.95.

- Martin Helzle, *Der Stil ist der Mensch*. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1996. Pp. 349. ISBN 3-519-07622-5. DM118.00.
- G. M. Kirkwood, *A Short Guide to Classical Mythology*. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1995. Pp. x + 109. ISBN 0-86516-280-8. US\$8.00.
- David Kovacs (ed. and tr.), *Euripides: Children of Heracles, Hippolytus, Andromache, Hecuba*. London and Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995. Pp. viii + 519. ISBN 0-674-99533-3. UK£11.95.
- R. M. Lacy, *Rebelliones populares en la Grecia Helenística*. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1995. Pp. ii + 274. ISBN 968-36-4525-9. No price supplied.
- Richard A. Lafleur (ed.), *Love and Transformation. An Ovid Reader*. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1995. Pp. x + 150. ISBN 0-8013-1299-X. US\$19.66.
- Richard A. Lafleur (ed.), *Love and Transformation. An Ovid Reader: Teacher's Guide*. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1995. Pp. 30. ISBN 0-8013-1503-4. US\$17.27.
- Barbara Lawatsch-Boomgaarden and Josef Ijsewijn (edd.), *Voyage to Maryland. Relatio Itineris in Marilandiam: Original Latin Narrative of Andrew White, S.J.* Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1995. Pp. vi + 113. ISBN 0-86516-280-8. US\$25.00.
- Mary R. Lefkowitz and Guy MacLean Rogers (edd.), *Black Athena Revisited*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996. Pp. xxi + 522. ISBN 0-807-2246-9. US\$55.00.
- Mary Lefkowitz, *Not Out of Africa: How Afrocentrism Became an Excuse to Teach Myth as History*. New York: Harper-Collins, 1996. Pp. xvii + 222, incl. 4 illustrations. ISBN 0-465-09837-1. US\$24.00.
- C. A. E. Luschnig, *The Gorgon's Severed Head: Studies of Alcestis, Electra and Phoenissae*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996. Pp. xv + 255. ISBN 90-04-10382-1. Gld121.00/US\$78.00.
- André Magdelain, *De la royauté et du droit de Romulus à Sabinus*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Pp. 217. ISBN 88-7062-881-7. L200 000.

- Donald Mastronarde, *An Introduction to Attic Greek: An Electronic Workbook*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996. Pp. 3 (installation instructions) + 4 high-density computer disks. ISBN 0-520-20281-3 (e). US\$29.95/ UK£21.95.
- Nazarena Valenza Mele (ed.), *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Museo Nazionale di Napoli: Raccolta Cumana*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Pp. 57, incl. 80 black-and-white plates and 17 figures. ISBN 88-7062-899-X. L450 000.
- S. L. Mena (ed.) and J. A. Pagaza (tr.), *Publio Virgilio Marón: Geórgica Primera*, Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1995. Pp. 60. ISBN 968-36-4451-1. No price supplied.
- Carole E. Newlands, *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995. Pp. xiv + 254. ISBN 0-8014-3080-1. US\$35.00.
- Roberta Belli Pasqua, *Sculture di età in 'basalto'*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Pp. xvi + 163, incl. 89 black-and-white-plates. ISBN 88-7062-885-X. L200 000.
- R. C. Penn, *Medicine on Ancient Greek and Roman Coins*. London: B. T. Batsford, 1993. Pp. vi + 186. ISBN 1-85264-070-71. UK£19.99.
- John Penwill, *Two Essays on Virgil: Intertextual Issues in Aeneid 6 and Georgics 4*. Bendigo: La Trobe University, 1995. Pp. 60. ISBN 0-909977-20-8. A\$8.50.
- Janet Pérez and Wendell Aycock (edd.), *Climate and Literature: Reflections of Environment*. Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 1995. Pp. x + 144. ISBN 0-89672-359-3. US\$30.00.
- Barry B. Powell, *Classical Myth*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1995. Pp. xxvi + 707. ISBN 0-13-143470-5. US\$25.00.
- Flavio Raviola, *Napoli Origini*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Pp. 272, incl. 2 tables. ISBN 88-7062-925-2. No price supplied.
- H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Latin Literature*³. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1995. Pp. x + 582. ISBN 0-86515-317-0. US\$19.00.
- Biagio Saitta, *L'antisemitismo nella Spagna visigotica*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Pp. 158. ISBN 88-7062-896-5. L150 000.

- John Scheid and Jesper Svenbro (tr. Carol Volk), *The Craft of Zeus: Myths of Weaving and Fabric*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996. Pp. viii + 226. ISBN 0-674-17549-2. UK£25.50.
- Clive Skidmore, *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996. Pp. xvii + 142. ISBN 0-85989-477-0. UK£30.00.
- Susan A. Stephens and John J. Winkler, *Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995. Pp. xvi + 541. ISBN 0-691-069-41-7. US\$59.50/UK£48.00.
- J. Stern (ed. and tr.), *Palaephatus. Peri Apiston: On Unbelievable Tales*. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1996. Pp. vii + 167. ISBN 0-86516-320-0. US\$20.00.
- Brian Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge, and the Ethics of Interpretation*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1996. Pp. x + 463. ISBN 0-674-05276-5. UK£25.50.
- J. C. Traupman, *Conversational Latin for Oral Proficiency*. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1996. Pp. 224. ISBN 0-86516-316-2. US\$15.00.
- M. P. I. Troconis (ed. and tr.), *Julio Paulo: Sentencias a su Hijo Libro I: Interpretatio*. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1995. Pp. lxxxv + 49. ISBN 968-36-4527-5. No price supplied.
- Vincenzo Tusa, *I sarcofagi romani in Sicilia*². Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Pp. xvi + 119, incl. 181 black-and-white plates. ISBN 88-7062-895-7. L250 000.
- Gabriella Vanotti, *L'altro Enea: La testimonianza di Dionigi di Alicarnasso*. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Pp. 343. ISBN 88-7062-908-2. L220 000.
- John Wilkins, David Harvey and Mike Dobson (edd.), *Food in Antiquity*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1995. Pp. xii + 459. ISBN 0-85989-418-5. UK£35.00.
- T. P. Wiseman, *Historiography and Imagination: Eight Essays on Roman Culture*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1994. Pp. xiv + 167, incl. 5 half-tone illustrations, 1 line illustration and 2 maps. ISBN 0-85989-422-3. UK£13.95.
- Ian Worthington (ed.), *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. London: Routledge, 1994. Pp. xii + 277. ISBN 0-415-08138-6. UK£12.99.

RETRIEVING *SCHOLIA* ELECTRONICALLY

How to Subscribe to Scholia Reviews

Scholia Reviews consists of the electronic, pre-publication versions of reviews that may appear in printed form in the journal itself. Subscription to the reviews is free. To subscribe simply send a request to the e-mail address scholia@classics.und.ac.za and the Reviews Editor will add your address to our distribution list. Subscriptions are administered by the Reviews Editor and not by a list server.

How to Retrieve Scholia and Other Information

Scholia has established a World Wide Web site at the following address: <http://www.und.ac.za/und/classics>. Information about the journal, its contents (including abstracts but excluding the text of articles), and the electronic version of its reviews, known as *Scholia Reviews*, are available here. The *CASA Directory of Classical Scholars and Research for Higher Degrees at Universities in Sub-Saharan Africa (1995-1996)* can also be found here. Finally, there is information about the Department of Classics and the Museum of Classical Archaeology at the University of Natal, Durban, who hosts this site.

This information can also be obtained by Gopher at gopher.und.ac.za, following the path: 1. Campus Information System; 4. Faculty Information; 2. Classics. The full Gopher address is: Gopher://gopher.und.ac.za:70/11/Campus%20Information%20System/Faculty%20Information/Classics.

Access to Scholia at Pennsylvania

The *Scholia* web site has been mirrored at the University of Pennsylvania. The URL is <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~scholia/scholia.html>.

Reviews can also be obtained by Gopher at ccat.sas.upenn.edu and looking under menu item 8 (Electronic Publications and Resources). *Scholia Reviews* appears as item 19.

The gopher bookmark that will enable you to add this to your own gopher menu is: Type=1; Name=Scholia Reviews (Classical Studies); Path=1/scholia; Host=ccat.sas.upenn.edu; Port=5070; URL:gopher://ccat.sas.upenn.edu:5070/11/scholia.

**UNIVERSITY OF NATAL *EPOS* AND *LOGOS*:
ANCIENT LITERATURE AND ITS ORAL CONTEXT
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS**

Durban, South Africa
Monday, 1st July to Friday, 5th July 1996

Organiser: E. A. Mackay

SESSION 1, RAINER FRIEDRICH, CHAIR

HOMER AND THE FLOATING GAP

W. Kullmann, Albert Ludwigs University, Germany

When dealing with the past, according to anthropological studies in oral cultures, poetry and narrative refer either to the recent past or to a time of origin. In the course of time, the living memory always shifts to its own present time. Thus there is a 'floating gap' between the time narrated and the time of origin. In the Homeric epics the situation is different. Their subject-matter is the heroic age, which seems to be part of the historical memory. Since in an illiterate society historical knowledge of the Mycenaean time could not have survived in oral poetry over 500 years, there is every reason to believe that it was owing to the ruins of the Mycenaean palaces and of Troy that the idea of a campaign of the united Greek territories against Troy developed.

ODYSSEUS' EVASIVENESS AND THE AUDIENCE OF THE *ODYSSEY*

R. Scodel, University of Michigan, USA

At *Odyssey* 7.238f., Arete asks Odysseus who he is. Odysseus does not answer until book 9. Odysseus may be worried that the Phaeacians have a prophecy about him. Polyphemus and Circe had both heard prophecies about Odysseus. The Phaeacians do have a relevant prophecy (8.564-71), but it does not name Odysseus. However, these prophecies, though they are in the past of the story, are still ahead in the narrative. Rather than assuming that Homeric audiences all knew the tradition intimately, I suggest that hearers were willing to tolerate temporary opacity.

