2004

Ephemeris Vol. V

Georgia Blume
Denison University

Bob Wyllie
Denison University

Nicole Miller
Denison University

Andrew Sweet
Denison University

Autumn Lotze
Denison University

See next page for additional authors

Ephemeris Vol. V

Authors
Georgia Blume, Bob Wyllie, Nicole Miller, Andrew Sweet, Autumn Lotze, Heather Thompson, Larkin Kennedy, and Frank Ward

*a tabular statement of the assigned places of a celestial body for regular intervals*An ephemeris is a day-by-day listing of the zodiac positions of each planet. Ultimately, many important astrological techniques boil down to comparing your birthchart to the ephemeris and knowing how to pull information out of these tables. To most people, this is just a boring table of numbers. To me, an ephemeris is a fascinating story just waiting to be discovered*A record of daily occurrences; a diary, journal*A table showing the predicted (rarely the observed) positions of a heavenly body for every day during a given period. Also, in pl. the tabulated positions (of a heavenly body) for a ser   of the heavenly   ted in advance   nac.*a uniform   orbital motions   al unit the ephe   al year 1900*A   e the positions of the celestial bodies throughout the year, "today computers calculate the ephemeredes."*An astrological ephemeris indicates the exact position of the Sun, the Moon and Planets in relation to the Signs of the Zodiac. *Latin for "journal." *a tabular statement of the assigned places of a celestial body for regular intervals.*An ephemeris is a day-by-day listing of the zodiac positions of each planet. Ultimately, many important astrological techniques boil down to comparing your birthchart to the ephemeris and knowing how to pull information out of these tables. To most people, this is just a boring table of numbers. To me, an ephemeris is a fascinating story just waiting to be discovered*A record of daily occurrences; a diary, journal**A book in which the places of the heavenly bodies and other astronomical matters are tabulated in advance for each day of a certain period; an astronomical almanac.*The appointed daily order of religious services.*a tabular statement of the assigned places of a celestial body for regular intervals*A table showing the predicted (rarely the observed) positions of a heavenly body for every day during a given period. Also, in pl. the tabulated positions (of a heavenly body) for a series of succ   An astrological ephemeris ind   he Moon and Planets in r   *An annual publication containing tables that give the positions of the celestial bodies throughout the year; "today computers calculate the ephemeredes."*Latin for "journal."

ephem*er*is

Spring 2004, vol. V

EPHEMERIS

Ephemeris, the Classical Journal of Denison University, is published twice a year and seeks to offer an opportunity for those interested in Classical studies to publish their scholarly work in an undergraduate forum. *Ephemeris* invites contributions from students at Denison University, Kenyon College, Oberlin College, The College of Wooster and Ohio Wesleyan University. It is the first intercollegiate journal of its kind. It promotes the coming together of history, literature, philosophy, religion, art, and architecture in a way that is both analytical and creative. As is an objective of Classical Studies departments, *Ephemeris* fosters an attitude about and an appreciation for criticism and interpretation of the Classical civilizations. It is our hope that students, faculty and staff are inspired to continue to cherish the fundamental principles established by the ancient societies.

A Letter from the Editors

Dear *Ephemeris* Readers,

When we founded the Classics journal *Ephemeris* two years ago, we had no idea what we were getting ourselves into. We wanted to create an undergraduate forum for the union of students from all departments in the spirit of the Classics. Both the work and joy the journal has given us has been rewarding and surprising. Originally distributed around Denison University's campus only, we sent issues to local high schools in the fall of 2002. Then, in the fall of 2003, we were given the opportunity to put the journal online – a first for Denison University.

This issue, our last issue as editors, brings us great pride, excitement, and yet, some sadness. For the first time, *Ephemeris* will be intercollegiate in Ohio, with contributors from Kenyon College and Oberlin College. Two of our contributors have made us international with their essays from work in Rome and in Cork, Ireland! The journal will also travel to Ohio Wesleyan University and the College of Wooster, making this the most distributed and most read issue we have ever produced. Next semester, we hope to establish an intercollegiate editorial board to further our goal of broadening the scope and impact of the journal.

To those of you involved with *Ephemeris* in the future, we wish you the best of luck and continued accomplishment. To those of you who have been loyal readers and contributors, we thank you for all you have enabled us to do. We would like to extend special thanks to Dr. Michael Fronda for his support of and his vision for *Ephemeris*.

Valete omnes!
Betsy Prueter and Melanie Vanderkolk, '04

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Literary Analysis

A Change of Ways… A Change in Building…
The Fora of Julius Caesar and Augustus
By Georgia Blume '06
Intercollegiate Center for Classical Studies in Rome

During the first century B.C.E., Rome transformed from a republic to an imperial regime. Such alterations occurred initially under Marius, Sulla and Pompey, but became clearer during the time of Julius Caesar and Augustus. The changes that occurred in the law, public practices and everyday life of the Roman Empire are not only evident from primary literary sources, but are also clearly reflected in the archaeological remains of the period. The first imperial fora, the forum of Julius Caesar and the forum of Augustus, tell us a complex, intriguing story. Their art and imagery, architectural innovations, and the concept of their existence itself reveal the intentions of these "dictators" and the effects of their actions on the Roman Empire.

By the time Julius Caesar had gained power, the Roman Forum was still the center of political, religious and business transactions. Thus far, Romans were about thirty years beyond the ruling class' modest contributions of victory temples. They had witnessed the military dynasts' expanse in building - Sulla's repaving of the forum, Pompey's theater, and other services to the people.[1] The building of a new forum, used for important transactions, built by and named after one person, however, was a new concept entirely. Caesar took advantage of location by building his forum next to the Roman Forum, accessible through the Curia

---

[1] Lecture: Salzman, Michelle. "Roman Republic in Flux". February 9th, 2004.

Julia.[2] He associated himself with the heart of the
Roman city and dramatically changed it when he built
this new element. By making the Curia Julia the main
entrance to his forum, he also associated himself with
the Senate, the "central control" over the city, which was
ironically moved to a building under his name. The shift
in power became overwhelmingly obvious. The focus
was turned to Caesar, and everyday life was viewed
under his powerful image.

Augustus paralleled these progressions and
associations by building his forum next to the Forum of
Caesar and by making his own forum accessible through
it.[3] By the time of Augustus' succession, Caesar had
successfully shifted the power from the Senate over to
himself. Augustus wanted to make his succession into
power clear to the public. He shifted various functions
from the Roman Forum and the Forum of Julius Caesar
over to his own space.[4] Through the construction of the
Forum of Augustus and the placement of important
transactions within it, he was able to successfully project
this shift in power.

The specific functions transferred to these
imperial fora reflect Caesar and Augustus' political
intentions for Rome. The forum of Caesar mainly
served as a place for legal transactions. The presence of
a basilica in the forum affirms this idea. The Basilica
Argentaria was a portico with basilica-like qualities next
to the temple.[5] It is interesting to note that there was no

---

[2] Lecture: Greggs, Chris. "Forum of Julius Caesar". February 12th, 2004.

[3] Lecture: Greggs, Chris. "Forum of Augustus". February 17th, 2004.

[4] Richardson, L. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London, 1992, 162.

[5] Richardson, L. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London, 1992, 167.

basilica in the Forum of Augustus. *Tabernae* served as the archives and committee rooms of the Senate.[6] The forum held important law courts as well as places for teaching law. As a result of these activities, Caesar positioned himself as the underlying force of the law even though that was officially the Senate's position. He brought the senate under his domain, a statement also enhanced by the creation of the Curia Julia and Basilica Julia. This structural propaganda gave off the image of Caesar as the new government. He also used the unusually long podium from the temple as a *rostrum* (speaker's platform), so that important speeches would be given under his realm, as well.[7]

Augustus brought over slightly different and certainly more functions to his forum. Its most important function was as Rome's foreign office. Cassius Dio, an ancient writer, gives a list of activities appointed to take place in the forum. Many involved foreign administration: it was the starting point of governors about to be sent to provinces. The Senate would deliberate on war and the award of triumphs in this place. It became the final stop on the triumphant march (the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus had been the original final stop), where *triumphators* dedicated their crown and scepter to Mars.[8] These functions, which had taken place in the Curia (the Senate House) under the republic, then suddenly administered under Augustus' name and space, produced a strong tie

---

[6] Richardson, L. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London, 1992, 166.

[7] Lecture: Greggs, Chris. "Forum of Julius Caesar". February 17th, 2004.

[8] Richardson, L. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London, 1992, 162.

between Augustus and military power.[9] He also transferred the law courts to his forum.[10] He used the forum as a means of placing the entire empire under his own eyes while still officially giving the power to the Senate and the people. The Senate still made decisions concerning war, governors could still control provinces, and generals could still be considered *triumphators*, as long as these events took place under his domain. Augustus strategically kept this illusion of restoring the republic and restoring the power to the people of Rome while creating his own image as the central, underlying force of the entire Roman Empire.

Another important function of the forum was that it was the location in which boys assumed the *toga virilis*, "the toga of manhood." Augustus, through his identity with the forum, figuratively supervised the transition of the next generation into adulthood and therefore became the foundation of the men of Rome and thus Rome itself.

The art, architecture and imagery of these fora served as propaganda. They projected a strong image concerning Caesar and Augustus' political, religious and social intentions and the profound, resulting effects on the city and empire of Rome. The temple of Venus Genetrix in the Forum of Julius Caesar and the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus both attract religious powers to the *imperator*. Caesar originally vowed a temple to Venus Victrix (Venus the conqueror) on the eve of battle, but later decided to build one to Venus Genetrix (the ancestress of the *Gens Julia*).[11]

---

[9] Lecture: Greggs, Chris. "Forum of Augustus". February 17th, 2004.

[10] Lecture: Greggs, Chris. "Forum of Augustus". February 17th, 2004.

[11] Richardson, L. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London, 1992, 166.

Through this change in names, the temple essentially became a place for worship of his family.[12] Caesar did not centralize the focus on his military feats, as was evident in the functions of the forum. Instead, he emphasized his godly descent, a maneuver that portrayed him as more powerful, important and divine. Augustus, however, did choose to focus on his military feats by building the temple of Mars Ultor (Mars the avenger). He placed his temple in the same relative position as the temple of Venus Genetrix but made it larger. This way he emphasized his connection to the previous power but attempted to prove that he, Augustus, and his power were greater.

Augustus also associated himself with the divine and displayed himself as the most important man of Rome through statuary. He placed three statues in the *cella* of the temple: Mars Ultor in the middle, Venus and Cupid to his right and *Divus Iulius* to his left. There he signified his military success, surrounded by his divine origin. Augustus made other associations as well. There were two hemicycles flanking the porticos near the temple. One held a statue of Romulus and the other held one of Aeneas.[13] The founders of Rome were now under his domain, as if he was also a founder of Rome: a founder of a new age of Rome and the restorer of Rome as a republic. However, Augustus wouldn't dare make this association more directly. He refused to be given the name Romulus when a new name to replace Octavian was being proposed.[14] In the porticos were statues of the *summi viri* (the most important men) on one side, including great generals such as Pompey and

---

[12] Stambaugh, John E. *The Ancient Roman City*. London, 1988.

[13] Lecture: Greggs, Chris. "Forum of Augustus". February 17th, 2004.

[14] Suetonius. *Divus Augustus*. Section 7:1.

Sulla. On the other side were statues of the Julio-Claudians, forming a statuary ancestral tree. In the middle of the forum was a statue of Augustus himself as *pater patriae*.[15] Through this careful positioning, Augustus displayed himself as the great descendant of all that is important in Rome: not only the Julio-Claudians, but also the *summi viri* and the founders of Rome. He surpassed everyone.

In the center of the Forum of Julius Caesar there was a statue of Caesar on the horse of Alexander the Great, an association that highlighted his military skills. The positioning of the statue brought the focus of a Roman entering the forum immediately to Caesar. There was another statue of Caesar in the forum standing in his military dress, stressing the same idea. The lavish décor of the temple and the forum allowed Caesar to show off his wealth, earned by means of his military spoils as well as his birth status. The temple was filled with valuable antique paintings, gems and a gold statue of Cleopatra.[16]

These lavish, public spaces transformed not only the standards of building, but the limit of personal power. Caesar and Augustus set the stage for later emperors to build bigger and better. Imperial fora became a trend as imperial rule transcended. These structures created powerful iconography and propaganda for the Romans to absorb and sent out a defiant message about the creation of a new centralized power. The architecture, art and layout of the fora of Julius Caesar and Augustus were clear enough that we can still perceive them in modern times and use them as a means of understanding the transformation into imperial Rome.

---

[15] Lecture: Greggs, Chris. "Forum of Augustus". February 17th, 2004.

[16] Claridge, Amanda. *Oxford Archaeological Guides: Rome*. New York, 1998.

Forum of Julius Caesar, http://www.cavazzi.com/roman-empire/tours/rome/forum-julium.html

A Reconstruction of the Forum of Julius Caesar, http://www.cavazzi.com/roman-empire/tours/rome/forum-julium.html

Forum of Augustus, http://www.cavazzi.com/roman-empire/tours/rome/forum-augustus.html

A Reconstruction of the Forum of Augustus, http://www.cavazzi.com/roman-empire/tours/rome/forum-augustus.html

Ideal of Efficiency: Aims of Roman Imperial
Government
By Bob Wyllie '04
Denison University

_____

      If taken literally, Aristides' panegyric offers an impressive account of the extent and effectiveness of imperial administration in the mid second century AD. Of course, it would be folly to take the tribute at face value, and one cannot rely upon such a document as a completely faithful rendering of the situation of the provinces. Indeed, Aristides makes no pretensions of objectivity and continually reaffirms the greatness of the civilization for which his work still stands as praise. Knowing this in advance, however, *To Rome* is not yet beyond the capability of providing great insight of sorts, for it lays out quite clearly an idealized conception of some of the reasons for the successes of Roman imperialism. These claims can guide us in our inquiry as to what made the provincial government of the Romans successful. In other words, to what extent were the ideals of Aristides realized? It will be essential first to understand the aims of provincial administration, since only the discovery of the notion of what the Romans would have considered "successful" defines whether or not the Romans were *actually* successful. That is, an examination of whether or not the administrative policies of the provinces were successful is fully dependent upon and indeed presupposes a theory of what the Romans wanted out of the provinces.

      When looking for what may have been the motivating force behind provincial administration, I am struck by Trajan's words to Pliny as he arrived in Bithynia to start a term as governor: "Your first task must be to inspect the accounts of the various towns, as

they are evidently in confusion."[1] In the same vein, also remarkable are the reforms Agricola makes as governor of Britain of various administrative policies which seemed to be inefficient.[2] Though these reforms do not actually raise more taxes, they appear to make more efficient uses of the burden the taxed bore and thus free more resources to be put to better uses. Trajan's effort to stop troops from being taken off duty is an example of the same effort to squeeze the greatest efficiency possible out of the provinces. He tells Pliny repeatedly to "keep to the general rule that as few soldiers as possible should be called away from active service."[3] Each of these sources indicates that the goal of provincial government is the attainment of resources for Rome and the empire (i.e. taxes, soldiers, edible and material goods, etc.). Implicit is a disposition towards the elimination of waste and corruption, as well as the desirability of tranquility along with the above mention tribute, since civil discord inevitably results in a necessary rededication of thinly spread resources to deal with the problem. Tumult ate into any wealth a province was able to provide, and so the maximization of the collection of resources required the minimization of the resources lost to corruption, inefficient governance, and policing. Having so identified the Roman view that the provinces were for the harvesting of taxes and other resources, we can now begin to try and understand whether or not the empire was successful.

Clearly *something* went right in the Roman provincial government. By the very existence of the vast area we know to have been under direct Roman control,

---

[1] Pliny, *Letters* (10.18). The tenth book of letters is filled with a general concern for thrift and efficiency. For other examples see 10.17a-b, 10.24, 10.43, and 10.91.

[2] Tacitus, *Agricola* (19).

[3] Pliny, *Letters* 10.20, 10.22

even with the limits imposed upon communication in a pre-modern society, as well as the existence of a continued large scale building programs into the second century AD,[4] it seems Rome exercised somewhat effective control over her subjects. But despite this there were some large issues that confronted the empire in governing of the provinces.

First, corruption among governors and representatives of the emperor seemed all too common. For example, when Julius Bassus was on trial for accepting gifts while governing a province, another senator "[recommended] clemency for behavior which is admittedly illegal, but not uncommon."[5] Indeed, the very existence of the laws against the acceptance of gifts, or again the existence of the laws laid out in some municipal charters to the effect that "no candidate seeking office shall knowingly and with wrongful intent give or make largess of any gift or present or any other thing with a view to his candidature"[6] indicates that corruption was a common source of frustration for the empire.[7] Further, Tacitus remarks with great pride that Agricola:

> was not corrupted by [the province of Asia] or proconsul Salvius Titianus, although the province is rich and wide open to wrongdoers, while the proconsul, who was prone to all forms of greed, was

---

[4] Stambaugh. *The Ancient Roman City* (p 75-81).

[5] Pliny, The Trial of Julius Bassus, cited in Keagi (p 169).

[6] Charter of Urso, chp. 132.

[7] Additional laws regulating gifts of magistrates and potential magistrates are given in the Charter of Urso chapters 70-1, 93-4, 96, 102.

only too ready to guarantee a mutual cover up of illegal conduct.[8]

Such varied accounts of the crooked dealings of politicians as well as the various rules meant to stop them allude to two things. First, though there were clearly problems with corruption in provincial administration, obvious attempts were made to address them. If corruption continued to exist in the empire, it was not because of lack of laws against it. However, more importantly, problems with the potential corruption of governors are an inevitable result in a system where the successful and honest administration of a province depended largely upon the character of a few individuals. The administrators were sent out into the provinces every few years with a small support staff to rule an extensive area. And though Pliny appears to have been in constant contact with the emperor, it seems that governors were generally quite isolated and autonomous from the central government.[9] Such autonomy would make corruption difficult to observe until after extensive damage had already been done. Clearly, this corruption ran counter to the interests and goals Rome entertained for its provinces, for if the governor is corrupt, then resources are being taken from elsewhere both in the form of lost money and in the form of civil discontent requiring either trials for misgovernment or garrisons to keep the locals in line despite it.

There is one other problem which contributed to the inefficiency of provincial management. In a system like that of the Romans, where the emperor held power through sanction of the military rather than any legitimate constitutional institution, the emperor must

---

[8] Tacitus, *Agricola* 6.
[9] See *Letters* 10.62, 10.76, 10.84, 10.117.

always be wary of conflicting loyalties to excellent generals and leaders in the provinces. The men of exceedingly great talent and popularity were certainly held under suspicion during the reign of the "bad" emperors. As Tacitus says "distinction aroused unfavorable reactions and a great reputation was no less dangerous than a bad one."[10] Near the end of the *Agricola*, Tacitus suggests that his father-in-law was recalled from Britain and forced into retirement because he was *too* good, and Domitian had started to become worried.[11] We need only look to the events of the mid third century AD and the rapid succession of emperor generals from the provinces, to see the worst fears of emperors like Domitian made reality. Perhaps, then, some amount of ineffectiveness was built into the government itself.

But the above observations fail to account for enormous and previously unparalled successes of the Roman Empire. Indeed, I have up till now given reasons only why Roman government might have failed to secure resources and peace from the provinces, i.e. because many governors were corrupt and the good ones might have fallen under the suspicion or jealousy of the emperor. But clearly Roman provincial administration must have had a positive side, and this side is the more conspicuously absent if we are to explain how such an immense area lay under Roman rule and the inherent inefficiencies in their empire system did not prevent Romans from harvesting sufficient resources from the provinces. Here, perhaps, *To Rome* might be used to shed light on which virtue of Roman government led to the successful though not fully efficient management of an empire. *To Rome* reveals the glue that held the

---

[10] Tacitus, *Agricola* 5.
[11] Tacitus, *Agricola* 39-43.

empire together despite the existence of strong divisive forces.

        Aristides' explanation is the perfect and inevitable Romanization of the provinces. As he says, "Conditions no longer differ from island to mainland, but all, as one continuous country and one people, heed quietly."[12] The continuity of civilization was a major force binding the empire together. The arts, then, were seen as a central means for controlling the provincial subjects: "You built the walls to defend you and then erected towns bordering upon them, some in some parts, others elsewhere, filling them with colonists, giving these the comfort of arts and crafts, and in general establishing order."[13] Romanization was also integral to Agricola's successful organization of the province of Britain, and as he built Roman structures, educated the leaders' children, and introduced them to the amenities found in other parts of the empire, they vied for his favor.[14] Tacitus sums up the idea with eloquence: "The Britons…called it 'civilization,' although it was a part of their enslavement."[15] The power of the common cultural heritage must not be overlooked. This force tied together the conquered people from distant places and gradually made these people partially indistinguishable from Romans. The boundaries of the distinction between the city Rome and the empire of Rome seem to have melted away throughout the second century AD.

        The process of cultural amalgamation was aided by the architecture of the period. As Roman colonies were sent as outposts of the empire, they represented:

---

[12] Aristides, *To Rome* 30.
[13] Aristides, *To Rome* 81.
[14] Tacitus, *Agricola* 21.
[15] Tacitus, *Agricola* 21.

> Urban values cultivated through the centuries in the Italia cities under the influence of Greeks and Etruscans…it articulated the message of Roman culture in its buildings—basilica, curia, comitium, and temple dedicated to the Capitoline triad… which helped make the colony a small-scale copy of Rome.[16]

These copies of Rome were bastions of a civic vision central to what it was to be Roman. They would obviously help to spread Roman values, as would the military, for not only would the military itself be of diverse composition, but armies would be stationary for extended periods of time as their job became more defensive than offensive. Soldiers placed permanently on the frontier would likely build families and retire there after their tour of duty had ended. In this situation, these soldiers could not help but spread the customs and values of Rome.

