

College of the Holy Cross CrossWorks

Parnassus: classical journal

Classics Department

Spring 2016

Parnassus: Classical Journal (Volume 4, 2016)

Corey J. Scannell

College of the Holy Cross, cjscan18@g.holycross.edu

Charlie Schufreider

College of the Holy Cross, cjschu17@g.holycross.edu

Margaret Jones

College of the Holy Cross, mrjone16@g.holycross.edu

Michael Kelley

College of the Holy Cross, mjkell18@g.holycross.edu

Christopher Ryan

College of the Holy Cross, cdryan16@g.holycross.edu

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <http://crossworks.holycross.edu/parnassus>

 Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Scannell, Corey J.; Schufreider, Charlie; Jones, Margaret; Kelley, Michael; Ryan, Christopher; Merola, Steven; Hanley, Claude; Gryan, Melissa; Manoussakis, John Panteleimon; Krueger, Thomas; Whitmore, Lawrie; Weir, William; Guarracino, Nicholas; and Larkin, Alexandra, "Parnassus: Classical Journal (Volume 4, 2016)" (2016). *Parnassus: classical journal*. 4.

<http://crossworks.holycross.edu/parnassus/4>

This Journal is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics Department at CrossWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Parnassus: classical journal by an authorized administrator of CrossWorks.

Authors

Corey J. Scannell, Charlie Schufreider, Margaret Jones, Michael Kelley, Christopher Ryan, Steven Merola, Claude Hanley, Melissa Gryan, John Panteleimon Manoussakis, Thomas Krueger, Lawrie Whitmore, William Weir, Nicholas Guarracino, and Alexandra Larkin

PARNASSUS

Undergraduate Classical Journal

College of the Holy Cross | Volume IV ♦ MMXVI

PERSONA

Journal Staff

EDITOR	Christopher Ryan
ASSOCIATE EDITORS	Margaret Jones Claude Hanley
LAYOUT EDITOR	Anne Thompson
EDITORIAL BOARD	Claude Hanley Nicholas Jalbert Margaret Jones Michael Kelley Alexandra Larkin Margaret MacMullin Corey Scannell Anne Thompson Henry Whitmore
CORRESPONDANCE EDITOR	Nicholas Jalbert
COPY EDITOR	Corey Scannell
PUBLICITY EDITOR	Alexandra Larkin
FACULTY ADVISORS	Timothy Joseph, Ph.D. Aaron Seider, Ph.D.

Contents

Cover Art Margaret MacMullin '16	
Editor's Note Christopher Ryan '16	vi
Translation Contest Corey Scannell '18	1
<i>Caesar Famulus Fortunae:</i> Fortune's Dominance in Lucan's <i>Pharsalia</i> Charlie Schufreider '17	4
Lucan's Tale of Two Leaders: Rhetoric and Syntax Preceding the Battle of Pharsalus Margaret Jones '16	14
The Best-Laid Plans of Arms and Man: A Reimagining of Vergil's Aeneid, Book I.198-203 Michael Kelley '18	22
Madness Unburied: The Use of <i>Condere</i> in Lucan's <i>Pharsalia</i> Christopher Ryan '16	23
Immortalitas Poetica Steven Merola '16	33
A Passage to Oblivion: Memory in <i>Odes</i> Book 2 Claude Hanley '18	35
Dido Melissa Gryan '18	44
On the Tragic Tension of Actor and Spectator in the <i>Trachiniae</i> Michael Kelley '18	45

A Preliminary Analysis of <i>Coincidentia Oppositorum</i> in Euripidean Drama: The Case of <i>Hecuba</i> Prof. John Manoussakis, Philosophy	55
Ancient Justice Thomas Krueger '16	73
Utilizing Athenian History in the <i>De Corona</i> Lawrie Whitmore '16	74
The Un-amused Muse William Weir '18	85
Goliath of Troy Nicholas Guarracino '18	88
Modernity Alexandra Larkin '18	96
Spencer as Daedalus <i>and</i> Icarus: Art, Nature and Moderation in the <i>Faerie Queene</i> Corey Scannell '18	98

Editor's Note

The Editors before me have duly noted that the name of this journal, *Parnassus*, was inspired by the mountain of the same name still standing tall in the storied land of Central Greece. In ancient times, it was thought that inside Mt. Parnassus dwelt the nine muses, inspirations for Homer, Vergil, and indeed all future authors. The aim of this journal is to provide a second home for those nine Muses, here on Mount St. James.