SESSION 2, DANIE LOMBARD, CHAIR

HOMER AND THE NAMING OF CHARACTERS IN HELIODORUS

J. Hilton, University of Natal, Durban

The close link between the Homeric epics and the *Ethiopian Story* of Heliodorus has frequently been noted. This paper examines two examples of this relationship: first, the

Homeric pattern of naming heroes is compared with the treatment of the genealogy and name of Theagenes in the romance; secondly, the dream of Penelope in book 19 of the *Odyssey* is compared with the dream of Charikles in book 4 of the *Ethiopian Story*. An analysis of these passages shows that the later writer's treatment of his literary model is more original than comparable material in the other four extant Greek romances.

DESCRIBING AND NARRATING IN HOMER'S *ILLIAD*

E. Minchin, Australian National University

This paper is a study of passages of description in Homer's *Iliad*. It considers descriptive material as material closely related to, but quite distinct from, narrative. It considers how an oral poet composes descriptive passages (e.g., of a lyre or a cup) and proposes that Homer composed such passages by referring to a description-format stored in memory. A story or a story-fragment is usually associated with descriptive material. The place of narrative within description is examined and reasons for its particular appeal are suggested. Descriptive passages within narrative are not without their significance in the epic: as a source of delight, of cohesion, and as an unexpected source of evaluative information in that they promote our understanding of the action.

SESSION 3, EGBERT BAKKER, CHAIR

RING COMPOSITION AND LINEARITY IN HOMER

S. Nimis, Miami University, Ohio, USA

In the *Shield of Homer*, Keith Stanley argues that ring composition is a fundamental tool Homer consciously uses to control the progress and meaning of his poem. Using the example of *Iliad* 8, I argue that ring composition is a feature of improvisational art. Whereas Stanley sees here a series of rings that give a thematic unity and closure to the book, I argue it is the linear unfolding of thematic material that gives the book its peculiar shape. My account of book 8 emphasises the dynamic quality of Homeric composition in contrast to any account of the poem as a 'stable object of distanced and repeatable appraisal'.¹

HOMER AND THE ART OF DYING

J. Hollands, University of Natal, Durban

This paper examines selected formulations associated with the deaths in battle of heroes who have varying degrees of importance in the *Iliad* of Homer. The questions asked are to what extent the formulations are contextually appropriate and to what extent their use may be motivated purely by structural considerations in the relevant section of the epic.

¹ K. Stanley, *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the Iliad* (Princeton 1993) 268.

SESSION 4: KEYNOTE ADDRESS**READING BETWEEN THE SIGNS: HOMER AND ORAL TRADITION**

J. M. Foley, University of Missouri, Columbia

This paper attempts to engage Homer through his tradition. The first section concentrates on some problems that have plagued the Parry-Lord Oral Theory since its inception: the privileging of composition over reception, the Great Divide of orality versus literacy, and the persistence of oral traditional language into texts. The second section argues that the mode of representation signalled by a *sema* in the *Iliad*, *Odyssey* and the *Hymns* is equivalent to the traditional referentiality attached to all of Homer's verbal signs, whether they be formulaic phrases, typical scenes or story patterns. Finally, the infamous 'writing' on Bellerophon's tablet is understood within the Homeric tradition not primarily as literate encoding but rather as traditional communication—that is, that the only sure instance of what we call 'writing' in either epic is understood as a species of *semata* and thus of oral traditional signification.

SESSION 5, RUTH SCODEL, CHAIR**THE STUDY OF HOMERIC DISCOURSE:
QUESTIONS OF MEDIUM AND CONCEPTION**

Egbert Bakker, University of Montreal, Canada

While most research dealing with oral poetry views 'orality' as belonging to times and places other than our own, the 'orality' that is the subject of this paper is a less remote phenomenon. This paper considers Homeric poetry as 'speech' and focuses on a number of features of Homeric discourse that are better explained in terms of the medium of spoken language (as it can be observed in our own behaviour) than as 'oral' or 'archaic' style. Most important of these is the segmentation of Homeric discourse into small 'chunks', about two per line, corresponding to the way in which speakers produce their discourses.

**ENJAMBEMENT IN HOMER:
DOES THE HOMERIC TEXT PASS LORD'S THIRD TEST OF ORALITY?**

R. Friedrich, Dalhousie University, Canada

According to the statistics the Homeric epics cannot be said to pass the enjambement test of orality. This paper deals with the various strategies devised by oralists of getting around this *brutum factum*. It shows that these strategies can make only a portion of necessary enjambements disappear, but at a heavy cost. The Homeric sentence is only one casualty of this strategy; the hexameter is the other. By comparison, the South-Slavic texts behave as oral texts are supposed to behave, and Apollonius' and Vergil's texts behave as literate texts are supposed to behave. Yet the Homeric texts behave in a way that undercuts this

neat binary of oral/literate. From this arises the larger question: where does this leave the Homeric texts? Merely in limbo? Or is it not rather in the yet uncharted region of post-orality and the transitional text?

SESSION 6, WOLFGANG KULLMANN, CHAIR

HERO AS POET AND POET AS HERO

C. Mackie, University of Melbourne, Australia

This paper deals with the subject of Achilles' two teachers in the *Iliad*, Chiron and Phoenix. The essential focus is the fact that Chiron is largely excluded from the poem and overshadowed by Phoenix, but that this exclusion is not complete. There are still four references to the centaur in the text of the *Iliad*, including one that he taught Achilles medicine (11.828-32). It is argued that the poet retains allusions to Chiron in the text because they help to inform Achilles' uniqueness as an individual. It is argued further that, as with later sources, Chiron is Achilles' music teacher in the subtext of the *Iliad*. In this context the meeting between Phoenix and Achilles in book 11 is one in which public speech (taught by Phoenix) is rejected in favour of personal song (taught by Chiron).

SIGNIFICANT ADDITIONS AND MEANINGFUL ABSENCES IN HOMER

J. Watson, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

In the *Iliad* gods' approaches to mortals are structured by the compositional pattern described by Walter Arend as 'simple arrival'. When the approach results in the god addressing a mortal, the arrival pattern may or may not be expanded by a 'disguise' element, where the god is described as taking on the likeness of a mortal to make his/her address. This paper examines the circumstances under which the disguise element appears in the arrival pattern for gods and explores what significance may be attached to its inclusion or omission.

SESSION 7, NIAL SLATER, CHAIR

AIAS: IMMUTABLE HEROISM AND THE ORAL POET

J. Wilson, University of Scranton, USA

This paper explores the marginalisation of Telamonian Aias in Homer's *Iliad*. In spite of his consistently magnificent performance in battle, he never earns adequate recognition from the Greeks or from the poet. The failure to award him the arms of Achilles is only the final disgrace; prior to that episode and his consequent suicide, the poet has repeatedly failed to show due respect in his poetry for the accomplishments of the hero. Homer constructs Aias as an anti-Achilles, unreligious and anti-poetic (symptoms of the same

illness). Homer thus uses Aias to construct oral poetry as a grand narrative in competition with heroism itself.

THE MYTH OF RATIONALITY
M. Angelini, Queen's University, Belfast

For some modern theorists, the prospects of recovering a praxis-oriented approach in philosophy lie in a rediscovery of certain motifs in Aristotelian thought as it developed from the Platonic examination of the Good. This tradition of hermeneutics links the methodological concerns of modernity with their cultural roots in the daemon-inspired Socratic urge for the rational. Yet it is precisely this tension between the daemonic and the logocentric, the Apollonian and the Dionysian, which throws into relief certain considerations that call for a reinterpretation of fifth-century BC thought in the light of recent anthropological and linguistic research.

SESSION 8, LOUISE CILLIERS, CHAIR

ORALITY AND PLINY'S *PANEGYRICUS*
E. A. Fantham, Princeton University, USA

Pliny's generation was both highly oriented towards the written word and socially committed to receiving the spoken word as declamation, improvisation or recitation. Thus even speeches like Pliny's *Gratiarum Actio*, 'performance of thanks' to Trajan, were subjected to subsequent recitation as a form of revision of the written end-product. But this speech may be unique in its resort to quotation of oral formulae, prayers, oaths and vows, exchanged between the emperor as consul and the Senate, and between both parties and the gods. Pliny resorted to this new orality to escape devaluation of all non-formulaic utterances caused by the loss of free speech under Trajan's tyrannical predecessor.

SOUNDS AND SENSE: RHYTHMICAL
SHAPING OF NARRATIVE IN OVID'S *FASTI*
M. A. Gosling, University of Natal, Durban

This paper examines Ovid's use of metre and rhythm as a means of manipulating the narrative and its recipient in some of the narratives of the *Fasti*. Ovid's metre is well known to be fast-moving and relatively uncomplicated. Both in hexameters and in elegiac couplets he prefers dactylic line openings. More than two successive spondees are very rare and are used for poetic emphasis. Furthermore, it can be shown that spondaic patterning is used in shaping the narrative in the sense of Ovid's directing his reader's response. Enjambement is infrequent in Ovid's elegiac couplets even between the hexameter and pentameter of a single couplet. Where it is used, this too marks moments of significant narratorial direction.

SESSION 9, ELAINE FANTHAM, CHAIR**FOLEY'S ORAL-TRADITIONAL CRITICISM AND LATER ANCIENT EPIC**

M. Sale, Washington University, USA

Donatus considered Vergil's formulae props, to allow inspiration to flow uninterrupted by searches after the *mots justes*. They thus enable rapid composition, as do Homer's (so Parry). Donatus is right, but also wrong, for they *are* the *mots justes*. They put Vergil alongside Homer; they resemble Homer's formulae exactly, in form and in function, to evoke (so Foley) their referents in all their traditional force and colour; and to guarantee, through the presence of the Muses in them, the truths Vergil asserts—of Troy, of Rome, and of *pater* and *pius* Aeneas' evolution from Trojan to Roman.