However there was another, almost contradictory theme, running throughout Roman provincial administration which allowed the Romans to successfully control the people of the empire. Provincial governors would leave the local aristocrats in place after the territory was subdued, building the local ruling class into Roman institutions of government. In this way, the ruling class was placated because they still had a fair amount of control over what had previously been their territory. Furthermore, they no longer had to pour resources into war. Aristides says, "As on holiday the whole civilized world lays down the arms which were its ancient burden and has turned to adornment and all glad

---

[16] Stambaugh, *The Ancient Roman City* (p 247).

17

thoughts with power to realize them."[17] Ideally, the local aristocracy would stop fighting each other under Rome's hegemony and begin to dedicate their resources towards the good of the empire, competing for civic rather than military honors. Through these two processes of Roman control, Romanization and incorporating the local elite into the new government, Rome exercised effective power over their huge empire.

In general, understanding the goals of the Romans allows us to understand their provincial policies. Pliny's concern with the multitude of started projects that remained unfinished because of poor initial planning and lack of funds in letters 10.37, 10.39, and 10.41 reveal an understandable desire for efficiency. The half finished baths, theater, and aqueduct provide no benefit to the provincials and represent a loss in valuable resources for the central government. In addition, Pliny's queries about Christians and Trajan's answer in letters 10.96 and 10.97 reveal an administration that fears destabilizing organizations such as the Christians.[18] The same sentiment is found two hundred years earlier in a reaction against Bacchic associations which banned people from making "either man or woman a master or vice-master or mistress, or be minded henceforth to swear, vow, pledge, or make promise with others, or be minded to plight faith with others. Let no one be minded

---

[17] Aristides, *To Rome* 97.

[18] Most importantly, Pliny refers to an edict he issued on Trajan's orders to ban all political societies. Trajan also bans firefighters saying "we must remember that it is societies like these which have been responsible for the political disturbances in your province, particularly in its towns. Pliny, *Letters*, 10.34.

to hold ceremonies in secret."[19] The government consistently displayed an attempt at efficiency.

Everything points to a preoccupation with the efficient government of the provinces in order to obtain the most possible resources through a minimization of corruption and corresponding civil disturbance. The most important factor in the success of Rome's administration was Rome's successful incorporation of conquered provinces through a process of social and cultural amalgamation. The Roman realization was that successful empire was only possible by absorbing, rather than alienating, the subjected people. The key was removing the alienation between the governed and the governor, a lesson learned only the hard way by empires like Britain, centuries later.

---

[19] A Consular Letter Concerning Bacchic Associations, 186 B.C., cited in Keagi, (p 259).

Tacitus' Germania *as a Commentary on Moral Decay in Roman Society*
By Nicole Miller, '05
University College Cork, Ireland

Far off lands were in ancient Rome, as in modern western society, the places of wondrous creatures and mystical happenings. Rome, as centre of the empire, was considered the norm and urbanization the model of civilization. The farther a location was from Rome, the more mysterious its inhabitants were considered. This attitude was part of a well-established tradition of geographical thought reaching back to Alexander the Great. Stories inspired by supposed reports from these lands prompted writings about these peoples—quite literally in the Greek, ethnography. In this tradition of ethnography is Tacitus' *Germania*, a detailed account of the peoples living in the unconquered lands near the North Sea. Read within the tradition of ethnography, its historical context and with its companion book the *Agricola*, the subtext of Tacitus' *Germania* is a criticism of the state of moral decay in Imperial Rome. In his descriptions, Tacitus creates an underlying comparison to Roman mores and in making these distinctions creates a platform of criticism against its current state of moral degeneracy.

In order to understand the individual text of the *Germania,* the tradition within which it was written must be examined. Attitudes toward distant peoples applied to physical as well as temporal remoteness. Thus descriptions of remote peoples often parallel those of the first humans. In the tradition of ethnography, two approaches were taken in describing fantastic peoples—ethnocentrism and inverted ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism "denotes a construct of space which sees the center of the world as the best or most advanced location, and therefore demotes distant peoples to the

status of unworthy savages."[1] Conversely, inversion of ethnocentrism "envisions foreigners growing not less but more virtuous in proportion to their distance from the [Roman] center, [often] depicted as the most morally degenerate spot on earth."[2] The occurrence of such varying depictions of the same peoples invites further examination of the authors' intentions. In his book, *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*, James S. Romm asserts that, "Geographer's science and storyteller's art, in any period of antiquity, could not be fully detached from each other,"[3] and, "That nearly all geography, in antiquity, can be read as a from of literature."[4] Thus, geographies and ethnographies can be read as any other form of literature and become subject to an author's agenda.

If writings are taken in their historical contexts, it becomes quite clear that authors are projecting their own view of society onto their interpretation of foreign peoples. For example, Cicero, writing during the Republic, describes the first peoples with an air of disdain stating:

> Men, in the days before either natural or civil law had been drawn up, wandered dispersed and scattered about the fields and that each possessed no more than he could seize or keep by his own strength, through killing or wounding others.[5]

---

[1] Romm, James S. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992: 46.

[2] Romm, James S. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992: 47.

[3] Ibid.: 5.

[4] Ibid.: 7.

[5] Cicero, De Officiis 2:4.

In contrast to his bleak descriptions of primitivism are his declaration of the triumph of modern man and civilized life, he commented:

> In all these respects the civilized life of men is far removed from the level of subsistence and comfort of the animals. And without the association of men, cities could neither have been built nor peopled, as a result of which laws and customs were established and then the equitable determination of rights, and a settled discipline of life. When these were assured there followed a more human spirit and the sense of what is morally becoming, so that life was more secure, and that, by giving and receiving, by mutual exchange of goods and services, we were able to satisfy our needs.[6]

Cicero's descriptions of the evolution of civilization indicate an ethnocentric world-view: all that is Roman is good, all that is not Roman is not good. Conversely, Juvenal, writing during the decline of the empire, describes the decay of society as "an age worse than that of iron."[7] He further laments the loss of simplicity and declares, "Once the aborigines did live according to this rule of life, before Saturn feeling laid aside the crown to take up the rustic sickle, when Juno was a little girl and Jupiter still a private citizen in the caves of Ida."[8] He implies that although man once lived in a state of morality, he has degenerated beyond all recognition.

---

[6] Ibid.: 2:15
[7] Juvenal Satire 13, 28-59
[8] Ibid.

Juvenal's view reflects inverted ethnocentrism: the centre of immorality is Rome, and locations outside of the centre are inherently better. Cicero and Juvenal were describing the same original peoples and the same period of history, yet the underlying messages of each text are startlingly different. The divergence of these descriptions of primitivism illustrates how manipulations of a text can support an ideology.

This manipulation is key to understanding the works of Tacitus. The *Agricola* appears to be a biographical account of Tacitus' father-in-law, Gnaesus Julius Agricola, late governor of Britain, but serves rather as a platform for criticism of the decay of Imperial Government. Tacitus' aim is made quite clear in the very structure of the book; he does not even name the title character until the fourth chapter. He opens the books with a series of significant and blatant attacks on the decay of Rome, especially that of the emperor. One section describes a book burning ordered by the emperor:

> In those fires doubtless the Government imagined that it could silence the voice of Rome and annihilate the freedom of the Senate and men's knowledge of the truth. They even went on to banish the professors of philosophy and exile all honourable accomplishments so that nothing decent might anywhere confront them. We have indeed set up a record of subservience. Rome of old explored the utmost limits of freedom; we have plumbed the depths of slavery, robbed as we are by informers even of the right to exchange ideas in conversation. We should have lost our memories as well

as our tongues had it been as easy to
forget as to be silent.[9]

These first chapters reveal his intention to break the silence concerning the state of the Empire. When he begins to address the intended biography, Tacitus does not claim impartiality and declares that the reader should pardon "the loyal affection to which it bears witness."[10] In fact, Tacitus defines Agricola as a paradigm for Roman leadership. During his first military apprenticeship in Britain, Agricola established his character. Tacitus tells the reader that:

> He got to know his province and made
> himself known to the troops. He learned
> from the experts and chose the best
> models to follow. He never sought a
> duty for self-advertisement, never
> shirked one through cowardice. He
> acted always with energy and a sense of
> responsibility.[11]

Tacitus expands on the theme of leadership as he describes Agricola's military successes in the conquering and subjugation of the Britains. In these accounts highlighting Agricola's accomplishments as a leader, there is an underlying contrast to his contemporaries, such as "Agricola, however, […] had learned from the experience of others that arms can effect little if injustice follows in their train."[12] In this

---

[9] Tacitus, Cornelius. "Germania", *The Agricola and the Germania*. Translated by H. Mattingly. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970: 52.

[10] Ibid.: 53.

[11] Ibid.: 55.

[12] Ibid.: 70.

description, Tacitus manages to simultaneously praise Agricola, and criticize the Emperor. Although trumpeted as a eulogy for Agricola, the text becomes a condemnation of the decay of leadership in Imperial Rome.

The precedent of the *Agricola* as a criticism of Imperial leadership and policy allows for a reading of the *Germania* as an extension of this commentary. Very little had been written about these tribes, shrouded in mystery. In fact, only Julius Caesar had deemed them as important enough to discuss as distinct peoples. These descriptions were written only as a side note to his campaigns in Gaul, so Tacitus' *Germania* was the first exclusive treatment of the Germanii. Thus the book would have drawn great interest—the very title of the work recalling a myriad of images for the Roman *literati*. When all Europe stood unified under the banner of the Senate and People of Rome, Germania remained untamed. Germania represented the last fierce and savage land within immediate Roman reach, and it gained contemporary importance for Tacitus' peers as renewed Imperial campaigns were being waged in Germania.[13] The significance of this campaign was great as Germania also represented the geographical limit of the empire. Augustus had once hoped to expand the borders of the empire to the banks of the Elbe, but Germania proved impossible to subdue.[14] In the early imperial years, "limitless, ever-expanding empire was the prize which the new regime offered its citizens, as both a recompense for and a distraction from the loss of

---

[13] Mattingly, H. Introduction to *The Agricola and the Germania*, by Cornelius Tacitus. Translated by H. Mattingly. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970.
[14] Ibid.

republican government."[15] If the expansion of the Empire was to be the definition of success, Germania in effect, became a symbol of the failings of the Imperial Government. Therefore in writing an ethnography of the Germans, Tacitus was in fact detailing the deficiency of the empire.

Germania was both a symbol of imperial deficiency and a manifestation of all that was un-Roman. Although Britain was in fact physically removed from the rest of the empire, it was the untamed stretches of Germania, which represented barbarism in the Roman imagination. Germania represented a land inhabited by brutish peoples on the edges of the earth near the terrifying Ocean.   In his description of the German landscape, Tacitus places the pillars of Heracles in the North Sea just beyond the coast of Germania. To the Romans, the Columns of Heracles were "a vivid symbol of the gateway or barrier between inner and outer worlds."[16] Thus, Tacitus, in placing the Columns in the North Sea, rather than the traditional Straits of Gibraltar, was attempting to illustrate the remoteness of the North Sea and emphasize the remoteness of the Germanii. The Latin Tacitus chooses to use in his description of the North Sea further emphasizes his point. In the

> use of *adversus*, a term normally applied to antipodal worlds, and the phrase *ab orbe nostro*—which can be taken to mean simply 'from our region' but which also carries overtones of the more sweeping *orbis terrarum*—Tacitus

---

[15] Romm, James S. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992: 137.
[16] Romm, James S. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992: 17.

stresses the idea that the North Sea is entirely separate from the *oikoumene*.[17]

Germania was an *alius orbis* to the Roman mind, and Tacitus plays on this idea in his further descriptions of the landscape. In the use of the phrase "*informem terres* he uses a word that meant, simultaneously, 'shapeless' *and* 'dismal.'" In the Roman mind, "The sign of a pleasing landscape was necessarily that which had been formed, upon which man had left his civilizing and fructifying mark."[18] As the   Germanii did not practice any form of agriculture and lived in such an inhospitable climate, they were, to the Romans, the antithesis of civilization.

In the eyes of Tacitus, this "inversion of Roman values in the Teutonic woods is not without its redeeming features."[19]   Tacitus gives a "portrait of Germania as a not-Rome [...] completed by its relative indifference to property and elaborate distinctions of rank, and its marked preference for spontaneous forms of community: communal feasting and hospitality."[20] Throughout his descriptions of German customs, Tacitus explicitly insulted the Roman *luxuria*. Among these corruptions were gluttony, materialism, selection of unworthy leaders, undue deification of women, promiscuity and childlessness. *Luxuria* is most apparent in the infamous gluttony and materialism of the Romans. Tacitus emphasizes the German rejection of materialism as he states:

---

[17] Ibid.: 142

[18] Schama, Simon. "*Der Holzweg*: The track through the woods" *In Landscape and Memory*. London: Harper Collins, 1995: 81.

[19] Ibid.: 85.

[20] Ibid.: 86.

> The natives take less pleasure than most people do in possessing and handling these metals; indeed, one can see in their houses silver vessels, which have been presented to chieftains or to ambassadors travelling abroad, put to the same everyday uses as earthenware.[21]

He carries this emphasis on German simplicity further in describing the German food as "plain—wild fruit, fresh game, and curdled milk. They satisfy their hunger without any elaborate cuisine or appetizers."[22] That is to say, they do not corrupt themselves with the extravagant feasts characteristic of *luxuria*. Tacitus develops this theme of moderation forward into his description of the German reverence of women. Although "they believe that there resides in women an element of holiness and a gift of prophecy; and so they do not scorn to ask their advice, or lightly disregard their replies", this regard remains "untainted by servile flattery or any pretence of turning women into goddesses."[23] Tacitus' clever use of examples from Roman society, emphasize that he is chastising the Roman excess, by highlighting the German moderation. Tacitus delves deeper into the issue of morality associated with women as he details the customs valuing mothers and the family. As opposed to the Roman tradition of employing a wet-nurse, in Germania "every mother feeds her child at the breast and does not depute the task to maids or nurses."[24] In fact,

---

[21]Tacitus, Cornelius. "Germania", *The Agricola and the Germania*. Translated by H. Mattingly. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970: 105.

[22] Ibid.: 121.

[23] Ibid.: 108.

[24] Ibid.: 118.

"there is nothing to be gained by childlessness in Germany."[25] In these statements, Tacitus criticizes the absurdity occurring in Roman society when fortune hunters attempted to ingratiate themselves through gifts and attention to those about to die with no heirs. For Tacitus, Germania illustrated morality and Rome utter decay.

In his praise of the Germanii, he bluntly declares, "good morality is more effective in Germany than good laws are elsewhere."[26] By saying this, he alludes to the Augustan social legislation that had failed and the utter degeneration of Roman society that had followed. Taking the path of inverted ethnocentrism, Tacitus followed in the tradition of ethnography of melding the arts of geography and literature. The end result of his efforts was a condemnation of Roman moral decay.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mattingly, H. Introduction to *The Agricola and the Germania*, by Cornelius Tacitus. Translated by H. Mattingly. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970.

Romm, James S. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Schama, Simon. "*Der Holzweg*: The track through the woods" *In Landscape and Memory*. London: Harper Collins, 1995.

---

[25] Ibid.: 119.

[26] Tacitus, Cornelius. "Germania", *The Agricola and the Germania*. Translated by H. Mattingly. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970: 118.

Tacitus, Cornelius, *The Agricola and the Germania*. Translated by H. Mattingly. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970.

Brasidas
By Andrew Sweet '04
Kenyon College

Brasidas is the most compelling Lacedaemonian in Thucydides' account of the Peloponnesian war, and the abilities he shows as a warrior, a general, and a speaker differentiate him greatly from Thucydides' description of normal Spartan character. In fact, although he serves Sparta and her interests, Brasidas' approach and methods are more similar to the Athenians' than to his fellow Lacedaemonians'. He combines strength and bravery with inventiveness and vigor, and he is the only one of his countrymen who understands how to wage war rather than simply fight battles. Of all the Spartans, only he effectively works for the benefit of his homeland after the capture of the Spartans on Sphacteria at the battle of Pylos. He is surprisingly successful in this with his expedition to Thrace, but he is so alien to the other Lacedaemonians that they delay reinforcing him and even harbor ill-will towards him. I think this depiction contains a profound critique of the Spartan regime from Thucydides. If their most able citizen is so different from the other Lacedaemonians that they cannot accept him and even hinder him from aiding their national interests, this points to crucial problems in their political structure.

Despite Thucydides' statements concerning the high standards of accuracy he tries to uphold, it is seems likely that he takes liberties with certain facts either for literary effect or to better reflect his analysis of the war.[1] It is especially dangerous to draw conclusions about historical facts from Thucydides' portrayal of Brasidas, since he is the Spartan general who defeated the author

---

[1] 1.20-21.

and caused his exile. It is possible that Thucydides inflates many aspects of Brasidas' excellence in an attempt to excuse his own defeat. While I believe Thucydides' own statements on the accuracy of his work for the most part, these doubts make it necessary to limit the scope of this paper to an interpretation of Thucydides' portrayal of Brasidas and to leave open the question of whether this account accurately depicts the facts of Brasidas' life.

On the eve of the war, the Peloponnesians hold an assembly at Lacedaemon to discuss whether to declare war, and Thucydides outlines the basic national character of the Athenians and the Spartans through the speeches of the Corinthians and the Lacedaemonian King Archidamus there. The Corinthians try to explain why Athens is so dangerous to Sparta, and they do so by contrasting the Athenian character with the Spartan. This is one of many cases of antithesis in Thucydides' work, and it is important to be mindful that this passage is arranged to highlight these contrasts. That said, the Corinthians paint a picture of Lacedaemonian character that agrees with Thucydides' portrayal of the Spartans, excluding Brasidas, in the rest of the history. Brasidas, however, matches the Athenian character much more closely, insofar as the Corinthians describe it here. The Corinthians tell the Lacedaemonians that

οἱ μέν γε νεωτεροποιοὶ καὶ ἐπινοῆσαι ὀξεῖς
καὶ   ἐπιτελέσαιἔργῳ   ἃ   ἂν
ὑμεῖς δὲ τὰ ὑπάρχοντά τε σῴζειν καὶ
ἐπιγνῶναι μηδὲν καὶ ἔργῳ οὐδὲ τάναγ καῖ
α   ἐξικέσθαι.
ὗθις δὲ οἱ μὲν καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν
τολμηταὶ καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κινδυνευταὶ
καὶ   ἐν   τοῖς   δεινοῖς
ὁ δὲ ὑμέτερον τῆς τε δυνάμεως ἐνδεᾶ

πρᾶξαι τῆς τε γνώμης μηδὲ τοῖς βεβαίοις
πιστεῦσαι τῶν τε δεινῶν μηδέποτε οἴεσθαι
ἀπολυθήσεσθαι.[2]

The Corinthians go on to describe how the Spartans
never want to leave home for fear of endangering it and
constantly hesitate to act even in dire circumstances, but
the Athenians are constantly away from home
attempting new things and act so swiftly that a plan is
practically an accomplishment.[3]

      Archidamus does not dispute the truth of the
Corinthians' claims but defends these characteristics of
his homeland in a speech in the same assembly. He calls
their hesitation σωφροσύνη ἔμφρων and praises it as
the possession that differentiates them from others,
preventing them from being carried away in success and
helping them endure hardship. He even says that it
allows them to disregard the corrupting influences of
others, although Thucydides portrays corruption of
Spartans abroad as a real danger.[4] Archidamus explains
that their strict and ancient customs form the basis of the
inflexible mindset that results in the Lacedaemonians'
continued preeminence:

---

[2] 1.70.3: The Athenians "are innovating and keen to contrive
and carry out with action whatever they determine; but you
save your possessions and come to no new resolve, and you do
not even carry out with action the minimum which is
necessary. Again, they dare beyond their power and run risks
beyond their judgment, and they are of good hope in dangers;
but, for your part, you act short of your power and do not even
trust the certainties of your judgment, and you believe that
there will never be a release from dangers."
[3] 1.70.4-7.
[4] 1.84.1-2. See also 1.128-135, where Thucydides fully
explains the circumstances of Pausanias' recall and death.

πολεμικοί τε καὶ εὔβουλοι διὰ τὸ εὔκοσμον
γιγνόμεθα, τὸ μὲν ὅτι αἰδὼς
σωφροσύνης πλεῖστον μετέχει, αἰσχύνης δὲ
 εὐψυχία, εὔβουλοι δὲ ἀμαθέστερον τῶν
νόμων τῆς ὑπεροψίας παιδευόμενοι καὶ ξὺν
 χαλεπότητι σωφρονέστερον ἢ ὥστε
αὐτῶν ἀνηκουστεῖν . . .ομίζειν δὲ τάς τε
διανοίας τῶν πέλας παραπλησίους εἶναι
καὶ τὰς
προσπιπτούσας τύχας οὐ λόγῳ διαιρετάς.
 . . . πολύ τε διαφέρειν οὐ δεῖ νομίζειν
ἄνθρωπον ἀνθρώπου, κράτιστον δὲ εἶναι
ὅστις ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις παιδεύεται.[5]

Archidamus ends this speech by reminding his listeners how long Sparta has profited from its current political system and urging them not to depart from the practices of their ancestors, but Brasidas excels precisely by not manifesting the effects of his Spartan education which Archidamus praises and the Corinthians blame.[6] This proves the analysis of the Corinthians, who have specifically addressed how badly suited these supposed advantages are to contending with the Athenians. As the

---

[5] 1.84.3-4: "We become both warlike and prudent because of good order. On the hand, because modesty has the greatest share of moderation and courage [has the greatest share] of a sense of shame; and, on the other hand, we are prudent being educated more ignorantly concerning contempt for the laws and more wisely with difficulty than would result in us disobeying them. . . . And [we] believe that the thoughts of our neighbors closely resemble [ours] and that chance circumstances are not determinable by argument. . . . And it is not right to believe that man differs much from man, but that the strongest is whoever is educated in the most constraining things."
[6] 1.85.1.