In this fourth edition of *Parnassus*, the members of the editorial board, composed exclusively of undergraduate students at the College, have selected pieces that deepen our understanding of the classical world, how that world interacts with our past, and how it continuously shapes our present. All of these pieces stem from the Holy Cross community, spanning departments and degrees, including various voices from each class year, both in poetry and in prose.

The theme of this fourth edition is *Persona*. An informal understanding of *persona* might supply the synonyms of “character” or “role.” In fact, antiquity’s understanding of the word was situated within the theatre. *Persona*, literally meaning in Latin “a sounding through,” denoted the mask through which an actor on stage would voice his character. *Persona* ultimately can be traced back to the Greek word πρόσωπον. Though literally meaning “a looking through,” the Greek word also meant “mask.”

I would be remiss here if I did not mention that the word *persona* has a special place at the College of the Holy Cross, a Catholic institution. The Christian tradition transformed the meaning of *persona* into something sacred, calling the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit of the Trinity each a *persona*. Insofar as we too as a Catholic community believe that we are in the image of God, we are each in command of our own *persona*. The result of this theology over the course of the last two hundred years has been staggering. Perhaps no word has had a greater impact on the universal struggle for human rights than *persona*. Today, we can see this most clearly in the “Universal Declaration for Human Rights” drafted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, within which the rights and liberty of each individual are completely wrapped up within the language of “person” and “personhood.” It would not be a stretch to say that the language of this struggle has its roots at the theatre in Athens some 2,500 years ago.

To return to that sacred mount in Greece, Mt. Parnassus can be seen through the special lens of *persona*. Mt. Parnassus has stood for thousands of years, stretching the course of human history and witnessing famous events of our collective past. Each façade frames a different perspective, which in turn recounts a different drama.

Steep on its southern slope clutching the bare rock of Mt. Parnassus, the ruins of Delphi cling as a testament to its illustrious past as the hub of the world, cradle of alliances, and major tourist attraction for centuries. To the east of those oracular ruins the modern village of Arachova pays tribute to Delphi's touristic legacy as a popular ski town. On that very slope in 1826 C.E., the Greek Georgios Karaiskakis defeated the Ottomans in pursuit of independence for the modern Greek state. Still further south and to the east on the foothills of the mountain range, the Greeks at the small town of Distomo suffered one of the worst massacres in World War II at the hands of the Waffen-SS, with over two hundred men, women, and children killed. In short, Mt. Parnassus has witnessed the glorious crests and the grievous troughs of Greek civilization.

The *persona* of the mountain has changed over the years in the drama of history. And yet, those rocks are the very same rocks that the forefathers of Western Civilization transformed. This paradoxical relationship between permanence and change, essence and character, is precisely what an appreciation for the Classics realizes. The classicist knows all too well how the essence of it all remains the same – the mountainous bedrock of culture and literature and politics and love of life. Yet for each woman and man, the *persona* of this bedrock changes. Thus a nuanced understanding of the world arises from the study of Classics, which, from its unique perspective on history, acknowledges the human tragedies and challenges of the past, recognizes them in the present, and looks forward with hope for the future. Classical studies, then, provide an education of how to shape the *persona* of one's society, one's family, and ultimately oneself.

In some way or another, all seventeen featured pieces in this edition of the journal relate to the theme of *Persona*. The first section of this journal focuses on Lucan and his epic poem, the *Pharsalia*. On the cover of the journal, Maggie MacMullin '16 depicted a lightning bolt striking a dilapidated tree, symbolizing Caesar's defeat of Pompey. Though they were both great men of Rome, the so-called *summi viri*, each leader had a very different *persona*. The symbolism of the stricken tree is drawn from Book

1 of the *Pharsalia*. In that same vein, Corey Scannell '18 won this year's translation contest on *Pharsalia* 7.7-25, a passage that characterizes the dramatic *persona* of Pompey. Three pieces follow on Lucan's poem, each of which investigates both the characters within the epic poem and the *persona* of Lucan within the larger context of epic poets.

A brief section on Horace and Ovid follows with a brilliant series of translated poems by former Editor-in-Chief Steven Merola '16 and with "A Passage to Oblivion: Memory in *Odes* Book 2" by Claude Hanley '18. The editorial board also for the first time accepted a piece of artwork featured inside the journal, "Dido" by Melissa Gryan '18. This concludes our Latin half of the journal.