SPEECH IN FLAVIAN EPIC

W. J. Dominik, University of Natal, Durban

This paper examines the role of speech in the epics of Statius, Valerius Flaccus and Silius Italicus. These poets use direct speech for a variety of literary ends. On the most basic level the speeches contribute significantly to the dramatic quality of their epics by affording variety to the scenes and bringing relief from descriptive narrative. Far more important is the critical role played by the speeches, which function to explore and clarify thematic issues, establish tone and mood, vary the level of emotional intensity in the narratives, emphasise the epic circumstances, vary the pace of the narratives, present and treat the causes of events, provide motivation for subsequent action, define personalities and present information.

SESSION 10, MICHAEL GAGARIN, CHAIR**DIALOGUE AND STORY-TELLING: FROM PLATO TO LUCIAN**

H. Tarrant, University of Newcastle, Australia

How useful are dialogues for finding out about how stories were told? How far did written dialogue reflect oral practices? This paper begins with philosophic dialogue but focuses finally on Lucian. Perhaps more than any other genre dialogue does imitate real life. Philosophic practice and philosophic writing were so closely linked that a word for the school activity (*scholē, sympotica, sermo, disputatio, lectio*) became a word for the literary imitation of that school activity. In Lucian too we find narrations within dialogue that cast the principal performer in the role of expert teller of tall stories and private-eye stories.

EVIDENCE OF ORALITY IN HERODOTOS: SOME OBSERVATIONS

A. Delany, University of Natal, Durban

This paper seeks to identify traces of both oral and oral-derived composition and oral tradition in Herodotus, using some generally accepted criteria as benchmarks. Comparison with the Homeric texts is made where appropriate. Using the Cyrus *logos* in book 1 of the *Histories* as an example, this paper points out some instances where such traces of orality and oral tradition occur in Herodotus and also some instances where he deviated from the older tradition and broke new ground. Since Herodotus invented a new genre, it is worth examining how he blended older, well-known techniques with new innovations and suggesting tentative reasons for his choices.

SESSION 11, HAROLD TARRANT, CHAIR

SPEECHES IN GREEK HISTORIANS: FROM SPEECH TO TEXT

D. Kelly, Australian National University

This paper deals with the historicity of formal speeches in Thucydides and Xenophon's *Hellenica*. The speeches in later historians are put to one side, along with Herodotus, whose speeches are regarded as belonging to story-telling, not historical research. Thucydides 1.22.1-3 means that he wrote his speeches after recollection and enquiry, not out of his head. On the question of how well actual speeches in politics and litigation were remembered in his day, evidence from published speeches is assembled to show the wide range and the facility of such memories. Thucydides believed he had enough to go on in writing speeches and Xenophon did the same according to his lights.

ORAL AND WRITTEN IN GREEK FORENSIC ORATORY

M. Gagarin, University of Texas, USA

After emphasising the fundamentally oral nature of classical Athenian law, this paper considers the main evidence for law, namely forensic oratory. Although these speeches were composed in writing, their style, including forms and strategies of argument, was mainly oral. I demonstrate this by contrasting the precise, complex and analytical arguments of Antiphon's Second Tetralogy, a work intended for reading, with the imprecise, non-analytical arguments of two of his court speeches (1, 6) intended for delivery. Understanding this oral aspect allows us to appreciate better the effectiveness of Antiphon's forensic strategies and may provide some insight into our own law.

SESSION 12, BILL HENDERSON, CHAIR**HELLENISTIC THOUGHTS ON HOMER**

S. Jackson, University of Natal, Durban

The Hellenistic poets could imitate Homer, but they could never hope to rise to his heights. Many epic poems were composed in the Hellenistic age and not just by Apollonius, Rhianus and Aratus. The Hellenistic enthusiasm for anything Homeric did not find its limits in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* but extended to imitation of the last great years of oral tradition as encapsulated in the Homeric hymns and the various Hesiodic works of the sixth century BC. And it was reflected in Hellenistic lyric, elegy, epic, paradoxographical, aetiological and ktistic poetry. This paper considers how the Alexandrian poets combined these different genres with some compulsory Ptolemaic propaganda.

RELICS OF ORAL TRADITION IN RIG VEDA UPANISHADS

G. Tanner, University of Newcastle, Australia

This paper is concerned with the extent to which the Milman Parry view of Greek epic poetry in antiquity as an oral tradition passed on by memory and word of mouth can provide a parallel for the transmission of the Rig Veda and the earlier Upanishads in early Aryan India. In contrast to Parry, A. A. MacDonell sees a written background for Rig Veda rather than a purely oral one, such as the one that Julius Caesar gives to the traditional poetry the Gaulish Druids passed on to their pupils. This paper also examines the history of Padea-pada and Samhita Vedic texts and elements of the Katha and Chandogya Upanishads, which may depend on other lost epic texts.

SESSION 13, ANNE GOSLING, CHAIR**FROM ORAL TRADITION TO MUSICAL NOTATION**

B. Kytzler, University of Natal, Durban

Medieval manuscripts preserve many thousands of liturgical Christian texts such as hymns, antiphons, *cantica*, psalms and mass formulas. While these words were sung from the books during celebrations, their melodies were transmitted by memory only. To help the members of the choir, a leader (*cantor*) indicated to them the direction the melody was going to take: straight, up or down. At some point in time these indications were written into the manuscripts above the line of the words. In a further development, first one, then two more lines were used to indicate the intervals of the single notes until a four-line system had been achieved: the staff was created to record the melody. However, rhythm, volume and tone colour were still left out.

ANCIENT ORAL ART AND THE MIRROR OF
WESTERN MUSIC: SOME REFLECTIONS

D. Smith, University of Natal, Durban

This paper takes as its starting-point the silence to which the musical aspect of ancient orality has been reduced. Modern conjectures as to its nature are given brief consideration. These demand that a question of musical value be posed: in what sense were the now lost musical scores actually worth preserving? Attention is then turned to two subsequent attitudes to antique oral art. The first, intimately connected with the Renaissance, is humanistic antiquarianism; the second attitude, characteristic of the much more recent past, may be called 'poetic myth-making'. There are some noticeable contradictions in these efforts at 're-making'. In the early-modern imitation of the ancient model, marks of the present intrude; and in the recent attempts to update the past, the historical sense, the feeling for authenticity, hovers in the consciousness of the artist. Evidence of these contradictions is discussed and the paper is illustrated by musical examples.

SESSION 14, ANNE MACKAY, CHAIR

THE VASE AS VENTRILOQUIST: *KALOS*-INSCRIPTIONS
AND THE CULTURE OF DISPLAY

N. Slater, Emory University, USA

Kalos-inscriptions are usually understood as acts of communication (declarations of affection), whether from painters or purchasers, but this neglects the audience for, and reception of, these messages beyond the individual praised. Though frequent on symposiastic vessels, *kalos*-inscriptions also appear on other vases, thus projecting their message to a wider audience. *Kalos*-inscriptions put named individuals on public display and invite audience participation in a larger economy of fame. Early Greek inscriptions exist to be read aloud. *Kalos*-inscriptions not only represent but help create contemporary discourse, by scripting performances of these names. *Kalos*-inscriptions therefore raise fundamental questions about authorship, control, and even the orchestration of the culture of fame.

FOUR WEDDINGS AND A FUNERAL:
MYTHOLOGY AND EARLY BLACK-FIGURE PAINTINGS

M. Kilmer, University of Ottawa, Canada

Sophilos is among the first Attic painters to name his mythological figures. He does not always do this, but he has given us three samples of painted story-telling that give a great deal of information in a rather confined space. The certain cases are the Wedding of Peleus and Thetis and the Funeral Games of Patroklos. Neither the former nor Kleitias' François Vase, which features the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, depends on the same visual model or literary version. The same applies to the Games of Patroklos, somewhat

dangerously inferred on the same vase. Too little credit is given to these early painters for their imagination. Variance is as important in visual art as it is in Greek literature.

SESSION 15, JOHN FOLEY, CHAIR

THE EFFECT OF THE BYSTANDER ON GROUP E VASES

D. Harrison, University of Natal, Durban

An examination of the scenes on the vases of painters within Group E shows that the compositional arrangement of figures seems to be systematically ordered and is often symmetrical in a manner reminiscent of the ring composition characteristic of oral poetry. This is particularly true in the case of the bystanders commonly included in these scenes. This paper analyses the positioning, stance and gesture of the bystanders and the signification of these figures within the symmetry and general composition of the scenes. The compositional patterning that is evident within certain scene types is discussed with a view to identifying an established relationship between type-scene and ring-compositional configuration.

INTERPRETING THE BYSTANDER ON VASES OF THE PAINTER OF THE VATICAN MOURNER

S. Masters, University of Natal, Durban

This paper focuses on the extant corpus of the Painter of the Vatican Mourner (fl. 530 BC), who worked on the fringes of Group E and was substantially influenced by Exekias. Analysis of the marginal figures in all the scenes of his comparatively small corpus shows that this painter seems to have had a finely tuned sense of the structural potential of figural frames. He develops the concept of visual ring composition into a more analytical tool capable of suggesting specific interpretation of individual scenes and, through a kind of visual enjambement, creating subtle linkages between obverse and reverse scenes. This represents a later stage of black-figure ring composition.