Corinthians warn, this conservative mindset greatly hinders the Lacedaemonians during the war.

According to Thucydides, the Spartan's vaunted mindset actually results in poor relations with allies and ineffective strategy on the part of the city and its commanders, bearing out the Athenian warning to the Lacedaemonians that ἄμεικτα γὰρ τά τε καθ' ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς νόμιμα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔχετε καὶ προσέτι εἷς ἕκαστος ἐξιὼν οὔτε τούτοις χρῆται οὔθ' οἷς ἡ ἄλλη Ἑλλὰς νc Once the war begins, the Lacedaemonian strategy consists of marching into Attica once a year, devastating the land, and then leaving. While the Long Walls from Athens to Piraeus stand, the Lacedaemonians cannot properly besiege the city, but yearly ravaging is not an effective alternative. Their inexperience at fighting a naval power and eagerness to return home prevent them from devising better plans.

The examples of the following three Lacedaemonian generals show what results from the standard Spartan mindset in practice. The commander Alcidas, with whom Brasidas has a disagreement at Corcyra, leads an expedition in the summer of the fifth year of the war to protect Mitylene, but he hears that the Athenians captured it before he arrives. He refuses proposals to attempt to retake Mitylene or to begin a revolt in Ionia in another way, and sails homeward to the Peloponnese instead. Along the way, he kills the Ionians he takes prisoner until the Samians send him an envoy telling him that he is foolishly alienating people who should be his friends.[8] This shows both the Spartans'

---

[7] 1.77.6: "for you have customs for yourselves incompatible with others and, furthermore, when each one [of you] goes out, he follows neither these nor the ones the rest of Greece observes."

[8] 3.30-32.

unwillingness to change objectives to attack targets of opportunity and their inability to interact with other Greeks, the combination of which prevents this expedition from achieving anything that furthers the Peloponnesian cause.

Polydamidas, whom Brasidas places in control of the garrison at Mende, also exemplifies the Spartan inability to deal with allies. His bad conduct first causes a group of allies to desert the garrison, then he starts a fight with the townsmen, and in the ensuing struggle, the Athenians to rush in and seize the town.[9] Pausanias, a Spartan commander during the Median War, is an even better example of a bad Lacedaemonian general who ruins relations with other cities. Thucydides explains that the Ionians first turned to Athens during the Median Wars in order to get protection from Pausanias, who became βίαιος and began intriguing with the Persians. Having recalled Pausanias, the Lacedaemonians held a trial but acquitted him of most charges, including the well founded accusation of Medism. Seeing that the allies already regarded Athens as their leader, the Lacedaemonians were satisfied as it allowed them to withdraw from the war.[10] This final affair is indicative of both the ill conceived way in which the Lacedaemonians approach foreign relations and the tendency for time abroad to corrupt them.

Although he serves his city's interests throughout his career, Brasidas shows characteristics that differentiate him from these typical Lacedaemonians both before and after he leaves the Spartan command structure. While his difference from the other Spartans is muted by his limited freedom of action before the Thracian expedition, Brasidas does manifest un-Spartan

---

[9] 4.130.
[10] 1.95.

swiftness and willingness to contradict superior officers. When an Athenian force assaults Methone in the first summer of the war, Brasidas arrives quickly with a hundred heavy infantry he is commanding. He acts promptly in response to a threat and unhesitatingly throws himself into battle. The Athenians withdraw, and Brasidas

ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ τολμήματος πρῶτος τῶν

κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἐπῃνέθη ἐν Σπάρτῃ[11] Here the Lacedaemonians honor Brasidas for being outstanding, but they react quite differently during his campaign in Thrace. This first mention of Brasidas in the History foreshadows his value to Lacedaemonian interests and his quick thinking, and so Thucydides may emphasize it for literary effect. Thucydides next distinguishes Brasidas from typical Lacedaemonians on his second naval expedition, during which he is advisor to the admiral, Alcidas. Their object is to capture Corcyra while it is embroiled in civil strife, and they defeat the allied Athenian and Corcyraean fleet sent out against them. They fail to complete their goal when Athenian reinforcements arrive because they do not attack the city, καίπερ ἐν πολλῇ

ταραχῇ καὶ φόβῳ ὄντας καὶ Βρασίδου

παραινοῦντος, ὡς λέγεται, Ἀλκίδᾳ,

ἰσοψήφου δὲ οὐκ ὄντος[12] Brasidas violates one of the core Spartan values by questioning a superior officer, and this sets him apart from Archidamus' account of Lacedaemonian conduct.

---

[11] 2.25.2: "from this feat of daring, received the thanks of the state first of those [being honored] in Sparta during the war."
[12] 3.79.3: "although they [the Corcyraeans] were in much disorder and fear, and, as is said, Brasidas was urging Alcidas [to attack], although he was not of equal vote."

In consequence, Brasidas is demoted, commanding only a single ship during the pivotal battle at Pylos. His character thus leads him in a circle: while his abilities help him advance, they also hinder him when he interacts with his less able superiors. Without regard for this demotion, Brasidas unhesitatingly risks his life for the Peloponnesian cause. When the Peloponnesians are trying to land to attack the Athenians on shore, he exhorts the other ships to run aground and fight without reservation. He then leads by example, forcing his helmsman to run the ship onto the shore, and an enemy wounds him as he charges off.[13] When he utilizes his skills within the Spartan hierarchy, Brasidas and his city both gain nothing. Despite risking everything in this battle, he cannot prevent the Peloponnesians from suffering a crushing defeat, in which the Athenians capture some Spartan heavy infantry alive on the nearby island of Sphacteria. This leaves Brasidas with only one choice to benefit his city: to leave home so that his exceptional abilities can actually help the Lacedaemonians prosecute the war.

Brasidas therefore convinces the Spartan leadership to allow him to undertake his Thracian campaign, and he truly distinguishes himself both in character and tactical skill from the other Lacedaemonians during the course of this expedition. Brasidas commands of an army of Helots and mercenaries with no regular Spartan heavy infantry, and the Chalcidians and the barbarian Perdiccas fund the expedition.[14] The Spartans were glad for the excuse to send away some Helots because there was fear of a revolt after the surrender on Sphacteria, and αὐτόν τε Βρασίδαν βουλόμενον μάλιστα

---

[13] 4.11.4-12.1.
[14] 4.79.2.

Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἀπέστειλαν[15] They did not have to risk their precious heavy infantry or spend any money, so the Spartan command must have seen the whole mission as a risk-free chance to get rid of some undesirable elements while also possibly hurting the Athenians. The disaster on Sphacteria completely destroyed the will to fight of most Lacedaemonians, which is all the more reason why leaving the Spartan military hierarchy and taking command of this unconventional expedition was necessary for Brasidas.

Even before leaving for Thrace, Brasidas shows how quickly and effectively he can react to developing situations when commanding an army. He receives word of an Athenian assault on Nisaea and immediately gathers additional Corinthian and Boeotian allies to protect the nearby town of Megara. The Megarians refuse him admittance until they can see whether he will defeat the Athenians, so Brasidas forms his troops for battle outside Megara and waits for the Athenians to attack him. They withdraw since they have already captured Nisaea and see no need to risk the battle, and the Megarians consider Brasidas and his allies victorious.[16] This is the first time Brasidas has sole command of a significant force, and his genius and skill are quite evident from the masterful way he handles events. He outmaneuvers the Athenians and saves Megara by quick action and cleverness without even having to engage the enemy in battle, whereas a typical Spartan could have avoided fighting only by arriving at Megara after it was captured and then going home like Alcidas at Mitylene.

Next Brasidas sets out for Thrace, where he attempts to disrupt the Athenian power base by causing

---

[15] 4.80.2, 4.81.1: "And the Lacedaemonians dispatched Brasidas, who wanted himself [to be sent out] most of all."
[16] 4.70-73.

their tributary allies to revolt in any way possible, a strategy unlike other Spartans' since it requires constant reassessment of goals and vigorous movement. In fact, the Corinthians' statement concerning the Athenians that εἴ τις

αὐτοὺς ξυνελὼν φαίη πεφυκέναι ἐπὶ τῷ μήτε αὐτοὺς ἔχειν ἡσυχίαν μήτε τοὺς

ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους ἐᾶν, ὀρθῶς ἂν εἴποι aptly describes Brasidas on this campaign.[17] The Spartans only resume these methods after Alcibiades joins them and persuades them to do so.[18] Depending on the situation, Brasidas uses one of two different tactics to win over the Athenian allies who do not immediately join him: he convinces them that he comes on a noble quest for the freedom and honor of the Hellenes, or he simply takes their towns by treachery. In all cases, Brasidas offers favorable terms and does his best to assure the revolting cities that they have nothing to fear from Athens while he is there to protect them. This strategy is so successful that the Athenians become greatly afraid of a large scale revolt in Ionia, ὁ γὰρ Βρασίδας ἔν τε τοῖς

ἄλλοις μέτριον ἑαυτὸν παρεῖχε, καὶ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις πανταχοῦ ἐδήλου ὡς

ἐλευθερώσων τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐκπεμφθεὶ

Thucydides also explains that Brasidas is responsible for later effects on the Athenian allies:

---

[17] 1.70.9: "If someone should say, in short, that they were born in this world neither to have rest themselves nor to allow other men [to have it], he would speak correctly."

[18] 8.12. Compare Alcidas, who twice refuses suggestions to incite revolt in Ionia (see pp. 4-5).

[19] 4.108.2: "Since Brasidas was proving himself moderate both in other things and in the declarations he was making known everywhere that he was sent out to free Hellas."

ἔς τε τὸν χρόνῳ ὕστερον μετὰ τὰ ἐκ
Σικελίας πόλεμον ἡ τότε Βρασίδου ἀρετὴ
καὶ ξύνεσις, τῶν μὲν πείρᾳ αἰσθομένων,
τῶν δὲ ἀκοῇ
νομισάντων, μάλιστα ἐπιθυμίαν ἐνεποίει
τοῖς Ἀθηναίων ξυμμάχοις ἐς
τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους. πρῶτος γὰρ
ἐξελθὼν καὶ δόξας εἶναι κατὰ
πάντα ἀγαθὸς ἐλπίδα ἐγκατέλιπε βέβαιον
 ὡς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι τοιοῦτοί
εἰσιν.[20]

By acting thus, Brasidas helps the Lacedaemonians both
in the short term, by gaining them some towns to
exchange with the Athenians during the peace
negotiations that take place after his death, and in the
long term, by convincing the allies of Athens that the
Spartans are truly fighting for freedom and honor.

The speech of Brasidas to the Acanthians is the
only example of an exhortation to Athenian allies to join
him willingly that Thucydides records. During this
speech, Brasidas combines clever rhetoric designed to
convince the Acanthians that he has come to release
them with overt threats, and thus he successfully incites
their revolt. Unlike the other Spartans, Brasidas
accomplishes this because he understands how to appeal
to other Greeks and is capable of

---

[20] 4.81.2-3: "And later, after the happenings in Sicily, the
excellence and sagacity of Brasidas at this time, which some
learned by experience and others believed from hearing, most
of all made in the allies of the Athenians an inclination
towards the Lacedaemonians. Since he was the first who
came out, and, having gotten the reputation of being good in
everything, he left behind the firm expectation that the others
were also of such a kind."

τὸ τὰ δέοντα πρᾶξαι like an Athenian.[21]
Acanthus is the first Greek city that Brasidas approaches
on his Thracian expedition, and he persuades its citizens
to admit him alone to speak.[22] While he is delivering
this skillfully constructed exhortation, Brasidas appeals
to the Acanthians by portraying himself both as a
glorious liberator and representative of the Spartans in
general.   He immediately explains that the
Lacedaemonians brought about his and the army's
ἔκπεμψις to substantiate the reason for which they
began the war, Ἀθηναίοις ἐλευθεροῦντες

τὴν Ἑλλάδα πολεμήσειν[23]   Archidamus also claimed
this when he campaigned against Plataea, but it was no
more than a justification of Lacedaemonian aggression
for him.[24]   Brasidas, on the other hand, transforms
another Spartan's excuse for aggression into the basis of
a crusade for justice and honor.

His exhortation to join the fight for Hellenic
freedom begins with a portrayal of the Lacedaemonians
as friends of the Athenians' tributary allies. He tells the
Acanthians that this first expedition from Sparta has
arrived so late because of an opinion about the war that

---

[21] 1.70.8.

[22] 4.84.

[23] 4.85.1: "that freeing Hellas [we] would make war against
the Athenians."

[24] 2.71-74: Archidamus undertook this campaign with the
Boeotians, who were long standing enemies of the Plataeans,
for no other purpose than the destruction of Plataea. They
besiege Plataea and make ludicrous demands to its people,
which marginally comply with the treaty binding all of them,
and the Plataeans have no choice but to reject these. Since
Archidamus' final response to the Plataean denial of his
demands is little more than a summary of how he is legally in
the right, it proves he invoked the cause of Hellenic freedom
only to justify attacking the city.

led them to hope for a swift victory without the Acanthians' κίνδυνος, but now that chance has offered they should join with him against Athens.[25]   Brasidas even feigns amazement that the gates were shut against him and tells the Acanthians that the Lacedaemonians considered them allies in spirit even before their actual arrival. Brasidas offers as proof of this goodwill that his expedition ran a great risk by traveling a long and dangerous road through a foreign land and showing πᾶν τὸ πρόθυμον[26] By saying these things,   Brasidas begins to deceive the Acanthians by representing his own attitude as the general outlook of the Lacedaemonians while making the Acanthians better disposed towards them.   He depicts his fellow countrymen as quite eager to fight for Hellenic freedom, but the other Lacedaemonians are actually trying to negotiate peace with Athens at this time.

In order to further build friendly feeling towards Lacedaemon, Brasidas moves on to emphasize to the Acanthians how crucial they are to the fight for Hellenic freedom: since he has come to them first, the other Greek cities would be hesitant to join him should the Acanthians, men who are πόλιν ἀξιόχρεων παρεχομένους καὶ ξύνεσιν δοκοῦντας ἔχειν refuse to do so.[27] Thus he flatters them but holds back his highest praise, implying that they must prove their ξύνεσις to him, no doubt by revolting from Athens. By casting opposition to him as opposition not only to their own freedom but also to freedom for all the other Athenian allies, Brasidas augments the shame that would come from rejecting

---

[25] 4.85.4.

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] 4.85.6: "providing a noteworthy city and seeming to have sagacity."

him. These appeals to glory and shame are natural for someone who represents himself as a freedom fighter, but Archidamus did not use anything similar to address non-Spartans. Brasidas, on the other hand, embraces his role as a liberator and all of the rhetorical tools this offers him.

Brasidas' refutation of two central points of argument against joining his crusade, that he brings ἄδικον τὴν ἐλευθερίαν or that he is unable to fight off the Athenians, reinforces the contrast between Brasidas and other Lacedaemonians.[28] In order to prove that he is quite capable of repelling the Athenians, Brasidas reminds his listeners of what happened at Megara. Unashamedly lying, he says that there he commanded the army he currently has and that the Athenians were more numerous than his troops.[29] He insists that the Athenian unwillingness to fight him there is evidence that they will also be unwilling to fight him in Ionia. This point is particularly specious given the Athenian willingness to dispatch fleets and since revolting allies threaten Athenian revenue and thus their ability to make war, but Megara was not strategically important enough to risk the battle. Thus he adroitly focuses more on proving that he brings just freedom, both because he can cite more evidence for this assertion and because it enhances the conception of him as the liberator of Hellas.

---

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] In fact, his force was more numerous and included Corinthians, Phliasians, Sicyonians, and Boeotions who did not accompany Brasidas on this expedition (4.70.1, 4.72.1, 4.74.1). The Athenians had already captured Nisaea, their most important objective, and could have lost their best heavy infantry in a battle, so they did not attack. Nor did Brasidas attack, but the Megarians lauded him as victor when the Athenians withdrew from the field first (4.73.4).

The ὅρκοι by which the Lacedaemonians are bound are his first support for bringing true freedom, namely Brasidas' pledge that ἐ μὴν οὓς ἂν ἔγωγε προσαγάγωμαι ξυμμάχους ἔσεσθαι αὐτονόμους.[30] He continues that they do not want to compel the Acanthians by force or fraud but to join them as allies since the Acanthians were enslaved by the Athenians. Brasidas portrays himself as an eager liberator using especially clever rhetoric, since he is deceiving them and willing to use force if necessary, and even adds that it is not right to mistrust him in light of these guarantees and his ability to fight the Athenians. As additional support for the truth of the freedom he brings, Brasidas addresses the fear that he might meddle in the Acanthians' domestic affairs. He explains that if he supported a faction, it would be worse than foreign rule, and the Lacedaemonians would receive αἰτία instead of the τιμή and δόξη they seek.[31] Again, Brasidas portrays his own motivations, honor and glory, as those of all the Lacedaemonians, who would leave allies autonomous mostly from a desire to return to Sparta. He even says that by intervening they would become worse than the Athenians, whom they are fighting for interfering with other cities, since the Lacedaemonians have represented themselves as just due to the fact that

> ἀπάτη γὰρ εὐπρεπεῖ αἴσχιον τοῖς γε ἐν
> ἀξιώματι πλεονεκτῆσαι ἢ βίᾳ ἐμφανεῖ· τὸ
> μὲν γὰρ ἰσχύος δικαιώσει, ἣν ἡ τύχη ἔδωκε

---

[30] 4.86.1: "I swear, those whom I bring over will be autonomous allies."
[31] 4.86.5.

ν, ἐπέρχεται, τὸ δὲ γνώμης ἀδίκου ἐπιβουλῇ.[32]

This is both an elaborate manner of rhetoric and a rather Athenian idea that Brasidas expresses.[33] Brasidas uses any means necessary to achieve his goals, including duplicity, but convincing the Acanthians he thinks it is shameful allows him to mislead them better.

Only after establishing himself as a liberator does Brasidas turn to threatening the Acanthians, and he even relates his threat back to the fight for Hellenic freedom. Brasidas echoes Archidamus by calling on the local gods and heroes as witnesses but for a slightly different purpose. While Archidamus invokes them as witnesses that he is following the treaty with the Plataeans, Brasidas says μάρτυρας μὲν θεοὺς καὶ ἥρωας τοὺς ἐγχωρίους ποιήσομαι ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἀγαθῷ ἥκων οὐ πείθω[34] Brasidas thus continues to assert he fights for justice and then bolsters this claim with two ways in which the Acanthians would oppose what is right: first, by harming the Lacedaemonians with tribute payments to Athens, and second, by hindering the release of the other Greek from slavery. Brasidas even explicitly states that the Lacedaemonians owe freedom to the other Greeks because of κοινόν τι αγαθ.[35]

---

[32] 4.86.6: "since, for those of reputation at least, gaining advantage by a comely trick is more shameful than by open force; for the one comes about by the just claim of strength, which fortune gave, but the other by the scheme of an unjust mind."

[33] Gomme, v. 3, 554. He calls it a "Thucydidean-Athenian" idea comparing it to 1.76-77.

[34] 4.87.2: "I will make the gods and heroes of this country witnesses that, although I came for the good, I do not persuade [you]."

[35] 4.87.4.

Because of this, it would be wrong for the Spartans, who are not at all looking for empire according to Brasidas, to overlook opposition from the Acanthians. Brasidas concludes with a final exhortation to be the first to fight for Greek freedom and, in so doing, ἀίδιον δόξαν καταθέσθαι, καὶ . . . ξυμπάσῃ τῇ πόλει τὸ κάλλιστον ὄνομα περιθεῖναι.[36]

This speech, with its well constructed appeal to the Acanthians, is different from any other Lacedaemonian speech in the History, and it shows Brasidas taking over the formerly Athenian position of liberator in Ionia.[37] While the idea that Sparta is fighting for liberty is not new, Brasidas is the first to use it to create an argument that actually sways other Greeks. In order to get the Acanthians to join him, Brasidas uses every means available to him, even deceiving them and simultaneously condemning deception. The success of this speech proves that Brasidas understands the specific psychology of the Ionian Greeks, which contrasts with the assertion of Archidamus that the Spartans view all men as fundamentally the same as themselves but inferior. Brasidas reveals how desperately he needs the Acanthians to join him as part of his rhetorical strategy, but the behavior of Alcidas shows that he was not concerned with gaining Ionian support either in action or in mindset.

Brasidas also approaches the battle exhortations that he gives in Thrace with a more Athenian than Spartan mindset. In the third year of the war, Brasidas and other Lacedaemonians are advisors to the commander of the Peloponnesian fleet, Cnemus, and

---

[36] 4.87.6: "to lay up a store of everlasting glory, and . . . to place the noblest fame around the whole city."
[37] Gomme, v. 3, 554.

Brasidas' unique perspective seems to be lost in their speech before the battle at Naupactus.[38] In fact, Brasidas' subsequent battle speeches resemble Phormio's to the opposing Athenian fleet much more than the Lacedaemonian speech here. The Lacedaemonian commanders are attempting to encourage their newly reinforced fleet that they will defeat the smaller Athenian fleet, which previously overcame them. They say that they lost the battle before because they were unprepared to fight by sea rather than on land, fortune was against them, καί πού τι καὶ ἡ ἀπειρία πρῶτον ναυμαχοῦντας ἔσφηλεν.[39]

The commanders argue that this time is different, but the reasons they cite are flimsy and unconvincing. They say that the defeat did not overcome the inherent bravery of the troops, which is primarily due to the severe training and resulting quality of their heavy infantry, and they excel the Athenians in this more than the Athenians excel them in experience. Once the battle is joined, fear will drive out the Athenians' superior expertise, since they lack bravery ἄνευ δὲ εὐψυχίας οὐδεμία τέχνη πρὸς τοὺς κινδύνους ἰσχύει[40] They emphasize ill preparation instead of inexperience as the decisive factor in the earlier battle, but the commanders try to prove that they are prepared this time because making the previous mistakes educated them and their preparation is not inferior to that of the previous commanders. The best argument they make is that

---

[38] 2.85-87.