Michael Kelley '18 kicks off our Greek focus of the journal with his essay "On the Tragic Tension of Actor and Spectator in the *Trachiniae*," which also relates to the setting of the *persona* within the Greek tradition. This journal is also proud to feature an essay entitled "A Preliminary Analysis of Coincidentia in Euripidean Drama: The Case of *Hecuba*," written by our very own Prof. John Manoussakis of the Philosophy Department. Although the editorial board of *Parnassus* will remain undergraduate, the board welcomes any pieces submitted by the larger Holy Cross community that deepens our understanding of the ancient world. Physics and philosophy double major Thomas Krueger '16 also shows how an appreciation for the Classics reaches far beyond the hallways of Fenwick IV with his poem "Ancient Justice." Similarly, English majors William Weir '18 and Alexandra Larkin '18 grace us with their poetic talent. Finally, Corey Scannell '18 brings the journal to a close and across history with his essay "Spencer as Daedalus and Icarus: Art, Nature and Moderation in the *Faerie Queene*."

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all who submitted to the journal and all who worked to make this edition possible. In a special way, I also thank all those who are committed to educating and providing a space for discussion and appreciation of the Classics. The following pages are a testament to your work.

Christopher Ryan
Editor-in-Chief

Lucan, *Pharsalia* 7.7-25

Parnassus Translation Contest

at nox felicitatis Magno pars ultima uitae
sollicitos uana decepit imagine somnos.
nam Pompeiani uisus sibi sede theatri
innumeram effigiem Romanae cernere plebis 10
attollique suum laetis ad sidera nomen
uocibus et plausu cuneos certare sonantes;
qualis erat populi facies clamorque fauentis
olim, cum iuuenis primique aetate triumphi,
post domitas gentes quas torrens ambit Hiberus 15
et quaecumque fugax Sertorius inpulit arma,
Vespere pacato, pura uenerabilis aequae
quam currus ornante toga, plaudente senatu
sedit adhuc Romanus eques; seu fine bonorum
anxia mens curis ad tempora laeta refugit, 20
siue per ambages solitas contraria uisis
uaticinata quies magni tulit omina planctus,
seu uetito patrias ultra tibi cernere sedes
sic Romam Fortuna dedit. ne rumpite somnos,
castrorum uigiles, nullas tuba uerberet aures. 25

Winner of the Translation Contest

Corey Scannell '18

In rendering Lucan's verse into English, I had to strike a careful balance between artfulness and literalness. Of course, a literal translation is rarely touched with art, just as artful translations must concede its literal sense at times. Achieving this balance becomes all the more difficult when one tries to translate into meter, and even harder when that meter rhymes. This is what I have done here. As Lucan wrote the *Pharsalia* in his epic meter, the dactylic hexameter, I translated it into ours, the heroic couplet. In doing so, I tried my very best to maintain the literal sense everywhere I could, but of course, I couldn't maintain it everywhere. I like to think Lucan would appreciate my artistic license; his poetry is much more than the literal meaning of his words, so I conceded these literal meanings where I think artfulness should take precedence. Wherever I judge the literal meaning to be more important than the art, my meter breaks down, and "couplets" actually extend to three rhymed lines at times. With that said, I hope you agree with the concessions I had to make, and I hope any disagreements foster discussion in the future.

Pharsalia 7.7-25

Corey Scannell '18

The final part of Pompey's happy lot
was a night that roused his sleep with faulty thoughts:
He deemed he saw the countless Roman masses,
while seated in his theater as they passed him,
and by their joyous voices was his name
lifted to the stars in high acclaim,
as booming benches battled with their praises...
So well disposed were people's cheers and grins
as in his youth, the first of all his wins –
He tamed the tribes that Iberus includes
plus other forces Pompey had subdued:
whatsoever arms Sertorius hurled in flight,
and in the west, then, all was made aright –
So he sat, respected, dressed in white,
his honor matching that of Roman knights,
with the senate's cheer, his chariot's purple bright...
Say, at the end of Pompey's happy days,
does his troubled mind, from 'morrow, run away
to happy yesterday? Or in round'bout ways,
reverse events his slumber now portrays,
(having forecast some ruinous coup)
with sights, as wand'ring sleep is wont to do?
Or maybe, fortune cast this view of Rome,
thus barring sight of later life at home...
Oh ramparts' guards, don't interrupt his sleep!
And upon his ears, no trumpets' war cries leap!