'RING COMPOSITION' IN ARCHAIC VASE-PAINTING: THE BYSTANDER AND OTHER STRUCTURAL DEVICES

E. A. Mackay, University of Natal, Durban

In past studies I have demonstrated that for the formulae and themes of the early Greek oral tradition, there are functional parallels in the iconography and type-scenes of the archaic vase-painting tradition. Turning now from form to structure, I offer the hypothesis that the composition-patterns of archaic narrative painting often involve figure arrangements that constitute a visual equivalent to poetic ring composition. Analysis of the visual narrative effects of such painting structures gives insight both into the signification of the oral poetic compositional patterns and into the way in which poets may have controlled their material.

IN THE MUSEUM

Scholia publishes news about the University of Natal's Museum of Classical Archaeology. Information about Classical exhibitions and artefacts in other museums in Africa is welcome and should reach the In the Museum Editor, Scholia by 30 June.

MUSEUM OF CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF NATAL

E. A. Mackay, Curator

Museum of Classical Archaeology, University of Natal, Durban
Durban 4041

In the past three years the Museum of Classical Archaeology has made a series of acquisitions that, though small, are each of intrinsic interest for a teaching collection.

Figure 1. Silver 'cosmetic' spoon. The end of the tang is damaged and it seems possible that there was originally a decorative handle, perhaps of a different material. This implement was used in antiquity for removing wax from the ear, and dates from about the second century AD.

Durban 1994.37: length 104mm. Bibliography: *Ede Antiquities* 157 (November 1993) 67.

Figure 2. Roman terracotta lamp. This is a circular lamp that once had a stub handle opposite the spout. Mould-made, it has an inscription in two rings on the discus:

Outer ring: ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΘΕΟΤΟΚΥ ΜΕΘ ΗΜΩΝ

Inner ring: ΕΠΙΓΡΑΜ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ

This can be translated as:

Outer ring: The blessing of the Mother of God (be) with us.

Inner ring: Inscription of John

Of interest are the abbreviation ΕΠΙΓΡΑΜ for ἐπίγραμμα and the misspelling ΘΕΟΤΟΚΥ for θεοτόκου (especially considering the correct spelling of the genitive ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ in the inner ring). The term ἐπίγραμμα was used in classical Greek in reference to an inscription noting the maker of a work of art or the dedicator of an offering (cf. Hdt. 5.59, 7.228; Thuc. 6.54, 59.).¹ This is a lamp dating from the fifth to sixth century AD and deriving from the Roman province of Syria (which included Palestine).

Durban 1994.38: diameter 74 mm. Bibliography: *Ede Antiquities* 157 (November 1993) 31 b.

¹ It could also perhaps refer to a commemorative inscription (cf. Dem. *Lept.* 491).

Figure 3. Gypsum lamp mould. This was the mould for the upper part of a terracotta lamp (the lower bowl would have been formed separately). The decoration on the discus, which is still very sharply defined (indicating that the mould was not much used), consists of a pair of fish of different species, surrounded by a border of alternating motifs: sets of concentric circles and rosettes, ending on either side of the spout with a square containing two concentric circles. Four rounded indentations around the outer edge of the mould seem to have been intended as guides for matching together the moulds for the discus and bowl of the lamp, which would imply that the two halves were joined in the mould. The provenience is North Africa and it dates to the fourth or fifth century AD. This period and provenience have produced a comparatively large number of terracotta lamps (and some moulds) of comparable shape and size to this example; they are regularly decorated with Christian motifs on the discus, surrounded by a border similar in concept to that described above.

Durban 1994.39: length 216 mm.; width 143 mm.; height 52 mm. Bibliography: Ede *Antiquities* 159 (November 1994) 70.

Figure 4. Athenian fish plate, recomposed from fragments (missing portions plaster). This conforms to a type known as the Gallatin plate,² which seems to have been a forerunner of the better known Athenian red-figure fish plate. Gallatin plates were produced in Athens over about a hundred years, from the end of the sixth century to the last quarter of the fifth. The Durban example should be classified with Trendall and McFee's Group III (the largest group):³ the floor, painted black, rises gradually from a small, reserved depression in the centre (decorated with a black dot in a circle) towards the edge before falling away into a convex overhanging rim marked off by a very shallow tooled groove;⁴ on the outer edge of the floor is a reserved zone containing a narrow band of alternating black dots bordered outside by three and inside by two black rings; a little further in on the floor is a narrow reserved band. The outer and inner surfaces of the overhang are painted black, extending a little way into the underside of the floor; the latter is otherwise reserved apart from a narrow black band set halfway towards the junction with the stem. Below the black fillet marking this junction is a reserved band. The stem and the upper surface of the ring foot are black, but the concave edge of the foot is reserved apart from a black ring around a projecting element at its base. The resting surface is reserved but not grooved; the underside of the foot is black, the inner surface of the stem reserved.

Durban 1995.40: diameter 215 mm.; height 62 mm.; foot diameter 100 mm. Bibliography: not previously published.

² Named for an example in the New York Metropolitan Museum (41.162.37), formerly in the Gallatin Collection. A discussion of Gallatin plates may be found in I. McPhee and A. D. Trendall, *Greek Red-figured Fish-plates* (Basel 1987) 23-28 and pll.1-3. I acknowledge with gratitude the help of Jasper Gaunt in attributing the fragments to the plate-type and providing access to the above-mentioned publication.

³ For characteristics see McPhee and Trendall [2] 23; the catalogue follows on pp. 25f.

⁴ The tooled groove is characteristic of Trendall and McPhee's Groups I and II.



Figure 1: Durban 1994.37
Silver 'cosmetic' spoon



Figure 2: Durban 1994.38
Roman terracotta lamp



Figure 3: Durban 1994.39
Gypsum lamp mould



Figure 4: Durban 1995.40. Athenian fish plate

B. X. DE WET ESSAY

*The paper judged to be the best student essay submitted to **Scholia** by 30 June for the preceding year is published annually as the B. X. de Wet Essay. The competition is open to undergraduate students every year and to Honours students in even-numbered years. Classics Departments in Africa are encouraged to send their submissions to Professor Jo-Marie Claassen, Department of Latin, University of Stellenbosch, Private Bag X1, Matieland 7602, South Africa. Papers should not ordinarily exceed 3 000 words in length. The essays are judged anonymously by Professor Jo-Marie Claassen, Dr Sarah Ruden (Cape Town) and Mr Mark Hermans (Western Cape). There is a cash prize of R200. The author of the essay chosen for publication should be prepared to edit it if so requested. The final editing and preparation of the essay for publication are done by the Editors.*

This essay is named in honour of Emeritus Professor B. X. de Wet, who was Head of the Department of Classics at the University of Natal, Durban from 1975 to 1989.

The runner-up in 1996 is Ruth Leslie (University of Rhodes).

INFELIX DIDO: IMAGERY AND SYMBOL— CLOUDS OF FOREBODING

Lynette Marx

Classics Honours

University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7700

Throughout the narrative of Dido's story in the *Aeneid*, the imagery and symbols form a very cohesive whole by reinforcing and extending one another.¹ They create a foreboding atmosphere, which is built up from the very first moments (*praecipue infelix, pesti devota futurae*,² 'especially unlucky Dido, fated to be destroyed', 1.712); they give depth to and explain Dido's character. The constant presence of the imagery and symbols reveals the present and foreshadows the future³. And by giving it a certain universal quality they turn the story of Dido into one of the focal points of the *Aeneid*.

Dido's story is first told in 1.340-68. It is striking how many references there are to cities, city-walls, kingdoms and ruling in these lines. Significantly Dido is introduced as almost identical with Carthage, her city. Most of what we learn about Dido's character is tied up with her role as ruler, leader and city-founder. She is the brave *femina* ('woman') who acts as a *dux* ('leader', 364), a woman fulfilling the role

¹ I would like to thank Dr M. R. Mezzabotta for her assistance and helpful advice.

² I use the text of T. E. Page (ed.), *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books I-VI* (London 1964) throughout.

³ V. Pöschl, *The Art of Virgil: Image and Symbol in the Aeneid* (Ann Arbor 1962) 80.

of a man. So too does Penthesilea, the Amazon woman, the last person to be mentioned (490-93) before Dido's entrance. Her fate foreshadows that of Dido. Dido's story is told to Aeneas before he meets her. Does he recognise in her story elements of his own—the leaving behind of a city in tragic circumstances, the travels to found another? Such early links between the two foreshadow the tragic and fatal outcome of their meeting. In these lines Dido is linked to Carthage and cities in general. This link forms the basis of imagery found throughout her story of cities attacked and captured, which symbolise Dido's own capture and destruction. When Venus reveals her scheme to make Dido fall in love with Aeneas (673-88), the image of the city being captured (*capere*, 673) and destroyed by fire (*cingere flamma*, 673) is apparent.

In book 4 Dido is seen holding Ascanius on her lap, *genitoris imagine capta* ('captured by his likeness to his father', 84). Later Juno commends Venus for the *spolia ampla* ('rich spoils', 93) she and Cupid have won in Dido, who is described as a *femina victa* ('conquered woman', 95). These are images of warfare, of cities being conquered and despoiled. As if Dido were a city, Venus despoils her of her most precious possessions and destroys her very foundations—her loyalty and love for Sychaeus, her queenship, her rationality, her happiness, her life. After the so-called marriage between Dido and Aeneas, Fama spreads the word that both Dido and Aeneas are *turpique cupidine captos* ('captured by sordid lust', 194). Dido is not only captured by desire but also by Fama's rumours: they alert the audience to the fated outcome of the marriage, so that Dido is in a sense caught in the text itself; they also alert Iarbas, which leads to Aeneas' departure and consequently to Dido's destruction. With the Dido-city symbolism in mind, the description of Fama as one who *territat urbes* ('terrorises cities', 187) becomes significant. The imagery becomes extended in meaning and wider in reach.