[39] 2.87.2: "And perhaps also to some degree inexperience hindered [us] fighting at sea for the first time."

[40] 2.87.4: "and without bravery no art is strong against dangers."

περιγίγνεται δὲ ὑμῖν πλῆθός τε νεῶν καὶ πρὸς τῇ γῇ οἰκείᾳ οὔσῃ

ὁπλιτῶν παρόντων ναυμαχεῖν but this is a much greater advantage for a land battle.[41] They conclude with a warning about the punishment for cowardice and the rewards for valor. Even the conclusion of this speech thus reinforces that it is unconvincing, since the speech offers no proof that the commanders have made any real improvements. The commanders are also clearly making the same mistake as at the previous sea battle, treating this fight as if it were on land and relying on their advantage there to give the troops confidence here.

Phormio, on the other hand, must prove to his troops that their expertise at sea will enable them to overcome the more numerous Peloponnesians.[42] In contrast to the Peloponnesian commanders, who tell their men to depend on their natural superiority, Phormio argues that the right knowledge will be the decisive factor. This consists of understanding that the Peloponnesians' large fleet reflects the fear arising from their previous defeat and that the Athenians' naval expertise gives them the same advantage at sea as the Lacedaemonians enjoy on land. Furthermore, unwilling allies of Sparta make up much of the Peloponnesian fleet, and the very fact that the Athenians fight with such small numbers proves their greater courage and terrifies the enemy. Phormio also explains his own strategy for the battle, so that his men will know exactly how he expects to capitalize on their advantages to overcome the Lacedaemonians. He concludes by reminding them

---

[41] 2.87.6: "there is both superiority for us in the number of ships and [we] fight at sea near our own land with hoplites present."
[42] 2.89.

ὅτι νενικήκατε αὐτῶν τοὺς πολλούς· ἡσσημένων δὲ ἀνδρῶν

οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν αἱ γνῶμαι πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς

κινδύνους ὁμοῖαι εἶναι[43]   Phormio thus teaches the Athenians that despite appearances they actually have the advantage, offering their expertise and the Peloponnesians' fear as proofs.

The speech that Brasidas gives to his troops before they join battle with barbarians in Thrace is remarkably similar. Phormio and Brasidas are both outnumbered and fighting the type of battle at which they excel, but these speeches are more alike than this alone warrants. Brasidas opens by explaining that he called his troops together upon seeing their attitude and offers a διδαχή with a παρακέλευσις so that they will be brave.[44] Although Brasidas tells his troops that their bravery rests on innate courage, his main goal is to correct the ἀπειρία that is causing their fear.[45] Brasidas' approach to this exhortation is thus to educate his men about the inferiority of the enemy in order to bolster his troops' resolve, just as Phormio does at Naupactus. A discussion of the fighting techniques of the barbarians forms this teaching, as Brasidas explains that they do not fight in ordered ranks or with any sort of discipline.   The barbarians may look and sound frightening but will not stand firm against well ordered Greek troops.   In this way, Brasidas uses the same approach as Phormio, and his army successfully fights off the more numerous barbarians.

---

[43] 2.89.11: "you have defeated many of them; and the mindset of men, who have been beaten, is not likely to be similar against the same dangers."

[44] 4.126.1.

[45] 4.126.3.

Brasidas again uses this method while exhorting his troops before the battle with the Athenians under Cleon at Amphipolis. Quickly dispensing with the idea that they usually beat the enemy because of innate superiority, Brasidas spends most of this speech explaining his tactics and why these will bring victory. The reason for Brasidas' unconventional approach is that

> ὅστις . . . πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν τὴν
> ἐπιχείρησιν ποιεῖται μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ
> προφανοῦς μᾶλλον καὶ
> ἀντιπαραταχθέντος ἢ ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς τὸ
> παρὸν ξυμφέροντος, πλεῖστ' ἂν ὀρθοῖτο·
> καὶ τὰ   κλέμματα ταῦτα καλλίστην
> δόξαν ἔχει ἃ τὸν πολέμιον μάλιστ' ἄν τις
> ἀπατήσας τοὺς φίλους μέγιστ' ἂν
> ὠφελήσειεν.[46]

Brasidas thus shows his favor for taking advantage of whatever the situation offers, an Athenian rather than Spartan attitude, and this flexibility leads to his many successes. His strategy involves splitting his force so that he can increase the confusion and fear among the disorganized Athenian troops, and he explains the benefits of this plan to give his men courage. Brasidas even finishes this speech by returning to the idea, which is most prevalent in his speech to the Acanthians, that he fights for freedom against the Athenian oppressors. Although he is fatally wounded in this battle, Brasidas lives long enough to learn that his troops are victorious

---

[46] 5.9.4-5: "whoever makes an attempt with regards to his own power, not by an open and hostile array rather than by taking advantage of the circumstance, succeeds most of all; and these tricks, which benefit our friends most greatly when someone has deceived the enemy completely, have the noblest reputation."

and dies a hero to the Ionian Greeks with whom he fought.

Brasidas more successfully promotes Sparta's interests than any other Lacedaemonian general, but his countrymen do not support him. An excellent contrast to this is Pausanias, the Spartan commander during the Persian Wars, who becomes so fractious and violent that the allies seek Athenian help rather than work with him. Pausanias intrigues with the Persians and begins to Medize, which causes the Lacedaemonians to suspect him as a traitor. The Spartans let him go again and again, however, not even being convinced by an incriminating letter he tries to send to the Persians. They are finally persuaded by overhearing him admit to a servant that he is betraying Lacedaemon but wait until later to arrest him, and one of the officials lets him know what was about to happen so that he has a chance to run.[47] Just as Brasidas acts moderately and recruits allies in any way possible, Pausanias drives them away. Brasidas goes out in order to benefit his country, but the Lacedaemonians suspect him of the same personal aggrandizement of which Pausanias is guilty. While suspicion of Brasidas' motives is expected, it is remarkable that they react to him with φθόνος.[48]

Brasidas is certainly not a traitor like Pausanias, but the Lacedaemonian leadership must expect him to fail because of the nature of his army and the unconventional tactics he utilizes. Since these things lead to wild success rather than failure, Brasidas challenges the core beliefs as enumerated by Archidamus. The Lacedaemonians show pity to Pausanias because they understand him, but they envy Brasidas since he is incomprehensible and therefore dangerous.

---

[47] 1.128-134.
[48] 4.108.7.

Brasidas is of the greatest benefit to his city, both acquiring towns that the other Lacedaemonians can barter with during peace negotiations and creating a friendly feeling among the Ionians for Sparta. In order to do this, Brasidas must be flexible and swift to act, which sets him apart from the other Spartans. In this approach to war, Brasidas shows a mindset more Athenian than Spartan, and the other Lacedaemonians react badly toward him. This contrast between Brasidas and other Spartans combines with their reaction to him to portray the Lacedaemonian system as flawed. The typical Spartan cannot command as skillfully or speak as persuasively as Brasidas, but the city does not send support for his expedition to Thrace until he has already died. The prized constitution of Sparta thus creates citizens who are unable to prosecute a foreign war successfully and hate any of their number who manage to retain these abilities. Just as the Corinthians warn, the ancient regime at Sparta is ill suited for the Peloponnesian War, and the example of Brasidas makes this very clear.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gomme, A. W. A Historical Commentary on
        Thucydides. London: Oxford University Press:
        1956, Volumes 1-3.
Wick, T. E., ed. Thucydides' Peloponnesian War. New
        York,   Random   House,   Inc.:   1982.

Myth and Society in Shakespeare's
A Midsummer Night's Dream *and* The Tempest
By Autumn Lotze '07
Denison University

The Elizabethan age was one full of contradictions. Peace was sought throughout the realm, but the former and current Churches of England were at war. Women were considered inferior, naturally licentious subjects of their husbands, and yet on the throne sat the Virgin Queen —one who would become England's greatest monarch. The Great Chain of Being was the cosmic hierarchy upon which adherence to English life depended, but nowhere before in English history had there been such an upward movement of the middle class. Classic ideologies were being resurrected simultaneously with the formation of new philosophies. The quest to uncover the mysteries of the magical world paralleled the search for answers in the scientific. This explosion of political, spiritual, and artistic thought created a cultural "rebirth." Out of this social reinvention, which we now call the Renaissance, emerged the greatest dramatist of the English language, William Shakespeare. He brought together the artistic elements of his time with the literary tradition of the Greeks and Romans to both entertain his audiences and provoke them to think of the society that affected them all. In his plays, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*, Shakespeare makes use of myth not only to expand and resolve his plots, but also bring to light for his audience the inconsistencies of the Elizabethan society to which the plots relate.

The Renaissance period was so named because a rebirth of society, politics, science, and art occurred as Europe left the Middle Ages behind, Renaissance being French for "rebirth" (Renaissance: Introduction). This

rebirth was perpetuated by the advent of the printing press; it made available to the populous writings of the ancient Greeks and Romans, who eagerly seized on the classic theories of art, philosophy and government (Renaissance: Printing and Thinking). It was only appropriate that the Renaissance's great dramas also employed Greek and Roman writings, predominantly in the form of mythical allusions. In Shakespeare's contributions to Renaissance drama, the use of these classic myths had a dual purpose: they enhanced his plots and also provided him with a vehicle for critiquing the society in which he lived.

A Midsummer Night's Dream (MND) is one play in which Shakespeare makes extensive use of classical mythology to suit both of his purposes. From the play's very inception, Shakespeare draws on ancient Greek culture. He sets the play in early Athens, the dukedom of the hero, Theseus, at the time of the drama—both place and character have strong ties to classic mythology. Shakespeare continues to utilize myths in a variety of ways throughout the rest of the play, but the foci of the critiques he makes through mythological allusions are on the gender roles and the hierarchy of power in Elizabethan society.

Shakespeare's choice of this particular setting emphasizes the struggle between male and female dominance in both the play and Elizabethan society. The conflict of Oberon and Titania, Fairy King and Queen in MND, the consequential natural disasters, and the eventual outcome are reminiscent of the competition between two gods for the patronage of Athens. Early in the city's history, a spring gushed forth from the ground, and simultaneously an olive sprang up from the earth. After consulting the Oracle at Delphi, the current king was told that the citizens must choose which of the gods, Poseidon represented by the spring and Athena by the

olive, would become the city's patron. The citizens, being of a matriarchal society at the time, sided with Athena and the city came to be called Athens. Poseidon, furious, flooded the shores of the newly-christened Athens. To placate him and restore order to their natural world, the women relinquished their control, and the society shifted to a patriarchy (Freake 263-267). In MND, Titania is made to release the child in much the same way, as Oberon forcefully tries to restore male dominance to his world.

As with much of English literature during the Elizabethan age, references are made to Queen Elizabeth in MND. When Oberon refers to "a fair vestal, throned by the west…imperial votress" (II.i.58, 63), it is really Shakespeare referring to Elizabeth (Montrose 224-225). As a virgin queen, Elizabeth's chastity was one of her defining characteristics and one for which she was revered. Because her virginity was a source of constant comment throughout her reign, Elizabeth was often associated with the also-virgin Greek goddess, Diana. Titania is another name for Diana. Thus, Titania becomes a representation of Elizabeth. The chaos of the play is caused by Titania's refusal to submit to her husband, Oberon, consequently disrupting the natural order of things or, as the Elizabethans would have seen it, the Great Chain of Being. The result of this disruption in the play is described as such:

> No night is now with hymn or carol
> blessed …
> That rheumatic diseases do abound.
> And through this distemperature we see
> The seasons alter: hoary-headed frosts
> Fall in the fresh lap of the crimson rose,
> And on old Hiems' thin and icy crown

An odorous chaplet of sweet summer
buds
(II.i.102, 105-110).

The Elizabethans feared that a great disruption of the social world would have repercussions in the physical, eventually leading to the end of the world. Titania's struggle against Oberon's control, then, parallels Elizabeth's struggle to rule in a society where her sex was subordinate, and through Elizabeth, the struggle of every woman against the laws and stereotypes that bound them.

Helena, one of the human lovers of the play, comes into contact with such a stereotype. She can be thought of as a kind of Everywoman character. She personifies what the Renaissance people thought of as beautiful; she was tall and fair, a "princess of pure white" (III.ii.144). The mythological Helen was also a personification of beauty. However, that Helen possessed another characteristic the Renaissance attributed to women: disloyalty. She deserted her husband for another man. Cuckolding was an Elizabethan husband's biggest fear; there were few greater societal embarrassments than an unfaithful wife. Shakespeare's Helen, though, refutes the Renaissance stereotype. She is the faithful one, and for that matter so is her counterpart, Hermia. It is the men whose affections wander in MND. Here again, Shakespeare brings in mythological references to augment his descriptions, yet at the same time he questions the social validity of what he is describing.

The final act of Shakespeare's MND is concerned mainly with a comic rendering of the *Pyramus and Thisbe* myth. A story of the most grave and pathetic kind originally, *Pyramus and Thisbe* still retains its meaning despite its comical performance. In

this instance Shakespeare utilizes the myth more as warning to the audience about an aspect of society than a critique of it. Pyramus and Thisbe are two young lovers whose hearts are set on marriage; however, both sets of parents object to the match. As the children, Pyramus and Thisbe are lower in the social hierarchy and must submit to their parents. To circumvent their parents' restrictions, the couple decides to sneak outside the city walls, which ultimately leads to the deaths of both lovers. The myth serves as a warning to Egeus, Hermia's father who objects to her marriage to Lysander, as to the dangers of imposing one's will onto a child, and of standing in the way of true love. It also serves as a warning to all of the authority figures in the play: the possession of power does not always necessitate the use of that power. Shakespeare leaves his audience with this message: a higher standing on the social hierarchy does not give an individual exclusive right to direct the lives of those beneath him, and misusing that power could have fatal consequences.

Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, like MND, makes use of classical mythology. Direct allusions abound in MND in ways that they do not so in the *The Tempest*; however, beneath the surface of *The Tempest*. lies a wealth of indirect allusions. Shakespeare again uses the classic myths to enrich his narrative, but in the case of societal commentary, the emphasis is placed instead on the hierarchy of power and maintaining the natural order.

Two major mythical themes run through the play, the first of which is the story of the creator, Daedalus. He engineers the escape of his son and himself from the island of Crete where they were enslaved, just as Prospero engineers the escape of his daughter and himself from their own island. This parallel speaks to the restoration of the hierarchy of

power and, consequently, the preserving of the rigid Great Chain of Being.

In the original Daedalus myth, he and his son, Icarus, were enslaved and forbidden to leave the island. So, as a means of escape, Daedalus created a pair of wax wings for each of them. Before commencing with their escape, Daedalus warned his son not to fly too close to the sun, as the wings would melt from its heat. Icarus, however, enjoyed too much the privilege of flying, one that did not belong to mortals (Garber 54-59). He proceeded to violate two Elizabethan laws of society: first he did not obey his father—a father had the authority over his son as a king did over his subjects; and second, he did not respect his place on the Great Chain of Being. The heavens were the domain of the gods and, by approaching them, Icarus overstepped his boundaries as a mortal. As a result of his disruption of order, Icarus drowns. When Icarus threatens to upset the balance of the social hierarchy, he is removed from it altogether.

Prospero's situation is very similar to that of Daedalus, yet the outcome is very different. Prospero, like Daedalus, has tried to instruct his daughter, Miranda: several times he says to her "Obey and be attentive" (I.ii.38) and "I pray thee mark me" (I.ii.67). Miranda, unlike Icarus, takes her father's words to heart; she follows the laws of the social hierarchy that bid her obey those above her. Prospero passes his test, as well. His power has allowed him to restore the order that was lost when his rule was usurped, but it also raised him above his station as man, elevated him almost to the level of a deity. His work done, Prospero relinquishes his power:

> But this rough magic
> I here abjure…

I'll break my staff…
I'll drown my book (V.i.50-51, 54, 57).

Unlike the original myth, "The artisan father succeeds in his project of education, and the art is drowned, instead of the child" (Garber 58). Prospero returns again to his allotted place on the Great Chain of Being, preserving the natural order so cherished by Elizabethans. In maintaining this order, his and his daughter's lives continue in happiness while Daedalus' goes on in grief and Icarus' ends all together.

It would seem that Shakespeare is supporting the Elizabethan concept of a rigid, stratified society. *The Tempest* does indeed support filial obedience. However, the part of the parent differs here from elsewhere in the Shakespeare canon, from Egeus in MND, for example. What Prospero does, though partly for his benefit, is out of genuine love and concern for his daughter—she is his "cherubin" (I.ii.152). He wishes for her well-being and does not stand in the way of true love, a marked difference from other Shakespearean fathers. Miranda will become his social superior—a queen outranks a duke—and a selfish character would do everything in his power to prevent those beneath from rising above. Here Shakespeare does not question a societal norm, but rather the motivations of the members of that society. The message of the Daedalus/Prospero parallel is this: those who are socially inferior should respect the commands of their superiors, but it is just as imperative that the social superiors consider the well-being of their inferiors.

The second of the two themes concerns Bacchus and Ceres, the god of wine and goddess of grain. Scene Two of the second and third Acts belong to Bacchus, while the better part of the first scene in Act Four is the domain of Ceres. As the deity of wine, Bacchus is often

portrayed as the god of disorder and mayhem, results of the frequent abuse of his art. The worship of Bacchus was called Bacchanalia, festivals characterized by drunkenness, promiscuity, and violence. Attending these festivals were the human followers of Bacchus and often satyrs—mythological beast-men who stood as symbols of brutality and base desire. II.ii and III.ii can be seen as a sort of Bacchanalia: Caliban, a creature more monster than man, proceeds to get drunk with humans Stephano and Trinculo. They plan the murder of Prospero, setting up a new "king" and destroying the current order, and then the violation of his daughter. Both scenes are distinguished by disruption of order and men being taken over by their basest natural instincts—the result of any Bacchanalia festival.

This was not the case with the worship of Ceres. In contrast to the festivals of Bacchus, those of Ceres celebrated harmony and order. As the goddess of grain, Ceres was seen as a Mother Earth deity, and it was necessary for the earth to be in balance or human life would not be possible. Cerealia and the Eleusian mysteries (the festivals of Ceres) celebrated good harvests, which were only possible when all of the earth was in harmony. The first scene of Act Four is a portrayal of that accord—both the balance of earthly elements themselves, and the balance between the heavens and the earth. This is indicated by the Celestial Queen, Juno, and Mother Earth, Ceres, ordering a dance of the nymphs and reapers:

> You nymphs, called Naiads, of the
> windring brooks…
> You sunburned sicklemen, of August
> weary…
> These fresh nymphs encounter every
> one

> In country footing (IV.i.128, 134,137-138).

The dance, a symbol of Elizabethan order, represents the harmony of earthly beings (sicklemen) and the divine (Naiads), thus maintaining the Great Chain of Being.

Here again Shakespeare supports the Renaissance concept of a rigid order, but he also questions an aspect that played a prominent role in Elizabethan society: stereotypes. The audience is too willing to label the trio of Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo evil and therefore assign all negative traits to them. They are just as willing to label the trio of Prospero, Ferdinand, and Miranda good, allotting all positive traits to them. That mistake must not be made, and that is where the mythological references to Bacchus and Ceres come into play.

While the characteristics of Bacchus and Ceres may seem to lead them into perpetual opposition, Bacchus as the representation of man's pleasure-seeking and destructive qualities and Ceres as man's diligent, and nurturing side, that was not the case. Both Bacchus and Ceres were Earth deities, and together they were the god and goddess of fertility. They represented the dual aspects of fertility and marriage—nature and nurture. Bacchus stands as the incarnation of man's base, physical desires, nature, and Ceres is the embodiment of nurture—care, tending, and growth. They are two sides of the same coin, so to speak.

Shakespeare uses this reference to show that while the "evil" trio and "good" trio may seem entirely independent of each other, they, in fact, cannot be separated. Each trio possesses qualities of the other. Stephano is not essentially evil; in reality, he has a very genuine and noble concern for Trinculo, whom he believes to be drowned at sea. Stephano's nurturing

aspect jumps at the chance to recover his lost companion, "If all the wine in my bottle will recover him [bring back Trinculo], I will help his ague [Caliban's desire of alcohol] (II.ii.91-92). Ferdinand and Miranda also possess some of the Bacchanal nature; Prospero chastises them after they are caught in an embrace:

> Look thou be true: do not give dalliance
> Too much the rein: the strongest oaths
> are straw
> To th' fire i' th' blood.   Be more
> abstemious,
> Or else good night your vow! (IV.i.51-
> 54).

Elizabethan society depended upon stereotypes and assumptions to keep their social hierarchy intact. Here, using the myths of Bacchus and Ceres, Shakespeare warns the audience not to be overly hasty in assuming the character of an individual and confining him or her to a certain area of social strata. The reason for this Shakespeare proves in *The Tempest*; all aspects of human nature, positive and negative, are not specific to any social class.

Shakespeare makes frequent use of the classic Greek and Roman mythology so familiar to the Elizabethans throughout his plays. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*, Shakespeare's mythical allusions serve two purposes.   First, the allusions enrich his descriptions; they bring to mind knowledge of the particular myth or mythological character and that knowledge is then transferred to the dramatic character. This lends the audience a deeper understanding of and appreciation for the intricacies of Shakespearean text. Subtle meanings and undercurrents

are picked up by an audience familiar with the mythical references, as the Elizabethans would have been.