When Aeneas is about to leave, Dido begins to realise just how much she is *capta* ('trapped', 330) and already sees herself as *deserta* ('left alone', 330).

quid moror? an mea Pygmalion dum moenia frater
destruat aut captam ducat Gaetulus Iarbas?

(4.325f.)

What am I waiting for? My brother, Pygmalion, to destroy my city-walls or
Gaetulian Iarbas to capture and marry me?

If Aeneas were to leave, Dido and her city would probably be attacked or she might be captured in the sense of being forced to marry. The progression of imagery helps to express her terrible predicament. The image of the deserted city (*deserta*, 330), the city bereft of people, is introduced here. Even in her dreams this prospect haunts Dido:

in somnis . . . semperque relinqui
sola sibi, semper longam incommitata videtur
ire viam et Tyrios deserta quaerere terra

(4.466-68)

And in her sleep she dreams that she is always completely alone, that she is forever wandering along an unending road without companions, searching for her Tyrians in an empty land.

Without her Tyrians, Dido is no longer a ruler and is bereft of a significant part of her identity.

When Aeneas first looks out over Carthage (1.419), Vergil impresses upon us that this is a busy and bustling city by comparing the Tyrians to busy bees in a simile (*qualis apes*, 'just like bees', 430-36). In the midst of all the activity in her city is Dido herself.

Talis erat Dido, talem se laeta ferebat
per medios instans operi regnisque futuris
.....
iura dabat legesque viris, operumque laborem
partibus aequabat iustis aut sorte trahebat

(1.503f., 507f.)

So was Dido, and so she moved joyously amongst her people, hastening the work of her future kingdom. . . . She was busy giving statutes and laws to her people, and assigned their various tasks in equal parts or by lot.

Dido fits in perfectly, as she too is busy, directing the affairs of her city. She is seen in a role that would normally have been reserved for a man. These positive images are recalled in book 4, when Vergil tells us:

non coeptae adsurgunt turre, non arma iuventus
exercet portusve aut propugnacula bello
tuta parant: pendent opera interrupta minaeque
murorum ingentes aequataque machina caelo.

(4.86-89)

The half-built towers are no longer rising up, nor are the young men drilling. Construction on the harbour or secure battlements has ceased: the half-finished work has been suspended, the huge, threatening walls, the cranes level with the sky.

No one is building the city any more; its defences (*propugnacula*) are down, so to speak, and vulnerable to attack, and so is Dido. She is not directing the affairs of her city, as she has forsaken her duty because of her infatuation with Aeneas. Since Dido and Carthage have become interdependent to a great extent, Dido has forsaken her duty to herself and has allowed another person or other forces to take control of her life. It seems that Dido has reverted, at least partially, to roles traditionally more suited to a female. West notes that when Mercury finds Aeneas in Carthage, he is busy superintending the work on the buildings, wearing a fine purple cloak made for him by Dido (*Tyrioque ardebat murice laena*, 'a cloak glowing with Tyrian purple', 4.262). The cloak symbolises Dido's 'abandonment of her reign' to Aeneas and confinement

of herself to marriage and 'domesticity'.⁴

The imagery of the city reaches a climax with Dido's death:

concussam bacchatur Fama per urbem.
lamentis gemituque et femineo ululatu
tectata fremunt, resonat magnis plangoribus aether,
non aliter, quam si immissis ruat hostibus omnis
Karthago aut antiqua Tyros, flammaeque furentes
culmina perque hominum volvantur perque deorum.

(4.666-71)

Rumour ran riot through the stunned city. Lamentation and sobbing and women's wailing filled the palace and the skies echoed with loud mourning, just as if Carthage or ancient Tyre were falling to enemy forces that broke into the city, and flames furiously sweeping over the homes of men and gods.

When one reads this passage, one is gripped by the feeling of chaos and despair associated with the fall of a city, which symbolises Dido's death. The reference to Carthage suggests that the fall of Dido is the fall of Carthage. Anna tells Dido, *extincti te . . . urbemque tuam* ('you have destroyed yourself and your city', 4.682f.). The cries of the women ironically echo the ecstatic cries of the nymphs at the 'wedding' (*ulularunt . . . Nymphae*, 'the nymphs cried out', 169), which brings to mind the *malorum . . . causa* ('the cause of misery', 169f.). Moreover, in this passage there are definite echoes from the fall of Troy in book 2 in both atmosphere and text. When Aeneas describes the scene in Priam's palace in 2.486-88, the same words and ideas occur; there is the same panic in the atmosphere. There are other thematic similarities. Just as Troy was in a sense betrayed by her own Trojans because they were too trusting, so Dido was too trusting and allowed Aeneas within her battlements. She broke down both her own convictions and the defences she had put up after the death of Sychaeus, just as the Trojans pulled down their own city-walls to allow in the Trojan Horse. This resulted in the neglect of Carthage's building programme, leaving it as defenceless as Dido's heart, and caused the destruction of both. Just as the fall of Troy was fated and predestined, so too Dido's death is depicted as fated. Aeneas gives Dido a sceptre that once belonged to Ilione, king Priam's daughter (1.653). As the possession of a Trojan it symbolises Dido's fated death, and as a sign of royalty and government it symbolises the end of Dido's rule over Carthage. Aeneas leaves Troy in flames. When he looks back at Carthage from his ship, he sees the city-walls lit up with the flames from Dido's funeral pyre (5.3f.). The tragedy of Dido is elevated to the tragedy of Troy. The rich imagery of the city suits the context of the *Aeneid*, since the fated destruction and destined foundation of cities underlie the whole narrative.

We now come to another set of imagery. Upon Dido's first entrance, Vergil describes her by means of a simile:

⁴ G. S. West, 'Caeneus and Dido', *TAPhA* 110 (1980) 320.

qualis in Eurotae ripis aut per iuga Cynthi
 exercet Diana choros, quam mille secutae
 hinc atque hinc glomerantur Oreades; illa pharetram
 fert umero gradiensque deas supereminet omnis

(1.498-501)

She was like Diana who exercises her dancers on the banks of the Eurotas or on the slopes of Cynthus, followed by a thousand mountain nymphs on this side and that; she towers over all the other goddesses, as with her quiver slung from her shoulder she steps on her way.

Through her identification with Diana, Dido is linked to Apollo and then later also to Aeneas in a corresponding simile in 4.143-50. These links point to their future relationship. Diana is also the goddess of the hunt, as symbolised by the *pharetra* ('quiver', 1.500). The simile, placed right at the beginning of the hunt, foreshadows the 'marriage' about to take place.

The scene of the hunt is the only one where Dido is seen as the hunter and not the hunted—she also has some responsibility for the event to follow. Yet the imagery of Dido as the hunted is far stronger. A very significant simile earlier in book 4 describes Dido, raging with love, as a wounded deer.

... est molles flamma medullas
 interea et tacitum vivit sub pectore vulnus.
 uritur infelix Dido totaque vagatur
 urbe furens, qualis coniecta cerva sagitta,
 quam procul incautam nemora inter Cresia fixit
 pastor agens telis liquitque volatile ferrum
 nescius: illa fuga silvas saltusque peragrat
 Dictaeos; haeret lateri letalis harundo.

(4.66-73)

All the while the flame eats away at her soft marrow and in her breast lives the silent wound. Unhappy Dido was afire and in a frenzy wandered all over her city, just like a deer wounded by an arrow, that, unwary, near the Cretan woods, a shepherd hunting with arrows had struck, unknowing, leaving in her the swift steel: in flight she crossed the Dictaeon woods and pastures, with the deadly shaft stuck in her flank.

The most foreboding word in the simile is *letalis* ('fatal'), which warns at this early stage of Dido's fatal end. This word is echoed by *leti* ('death') when Vergil says of the wedding day: *ille dies primus leti primusque malorum / causa fuit* ('that day was the first day of death, that first day the cause of suffering', 169f.). So the image of the dying deer is expanded subtly to create 'clouds of foreboding'.⁵ The simile shows how 'unprotected and exposed (*incautam*, 70)' Dido is 'to the danger of falling in love' and her 'inner restlessness' is 'reflected in the image of flight', as if she is making a last

⁵ Pöschl [3] 71.

attempt to escape from an unavoidable fate. The simile 'illuminates a present state and reveals a destiny'.⁶

Dido is even hunted in her dreams, showing her inner torment: *agit ipse furentem / in somnis ferus Aeneas* ('in her sleep, fierce Aeneas himself pursues her as she rages', 4.465f.). It is not just the mad love for Aeneas that pursues her, but her own guilt at what that love has caused her to do and become, as is made clear by further references to Sychaeus and the Tyrians. Accompanying the imagery of the hunt are images of wounds and specifically of a wounded Dido. At the beginning of book 4 Dido *vulnus alit venis* ('feeds her wound with her life-blood', 2). Love is eating away at her flesh, causing a festering wound. The cause of her wound is made clearer by the words following: *haerent infixi pectore vultus / verbaque* ('his face and words stay fast in her heart', 4f.). These words are echoed by others in and preceding the deer-simile: *sub pectore vulnus* ('in her breast the wound', 67), *fixi* ('stuck', 70) and *haeret* ('remain fixed', 73). The expression and words of Aeneas are the 'barbs of love which remained fixed in the wound'.⁷ Through the simile, the images of Aeneas' appearance and words lodging in Dido's heart as if they constituted a weapon of some kind, and the resultant festering wound, are joined to create a complete picture. The words *sub pectore vulnus* are finally echoed with reference to the real wound: *infixum stridit sub pectore vulnus* ('the deep-set wound moans in her breast', 689). The images of the wound find their natural climax with the real wound at the end of book 4:

... atque illam ... ferro
collapsam aspiciunt comites, ensemque cruore
spumantem sparsasque manus.

(4.663-65)

And her companions saw her fall on the sword, the blade foaming and her
hands spattered with blood.

Much is made of the weapon, for it is Aeneas's sword (*ensemque ... Dardanum*, 'the Dardan sword', 646f.) that she uses on herself. So it comes full circle: it was Aeneas who caused the symbolic wound and now Aeneas (with his departure and his sword) who causes the literal wound. And as Vergil warned us from the beginning, both wounds are equally fatal.

Another image closely associated with the wound is that of fire. Fire is symbolic of love and sexuality. The flame symbolises the union of man and woman – the flame-form being masculine and the light feminine. So the flame suggests the union of Dido and Aeneas. Yet it is also associated with death and martyrdom.⁸ Venus introduces it when she plans to substitute Cupid for Ascanius so that he can *donisque furentem / incendat reginam atque ossibus implicet ignem* ('fire the queen into a frenzy with his gifts and inflame her very bones with fire', 1.659f.). Dido becomes

⁶ Pöschl [3] 80.

⁷ F. L. Newton, 'Recurrent Imagery in *Aeneid* IV', *TAPhA* 88 (1957) 37.

⁸ A. De Vries, *Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery* (Amsterdam 1974) 187f.

caeco carpitur igni ('consumed by a hidden fire', 4.2). The connection between love and fire is made more explicit as the narrative progresses. Anna causes Dido's passions to flare up: *his dictis incensum animum flammavit amore* ('with these words she inflamed Dido's kindled heart with love', 4.54). In the 'marriage' scene, we read that *fulsere ignes* ('lightning flashed', 4.167). In the deer-simile quoted above the three sets of imagery are combined. The hunt-motif, the images of the wound and fire are all there. The 'effect of this mass imagery is the more forceful because each image has appeared singly or with another often before'.⁹

As she prepares the funeral pyre, the final fire, Dido tells Barce:

sacra Iovi Stygio, quae rite incepta paravi,
perficere est animus finemque inponere curis
Dardaniique rogi capitis permittere flammae.

(4.638-40)

I have in mind to finish the sacred rites of Stygian Jove which I have rightly ordered and begun, and to put an end to my cares by giving to the flames the funeral pyre of that Dardan wretch.

It is ironic that Barce has no idea just how it is that Dido intends to put an end to her cares. Dido will die on a funeral pyre and her body will be consumed with fire. De Vries also notes a connection between fire and the sword, since they share the 'ambivalent' qualities, of 'physical destruction and spiritual energy'.¹⁰ The fire imagery then foreshadows not only the pyre but also the sword. Yet one should not forget that fire is also symbolic of purification. The only way that Dido can purge herself of her *furor* ('raving, madness, frenzy') and regain her dignity and respect is to die in the manner she does.

From fire we move to *furor*. Throughout book 4 *furens* ('raving'), like *infelix* ('unhappy'), appears as an epithet for Dido: *infelix Dido totaque vagatur / urbe furens* ('unhappy Dido wanders all over her city in a frenzy', 68f.). This epithet is reinforced by two supporting similes:

saevit inops animi, totamque incensa per urbem
bacchatur; qualis commotis excita sacris
Thyias, ubi audito stimulant trieterica Baccho
orgia, nocturnusque vocat clamore Cithaeron.

(4.300-303)

Feeble in mind she rages, and inflamed she raves through the whole city; just like a Thyiad, roused by the stirring of the sacred symbols, when, at the sound of Bacchic cries, biennial orgies kindle her and at night Cithaeron calls her with shouts.

⁹ Newton [7] 40.

¹⁰ De Vries [8] 187.

She acts as if she is a maenad or a Bacchanal at the Bacchic festival. The thought that Aeneas might leave her causes her to lose all her rationality and control. In the second simile she is compared with Pentheus and Orestes (4.469-73). The connection between the two similes lies clearly in the Bacchic/Dionysian frenzy and ecstatic madness. It creates a very striking picture when such imagery is transferred onto Dido, who used to be a stately queen. It is significant that Dido is here compared with men who lost their rationality and, in the case of Pentheus, his kingship. This suggests that Dido, who also once performed the duties of a man, has lost her 'masculine' qualities of rationality and rulership. Both Pentheus and Orestes received their madness as punishment. Is this Dido's punishment too? Why? Possibly, she did not stay true either to the vows she made regarding Sychaeus or to herself.

Dido finally realises the extent of her madness when she says: *quae mentem insania mutat?* ('What lunacy turns my mind?', 4.595). The suggestion is that it is not *furor* that leads to Dido's suicide but the realisation of *furor*. Dido's *furor* links her with the underworld. Her frenzy is reminiscent of that of the Sibyl when overcome by the god Apollo. The sexual element is central to both. Dido's *furor* leads in a sense to the 'marriage' ritual, an 'unlawful marriage' (*inconcensosque hymenaeos*, 1.651), just like Helen's, whose robe Aeneas presented to Dido (1.650-52). The wedding 'ceremony' (4.165-70) does not appear as a wedding feast, but it is 'rather related to the epiphanies of the gods of the nether world'.¹¹ It is a terrifying and foreboding scene. The *speluncam* ('cave', 4.165) reminds one of the cave at the entrance to the underworld in book 6. There are cosmic elements instead of traditional ones. So the lightning (*ignes*, 4.167) is substituted for the wedding torches and the cries of the nymphs (*ulularunt . . . Nymphae*, 4.168) become the hymenaeal wedding song.

As Dido's death approaches, imagery suggestive of the underworld occurs more frequently. This heightens the tension and the foreboding atmosphere. The sacrificial wine that she pours *in obscenum se vertere . . . cruorem* ('turns into foul blood', 4.455). This foreboding image of sacrifice not only foreshadows the literal blood from Dido's wound, but is also in itself symbolic of passion, of war, guilt and witchcraft.¹² *Solaque culminibus ferali carmine bubo / saepe queri* ('And alone on the rooftops an owl with its gloomy song often laments', 4.462f.). The owl was an Egyptian hieroglyphic sign for death and darkness, connected with Hecate and also symbolic of loneliness and despair.¹³ The owl prophesies Dido's death, but is also in itself symbolic thereof. The connection with Hecate links Dido more closely with the underworld, since Hecate is the chthonic version of Diana, with whom Dido has been identified previously (1.498-502). When the priestess performs her ritual ceremony, which has strong connections with witchcraft, she invokes primeval deities who are especially associated with the underworld.

¹¹ Pöschl [3] 82.

¹² De Vries [8] 52f.

¹³ De Vries [8] 353f.

ter centum tonat ore deos, Erebumque Chaosque
tergeminamque Hecaten, tria virginis ora Dianae.
sparserat et latices simulatos fontis Avernī.

(4.510-12)

With a voice of thunder the priestess calls on three hundred gods, Erebus and Chaos, and threefold Hecate, three-faced Diana. And she sprinkled water too, ostensibly from the waters of Avernus.

From Chaos was born Erebus (Hades). Lake Avernus is connected with the Sibyl's cave that gives entrance to the underworld in the sixth book (*spelunca alta fuit . . . tuta lacu nigro*, 'there was a deep cave, protected by a dark lake', 237f.). This passage conjures up an almost overpowering sense of evil and doom. Moreover, the references to primeval elements such as Chaos give the tragedy of Dido a universal quality.

Possibly the most pervasive and striking image in relation to Dido and the underworld is that of the labyrinth. In one way or another it touches on almost all the other images we have discussed. The labyrinth is symbolic of the universe, the underworld, the city, the mind and the subconscious.¹⁴ Within the first three lines describing Dido in book 1, the word *ambages* ('a long, winding story', 342) occurs. Later Vergil uses the word literally when describing the labyrinth of Daedalus (*Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resolvit*, 'Daedalus himself unlocked the palace's treacherous labyrinth', 6.29). The image of Dido wandering along labyrinthine paths is expanded to show her mentally roaming. She dreams of roaming the empty streets in search of the Tyrians (4.467f.). The whole context suggests that Dido is mentally trapped, raving, roaming. This fits well with the description of the labyrinth as 'the weaving patterns of thought of a haunted person; a mental torture chamber'.¹⁵

In book 6 the imagery of the labyrinth becomes more complex. When Aeneas arrives at Cumae he makes for the temple of Apollo built by Daedalus. On its door and walls are depicted the whole myth of the Cretan labyrinth and the minotaur (24-30). The figures associated with the labyrinth myth have significant connections with Dido. Pasiphae was overcome with unnatural desire for a bull and that desire was consummated. Dido too is overcome with desire to the point of it becoming unnatural and her desire is also consummated. Ariadne fell in love with the stranger who arrived on her shores and helped Theseus' 'blind steps' only to be abandoned by him later. Likewise Dido rescues Aeneas from his own labyrinthine wanderings only to be abandoned. The links between Dido and these mythological figures not only illuminate the story of Dido, but also elevate her to the level of a mythical figure. This has all been brought about by the single image of the labyrinth.

The image of the labyrinth has brought us to the edge of the underworld and can take us still further, deep into the underworld. The labyrinth and the underworld have some physical qualities in common. The entrance to the underworld, the Sibyl's cave, resembles a labyrinth with its many apparent entrances and exits. Once entered,

¹⁴ De Vries [8] 288.

¹⁵ De Vries [8] 288.

it is difficult, if not impossible, to make your way out of them. Aeneas' escort into the underworld, and in a sense ours, is the Sibyl. Vergil calls the utterances of the Sibyl *ambages* ('enigmas', 'riddles', 6.99), which recalls the image of the labyrinth. We have already seen the connection between the labyrinth and the figure of Pasiphae. Skulsky connects Pasiphae with the Sibyl. According to Skulsky, 'Apollo's prophetesses . . . were believed to be in sexual contact with the god, even to be, metaphorically speaking, impregnated by him'.¹⁶ One can see this even from a small section describing the Sibyl being inspired by Apollo.