The second function of myth in Shakespearean drama was as a vehicle through which the author could critique the Elizabethan society. Though the Renaissance was a time of great advancement in art and science, the political and social realm still had strides to take. Shakespeare recognized this and used mythical allusions to highlight some of the social inconsistencies. In *Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*, Shakespeare focuses mainly on gender roles, the hierarchy of power, and the natural order (Great Chain of Being) in Elizabethan society. Using such classic myths as those of Daedalus and Icarus, the naming of Athens, Pyramus and Thisbe, and Bacchus and Ceres, Shakespeare is able not only to highlight some of the contradictions present within the society that he and his audience inhabit, but also to send a message to the audience questioning their own behavior within that societal structure.

William Shakespeare is a truly great dramatist from a truly great age of human history. The product of such a progressive time, he realized that it was his duty as one who could speak to the masses to not only entertain them but provoke them to examination of their own society. The use of classical myths allowed Shakespeare to do just that.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Freake, Douglas. "*A Midsummer Night's Dream* as a Comic Version of the Theseus Myth." *A Midsummer Night's Dream:* Critical Essays. Ed. Dorothea Kehler. New York: Garland, 1998. 259-74.

Garber, Marjorie. "The Eye of the Storm: Structure and Myth in Shakespeare's

Tempest." Modern Critical Interpretations: *The Tempest*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea, 1988. 43-63.

Montrose, Louis A. "A Kingdom of Shadows." *A Midsummer Night's Dream:* Critical Essays. Ed. Dorothea Kehler. New York: Garland, 1998. 217-40.

"Renaissance: Introduction." Annenberg/CPB Learner.org November 2003 <http://www.learner.org/exhibits/renaissance/index.html>

"Renaissance: Printing and Thinking." Annenberg/CPB Learner.org November 2003 <http://www.learner.org/exhibits/renaissance/printing.html>

Shakespeare, William. A Midsummer Night's Dream. London, ca. 1596.

____. The Tempest. London, ca. 1610.

Psyche and Eros
By Heather Thompson, '05
Denison University

_____

What we call love, that worn, forked word,
is simply this: once there was a man
who rarely smiled, and a woman linked to him
early on. Against several wishes, they bought
a house they couldn't afford
and had a child. For eighteen
months, the woman cried

every day, beating her hands dry in the sun,
hanging clothes she would wear again
the next morning. Her nails cracked,
her fingers became hard and searching as she traced
the outline of his dull factory shirts. She waited
for her bestowment, for her immortality.

One evening he brought home a washing machine.

Do you think she smiled then? No. But they put
the child to bed early and touched a little, and when
the lighting dimmed that night, she was ready
with a match, ready to sing fire for him until the break
of day. So there was no real driving force, no dramatic
tension but this: sometimes it is enough just to
drink coffee in the middle of the night

together, and if they sit now without words
or even sight, listening to the evening news, does this
make them a diminished force?

Looking Back At the Romanian Dig
By Larkin Kennedy, '04
Denison University

Editor's Note: Larkin took part in an archeological dig in Mosna, Romania during the summer of 2003. The following is a look back at her experience that appeared in her senior research.

Site archaeology takes a lot of time and money, as first a preliminary survey must be done of the area to determine general topography and where the best place to open up trenches or archaeological units would be. The Neolithic Village site in Mosna, Romania, had been located by archaeologists doing surface site survey work the summer before volunteers were brought in to open actual trenches. Based on the presence of archaeological remains on the surface of a plowed field, a bounded area was chosen for the site of the actual excavation the following year. However, I would argue that during that particular summer, the 2003 excavations were themselves no more than survey work, where test trenches were dug providing a representative sample over the bounded expanse of the site. The purpose of these trenches was to find significant features such as the actual remnants of pit houses, burials, or hearths, and to place the anthropogenic soil horizon within a relative stratigraphic sequence prior to a full blown archaeological excavation the following year.

The work involved in digging the actual trenches was much more painstaking than digging a trench for a garden or plumbing, as well as much more thorough than most method and theory archaeological books advise. In fact, shovels were usually only used for sifting dirt to make sure no artifacts went unfound, and often we went down no farther than a couple inches a day using trowels to scrape off small curls of dirt if it looked like there

could be something interesting in the matrix down in the next layer. In especially fruitful trenches, such as ones containing parts of dwelling areas or burials, not only was the dirt removed from the trench chopped by shovels to find artifacts, but the broken up dirt was then passed through a sift so that even artifacts as small as beads would be found. One trench in particular was suspected to contain a burial, and work went especially slowly there; over the course of a week the ground level in the trench went down only two inches lower than it had been, as opposed to another trench in which few artifacts were found and was lowered over a foot. Not all of the remains were removed from the site immediately. Whenever possible, artifacts were left in place as they were discovered, *in situ*, often perched on top of a plateau of dirt that the worker was careful not to undercut or otherwise disturb. Then the artifact had to be cleaned in place before being mapped and photographed. Old dental tools seemed to be the easiest tools used to accomplish this cleaning.

Special attention was paid to keeping the bottom and sides of the trench flat, so that the stratigraphy of the site was referred to often, and relative dates of artifacts could be established.[1] According to the nature of deposition, as mentioned previously in this paper, the oldest layers at a site should be the deepest ones and objects at the same, flat, level should likewise be the same relative age. There were various tools used at the Mosna site to keep the integrity of the sedimentary layers straight, one of which was keeping the sides of trenches intact without cutting into them in order to remove interesting artifacts. The sides and bottom of trenches were kept flat using spades. Another technique used for recording stratigraphy involved measuring the

---

[1] Feinman & Price, 2001, p. 12

depths of the trench at each grid corner after removing any layers. Usually, one trench is designated the test trench, and this trench is the only one in which work proceeds quickly as spades are used to drive down through all layers in order to reach sterile ground as quickly as possible so that the sides of this trench can then be readily available as a reference guide for the stratigraphy of the site as a whole. In the Mosna excavation, though, different trenches were worked more quickly than others depending on the nature and density of the remains found at a particular level in each particular trench.

After excavation itself, and in fact there was a time period set aside every day for this in Mosna, the often vast amounts of artifacts had to be washed and catalogued, and the data had to be partly interpreted. These artifacts were bagged up at the end of each day, and the date and level depth recorded for use in their analysis. The washers had to be careful, also, due to some of the sherds being painted with charcoal which would come off if rubbed in the water. Many sherds could also dissolve altogether in the wash water due to the nature of their firing. Due to the funding of the Mosna site being given out by a museum, however, the washing was especially important because they wanted to know the kinds of artifacts found at the site as well as their suitability for display. This fact directly affected the work done on the site, as not as much of an emphasis was placed on the method of the excavation so much as whether anything significant could be found which would help support the need for another excavation the following year. When the site was closed for the year, the director looked optimistic as to the ability of the museum to fund another year of excavation and research: debris was placed on top of each trench's level so that the stopping place could quickly be determined

by workers the following year, and a bulldozer used to push dirt back on top of the debris to close off the site to curious locals or those searching for artifacts.

The anthropology of archaeology comes into play more in some areas of archaeological research than it does in others, of course. In studies of the Neolithic such as that in Mosna, which is located on at least one evolutionary threshold,[2] that of   sedentism for sure and perhaps others as well, anthropology can play a very big part indeed. The Neolithic Age began in around 7000 BC in the easternmost part of Europe, and in Southeast Europe, where Allison and I spent last summer, it lasted from 7000 to 5500 BC.[3] It is a difficult era to describe, situated as it is in the development of towns from wandering groups, and thereby closely associated agricultural skills and social complexity. To describe it and where exactly it fits into the chronology of human evolution, many models have been used including that of pure temporal relations, the change in technology, and culture.[4] Chronologically, the Neolithic occurred at different times in different parts of the world, so there is a rather large problem with simply assigning a time period as such and sticking to it. For technology, again, this differed across large areas depending on what sorts of tools were needed. On the whole, the appearance of ground and polished stone tools changed, pottery appeared and began to be refined, nets and baskets might have appeared, perhaps for fishing, and water and snow travel appear to have advanced. At the site we worked (which was dated roughly to about 6000 BC) we found a lot of pottery shards, for example.

This period also shows amazing changes in lifestyle, which would of course have an effect on the

---

[2] Feinman & Price, 2001, p. 21-22

[3] Whittle, 1996, p. 1

[4] Whittle, 1996, p. 5

culture of the people. The difference appears to be so great, in fact, that some archaeologists have hypothesized more advanced cultures from the Middle East, and especially Turkey, could have migrated into Southeast Europe, bringing their culture and sedentary lifestyle with them.[5] In the same vein, the population also increased markedly as humanity moved into the Neolithic age. Of course, there are still arguments about just how sedentary versus mobilized these peoples were. Some argue for a slow movement toward a completely sedentary life, with some living areas used on a circulating schedule throughout the year as a sort of recurring town depending on the availability of food in the area at the time.[6]

There were no awe-inspiring buildings to catch the imagination of the public – if the Neolithic is mentioned in the United States in casual conversation the usual response usually falls something along the lines of "Oh. [brief, thoughtful silence] Exactly when was that again?" or "How did people live then?" Not to belittle the intellect of the Americans spoken to, most people have just never been interested enough in wooden huts and post-holes and the possible beginnings of sedentism to remember these facts. They are, however, able to immediately recognize and name many of my pictures of Rome. ("That's a lovely picture of the Colosseum," etc.) The people of the area around Mosna were interested in the excavation, however, due to the expanded economic opportunities and capital brought in by the volunteer workers at the site. Also, certain finds interested them more than others, such as the potential burial, which was asked about by members of the local village every day.

---

[5] Whittle, 1996, p. 39-44
[6] Whittle, 1996, p. 35

The source of funding as well as the interest of the local population has an effect on the type of excavation being done. In Mosna, the result of the dig being museum instead of academically funded resulted in a more artifact-intensive search, sometimes at the expense of meticulous archaeological procedures. Perhaps in the following years, now that the future of the site is assured inasmuch as the museum has agreed to a couple years of funding for excavation, the actual techniques and methodology will become more precise, turning the excavation of the summer of 2003 into even more of a survey attempt.

The position of archaeology's findings and their interpretation has also always been insecure. Many people view the study as extremely subjective, as opposed to the objective and scientific position to which archeologists aspire. Throughout this paper, the subject of observer bias has been mentioned several times. Bias could be instilled via previous research, schooling, or even the investigator's own cultural background, including value judgments and gender roles in society. In recent years, a concern with recognizing bias and how it affects archaeological research has come into prominence in discussions of theory. Reflexivity, or recognizing that one's background or standpoint will have an effect on one's perspective and the data one collects, is somewhat of a hot topic. Proponents of reflexivity in archaeology simply point out that multiple positions and interpretations of the same set of data are often equally valid, and that one's background or beliefs about what one will find at a site will affect the way in which that site is excavated.[7] One way to mitigate this effect is through careful record keeping. Not only does this enable the archaeologist to have as much

---

[7] Hodder, 2003, p. 58

information as possible on the site as they dig, so that the techniques used in the excavation can be adjusted as needed, but an objective account of what is found, without the accompanying interpretations, can help other archaeologists make their own assumptions and contribute to multivocality, or a variety of interpretations. Another possibility is to have a variety of archaeologists present at the site at the time of excavation, each with their own knowledge base and possible bias.

Another critique of archaeology also has to do with the interpretations gleaned from research, and the relative correctness of the dominant theories found in the discipline which explain cultural systems. How, one might ask, can archaeologists really know exactly what one particular stone was used for, or its exact symbolic meaning? A popular example is the Neanderthal cave bear cult mix-up,[8] wherein some archaeologists claim the presence of five cave bear skulls in square cisterns in a cave represents too much of a coincidence to be an act of nature, and thus must indicate the presence of mysticism in Neanderthal society, with the cave bear itself featured at the center of the cult. From the other camp are the people that point out that these square cisterns were located in caves at the base of sloped floors, and that the skulls, being round, could simply have rolled down into them in the course of erosive forces. Proponents of the latter theory point out that the skulls show no signs of human interaction: there are no scratched present from the effects of killing or butchering, for instance. Bias seems to have a very large effect on what interpretation is accepted by whom – an investigator looking for evidence of religion might be predisposed to finding proof under every stone. Critics

---

[8] Hayden, 1993; Feder and Park, 2001, p. 338-339

are correct in this, unfortunately: archaeologists will never be completely sure one theory is that much more superior to another until the time machine is invented.

On the other hand, one of the field's most promising features is its ability to fix its most blatant mistakes. For example, the hoax of Piltdown Man was a mix of both well-meaning mistakes and the desire to intentionally fool the world on one person's part, at the least.[9] Piltdown Man was an "ancient hominid" with a big brain case but a primitive primate jaw found in England, was quickly seized upon by contemporary physical anthropologists as upholding the paradigm contending the brain size of modern humans was one of the original hominid evolutionary accomplishments and originated before any of the somatic features. Also, since Piltdown Man was found in Europe, he became the poster boy of the non-African origin hypothesis.[10] In reality, of course, the skull was a plant, a modern human's skull dome and an ape's jaw, skillfully filed down so they fit together and aged in the same solution to give the same exterior semblance.[11] The interesting thing about this shameful episode, however, is that despite however clever the hoaxer was, and how much their personal bias tried to change the archaeological record, they failed in the end. Too much other data has been found which claims basically the exact opposite of the Piltdown man; physical anthropologists now agree that brain size was one of the last things to evolve and that both *Homo erectus* and *Homo sapiens* evolved in Africa before migrating elsewhere. Even before Piltdown was proved a fraud, it had begun to be considered a strange anomaly whose academic standing had all but disappeared. Thus, the hopes of

---

[9] Spencer, 1990; Weiner, 1955

[10] Feder, 2002, p. 61-71

[11] Feder, 2001, p. 72-74

archaeologists and physical anthropologists alike are upheld by this small example. Much as theories in physical science have changed and evolved with advances in techniques and the volume of data produced,[12] archaeologists hope that through the use of scientific principles or at least well-documented finds, the pure volume of valid evidence should with time overwhelm both frauds and outdated theories alike.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bell, Jim. "Archaeological Explanation: Progress through Criticism." *Archaeology: theories, methods, and practice*. 2nd ed. London: Thames and Hudson, 1996.

Feder, Kenneth L. *Frauds, Myths, and Mysteries: Science and Pseudoscience in Archaeology*. 4th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill Mayfield, 2002.

Feder, Kenneth L. and Michael Alan Park. *Human Antiquity: An Introduction to Physical Anthropology and Archaeology*. 4th edition. Boston: McGraw Hill. 2001.

Feinman, Gary M. and T. Douglas Price, ed. *Archaeology at the Millennium: a sourcebook*. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.

Hayden, B. "The Cultural Capacities of Neanderthals: A Review and Reevaluation." *Journal of Human Evolution* 24 (1993), 113-46.

Hodder, Ian. "Archaeological Reflexivity and the 'Local' Voice." *Anthropological Quarterly* 76.1 (2003), p. 55-69.

Spencer, F. *Piltdown: A Scientific Forgery*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1990

Weiner, J.S. *The Piltdown Forgery*. London: Oxford Press. 1955.

---

[12] Bell, 1996, p. 66

Whittle, Alasdair. *Europe in the Neolithic : the creation of new worlds*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Gothic Architecture in America: Its
Roots,Significanceand Present-Day Standing
By Frank Ward '04
Denison University

_____

Close your eyes and open your mind. The land under your feet is part of the future country of France. Now you can open your eyes wide and take in the most enormous and imposing piece of architecture that you have ever seen. The year is 1140 AD, and you are just about to enter through the portal at the west façade of the site of Gothic architecture's founding. Now comfortably inside this holy realm known as St. Denis, you slowly move down the expansive center aisle. As you progress between the towering colonnades on each side of you, you move closer to the altar at the east end of the church. Looking above your head, you can little believe that stone is suspended that high. Taking in the tall arched windows with intricately designed circular windows above the altar, you are immersed in a sea of stone, slate, and glass. You have just received a satisfying taste of Gothic architecture.

There wasn't a revolt, a coup d'etat, or a bloody holy war that brought about this distinct change in the architecture of Europe. There was, however, a change in the social conscious that spurred the transition from Romanesque to Gothic architecture. There are numerous scholars who acknowledge that Gothic architecture's birth was not a singular event, but was contingent upon other occurrences. In fact, it seems that the twelfth century was one of the most complex crossroads of the last two millennia. In essence, had it not been for Gothic architecture, many other societal changes would not have occurred. Likewise, Gothic architecture was not only influenced by, but borne out of, various other changes of the times.   Erwin Panofsky cites

scholasticism as a major influence on Gothic architecture and its development. He says:

> Early Scholasticism was born at the same moment and in the same environment in which Early Gothic architecture was born in Suger's Saint-Denis. For both the new style of thinking and the new style of building (opus Francigenum) – though brought about by 'many masters from different nations,' as Suger [the first abbot of Saint Denis] said of his artisans, and soon developing into truly international movements – spread from an area comprised within a circle drawn around Paris with a radius of less than a hundred miles. And they continued to be centered in this area for about one century and a half (Panofsky 4,5).

Robert Branner also explains the significance of Gothic architecture. While the views of Branner can coexist with Panofsky's viewpoint, they are different enough, that it would seem inaccurate and intellectually deficient not to compare them closely. Branner believes that the basis for Gothic architecture is rooted in the fact that:

> The transcendental character of medieval religious architecture was given a special form in the Gothic church. Medieval man considered himself but an imperfect "refraction" of the Divine Light of God, whose temple on earth, according to the text of the

dedication ritual, stood for the Heavenly City of Jerusalem. The Gothic interpretation of this point of view was a monument that seems to dwarf the man who enters it, for space, light, structure, and plastic effects of masonry are organized to produce a visionary scale. There is no fixed set of proportions in the parts, such as can be developed from the diameter of a Greek column, and no standard relationship between solid and void. The result is a distortion: large as it may be in real size, the Gothic Church becomes prodigiously vast in appearance. Such a visionary character expressed not only the physical and spiritual needs of the Church, but also the general attitude of the people and the aspirations of the individual patron and architect (Branner 10).

It is crucial to the understanding of Gothic architecture to know and acknowledge that it began in the Church. As a result, this now ancient style was intended to be a form that was structured and respected, bold and powerful, and yet inviting and open. Gothic succeeded in these intentions because it was structured around a few simple design principles and involved only a few building materials. Two early and prime examples of this were the aforementioned cathedral at St. Denis and the younger Chartres Cathedral. St. Denis and Chartres are landmarks in a literal and metaphoric sense. They were truly the earliest and most significant examples of Gothic architecture, yet as a testament to the strength, durability, and even pride of Gothic style; both of these structures still stand today.

While windows are not at the center of Gothic's achievements, they are certainly a key component. The windows at St. Denis are noted for their form, but the stained glass of Chartres is known around the world. One of the biggest reasons that the stained glass of Chartres and of other cathedrals across Europe is so richly storied is the fact that first stained glass was prominent in churches of Gothic design. As a result, the stained glass of several of Chartres' main windows is appreciated the wide world over. The reason for this fame results from what is contained within those stained glass pieces: a shade of blue that no one has been able to reproduce in the eight centuries since its creation. Appropriately named, "Chartres Blue," this deep hued, rich fluid blue might not have been seen by its millions of viewers had it been built into another, less fortified, non-Gothic structure.

Combined with this emphasis on symmetry was a Christian-influenced church design known as the cruciform. While this cross-shaped design had been featured prominently in many of the Romanesque Pilgrimage route churches for several centuries, the advent of Gothic style allowed the cruciform to be seen in a new light. One of the first Gothic cruciform churches was at Chartres. With is stained glass windows, surreal size in a gigantic cross form, harmonious symmetry of columns, arches ambulatories, windows and virtually everything else imaginable, this church must have seemed quite a remarkable place for the worshiper of the twelfth century, because even today, it leaves millions of annual visitors from around the world in utter awe.

"Gothic architecture evolved at a time of profound social and economic change in Western Europe." In additions, "Politically, the twelfth century was also the time of expansion and consolidations of the

State" (Branner 11). Gothic was the confluence of a change in philosophical thought, societal advancement, new thoughts on religion, and a transition in spoken and written language. The last change, a shift in the spoken and written word, was significant. The translation of Greek and Arabic into Latin was a sign of change. The intellectual movement underway brought about "a new literature, both lyric and epic" (Branner 11). This movement had a unifying effect that rid Europe of its former isolationistic feudal ways and ushered in a new cosmopolitan world. Gothic architecture not only contributed to these changes, but was also influenced by them.

Combined with this overhaul in the European world was the fact that, "Gothic was not dark, massive, and contained, like the older Romanesque style, but light, open, and aerial, and its appearance in all parts of Europe had an enduring effect on the outlook of succeeding generations" (Branner 12). This reason sheds light on the decision to move towards Gothic. It was not only aesthetically more pleasing; there were practical purposes, as well.

This new style brought in more light, which would have had the effect of increasing daylight inside the church, thus extending working and worshiping hours. In its being a more "open" style, it would have created a more inviting atmosphere, which would be important for any church. Also, there was a principle behind building a more "aerial" structure. This, of course, had appeal to Christians and for two reasons specifically. First of all, they knew that the higher they could build, the more their church would be seen. Secondly, the higher they could build, the greater chance they had to create a sense of awe and splendor within their communities. While this was by no means the most notable of reasons as to why Gothic became popular, it

acts to explain much of the allure of this architectural style.

The power and influence that Gothic holds is vast. In the twelfth century, and for several hundred years following, there seemed numerous reasons that Gothic should be kind the world of European architecture. It required just a few building materials, all of which were natural resources of the surrounding lands, or could be made from nearby resources. It was also the sturdiest, best-made, longest lasting structure that had been developed in the Old World. The first Gothic cathedrals of France or England's great institutions of higher learning—Oxford and Cambridge—are a testament not only to the physical and spiritual strength of Gothic, but of its timelessness as an architectural style.

Gothic was already bigger and better than its predecessors and nothing as formidable or glorious seemed to be on the road ahead. For that "Gothic" thought process to continue into the eighteenth, nineteenth, and unbelievably enough, the twentieth century in America, is quite astonishing, especially considering how many new styles of architecture there were that could have been used. Yet, while some styles were certainly more practical at this point, Gothic's charm didn't seem to be diminishing.

The charm encapsulates a great deal more than a mere style of architecture; it included a unique way of thinking and thus encourages a different type of lifestyle. This "attitude" and approach to life was present at institutions of higher learning in modern-day America. At Yale, this unique approach to life was experienced first-hand by an undergraduate named Henry Seidel Canby. His life and observations there lend a large bit of credence to the influence of Gothic architecture. In New Haven, Canby observed the society of his 1890s college days. He acknowledged that simplistic living and

modesty was exercised by virtually everyone and those with money were sometimes the consummate examples of this approach to living. This lifestyle could be compared to the monastic life of the twelfth century.

In his book, *Alma Mater*: *The Gothic Age of the American College*, Canby writes:

> Relative poverty was regarded as a virtue, doing without was a pride. One walked not rode, went to concerts rather than to the theatre, danced to a piano and a cornet, gave books not jewelry, sat down four at a table not eight, kept married instead of toying with expensive ideas about lovers and divorce (Canby 16).

At this point in time the significance of the Gothic style was realized. It was more than an architectural style; it was a way of life. From Canby's description of Yale and New Haven, it can be gathered that much like the focus placed on structure, knowledge, and simplicity at the dawn of the Gothic era, this focus had not deteriorated or been altered much in over seven hundred years. In the fibers of this focus lies another point of substance from Canby. "It is impossible to think of the college of that day without its encircling town" (Canby 17). This point is well taken, as it cannot be lost on us that one of the most essential purposes of Gothic architecture was that of harboring a community, initially with a focus on religion and later with a focus on education.

In Canby's words, Yale College and the surrounding New Haven community was,

Cleaner, neater, than other towns, with green spaces somewhere toward the center, and white spires or Gothic towers or windowed dormitories half hid by trees, they were little capitals of the academic states. As trading or industrial centers their life might be indistinguishable from towns or cities of a like size, but in their social consciousness there was always some recognition of peculiarity. For the heart of the community was a college. Its subtle influences were as pervasive if less noticeable than the quite unstable symbols of college life—playing fields, cafes, and collegiate clothing (Canby 3, 4).

Established in 1701 in the once quiet, quaint, pious, and eventually industrial city of New Haven, Connecticut, Yale University has had a personal relationship with its hometown for over three hundred years. While there are always certain ideological and societal conflicts between a town and its university, Yale has done well for New Haven, just as New Haven has played its own important role in influencing the Yale that people know today. This dual commitment has helped to keep these two distinct places united as one greater community.

A college, most notably one in a small city, town, or village, has a commitment to the community, much like the community has a commitment to the college that is a center of educational, cultural, and sometimes even religious advancement for it. As Larson and Palmer note:

> When serious thought is given to the combined problem of social and physical relationship of the college as a whole and its relation to the community, and when that problem is intercepted by good architecture and beautiful landscaping, the college has done much to raise the standard of community living in America (Larson/Palmer 30).

This focus on community can be taken a step further and applied to the quadrangle design borne from the earliest British universities.

> The quadrangular type of campus with buildings closely grouped, as at Oxford and Cambridge, may be successfully developed for the American college. On a campus which is limited in area, such an arrangement commends itself by virtue of its economy of space, while on a campus of extensive size such concentration of the buildings makes for great ease of communication (Larson/Palmer 69).

This quadrangular design is seen at various American colleges across the country, yet, where Gothic architecture is involved, the quadrangle is a central feature of every campus. See most dramatically at Yale, Duke, and Rhodes College, Gothic architecture and the quadrangle are still thriving in the present day. Intriguingly, two of these schools—Duke and Rhodes—have Gothic campuses that were designed and constructed during the 1920s. This fact speaks volumes about Gothic architecture and shows that it has an

association attached to it that today speaks as strongly as the large stone pillars that have kept Gothic structures standing for so many centuries.

When people envision Gothic architecture, they don't just think of a mighty stone structure, towering high and airy. They think about where Gothic architecture has been put into place: in churches, cathedrals, chapels, academic buildings, museums, libraries, residences, and administrative buildings. What results from this is a feeling of respect, importance, dignity, civility, beauty, glory, enlightenment, and quiet pomp. In conveying this feeling of what Gothic is and what it means, Canby says:

> From these campuses, which even in my day had begun to go Gothic in their architecture, came many, if not most, of the two generations of Americans who now are in executive charge of the country, and the greater part of the codes, ideals, manners, and ideals of living which dominate us. Here was the conditioning laboratory for the most promising of our impressionable youth. These were the Utopias from which they emerged to tackle with extraordinary confidence, only recently shaken, a country which was becoming a social and economic problem while they fought for the prizes of their little college world (Canby xii, xiii).

With these qualities instilled in peoples' minds, Gothic architecture transcends the boundaries of time. It is not just the quality craftsmanship or strong building materials that have seen Gothic through to this point in

history—almost nine hundred years after its birth—it is the idea and conception of what Gothic is and what it means that has helped it to only survive, but to thrive into the twenty-first century.

Another sign of endorsement of Gothic is seen in peoples' willingness to go to great cost and expense to move a place and then create a Gothic form out of it. Rhodes College is a primary example of this. In 1925, Memphis citizens spent over a million dollars to have the college moved from a more rural location outside of the city, so that they would have a fine liberal arts college in their great Southern city on the Mississippi. There was an obvious interest in having a small liberal arts school with a focus on religion and scholasticism in Memphis, yet the efforts put forth to build a Gothic home for this college require much time, energy, and expense. With its various quadrangular forms, the local stone, well-tempered stained glass, thick, carved wooden doors, smooth slate roofs, irrigated green grass, symmetrical walkways, and other Gothic features Rhodes College is as well known today for its academic offerings as it is for its masterful architecture.

Erwin Panofsky helps to further the argument for Gothic architecture as a part of more than just an architecture movement, and also argues that Gothic helped to inspire and was inspired by other events of the Middle Ages. Panofsky's insight into Gothic architecture's relation to scholasticism is riveting. He asserts that there are valid reasons why the two subjects would have collided, and says:

> …setting aside for the moment all intrinsic analogies, there exists between Gothic architecture and Scholasticism a palpable and hardly accidental concurrence in the purely factual

domain of time and place—a concurrence so inescapable that the historians of medieval philosophy, uninfluenced by ulterior considerations, have been led to periodize their material in precisely the same way as do the art historians theirs (Panofsky 2, 3).

Understanding the connection between the two helps scholars understand why it is such that Gothic still lives. Gothic is true to its roots. When this style was the "new and hip thing," it still had practical purposes. While Gothic isn't impractical today, its substantial expense and exhausting attention to detail would seem to render it too much trouble; however the observations made by Panofsky, Branner, and others help us to understand the reasons why Gothic is still prominent:

The Gothic style cannot be called native to America in the sense that the Early American, the Georgian, the Classic, and the Spanish are native. Yet, since our colleges and universities derive from the universities of Europe, many of which date from the medieval era, it is admittedly traditional for college use. Naturally, then, the Gothic has been and is today an important type in college architecture (Branner 24).

That Gothic is "traditional," has much to do with its success. People love traditions, and in this ever-changing world, society considers it a luxury to be to cling to something as old and revered as Gothic architecture. Gothic's associations with religion, scholasticism, and thus respect, structure, and order,

make it a pillar of strength in a world of impermanence and instability.

Character also proves to be a staple in architecture, especially college architecture. Larson and Palmer write:

> Character in college architecture is attained not merely by a blind following of a certain period or style, but rather by the faithful interpolation of the specific needs of the individual college. These needs can be ascertained only through a thorough analysis and a careful appraisal of the particular problems involved. This dual process should take into account a number of factors, such as the traditional background of the college, the appropriate style of architecture, the available materials suitable to collegiate uses, the environment, both social and physical, in which it is to function and the general development program (Larson/Palmer 19).

These scholars provide some sound reasoning in their argument for the necessity of taking the various needs of a college into consideration before creating a design. While this may apply to most architectural styles, Gothic seems to transcend this aforementioned statement, as in the last seventy-five years a major Gothic architectural project took place at Duke University. A new quadrangle known as the West campus was constructed with a focus on Gothic design. Where the East campus was built in the a Classic Revival style, with buildings such as Baldwin Auditorium resembling the University

of Virginia's emblematic library of Jeffersonian design, the Gothic direction was quite different and thus seems a very intriguing move.

According to Larson and Palmer, Collegiate Gothic is the most expensive architectural style, yet is vital to the present and, more importantly, to the future. Built to not only withstand the elements and the test of time, the Gothic style is a rare achievement amongst other styles in that it is based on a model of simplicity.

The irony of Gothic is that the few building materials involved come together to form structures that are anything but models of simplicity. These structures—large in size and scope—inspire awe amongst their observers and set off the imagination of individuals with their intricate design and complex looking details. This series of statements could no doubt be applied to the late 20s and early 30s building project at Duke. Costing a mind-boggling total of $21, 254, 833.69, as the Depression was ensuing in the early 30s, the project did not come without extreme expense and years of work, but to see the present-day splendor of that place seems to justify all of the cost and tireless labor.

The project at Duke seems to be a total anomaly. Designers chose to build their new and central campus in a form of architecture that had been created over six hundred years before our nation's founding, understanding that their already existing campus was not Gothic in its form. They appointed Julian F. Abele—a young and prominent architect based in Philadelphia—to design the Gothic addition to the University. The mark left by Gothic design on Duke's campus is immeasurably large. To make the project happen they built a rail line through the construction site, so that they could transport rock from a local quarry. To go to that much trouble and expense is one more reflection of how much this Gothic campus meant to Duke at the time and

means to Duke today. The Chapel, academic buildings, residence halls, and other marks of Gothic on Duke's campus are a great source of pride for the University. Today, one of the University's bookstores is named for the architectural design that now graces much of the campus.

Gothic architecture is one of the oldest, best-respected, and thus most important architectural forms in the entire world. The style is bold, powerful, stoic, quietly beautiful, intimidating, magnificent, and virtually immovable; an architectural style so well known and loved that few question its importance and respectability. When noting yet another observation from the words of Branner, it is almost eerie to think how much modern-day society's conception of Gothic and its significance match up with this comment:

> Gothic was the final expression of the medieval world, of the concepts of a mystical cosmos and a transcendental, universal religion. It marked the emergence of a cosmopolitan society in Western Europe, whose increasingly elegant taste it was continually able to satisfy. But the essence of Gothic was most fully embodied in its conquest of space and its creation of a prodigious, visionary scale…(Branner 48).

Gothic, like the stone of its earliest foundations, has stood the test of time, the elements, changing world views, and numerous adjustments to fashions and styles of the world over the nearly nine hundred years since its bold beginnings at St. Denis in 1140 AD. As technology continues to advance, world views and the global climate continue to shift and peoples' forever wavering

view of what's fashionable and what's *faux pas* continue, one constant that we should be able to count on is the continued life and success of Gothic, not just as an architectural form, but as a thought process and a feeling. As this extensive tour draws to a close, I can say with much certainty that while this world may be a very different place nine hundred years from now, the Gothic cathedrals and chapels, museums, academic buildings and residences that are strewn across the world will continue to stand strong, proud, and beautiful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Branner, Robert. Gothic Architecture. New York:
        George Braziller, Inc., 1961.
Bucher, Francois. Architector: The Lodge Books and
        Sketchbooks of Medieval
        Architects. Volume 1. New York: Abaris
        Books, Inc., 1979.
Canby, Henry Seidel. Alma Mater: The Gothic Age of
        the American College. New York: Farrar &
        Rinehart Incorporated, 1936.
Klauder, Charles Z. and Herbert C. Wise. Collegiate
        Architecture in America: And Its Part in the
        Development of the Campus. New York:
        Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.
Larson, Jens Frederick and Archie MacInnes Palmer.
        Architectural Planning Of The American
        College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book
        Company, Inc., 1933.
Lesser, George. Gothic Cathedrals and Sacred
        Geometry. Volume One. London: Alec Tiranti
        Ltd., 1957.
Loth, Calder and Julius Trousdale Sadler, Jr. The Only
        Proper Style: Gothic Architecture

in America. Boston: Little, Brown, and
     Company, 1975.

Panofsky, Erwin. Gothic Architecture and
     Scholasticism. New York: Penguin Books
     USA Inc., 1957.

Von Simson, Otto. The Gothic Cathedral: Origins of
     Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept
     of Order. Princeton, NJ: Princeton
     University Press, 1988.

ΙΛΙΑΔΟΣ Book One
33-52:
An Anglo-Saxon Heroic Epic
Verse Translation
By Glenn Lacki '05
Oberlin College

Editors' Note: Last semester, in intermediate-level Greek, Glenn read and studied the Iliad of Homer. For a final paper project, he translated and discussed Greek passages. The following essay is the result of this assignment. Special thanks go to Professor Thomas Van Nortwick of the Oberlin College Department of Classics for his assistance and valuable input in the completion of his endeavor.

1. Original Greek (from Benner's Selections from Homer's *Iliad*): [1.33-52]

ὣς ἔφατ, ἔδδεισεν δ ὃ γέρων καὶ ἐπείθετο μύθῳ·
βῆ δ ἀκέων παρὰ θῖνα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης·
πολλὰ δ ἔπειτ ἀπάνευθε κιὼν ἠρᾶθ ὃ γεραιὸς   35
Ἀπόλλωνι ἄνακτι, τὸν ἠΰκομος τέκε Λητώ·
"κλῦθί μευ ἀργυρότοξ , ὃς Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας
Κίλλάν τε ζαθέην Τενέδοιό τε ἶφι ἀνάσσεις,
Σμινθεῦ. εἰ ποτέ τοι χαρίεντ ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρεψα,
ἢ εἰ δή ποτέ τοι κατὰ πίονα μηρί ἔκηα   40
ταύρων ἠδ αἰγῶν, τόδε μοι κρήηνον ἐέλδωρ·
τίσειαν Δαναοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα σοῖσι βέλεσσιν."
ὣς ἔφατ εὐχόμενος· τοῦ δ ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.
βῆ δὲ κατ Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων χωόμενος κῆρ,
τόξ ὤμοισιν ἔχων ἀμφηρεφέα τε φαρέτρην·   45
ἔκλαγξαν δ ἄρ ὀϊστοὶ ἐπ ὤμων χωομένοιο,
αὐτοῦ κινηθέντος· ὃ δ ἤϊε νυκτὶ ἐοικώς.
ἕζετ ἔπειτ ἀπάνευθε νεῶν, μετὰ δ ἰὸν ἕηκεν·
δεινὴ δὲ κλαγγὴ γένετ ἀργυρέοιο βιοῖο.

οὐρῆας μὲν πρῶτον ἐπῴχετο καὶ κύνας ἀργούς,   50
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ αὐτοῖσι βέλος ἐχεπευκὲς ἐφιεὶς
βάλλ · αἰεὶ δὲ πυραὶ νεκύων καίοντο θαμεῖαι.

2. Lacki Translation, 2003: [1.33-52]

Thus he proclaimed, and the aged cleric was cowed – he
carried out the demand.
He strayed, dumbstruck, along the strand of the deep-
rumbling sea.
This wizened father, forthwith, isolated himself and   35
fervently petitioned
that one delivered of milky-haired Leto – his master,
Apollo:
"Attend me, you sterling-bowed God – you who
shepherd Chryse
and Cil'la, the all-sanctified – who preside in strength
over Tenedos.
If ever skyward, Smintheus, I roofed a sanctuary
agreeable to you,
or if, righteously, I reduced to ashes for you the rich   40
thigh-pieces
of bulls and goats, then bring my appeal to fruition:
may the Danaans suffer the burden of my sorrow by
your bolts."
So he avowed, prostrating himself, and his overlord,
Phoebus Apollo, remembered him –
He stalked from the highest heights of Olympus, his
heart storm-smoldering,
clutching to his shoulders his short-bow and his close-   45
capped quiver –
the pinioned furies, from their sheaf, shrieked
shockwaves in his swelling ferocity
as he propelled himself on his travels.

95

                              He passed in, a
twin to the night,
settled far-off from the ships, and fired off a shaft –
a bestial bellowing sprang from the silver-plated bow.
Commencing, he brought carnage upon the pack-mules
and the quick-coursing hounds.   50
But then he loosed his biting blight-bringers on the
blasphemous men themselves,
relentlessly – and the high-piled pyres of the departed
were illuminated, undying.

3. Lattimore Translation, 1951: [1.33-52]

    So he spoke, and the old man in terror obeyed him
and went silently away beside the murmuring sea beach.
Over and over the old man prayed as he walked in
solitude   35
to King Apollo, whom Leto of the lovely hair bore:
'Hear me,
lord of the silver bow who set your power about Chryse
and Killa the sacrosanct, who are lord in strength over
Tenedos,
Smintheus, if ever it pleased your heart that I built your
temple,
if ever it pleased you that I burned all the rich thigh   40
pieces
of bulls, of goats, then bring to pass this wish I pray for:
let your arrows make the Danaans pay for my tears
shed.'
    So he spoke in prayer, and Phoibos Apollo heard him,
and strode down along the pinnacles of Olympos,
angered
in his heart, carrying across his shoulders the bow and   45
the hooded
quiver; and the shafts clashed on the shoulders of the
god walking

angrily. He came as night comes down and knelt then
apart and opposite the ships and let go of an arrow.
Terrible was the clash that rose from the bow of silver.
First he went after the mules and the circling hounds,
then let go   50
a tearing arrow against the men themselves and struck
them.
The corpse fires burned everywhere and did not stop
burning.

4. Fagles Translation, 1990: [1.38-60]
    The old man was terrified. He obeyed the order,
turning, trailing away in silence down the shore
where the battle lines of breakers crash and drag.
And moving off to a safe distance, over and over   40
the old priest prayed to the son of sleek-haired Leto,
lord Apollo, "Hear me, Apollo! God of the silver bow
who strides the walls of Chryse and Cilla sacrosanct—
lord in power of Tenedos—Smintheus, god of the
plague!   45
If I ever roofed a shrine to please your heart,
ever burned the long rich bones of bulls and goats
on your holy altar, now, now bring my prayer to pass.
Pay the Danaans back—your arrows for my tears!"
His prayer went up and Phoebus Apollo heard him.   50
Down he strode from Olympus' peaks, storming at heart
with his bow and hooded quiver slung across his
shoulders.
The arrows clanged at his back as the god quaked with
rage,
the god himself on the march and down he came like
night.   55
Over against the ships he drops to a knee, let fly a shaft
and a terrifying clash rang out from the great silver bow.
First he went for the mules and circling dogs but then,
launching a piercing shaft at the men themselves,

he cut them down in droves—
and the corpse-fires burned on, night and day, no end in   60
sight.

*"...what we are dealing with is a work of the greatest
imaginative vitality a masterpiece where the structuring
of the tale is as elaborate as the beautiful contrivances
of its language. Its narrative elements may belong to a
previous age but as a work of art it lives in its own
continuous present,
equal to our knowledge of reality in the present time."
--Seamus Heaney,* Beowulf, *introduction ix*

In the past semester of translating pieces and parts of the *Iliad* into English I have, just as Seamus Heaney did with *Beowulf*, "developed not only a feel for the language but a fondness for the melancholy and fortitude that characterized the poetry" (Heaney introduction xxii). I have come to healthy terms with some of the roots of the epic tradition and to the poetry which breathes life into it. With this project, I hoped to confront what it requires to assume the position of the mouthpiece – the conduit – of that poetry.

Since my studies have simultaneously led me down two different, though by no means conflicting, pathways – one into the world of Greek, Latin, and Classical antiquity and the other into the realm of Old and Middle English, and the early to late Medieval periods – I determined to investigate the compatibility of those two avenues by bringing them together. To that end, I have translated twenty lines of the *Iliad* into an adapted form of Anglo-Saxon heroic epic, alliterative verse. The result, I believe, is promising, though my motives and inspiration for bringing it into being, I imagine, hardly speak for themselves. In defense of my

purpose, therefore, I will address my meter, my diction, and my poetics, and weigh my interpretation of these lines against the published translations of Robert Fagles and Richmond Lattimore.

The meter into which I chose to render this part of the first book of the *Iliad* is a modified form of Old English alliterative verse. A heroic epic meter which lost track of its roots long ago in a forgotten Indo-European culture, it arrived into the light in the vigorous and compelling lines of *Beowulf* and flourished through the Middle Ages to blossom into the robust, romantic poetry of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* in the fourteenth century. In his preface, Fagles speaks of how "Homer's work is a performance, even in part a musical event," (ix) and with this I almost entirely agree. If I had come to no other conclusions from studying Homer, I would say that his work is without a doubt a musical event. When I first started learning Greek, I was immediately struck by the musicality of it – the tuneful consonants and melodious vowels, the mingling of harsh and even guttural sounds with ones mellow and kind to the ear. In Homer I see and hear this elevated to a new level, lifting that musicality to higher and more arresting heights. I find myself wandering around every so often murmuring a)rgure/oio bioi=o and other such choice word-blends to myself under my breath – my own form of poetic appreciation, and a never-ending source of amusement, as I cannot help but think it must surely alarm the uninitiated. It is this same musicality which I found when reading the alliterative verse of *Beowulf* and *Gawain* – a pulse that carries you along like a tide, sweeping you from one line to the next and catching you up in a splendor born from alternating elegance and simplicity. I sensed that these poets possessed a similar gift to Homer's, "his 'ear, ear for the sea-surge,' as Pound describes it" (Fagles, Preface xi). Since a good

translation "must, so far as possible, reproduce both the metrical variety of the original and its cumulative momentum or 'swing'," (Borroff, Introduction 13) it is largely on account of this similarity in musicality that I chose to translate this part of the *Iliad* into Anglo-Saxon alliterative meter.