... sed pectus anhelum,
et rabie fera corda tument, maiorque videri . . .

... but her chest heaves and her wild heart swells with frenzy,
and she appears larger . . . (6.48f.)

Her breast heaves as if with sexual frenzy and her body seems larger, as if swollen, impregnated. Both Pasiphae and the Sibyl take part in 'unnatural coupling'. The result of Pasiphae's union is a *proles biformis* (6.25) and the Sibyl's 'figurative pregnancy' also produces a kind of 'hybrid offspring'. Moreover, Pasiphae is associated with the horned lunar cow. The Sibyl's words emerge like the lowing of cattle (*remugit*, 'she bellows', 9) and she too is associated with the moon as the priestess of Diana.¹⁷

The importance of Pasiphae's connection with the Sibyl lies in her association with the labyrinth and Dido's association with Pasiphae. For Dido by implication is therefore also linked to the Sibyl. Skulsky observes further that 'as lunar figures and as victims of a kind of sexual aggression on the part of the gods, in which their own wishes are subordinated to the divine intentions for a particular man, these . . . women [Dido and Pasiphae] resemble the Sibyl'.¹⁸ So the sexual relationship between the Sibyl and Apollo resembles that between Dido and Aeneas. Dido's passion is inspired by Venus and her own wishes are not taken into account. Dido's prophetic qualities are emphasised through her identification with the Sibyl. So her speeches take on the qualities of prophecies. Note, for example, what she says about Rome and Carthage: *nullus amor populis nec foedera sunt* ('let there be no love or alliance between our people', 4.624). Her Roman audience would know full well the truth of this prophecy.

Both Dido and the Sibyl are used by divine powers to aid Aeneas, when they have fulfilled their roles, they are discarded. Similarly, Aeneas is ultimately discarded when he has done his duty. So we find Vergil's implicit sympathy with his characters underlying the series of linked images. When Dido is identified with the Sibyl, the victimisation of each figure by divine powers is highlighted. Skulsky remarks that Vergil is interested in 'victimization'—in the 'issue of the response of human beings

¹⁶ S. Skulsky, 'The Sibyl's Rage and the Marpessan Rock', *AJPh* 108 (1987) 57.

¹⁷ Skulsky [16] 64f. Only the bare outlines of Skulsky's complex argument can be presented here.

¹⁸ Skulsky [16] 70f.

when confronted with divine temptation, or divine force, or by what they symbolize in the *Aeneid*: the superhuman dynamics of political and historical movements'.¹⁹

Once in the underworld, Aeneas encounters many different figures, among them 'those consumed by the wasting torments of merciless love'.²⁰ These mythological figures recall those on the temple of Apollo and also have significant connections with Dido, who is now among them. Like Phaedra, Dido was struck with an unnatural love, was scorned, and killed herself. Procis was so suspicious of her husband that she followed him on the hunt and was killed accidentally by his spear. The imagery of the hunt and of weapons surrounding Dido has been treated above. Dido thought that she had betrayed her vows to Sychaeus, just as Eriphyle betrayed her husband. Evadne flung herself on the funeral pyre of her husband Capaneus. The funeral pyre on which Dido died was ostensibly built to burn Aeneas' belongings. Pasiphae was struck with unnatural love for a bull. Laodamia accompanied her husband to Hades. Dido and Aeneas also meet in the underworld. These figures highlight the important aspects of Dido's story that brought her to the underworld.

The last figure mentioned before we see Dido herself needs careful consideration. Caeneus was originally a girl named Caenis. In return for her favours, Poseidon made her invulnerable and changed her into a man. However, the last change, that of a man to a woman, exists in no other source, which suggests that Vergil invented it for his own purposes. Dido undergoes the same kinds of transformations. As a young woman she is married to Sychaeus. On his death she becomes the *dux femina*, doing the work of a man, gaining a 'masculine destiny'.²¹ Upon her own death she reverts to her female youth and her erstwhile husband. Although Vergil depicts Caeneus as transformed back into a woman, she retains her masculine name. She is therefore neither completely masculine nor completely feminine. This points to 'an ambiguity in Dido's soul'. She is taken with her masculine, 'heroic destiny' and yet finds that she longs for the love of a man, so is faced with 'two conflicting ways of life'.²² West concludes that the 'result is a tragic and eternal disharmony for the great queen who mourns in the grieving fields'.²³

The image of the labyrinth has taken us from Dido's early life right up to her roaming in the underworld. We can say that the symbols and imagery regarding Dido reinforce and extend one another. Different images are linked across the narrative to form a meaningful whole. While revealing and illuminating the present, they predict the future—these 'clouds of foreboding'—and are finally realised in the underworld and the greater narrative. Finally Dido herself, through her inner suffering, becomes a symbol of all that is tragic in the *Aeneid*.

¹⁹ Skulsky [16] 76.

²⁰ C. Day Lewis' translation of 6.442 in *The Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid of Virgil* (Oxford 1966).

²¹ West [4] 317.

²² West [4] 318.

²³ West [4] 324.

EXCHANGES WITH *SCHOLIA*

Scholia is exchanged with journals not subscribed to by the University of Natal. The list below includes journals and monograph series received in exchange for *Scholia*. Requests by editors of journals for exchanges should be directed to the Editor, *Scholia*.

- Acta Antiqua et Archaeologica* (Szeged, Hungary)
Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis (Debrecen, Hungary)
Acta Patristica et Byzantina (Pretoria)
Acta Universitatis de Attila Jozsef Nominatae (Budapest, Hungary)
Aevum (Milan, Italy)
Anales de Filologia Clasica (Buenos Aires, Argentina)
Anales de Historia Antigua y Medieval (Buenos Aires, Argentina)
Ancient History: Resources for Teachers (Sydney, Australia)
Ancient History Bulletin (Calgary, Canada)
Ancient Philosophy (Pittsburgh, USA)
Annales Universitatis Budapestensis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae (Budapest, Hungary)
Annales Latini Montium Arvernorum (Clermont-Ferrand, France)
Annali (Pisa, Italy)
Annali del Liceo Classico 'G. Garibaldi' di Palermo (Palermo, Italy)
Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Pisa, Italy)
Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia (Perugia, Italy)
Apeiron (Alberta, Canada)
Archaeological News (Athens, USA)
Archaeology (New York, USA)
Arctos (Helsinki, Finland)
Arethusa (Baltimore, USA)
Argos (Buenos Aires, Argentina)
Arion (Boston, USA)
Athenaeum (Padua, Italy)
AUMLA: Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association (Christchurch, New Zealand)
Bollettino dei Classici (Rome, Italy)
Bryn Mawr Classical Review (Bryn Mawr, USA)
Bulletin Analytique d'Histoire Romaine (Strasbourg, France)
Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé (Paris, France)
Cahiers du GITA (Montpellier, France)
Classica (Belo Horizonte, Brazil)
Classical Association of the Pacific Northwest Bulletin (Tacoma, USA)
The Classical Bulletin (Wauconda, USA)

- The Classical Journal* (Charlottesville, USA)
The Classical Outlook (Athens, USA)
Classical Studies (Kyoto, Japan)
Classics Ireland (Dublin, Ireland)
Classicum (Sydney, Australia)
Cuadernos de Filología Clásica (Madrid, Spain)
Drama (Stuttgart, Germany)
Durham University Journal (Durham, England)
Echos du Monde Classique (St John's, Canada)
Eikasmos (Bologna, Italy)
Eirene (Prague, Czech Republic)
Emerita (Madrid, Spain)
Eos (Warsaw, Poland)
Epistula Witwatersrandensis (Witwatersrand)
Epistula Zimbabweana (Harare, Zimbabwe)
Exercitus (Witcombe, England)
Les Études Classiques (Namur, Belgium)
Euphrosyne (Lisbon, Portugal)
Faventia (Barcelona, Spain)
Florilegium (Ottawa, Canada)
Gerión (Madrid, Spain)
Habis (Seville, Spain)
Hellenika (Thessalonica, Greece)
Hermathena (Dublin, Ireland)
Hesperia (Rome, Italy)
Hierax (Bilbao, Spain)
Humanistica Lovaniensia (Leuven, Belgium)
Humanitas (Coimbra, Portugal)
Inozemna Filolohiia (Lviv, Ukraine)
Institute for the Classical Tradition Newsletter (Boston, USA)
Invigilata Lucernis (Bari, Italy)
Iris (Melbourne, Australia)
Iris (Palaio Psychiko, Greece)
Itaca (Barcelona, Spain)
Journal of Ancient Civilizations (Changchun, China)
Journal of Classical Studies (Kyoto, Japan)
Kleio (Leuven, Belgium)
Latinitas (Vatican City)
Limes (Santiago, Chile)
Maia (Bologna, Italy)
Manuscripta (St Louis, USA)
Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici (Pisa, Italy)
Minerva (Valladolid, Spain)
Minos (Salamanca, Spain)

New England Classical Newsletter and Journal (Fairfield, USA)
Nova Tellus (Mexico City, Mexico)
Orpheus (Catania, Italy)
Pallas (Toulouse, France)
Papers on Grammar (Bologna, Italy)
Papers on Rhetoric (Bologna, Italy)
Parnassos (Athens, Greece)
Pegasus (Exeter, England)
Perficit (Salamanca, Spain)
Philologos (Thessalonica, Greece)
Philologus (Berlin, Germany)
Platon (Athens, Greece)
Primitiae (Canberra, Australia)
Ploutarchos (Logan, USA)
Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society (Cambridge, England)
Proceedings of the Virgil Society (London, England)
Prudentia (Auckland, New Zealand)
Quaderni di Storia (Bari, Italy)
Sandalion (Sassari, Italy)
Scripta Classica Israelica (Jerusalem, Israel)
Siculorum Gymnasium (Catania, Italy)
Southern Review (Adelaide, Australia)
Sri Lanka Journal of the Humanities (Peradeniya, Sri Lanka)
Studii Clasice (Bucharest, Romania)
Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica (Florence, Italy)
Studi Urbinati di Storia, Filosofia e Letteratura (Urbino, Italy)
Stylos (Buenos Aires, Argentina)
Syllecta Classica (Iowa City, USA)
Symbolae Osloenses (Oslo, Norway)
Tennessee Philological Bulletin (Chattanooga, USA)
Texas Classics in Action (Austin, USA)
Veleia (Vitoria, Spain)
Vergilius (Columbia, USA)
Voces (Salamanca, Spain)
Vox Latina (Saarbrücken, Germany)
Zetesis (Milan, Italy)
Živa Antika (Skopje, Macedonia)

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

1. Submissions are invited in every area of Classical Studies. Preferred languages are English and Afrikaans, but German, Italian, French and Spanish are acceptable.
2. (a) Contributors should address two copies of the submission to the Editor, *Scholia*, Department of Classics, University of Natal, Durban 4041, Republic of South Africa. Submissions not accepted for publication are normally returned at the journal's expense, but potential contributors should, in any case, retain copies of their manuscripts.
(b) Submissions are acknowledged forthwith and every effort is made to inform contributors of the Editors' decision concerning publication as promptly as possible.
(c) All contributions accepted for publication are edited to conform to the *Scholia* style.
(d) First (and occasionally second) proofs of articles are sent to contributors whose submissions are accepted for publication. Proofreading is then the responsibility of the author.
(e) While the *Scholia* Editorial Committee undertakes to publish submissions accepted as soon as possible, it reserves the right to hold over any contribution to another volume. The vast majority of articles and reviews are published in the volume of the journal specified in the formal letters of acceptance sent to contributors; however, some articles and reviews may not appear until the publication of the subsequent volume, owing to limits of space and printing deadlines.
3. (a) Articles should be submitted in clear type and be double-spaced throughout on 210 mm. x 297 mm. or 8.5 in. x 11 in. paper.
(b) Articles should not ordinarily exceed 7 000 words in length. Review articles should not be longer than 2 500 words. Reviews should not exceed 1 000 words except with the approval of the Reviews Editor. Reviewers should adhere to the guidelines that accompany books for review.
(c) A submission need not be accompanied by a copy on a computer diskette in computer-readable form; if a submission is accepted, the contributor should then post a hard copy of the final draft with accompanying copy on a diskette, indicating clearly the word-processing program used in writing the article. (To avoid damage to the diskette during mailing, please post in a diskette mailer.) Final manuscripts not accompanied by a copy on a computer diskette are accepted in some cases.

4. (a) The title of the article or review, author's full name and title, affiliation, position, full address (also e-mail address and fax number, if available), and a 40-70 word summary in English suitable for publication (for critical and pedagogical articles only) should be typed on a separate page; the title and summary alone should appear on the first page of the manuscript.
(b) References to the author's own work should be made in the third person. Any acknowledgements are to be included only after the submission has been accepted.
5. (a) Paragraphs should be indented five spaces, except the first paragraphs after subheadings, which should not be indented.
(b) Inverted commas (quotation marks) should be single, not double, unless they are placed within single inverted commas.
(c) Spelling and punctuation should be consistent. American spelling and punctuation are acceptable from American authors; otherwise, spellings should conform to the most recent edition of *The Concise Oxford English Dictionary*.
6. (a) Greek script should be used for quotations from Classical Greek. Short Greek quotations may be inserted by hand, but special care should be taken with breathings, accents and iotas subscript. Passages longer than a few words should be typed or photocopied.
(b) Greek names in the text should either be fully transliterated or fully Latinised (e.g., Klutaimestra or Clytemnestra) throughout.
7. (a) All Greek and Latin text should be translated, preferably by the author.
(b) Citations of ancient works should appear in brackets (parentheses) in the body of the text wherever possible.
(c) In the case of an indented passage, the translation should appear unbracketed (without parentheses) immediately below the quotation; the citation of the work in brackets (parentheses) should follow rather than precede the indented quotation.
(d) In the case of a short citation in the body of the text, the following convention should be followed: *cupido dominandi cunctis affectibus flagrantior est* ('the desire for power burns more fiercely than all the passions', Tac. *Ann.* 15.53).
8. (a) Notes should appear at the bottoms of pages.
(b) Citations of modern works should be given in the notes rather than in the body of the text.
(c) Do *not* use the Harvard (author-date) system of parenthetical documentation or the number system.
(d) Authors should be cited by initials and surname only.
(e) Titles of books, periodicals, and Greek and Latin technical terms should be italicised.
(f) Titles of articles should be enclosed in single inverted commas.

- (g) Volume numbers of periodicals should be given in Arabic rather than Roman numerals.
 - (h) Page and line references generally should be given as follows: 'f.' (e.g., '174f.') ought to be used, but 'ff.' should be avoided wherever possible (e.g., '174-76' is preferable to '174ff.').
 - (i) When citing a book or periodical in the notes for the first time, details should be given as follows:
 H. Cancik, *Untersuchungen zur lyrischen Kunst des P. Papinius Statius* (Hildesheim 1965) 93-110.
 K. H. Waters, 'The Character of Domitian', *Phoenix* 18 (1964) 49-77.
 All subsequent citations should contain the author's name, footnote number of the first citation of the work in square brackets, and relevant page numbers. The following forms should be used:
 Cancik [4] 38-40; Waters [17] 55f.
 - (j) The author is responsible for ensuring the accuracy and completeness of all references to primary and secondary materials. Incorrect citations of ancient authors and works and citations of modern works that do not include complete details such as the author's initials and date and place of publication may be deleted from the article unless the Editor can easily locate the missing information.
 - (k) Cross-references should be marked clearly in the left-hand margin of the manuscript.
9. (a) Periodicals cited in the notes should use the abbreviations in *L'Année Philologique*; the names of periodicals not listed in the most recent volume should appear in full.
 - (b) Abbreviations of ancient authors and works should be those listed in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*² (1970) or in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-82) and Liddell-Scott-Jones' *A Greek-English Lexicon* (1968).
 - (c) In citation of classical works, names of texts should be italicised and Arabic rather than Roman numerals should be used.
 - (d) Titles of standard reference works should be written out in full the first time that the works are cited:
Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft; Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.
 Subsequent citations of the works should be by abbreviation:
RE; FGrH.
 10. Contributors of articles and review articles receive twenty and ten covered offprints respectively; contributors of reviews receive six uncovered offprints. Additional covered offprints may be purchased from the Business Manager.
 11. *Scholia* retains copyright in content and format. Contributors should obtain written permission from the Editor before using material in another publication.

SCHOLIA

Natal Studies in Classical Antiquity

ISSN 1018-9017

FORTHCOMING IN *SCHOLIA* (1997)

Articles and reviews forthcoming in *Scholia* ns Volume 6 (1997) include:

ARTICLES

Invention, Guilt and the Fall from Innocence: Reflections on the Role of Feeling in Myth

Thomas E. Knight University of Zimbabwe

Form and Meaning in Bacchylides' Fifth Ode

Douglas L. Cairns University of Leeds, England

Euripides and the Damp Squid

Walter Hift University of Natal, Durban

The Unity of Plato's *Crito*

Ron Polanksy Duquesne University, USA

Two Reflections of Heraclitus?

A. V. Zadorojniy Moscow State Lomosov University, Russia

Claudian: A Greek or a Latin?

Peder G. Christiansen Texas Tech University, USA

REVIEWS

Susan Stephens and John Winkler, *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments* (Herwig Machler)

Alan Shapiro, *Myth into Art: Poet and Painter in Classical Greece* (E. A. Mackay)

Ronnie Ancona, *Time and the Erotic in Horace's Odes* (Aileen Bevis)

To subscribe, please cut along the line or photocopy the entire page.

Subscription Form

Name: _____

Institution: _____

Address: _____

City and Province/State: _____

Postcode/Zipcode: _____

Country: _____

Rates (1997): Africa R20 (+R2,80 VAT for South African orders); outside Africa US\$20/UK£13 (2 years: US\$34/UK£22). *Foreign subscriptions cover air mail postage, packaging and bank charges on institutional and personal cheques.* After initial payment, a subscription to the journal will be entered. Back numbers may be ordered from the Business Manager at the current subscription rates.

Mail subscriptions with cheque to:

Business Manager, *Scholia*
Department of Classics
University of Natal
Durban 4041
Republic of South Africa

Make
LATIN AVAILABLE
in your country via

ARTES LATINAE

The only comprehensive, self-teaching, and self-pacing
LATIN series
now available in two formats

CD-ROM



The CD-ROM has Ecclesiastical, Restored Classical, and American Scholastic pronunciations

Developed by
Waldo E. Sweet *et alii*

originally for
ENCYCLOPAEDIA
BRITANNICA ED. CORP.

TRADITIONAL



This two-level course in the traditional format includes

♦ 16 Books ♦ 27 Cassettes ♦ 15 Filmstrips

The CD-ROM format (IBM only) consists of two disks, one for each level.

Each disk comes packaged with

- ♦ Manual ♦ Graded Reader ♦ TM Graded Reader ♦ Reference Notebook
 - ♦ Test Booklet ♦ Test Guide ♦ Three Pronunciations
- (Sweet's original, Restored Classical, and Italian Ecclesiastical)

For a brochure on *Artes Latinae* or a copy of our complete catalog contact



BOLCHAZY-CARDUCCI PUBLISHERS, INC.

1000 Brown St., Wauconda, IL 60084 USA

847/526-4344; Fax: 847/526-2867; E-mail: Bolchazy@aol.com

Website: <http://users.aol.com/bolchazy/index.html>