  To assist in explaining the nuts and bolts of the verse, I shall draw heavily from Marie Borroff's information on "The Metrical Forms" (167-168) employed by the *Gawain*-poet, to illustrate the changes I made in my verse to the traditional pattern for Anglo-Saxon epic meter. "The line is divided into two half-lines; this division, called the caesura, is marked by a syntactic break of at least minor importance." In this, my verse complies with the established conventions. "Each half-line [in standard epic meter] contains two stressed syllables, or, as I call them, chief syllables, for a total of four per line," but in my meter I opted instead for a line of five chief syllables, three before and two after the central caesura. These chief syllables "may be separated by one, two, or three 'intermediate' syllables, most frequently by one or two," although this aspect of the poetry is largely unregulated, sometimes reaching as high as five intermediate syllables between chiefs. This presents the poet with the capacity to compensate for the transition from an inflected language such as Greek to a language like English, which relies heavily on the use of function words to denote meaning—this is, perhaps, the aspect of the verse which I find most appealing. "Chief syllables are spaced temporally as the downbeats of successive measures are spaced in a musical piece played freely rather than metronomically," writes Borroff. "That is, we perceive them as recurring in a time continuum at regular, though not at exactly equal, intervals. The line can thus be described as having four 'measures,' in the musical sense of that word." Since

my meter contains five chief syllables, it also has five 'measures', although they still function in the same way as Borroff describes.

"Alliteration is not ornamental," she continues, "as it is in most of the verse modern readers are familiar with, but a requirement of the form." The first chief syllable after the caesura I call the Key, as it determines the shape of the rest of the line. The Key must alliterate across the caesura with at least one chief syllable, but as many as all three, in the first half-line. Except in an attempt to achieve some specific poetic effect—framing a line in a particular manner or simulating a spondeic line, perhaps—the final chief syllable in a line never alliterates with the Key. As long as at least one chief syllable before the ceasura alliterates with the Key, the other chiefs in the line are not required to alliterate. Generally, though, at least two of the chiefs in the first half-line will alliterate with one another. Multiple alliterations can occur within a single line as long as the above rules are followed, allowing for many and varied alliterative permutations (i.e. aaa/ab, aab/ba, aba/ab, etc. as examples of lines with two different alliterations; axa/ax, abx/ba, xaa/ax, etc. as examples of lines where one or more chiefs do not alliterate with anything else in the line). In her analysis, Borroff talks at some length about lines which have chief syllables that do not actually coincide with the principal stresses of their words, but in my translation I strove to uphold the rule that only the dominant stress of a word can serve as a chief syllable. I believe this maintains a clarity and precision that a line would lose if one of its chief syllables were misaligned with the primary stress of its word.

Fagles mentions that there is "a kind of tug-of-war peculiar to translation, between trying to encapsulate the meaning of the Greek on the one hand and trying to

find a cadence for one's English on the other, yet joining hands, if possible, to make a line of verse," (Fagles, Preface xi) and I agree with this assertion. "Working from a loose five- or six-beat line but inclining more to six," he writes of his own translation, "I expand at times to seven beats—to imply the big reach of a simile . . . or contract at times to three, to give a point in speech or action sharper stress" (Preface xi). More often than not, however, I find myself looking at one of Fagles' numerous elaborations and wondering if there could have been a better way for him to stay within the line – to hug the Greek a bit more closely.

I feel that if Homer wrote a line of poetry that I want to translate, it should end up as a line of poetry – not half a line, not a line and a half, and certainly not two. The way I accomplished this in my own translation was through the use of what Borroff terms 'compound measures'. In essence, this involves translating in such a way so that some words in the line are subordinated to others, handing over the chief syllable status they would normally hold to words that are either naturally stronger than themselves or acquire that status through specific placement in the line. In other words, the line ends up containing certain words which have 'primary stress' and are, therefore, chief syllables, and other words which have 'secondary stress' and so count simply as intermediate syllables (Boroff 171). The musical nature of the poetry creates "a rhythmical momentum, an ongoing 'swing,' of [five] simpler measures per line to which the reader instinctively accommodates compound measures by accelerating them a little" (Boroff 173). This, combined with the fact that "It is natural to read measures containing two and three intermediate syllables more rapidly than those containing only one," (Boroff 168) keeps the pace moving steadily through the lines of verse. For instance, if one reads lines 34 and 35 of my

translation together, the natural flow of the beat from one line to the next takes the stress of "wizened", which would receive the stress if one read the line on its own, and instead places it on "father". The same occurs between "isolated" and "himself", causing the reader to flow straight through the *s* in the latter, over to the next chief syllable in the line, at
"fervently", despite the number of intermediate syllables in the measure. Working in this way with my lines, I can contain within the bounds of a single line nearly everything held in a line of Homer's dactyllic hexameter, ending up (for example) with a line such as I have at 35, whereas Fagles creates an entire extra line of poetry to encompass it (lines 39-40).

   "It has seemed to me that a modern verse-translation of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*," says Borroff, "must fulfill certain requirements deriving from the nature of the original style," (Introduction 12) and I do not believe it is any different with the *Iliad*. When Lattimore states, "My aim has been to give a rendering of the *Iliad* which will convey the meaning of the Greek in a speed and rhythm analogous to the speed and rhythm I find in the original," (Introduction 55) and then I look between his lines and the lines of the original Greek, a few things become apparent to me. To start with, he does indeed convey the Greek in a speedy manner – more accurately than Fagles, I think, as far as grammar and the written word are concerned. But the speed and rhythm he works in do not at all strike me as being analogous to those of the original Greek. Secondly, he is correct when he says, "My line can hardly be called English hexameter" (Introduction 55). How he can, on the one hand, assert that his lines do not resemble English hexameter and, on the other, claim that he is making a translation alike to the original in speed and rhythm, I fail to understand. Fagles is relatively

straightforward in his metric goals, and I do feel that he "occup[ies] a flexible middle ground, here between [Homer's] hexameter line . . . and a tighter, native English line." I do not feel that either of their translations is as faithful to the original Greek, metrically or rhythmically, as they could be. That became one of my primary goals, therefore – to create a translation with a pulse that feels more akin to the original, with lines that carry a similar inflection in verse to the Greek that Homer himself wrote.

Boroff says of the *Gawain*-poet that "such was [his] artistry that, while recounting the events of his narrative in thoroughly traditional fashion, he was able to stamp them with his own imaginative imprint," (Introduction 6) and that was something that I endeavored to do for my translation of these lines of the *Iliad*. As she cautions, "the diction of the translation must, so far as possible, reflect that of the original poem," (Introduction 13) and with this in mind, in the style of Heaney, I have "tr[ied] to match the poet's analogy-seeking habit at its most original" (Introduction xxix-xxx). Unlike Lattimore, I have not "used the plainest language I could find which might be adequate," (Introduction 55) nor have I allowed myself the metrical freedom of Fagles, but instead have done my utmost to stretch my wings of profundity, so to speak. I have sought to create a translation of these lines which captures the breadth and spectacle of Homer while getting as close to as many of the layers of meaning – which, I believe, impregnate nearly every line of the poem – as possible.

Heaney writes that he was "reluctant to force an artificial shape or an unusual word choice just for the sake of correctness" (Introduction xxix) in his translation, and I believe I acted similarly. I fell in love with these lines the first time I read them in the Greek,

104

and the picture they imprinted upon my mind was both vivid and evocative of many mixed emotions – fear, rage, reverence, the desire for vengeance, the thrill of the hunt, and the senselessness of death. Boroff complains that she "constantly had to compromise, sometimes forced away from literal rendition by the exigencies of the meter, sometimes foregoing an attractive phrase or cadence for the sake of a more faithful rendition, sometimes finding [her]self able to have it both ways" (Introduction 13). When the picture in my head came into conflict with the structure of my verse, however, I refused to give in until I had satisfied my desire to "have it both ways," as she says. Like Lattimore, I knew "I must try to avoid mistranslation," but unlike him, I did not do so by worrying that I might be "rating the word of my own choice ahead of the word which translates the Greek" (Introduction 55). Rather, I translated the lines into plain English – the sort of rendering which inevitably comes of poring over an *Iliad*-specific dictionary as your source of vocabulary – and then, with a rigid grasp on the grammar of the passage, I assembled the language and phrasing that fit my mental image around this framework.

In line 33, I translated ge/rwn as "aged cleric" and in line 35 I rendered geraio\j as "wizened father'. This point seemed an important one to me, since this is not simply your run-of-the-mill old man. Both Lattimore and Fagles translate it that way in line 33, though, and Lattimore again in 35. Fagles does seem to pick up a bit of the spirit that I was striving for, however, when he calls Chryses "the old priest" in line 35. To me, the character of Chryses is critical, whether or not the poem dispenses with him after he has served his purpose. I read the lines as he comes to the camp of the Achaeans to ransom his daughter and I get a specific vision in my head of a man bent by age and trampled by

his state of affairs, but who nevertheless preserves a great deal of the inviolability granted to him by his affinity to his god. As he wanders away from the camp, he is at first concerned for his life. When he gets far enough away, however, the confusion sets in – what is he doing? where is he going? who are these people who think themselves powerful enough to spurn him, a venerated priest of Apollo? That was the feeling I hoped to capture when he "strayed, dumbstruck, along the strand of the deep-rumbling sea." Lattimore's line does not seem to try to capture any sense of this, whereas Fagles starts off well, with Chryses "trailing away in silence," but by splitting the line he separates the sea from the man in a way that eliminates the metaphorical quality of the sea that I envision – a sea whose roaring washes over the man as surely as the waves wash upon the shore, leaving him waterlogged with his own jumbled thoughts and emotions.

In the invocation of Apollo (lines 37-42), I continue the compound formations which I began with the "deep-rumbling sea" when I make the a)rguro/toc' the "sterling-bowed God" and Ki/lla/n te zaqe/hn "Cil'la, the all-sanctified". Such compounds are extremely common in the descriptive Anglo-Saxon epic tradition from which I took my verse, and the more thought I gave to the idea, the more it seemed to me that by bringing the translation even closer to the form I was emulating I could only enhance its force and vitality. For instance, that Apollo would be the "sterling-bowed God" instead of the "God of the silver bow," as Fagles and Lattimore would have him, seems entirely natural to me. It is a stronger combination of words – it is faster and speaks to me of an adamantine hardness in the Apollo whom Chryses hopes to summon which "God of the silver bow" somehow lacks. Chryses is calling upon him to hearken to his call and wreak divine vengeance upon the

Achaeans – not to come down from the heavens and look pretty. It is this aspect of the Homeric gods which I hoped to capture through the hyper-masculinization of the Apollo figure that pervades my translation – their capacity to be chillingly sinister, even in their sublimely effulgent beauty.

At line 40, I translate dh/ as "righteously". This may seem to be a wanton use of poetic license on my part – and perhaps it is. But when I read through this passage, every adverb I come upon seems to carry with it shades of religiosity. In my eyes, it directly follows that dh/, usually translated as "indeed" or "truly," carries with it the sense that what Chryses did he did "rightly" or "in a proper manner". Therefore, against the religious backdrop before which the adverb stands, it can – and I believe does – mean "righteously" or perhaps even "reverently," though I felt that using the less patently religious of these two terms might allow my translation to occupy an intermediate and less affected ground. Both Fagles and Lattimore drop the adverb entirely – a crime of which I, myself, am also guilty at times – and thereby miss out on cashing in on its potential.

Given the nature of the invocation that Chryses sends up to Apollo, it seemed fitting to me that Phoebus should "remember" him instead of "hearing" him, which the verb e)/klue would normally imply. The priest calls to him, listing out first the god's central places of power and worship and then the deeds he himself has undertaken on behalf of the god, which he wants Apollo to recall. Neither Lattimore nor Fagles look as if they want to suggest this sense, as they translate the verb literally. The role of memory in the *Iliad*, however, is a pervasive and significant subject, in and of itself – the scope of which extends far beyond the confines of the space and time of this experiment, I fear – and I certainly feel that it is not out of the question to consider the

theme as manifest in this instance. In addition to this, there are also the religious undertones implicit in the word "remember" which I find too enticing to pass up. Almost every religion in the world harbors some sort of desire that the prayers we send up to our gods will one day be considered by those gods. When that happens, they will remember us, remember our prayers, remember our devotion, and accomplish that which we desire. These subtexts are the impressions I hope to evoke by having Apollo "remember" Chryses instead of simply hearing him.

The second half of the passage is definitely the part which I hold most dear and – just as when a new-born baby is brought into the light and put into the arms of her mother, who looks upon her and, while gazing, understands what her name must be – so did I, staring at these last nine lines, come to realize what I wanted to engender from them. Here is Homer, "recounting the events of his narrative," and here am I, "able to stamp them with [my] own imaginative imprint," as Borroff suggested an interpreter of a story can do (Introduction 6). The developing imprint in my mind was one of fire and brimstone, of storm-clouds and thunderbolts – of an unearthly huntsman, seeking a quarry upon which he means to visit a revenge so awe-inspiring and portentous that the very weapons he will employ, enlivened by the thought of the black outrages they will get to perform, are inspired with life so as to give vent to the blistering steam of his excess fury.

To emboss this mark of mine on the passage, I employed a number of conventions to call to mind all of these chilling images. When Apollo comes forth from Olympus, he does not simply "stride" as is the norm for translating bh=. Instead, he "stalks" down, and as he comes his heart is "storm-smoldering" in much the same way as lightning stirs up the clouds before it strikes to

earth. I take the word compounding to a new level by moving into the realm of the kenning, another poetic device common in the Anglo-Saxon epic tradition. In essence, it is a word-combination which metaphorically suggests its ordinary referent – for instance, "the sea" becomes "the whale-road" and a "shield" becomes a "war-board". Twice in these lines I create kennings to describe the arrows of Apollo—at line 46 they are the "pinioned furies" in the sheaf upon his back, and at 51 they are the "biting blight-bringers" which he is loosing upon the men in the camps. The "donkeys" and "swift dogs" (which both Fagles and Lattimore translate as "circling dogs/hounds" for some reason) which he assails become "the pack-mules and the quick-coursing hounds" which he "brings carnage upon" in line 50. Finally, I strove for an ironic tone for the ending line, in which the funeral pyres of the dead, instead of "burning always" – the literal translation of kai/onto ai)ei\ – are "illuminated, undying". I believe this word combination achieves a number of unique effects. First, illuminated brings to mind a tinge of the supernatural, which I think is just enough to conjure up the idea that the burning of the pyres is a sort of magical force which cannot be stopped by mortal men. Additionally, the changing of ai)ei\, "always", to "undying", through the weakening of the adverbial force, instead almost anthropomorphizes the pyres and grants an irony to the line which I see evidenced in the Greek – the pyres consuming the once-living soldiers are now the things that live, fueled by the corpses of the fallen.

"[Homer] is rapid, plain and direct in thought and expression," writes Lattimore, "plain and direct in substance, and noble" (Introduction 55). On these points I disagree. I do not feel that Homer is rapid, insofar as that term can be used of poetry written in dactyllic hexameter. What I would say is that Homer has a

rhythm that cannot be ignored, a beat that will carry you along with it and make you believe it is rapid, when really it is washing over you once more with every new line. Whether or not he is plain and direct in thought and expression is really a matter of individual interpretation of the verse laid out by Homer – it can be plain and direct when it needs to be, but it is also capable of weaving complex webs of images that you must study in order to separate them and see the whole picture. On that note, I do not feel he is at all plain and direct in substance, and I believe that to say so is to turn a blind eye to the myriad layers of depth that fill almost every single line of so-called plain and direct material. Noble, however, I will not dispute, and like Lattimore, the nobility of my interpretation is not for me to decide.

"Poets no longer write alliterative poetry in this technical sense," Boroff maintains, and I think this is an unfortunate fact since, as she says, "the modern language lends itself as well to the requirements of the form as the *Gawain*-poet's Middle English" (Introduction 6). I do feel that, in the end, I have created a rendering of these lines into a faithful adaptation of Anglo-Saxon heroic epic verse which, in some respects at least, better approximates the Greek of Homer, though the success or failure of it are, of course, up to others to judge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benner, Allen Rogers, ed. <u>Selections from Homer's Iliad</u>. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000.

Borroff, Marie, trans. <u>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, Patience, and Pearl</u>. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001.

Heaney, Seamus, trans. <u>Beowulf</u>. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2000.

Homer. <u>The Iliad</u>. Robert Fagles, trans. New

York: Penguin Books, 1990.

Lattimore, Richmond, trans. The Iliad of Homer.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Humphries, Porter, Matthews:
Modern Translation of Martial's Vitam Beatiorem
Epigram
By Derek Mong '04
Denison University

_____

The history of Martial in English begins with epigram 10.47, the so-called "Happy Life" poem—thirteen lines "which would become one of the most famous and most frequently translated in the oeuvre" (Sullivan and Boyle 3). English readers can thank Henry Howard, the Earl of Surrey, for 10.47's popularity. This "innovative metrician," Vergil translator, and future victim of beheading decided to (like Mallory before him) turn prison time into productivity (3). Around 1540, and likely "during a period of political confinement at Windsor" he cast 10.47 into "felicitous English verse" (3). Surrey titled his sixteen lines (eight couplets) of rhyming iambic tetrameter, "The Meanes to Attain Happy Life," and helped spark the English Renaissance. With the help of Sir Thomas Wyatt, Surrey included this translation in *Tottel's Miscellany* (1557), a volume meant by its editors to introduce Italian metrical techniques into English. From here English learned the sonnet and classical translations began to flourish: Marlowe's *Amores,* Golding's *Metamorphoses*, Chapman's Homer follow. "The *Miscellany* emphasized the Latin classics, but included translations of the Latin epigrams of later writers" (Sullivan and Boyle xxii). Martial had arrived on the English scene, and thanks to Surrey, his timing was impeccable.

In the generations to follow, Martial would attract admiration and translations from many accomplished English poets: Ben Jonson, John Dryden, Addison and Steele, Swift, Pope, Byron, and Ezra Pound. Often his more licentious poems prevented a

wide circulation, but with 1,500 epigrams spread across 12 books, Martial could literally become whatever his translator desired: Martial the moralist, Martial the stoic, Martial the satirist, Martial the misogynist. But despite its translator, and regardless of an era's taste or tact, 10.47 stayed popular. In *Martial: The Unexpected Classic,* Sullivan explains this phenomenon: "This depiction of the happy life has a tempered control that ensures its popularity" (217). He mentions the "surface simplicity of the pregnant language," and a poetry "untainted by the ironic comments [of Horace]" (215). The Watsons agree, cite Sullivan and add, "[10.47] represents M's answer to the familiar philosophical debate on the constituent elements of happiness" (139). They are both right. No matter the time period, its sexual or social mores, Martial 10.47 presents a balanced, approachable version of Epicureanism: avoid pain, advance pleasure. Thus in 10.47 we discover the perfect vehicle for evaluating Martial reception in a given translator. Its popularity challenges the translator to concoct newer, fresher language for what's essentially become a clichéd poem. In this paper, I intend to examine three post-war translations of 10.47: Rolfe Humphries (1963), Peter Porter (1972), and William Matthews (1995). What techniques do they employ to liven up Martial's "most famous and most translated poem" (Sullivan 215)? What level of translator's license do they incorporate in their poems? I will begin with Humphries.

The most noticeable element of Humphries translation is the meter and form, much of which he owes to Surrey. Humphries sets 10.47 in tetrameter and ends his lines on rhyming couplets. The rhythm may not be iambic, but as the first six lines show, the poem sounds slightly antiquated to our modern ears:

Here are the things, dear friend, which
make
Life not impossible to take:
Riches bequeathed, not won by toil;
Fire on the hearth; responsive soil;
No law suits; seldom formal dress;
A frank but wise disarmingness;

His diction isn't outdated or overblown; hearth for *focus,*
riches for *res,* soil for *aeger.* Even "formal dress" (one
imagines a suit and tie) betrays a certain modernizing of
Martial's *toga rara*, which was "synonymous with the
client's burdensome lifestyle in the city, its absence
symbolic of the relaxed life in the country" (Watson and
Watson 141). In fact the closer we read Humphries
10.47, the less acutely Roman it sounds. In fact the
entire poem has been "de-classified" (excuse the pun)
for a 20th century reader. From the three translators cited
above, only Humphries avoids naming the poem's
addressee. *Iuncundissime Martialis*, most literally
translated as "the most agreeable Martial" becomes a far
more general "dear friend." Martial could be chatting
with anyone, a co-worker at the water cooler, baggers in
a supermarket, his neighbor. Furthermore, Humphries
translates *non tristis torus et tamen pudicus* (line 10) as
"In bed, a wife not frigid nor/ Too reminiscent of a
whore" (line 13-14). Again, he attempts to de-Romanize
the poem, avoiding the word "chaste," commonly used
for *pudicus*. "Chaste" invokes the patriarchal society the
Romans openly supported. "Frigid" grounds the poem
in a 1960s marriage, an American marriage, commenting
on sexual frustrations therein. His word "whore" is
almost shocking, an effect that Martial
uncharacteristically avoids in 10.47. According to
Sullivan and Boyle, this tendency plagues Martial's
modern translations:

> In the multitudinous rush to liberate Martial from the shackles of sexual repression, some translators misread the Roman poet…. The so-called 'obscene' poems, to which attention will be seen to be drawn, often possess a more allusive refinement and urbane sexuality, as well as a richer linguistic context (305)

By elaborating *tamen pudicus* into "nor…a whore," Humphries falls into the trap described above. He drops the "w" bomb, for laugh, for rhyme, for the purpose of an un-Roman poem. And yet despite this approach Humphries' translation rings outdated, anti-modern, when read today. Why?

The answer is obvious: the rhyme scheme. Humphries takes 13 hendecasyllabic lines and steamrolls it into 18 lines of rhyming couplets. The need to expand the poem can be excused. Anyone who's ever translated Latin knows the economy of the language, an economy which the poetry accentuates. The rhyme, however, has no precedent in the Latin. Humphries explains: "Most of the time, because the tradition of English verse needs rhyme for wit, especially in the shorter poems, I have rhymed, as Martial did not" (27). The explanation is sensible, but somewhat shortsighted. This "tradition of English verse [which] needs rhyme for wit" includes the 400 year tradition of translating Martial. We return to my initial problem: how to make good ole 10.47 a fresh poem? Humphries' version does little to break the mold, sonically or metrically. Note the end rhyme on his second couplet: soil and toil. Although this cleverly mirrors *aeger* and *labore*, the rhyme's been overused since the 17th century. From an anonymous manuscript

containing "To Julius Martiall" in the British Library: "A good Estate, nott gott with mine owne toyle,/ But by Descent: plac'd in a fruitfull soyle" (Sullivan and Boyle 155). Others have done the same: Goldwyn Smith in 1893, A.E. Street in 1907 (Sullivan and Boyle 268-69, 278). Another overused trick has been to add an additional line to 10.47, a move which makes mathematical sense for couplets (and frequent sonneteers). The majority of translators do this, Thomas Heyrick's "Martial's Happy Life" (1691) being one notable exception. Still, Herrick rhymes *make* and *take* in couplet one, just like Humphries (Sullivan and Boyle 123). What then, is a translator to do? How does one liven up "the Happy Life?" Well, the first objective might be to dispense with the couplets. They're outdated, and although English wit often relies on rhyming couplets, they need not be a straightjacket or necessity, especially for a Martial poem that's less about wit than it is about wisdom. Secondly, 10.47 is no sonnet and should not be treated as such. Humphries does avoid this pitfall, as does Peter Porter.

Peter Porter's 10.47 departs from tradition, and according to Sullivan and Boyle his Martial translations remain "the most successful in this century, their complex allusiveness and energetic counterpoint with the original epigrams (and- frequently- with intervening translations)" (332). It is, at first glance, a long poem: 24 lines, each one hovering at or around ten syllables. Porter's lines enjamb as much as they end-stop. His rhyme scheme certainly defies the couplet tradition, expanding into a detailed pattern of twelve true rhymes. The scheme is this: ABC-ABC, DEF-DEF, GHI-GHI, JKL-JKL. Note his final seven lines:

> (*i*) don't scare yourself with formulae,
> like x

> *j*-equals nought, the schizophrenic
> quest!
> *k*- What else is there? Well, two points
> at least—
> *l*- wishing change wastes both time and
> breath,
> *j*- life's unfair and nothing's for the best,
> *k*- but having started finish off the
> feast—
> *l*- neither dread your last day, nor long
> for death   (lines 18-24)

The pattern is really quite stunning, both for its intricacy and subtly. We really don't notice the rhymes until the final sextet when the poet interjects, "What else is there? Well, two points at least—" (line 20). Perhaps the "breath/death" rhyme does it, perhaps the end-stops. Maybe since the last six end words can pass as slant rhyme the reader hunkers down in search of pattern. Whatever the case, it's a clever form, and one that rewards a reader's attention. With the aid of rhyme the virtues begin clumping, first into groups of three lines (ABC), then in chunks of six (ABC-ABC). Porter's pattern redefines the epigram.

However, can Porter's 10.47 still fall under the label epigram? He does bloat the poem well past Humphries 18 lines, and nearly doubles the 13 which Martial wrote. Furthermore, his tone strays from Martial's, especially in the final rhyme group. Note the Latin text which spawns the passage above: "*quod sis esse velis nihilque malis;/ summum nec metuas diem nec optes*" (lines 12-13). Watson and Watson write that "the final requirements for a happy life are expressed protreptically as subjunctives, varying the nouns of 3-11" (143). They are didactic lines, instructive lines, spoken to the addressee. They are also concise,

unpretentious, and well-thought. If one aims to moralize through epigram, 10.47's final two lines provide a useful model. Porter, however, takes a different route, adopting a more jocular, self-conscious voice. The interjection at line 20 has no precedent in the Latin text, and represents a "thinking out loud." The poet's voice continues while his mind recharges. Thus Porter abandons Martial's precision and directness, exchanging it for geniality, flippancy, and a little morbidity. Note line 22, where Porter writes "life's unfair and nothing's for the best," a very modern, abysmal sentiment. Again, this line has no precedent in the Latin. It is all Porter. What then, can we make of these additions? Clearly they liven the poem, replacing some of the classical moralizing with a modern, self-conscious monologue. The technique stretches the limits of epigram, but also provides a fresh variation on an old poem.

William Matthews translation of 10.47, however, neither lengthens nor adapts the original Latin. It is the most concise of our modern translations, and yet sonically fresh. Here is the poem in its entirety:

> The things that make life happier,
> Martial, my namesake, are these;
> what we don't earn, but get given;
> unstinting fields, a steady fire;
> no lawsuits, no togas, a restful mind;
> a healthy body not racked by long work;
> truth, tact, and democratic friends;
> good simple food, clear-hearted guests;
> nights carefree but not drenched by wine;
> a bed not guilty nor a prude's
> and sleep that snips short the long dark:
> let us wish to be none but who we are
> and neither dread the end nor lean to it.

Matthews does not exceed the length of Martial's Latin, maintaining the epigram's visual autonomy and epigram size. His images also retain their Roman-ness (he uses both "Martial," and "togas"), doing little to modernize or hide the poem's age. This is Martial fluidly transferred into modern American English. And yet, Matthews achieves this through a very close, very precise reading of the Latin. His lines are tight, avoiding the interjections of Porter or the couplets of Humphries. In fact, when one stands the Latin text alongside the English (as Matthews does on the pages of *The Mortal City*) one doesn't just see a Latin line directly across from the English equivalent, but two poems that mirror their syntax. Even some of the punctuation matches. Notice Martial's opening, with Matthews interspersed: "*Vitam quae faciant beatiorem* (The things that make life happier) *iuncundissime Martialis* (Martial, my namesake) *haec sunt* (are these)." The English doubles the Latin. Matthews continues this throughout the list of pleasantries, forfeiting little, gaining much. His poem cannot have a narrator anymore self-aware, anymore flippant than Martial himself. He must also stick to the poem's catalogue nature. Matthews achieves this through carefully chosen words, minimal conjunctions, articles, or extraneous verbiage. His English takes its lead from Latin's economy, a tactic which forces Matthews to concoct fresh, artful phrases for Martial's images. Note his "unstinting fields" for *non ingratus aeger* (line 4). The Latin takes six syllables, the English four, and yet the connotations match. Partially, this is due to Martial double negative (*non ingratus*) which we would naturally drop from the English, but one should also credit Matthews' ingenuity. He coins a new phrase, an unforeseen approach to line 4. There are also lines 10-11, whose Latin reads, "*non tristis torus et tamen*

pudicus/ somnus qui faciat breves tenebras." Matthews avoids any shock words, delivering "a bed not guilty nor a prude's" (line 10). This tone and diction remains faithful to Martial's unusual moderation in 10.47 He follows this with "and sleep that snips short the long dark," something of an improvement on the Martial. The sibilants in the line's first half speed the reading up ("sleep that snips short"), only to slowdown on "long dark," two words whose sense and spoken sound slow the mouth. In this way Matthews *adds* the advantages of a sonically interesting English phrase to the brevity of the Latin. Overall, his poem maintains Martial's intent, tone, and form, while utilizing the sounds of the English language accessible to the reader. It is a fresh, modern rendering.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Humphries, Rolfe. *Selected Epigrams.* Bloomington,
 IN: Indiana UP, 1963.
Martial. *Selected Epigrams.* Ed. Lindsay
 and Patricia Watson. Cambridge, UK.
 Cambridge UP, 2003.
Matthews, William. *The Mortal City.*
 Athens, OH: Ohio Review Books, 1995.
Sullivan, J.P. and A.J. Boyle. *Martial in
 English.* New York: Penguin Books, 1996.
Sullivan, J.P. *Martial: The Unexpected
 Classic.* Cambridge, UK. Cambridge UP, 1991.

The Use of Sappho
By Molly Samuel '05
Oberlin College

_____

(Sappho 107)
do I still yearn for my virginity?[1]

       Sappho is a mystery. Her biography has been written and rewritten at least as many times as her fragments have been deciphered and altered, yet we still know almost nothing about her. Her biographers have proposed various stories about her life, but the stories get tangled together and often contradict each other, even while they are ensconced in tradition. Sappho is widely renowned as a schoolteacher, an occupation that has been so widely accepted that when it is asserted, sources are rarely cited to support it.[2] This theory is as comfortable as Socrates' homosexuality or Homer's blindness. Sappho is also famous simultaneously as a homosexual poet and as a woman who killed herself because of her unrequited love for a man. Sappho is polysemous, but her multiplicities often go unexamined. She is simultaneously a symbol of any number of things and also of nothing at all: Sappho is in the empty part of a page where her fragments discontinue.

       With their tricky insistence on being impossible to grasp, the fragments provide no support for any concrete facts about Sappho. The problem with a fragment is that even if it is in the first person, a poem does not speak for the poet. Is it Sappho herself? Is she speaking from someone else's perspective? Sappho

_____

[1] All translations of Sappho are from Sappho, *If Not, Winter*, trans. Anne Carson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002).

[2] Holt N. Parker "Sappho Schoolmistress," *Re-Reading Sappho: Reception and Transmission*, ed. Ellen Greene (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996) 150-151.

symbolizes her work as much as she symbolizes homosexuals or female poets or anything else. Her name defines her poems and implies that they are about homoeroticism or women writers, while the poems define her and tell us that she was a woman writer or a homosexual.[3] Catullus criticizes those who criticize *him* because of his poetry: "For thinking me, because my verses / Are rather sissy, not quite decent. / For the true poet should be chaste himself, his verses need not be" (Catullus 16).[4]   Catullus may or may not be chaste; Sappho may or may not be a virgin.

The attempts to write a biography for Sappho are attempts to understand her and to integrate her into a framework in which she does not belong. Sappho is a threat—a talented and smart woman who does not seem to need men—but that threat is easily written away. Her invented role as schoolmistress is often as a *chaste* schoolmistress: a kind older spinster who prepared younger girls for marriage.[5] She has also made appearances as a gym teacher, a music teacher, and the leader of a cult.[6] The assumption in all of these (and all of these *are* assumptions, none of them are supported by anything she wrote) is that she is dominant over and older than the objects of her poems. Sappho is made safe again because the biographies write her into a pedagogical model. According to these stories, she is not writing about physical desire or love, and she is not writing to her peers, which would undermine social

---

[3] For the author-function, see Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?" *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977) 113-138.

[4] Catullus, *The Poems of Catullus*, trans. Guy Lee (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

[5] Parker, "Sappho Schoolmistress," 150-151.

[6] Ibid., p. 152, 159.

hierarchies. Rather, she is older, dominant (though not dominant over any men), and virginal. As Holt N. Parker puts it, "Sappho, it seems, needs to be explained away, isolated in a cult or shut away in a school. Like many women of genius, Sappho has been institutionalized."[7] Sappho is imagined as a threatening symbol, and then she is divested of the power it implies. She can't win.

(Sappho 29B)
lady

(Sappho 36)
I long and seek after

(Sappho 121)
but if you love us
        choose a younger bed
        for I cannot bear
        to live with you when I am the older one

        Part of the problem with labeling Sappho's poetry homoerotic is the difference between contemporary understandings of sexuality and ancient views on it. Rules for desire existed, but they differed from our own in important ways. Our knowledge of these rules, however, is based largely on fifth century Athens, and therefore is only uneasily applicable to Sappho. The preference for fifth century Athens is a reasonable choice when Athens is compared to seventh century Mytilene. Classical Athens provides us with

---

[7] Ibid., p. 175.

historians, legal arguments, philosophers, poets, and playwrights. Seventh century Mytilene mainly provides us with Sappho. Fifth century Athens, does not, however, offer any female writers.[8] Studies in the sexuality of Greece and Rome have introduced important ways of thinking about gender and sexuality as cultural constructs. The problem remains that the dominant voices are the ones that are most often preserved. Only rarely do other voices sneak through. Sappho's has, but it is so historically, sexually, and contextually isolated that it is incredibly difficult, almost impossible to understand what it is saying. Fifth century Athenian male authors have been made into the paradigm; Sappho does not fit. Because she is from a different time and place, she is remarkable. It is extremely difficult to measure how remarkable she was in her own time. Certain comparisons to Alcaeus are a start, but they resolve very few questions, and do not explain her remarkable afterlife.[9]

(Sappho 129A)
but me you have forgotten

(Sappho 61)
they became [
for not

(Sappho 147)
someone will remember us

---

[8] Page du Bois, *Sappho is Burning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995) 131.
[9] For comparisons to Alcaeus and other lyric poets, see Parker, "Sappho Schoolmistress," 179-183.

I say
Even in another time

(Sappho 175)
dawn

  Sappho is an icon: she is labeled the first female poet, and the first lesbian poet. But she is an iconoclast in a male dominated tradition. She is forced into a patriarchal hierarchy of ancestors and descendents. If the idea of matriarchy is only a response to patriarchy—an idea that would seem to empower women but is functioning more as an appeasement to keep them in a masculine order—then Sappho is a conciliatory offer. She is an allowance and an exception, but also a *de*ception.

  Often she has been referred to as the female Homer; they are the progenitors of western literature. Homer, the father, gives us complete and metered epic poems, while Sappho ,the mother, gives us wandering pieces of unpredictable and very difficult metered love poems. She is forced into an uncomfortable position. Not only is she allowed into the male-created, -dominated, and -oriented club of the elite in western art, she is a founding member. She is burdened with an impossible label in an impossible group.

(Sappho 182)
I might go

(Sappho 191)
celery

(Sappho 180)
holder

(Sappho 176)
lyre lyre lyre

(Sappho 192)
gold anklebone cups

      Some fragments are but one word in length. It is difficult to figure out what the importance of one word can be. Is it a poem? Is it even the suggestion of a poem? Often a single word is quoted for some reason by some other ancient author, and that is the only place it is found. The reference to the rest of the poem that the author would seem to be making is completely lost on us. The context of the word exists only in the context of the text in which it was quoted. Then it is removed from that text, given a number, and treated as a fragment.

      The words taken from citations are a different sort of fragment than those found on papyri. Fragments of poems on papyri are edited by time, an accidental editor,[10] while fragments from citations are intentional pieces chosen and separated by a different author.[11] Once they are all compiled together, though, it no longer matters which pieces came from which editorial board. Fragments are fragments, and meaning does not depend on which ones lost their surroundings due to the

---

[10] Heather McHugh, *Broken English: Poetry and Partiality* (Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1993) 70.
[11] Carson, *If Not, Winter*, p. xi

deterioration of papyri and which to the interests of other authors.

Sappho's fragments are endlessly recreatable. They suggest something more than what is there; the absence of the rest of the poem is painfully felt on a mostly blank page. Fragments are simultaneously lonely and liberating. A few words can suggest emotions or characters from what was once a complete work, but all meaning is left for the reader to invent. There is no point in searching for the original intent or feeling of a poem since it is as impossible to grasp as Sappho's biography.

(Sappho 69)
]
]sinful
]

(Sappho 32)
Who honored me by giving their works

(Sappho 188)
mythweaver

(Sappho 187)
of the Muses

So, what is Sappho? She is without biography, context, or history. Her poems are fragments. She and her fragments are unendingly remade and reified. She is married and homosexual; a virgin, and a mother. She is an origin and a continuation of a poetic tradition. Sappho is simultaneously all of the contradictory things people

have made of her. In the end, Sappho can only be the figure that she has come to represent. She is what people have assumed or believed she is. Sappho is a myth rather than a historical figure; she is a chimerical cultural icon.

CONTRIBUTORS' NOTES

Georgia Blume is a sophomore at Oberlin College, majoring in Classics with an emphasis on Latin Language and Literature. She is from Brooklyn, New York and is currently spending the semester at the International Collegiate Center for Classical Studies in Rome. She hopes to attend graduate school, acquire a Ph.D., and become a professor and renowned publisher.

Tashina Browning is senior Classics major, Art History minor at Denison University. She is from Utica, Ohio and is serving her first term on *Ephemeris'* editorial board.

Allison Cartmell is a senior Classics and Latin double major at Denison University from Marietta, Ohio. Alli has been a past contributor to *Ephemeris* and is a member of the editorial board for the first time. She plans to pursue a Ph.D. in Classical Archaeology after graduation.

Nate Emmerson is a senior from Rochester, New York. He is a Latin major, Music Performance minor at Denison University. Nate has been published in *Ephemeris* in previous issues and is serving his first term as an editorial board member. He has accepted a fellowship at Boston University next year to pursue a Ph.D. in Classics.

Larkin Kennedy is from Reno, Nevada, and is in her last year at Denison University studying both Biology and Classics. She has been working on various projects in archaeology since her freshman year and has done survey work in Greece as well as participated in an excavation in Romania. Her senior research project, a

portion of which has been included in this volume, is the culmination of these activities and takes into account various studies on the theory and methods involved in archaeological research, as well as how the results of such research affect modern peoples. She has been accepted as a Ph.D. candidate in Archaeology at Texas A & M University starting in the fall of 2004.

Glenn Lacki, a junior at Oberlin College, is triple-majoring in Greek Language & Literature, Latin Language & Literature, and English (with a concentration in Medieval Language & Literature). Glenn is from Cleveland, Ohio and has just been accepted at the Intercollegiate Center for Classical Studies in Rome to study in the fall of 2004.

John Leebens is a junior from Carterville, Illinois double majoring in Classics and History with a minor in Latin at Denison University. A former contributor and editorial board member of *Ephemeris*, John will maintain his position on the board next year, serving as Editor-in-chief.

Autumn Lotze is a member of the class of 2007 at Denison University. She is from North Lima, Ohio and is a Sociology/Anthropology and International Studies double major. Her paper was written for a Shakespearean Drama course. She chose the particular topic because of her interest in Classical mythology and because of the importance of Greek and Roman influence on Elizabethan literature. Her paper explores Shakespeare's multiple uses of mythology and his interest in social commentary.

Nicole Miller is a junior at Denison University, and, as she could not possibly choose between her two passions,

is double majoring in Latin and Psychology. As a timid first year student from Cincinnati, Ohio, Nicole met Betsy and Melanie who sucked her into the Classics department, which she very happily calls home now. In search of great adventure and enlightenment, Nicole has spent Spring 2004 studying at University College Cork in Ireland. Her submission was written as part of a course entitled "Geography and Imagination in Antiquity and the Middle Ages" offered at UCC. Nicole certainly enjoyed her experience in Ireland--including trekking up mountains to visit Medieval holy wells, attempting to understand the Cork accent, and blundering her way through a Spoken Irish Class; but she soon returned because she missed seeing the sun on a regular basis and the good company of the amazing Betsy and Melanie.

Derek Mong is a senior English Writing major with a minor in Latin at Denison University. Derek has before been a contributor to *Ephemeris* in previous issues. His future plans include much tree climbing, afternoon naps, and throwing sock balls at his cat Leonard. In the fall he will begin an MFA in poetry writing at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.

Betsy Prueter is senior Classics and English Literature double major with a Latin minor at Denison University. She, along with good friend, Melanie Vanderkolk, founded *Ephemeris* in the spring of 2002 in hopes of promoting and encouraging the study of Classics. She is excited to see it expand to include works from other universities in Ohio, Ireland and Italy! After five issues and little *otium* to speak of, Betsy will graduate and has accepted a position working for AmeriCorps in Massachusetts before entering graduate school. She would like to extend special thanks to the Denison Classics Department for their support and

encouragement of not only the journal, but of her personal academic career.

Molly Samuel is a senior at Oberlin College and is majoring in Ancient Greek and Comparative Literature. She is from Atlanta, Georgia.

Andrew Sweet is a member of the class of 2004 at Kenyon College, majoring in Classics and Political Science. He is originally from Fort Wayne, IN and will begin pursuing a Ph.D. in Classics from Cornell University in the fall. His study of Brasidas began in 2002 for a class on Thucydides in translation, and the generous help of Carolin Hahnemann and Devin Stauffer last semester enabled him to improve his work by dealing with Thucydides in the original.

Heather Thompson is a junior English Writing and Women's Studies double major at Denison University from Westerville, Ohio, who has long been fascinated by the myth of Psyche and Eros. After writing a hideous retelling of the story for her poetry class, she decided to modernize the tale and created the poem presented in this collection.

Melanie Vanderkolk, from Pittsburgh, is a senior Classics major and Art History minor at Denison University. She has been co-editor of *Ephemeris* since its inception in the spring of 2002, and she is proud of the progress it has made during these years. She would also like to thank Betsy Prueter, co-founder of *Ephemeris*, for her work and friendship over the years. To thank Denison for all that it has given her, Melanie dedicated her first book (published this year) to the Denison Classics Department. After graduation, she has

accepted a position with Prentice Hall Publishing in Columbus, Ohio.

Frank Ward is a senior English-Creative Writing major from Raleigh, North Carolina. He wrote this paper for a class entitled "Romanesque and Gothic Art from the Art History Department at Denison University. His paper traces the history of Gothic Architecture from its origins to its place in contemporary society. It attempts to show how and why Gothic architecture has survived for nearly nine centuries, making its transition from French cathedral design to an English university standard and finally, to American college, university, and residential archetype. After graduation, Frank, as is fitting for an outgoing student body president, plans to move to Washington, D.C. to work on Capitol Hill.

Bob Wyllie is a senior physics and philosophy double major at Denison University from Novelty, Ohio. His paper seeks to understand the goals of provincial management for the first century A.D. Roman Empire. Specifically, it notes the built-in inefficiencies of provincial government and yet seeks to account for the unparalleled success of the Roman system. Bob is planning on pursuing a Ph.D. in Physics after graduation. He has been a regular contributor to *Ephemeris*.