Caesar Famulus Fortunae: Fortune's Dominance in Lucan's Pharsalia

Charlie Schufreider '17

While it may be a sacrilege (*nefas*, 1.127) for Lucan to explain whether it was Caesar or Pompey who entered into the civil war more justly, Lucan has no problem explaining who is responsible for the wars' events. Fortune is the one who "finds the reasons for battle" (*Fortuna... causas invenit armis*, 1.264). There seems to be no event in Lucan's *Pharsalia* over which Fortune does not exert her power. Her influence in the poem is so strong that it actually eclipses Caesar's own power, forcing him to become Fortune's unwitting slave. Whereas Caesar sees the two of them as companions working together (*sola placet Fortuna comes [Caesar]*, 5.510), Lucan reveals that Fortune, ever the fickle force, will ultimately be behind Caesar's demise (*[Caesaris] sanguine... quo Fortuna parat uictos perfundere patres*, 10.339).

Lucan's Caesar should not be faulted too much for thinking that he and Fortune were working together as indeed this seems to be the case for much of the epic. However, it is the great storm scene (5.504-702) that highlights Fortune's dominance over Caesar. That Caesar gains Fortune only after the storm (*Caesar... Fortunamque suam tacta tellure recepit*, 5.677) makes clear why Caesar fails to complete the mission: Fortune was not bestowing her blessing on the expedition. Lucan takes this concept one step further by suggesting that Fortune actually causes the storm, apparently offended by Caesar's insults (*de [Caesare] male tunc Fortuna meretur*, 5.582). After exposing Caesar's powerlessness by means of the storm, Lucan allows Fortune one last display of her dominance. For at the end of the scene, Caesar pleads earnestly to the gods and Fortune to let him die, finding some advantage in dying as an unknown at sea and having the world fear that he might one day return (5.671). Even here, as Caesar begs for death, Fortune denies him his wish, thereby forcing him to accept the fate she has already prepared for him. Thus Lucan uses the scene to demonstrate that Caesar, although an undeniable monster, can only be as powerful as Fortune allows him to be.

The Fortune this essay focuses on, and which Lucan invokes in his epic, refers to that specific Roman deity (*Fortuna*) rather than some abstract concept (*fortuna*). Since Latin

manuscripts would never have capitalized the *f* and the difference between *Fortuna* and *fortuna* is so slight, treating both *fortuna* and *Fortuna* as equivalent hardly impacts the reading of the poem. Thus *Fortuna/fortuna*, as it appears in Lucan, always refers to that goddess (*Fortuna*) who doles out, not “chance” in the literal sense, but “controlled chance, administered, however whimsically and erratically.” Fortune does not reside on Mount Olympus, nor does she exist in an anthropomorphized form. Rather she exists as a “quasi-animistic” spirit as Ahl explains. Despite her non-Olympian status, the Romans still considered her so important and powerful that temples were constructed in order to worship her. Even though scholars argue that Lucan’s epic lack any intervention on the part of the Olympian gods, by recognizing Fortune Lucan clearly does not abandon divine intervention altogether. Rather, as Ahl points out, Fortune has been substituted into the role typically assumed by that of the Olympians in epic poetry. For Lucan, “Fortune is a force external to man, which confers its blessings upon individual countries and men.”

So, just as Apollo can directly attack Patroclus in Book 16 of the *Iliad*, Lucan’s *Fortuna* can do much more than merely bestow blessings; she actually directs the events of the war, both on a macro and micro scale. On the macro scale, it was Fortune who decided which spear-throwers would become murderers as missiles flew into the air at the eponymous Battle of Pharsalus (*incerta facit quos uult Fortuna nocentes*, 7.489). Yet, on the micro scale, Lucan shows that Fortune pervades interpersonal interactions. When Caesar presents clemency to Domitius after the siege of Corfinium, it is Fortune whom Lucan blames for the shame that Domitius will now carry, not Caesar. “How much better would Fortune have been able to spare Roman shame if a slaughter had been performed?” (2.517-518) Lucan asks. When Caesar presents this same scene of clemency in his account of the war, he discusses the interaction as a demonstration of his power, devoid of all mentions of Fortune, (*De Bello Civile*, 1.22-23). Lucan, then, uses Fortune to directly undermine Caesar’s own power, allowing her to be the one who really decides Domitius’s fate.

Beyond responding to Caesar’s own depiction of himself, Lucan uses Fortune as a foil to his own depiction of Caesar, especially during scenes where Lucan’s Caesar seems to be at the height of his autonomy. One of the more striking episodes in Lucan’s epic sees Caesar defiling a sacred grove (3.399-452). This grove has never before violated (*lucus...*

numquam uiolatus, 3.399), and its very presence causes brave men to tremble (*sed fortes tremuere manus*, 3.429). Still, Caesar dared to be the first to chop down an oak tree. (*primus... ausus... aeriam ferro proscindere quercum*, 3.433-434). Some might argue that since Caesar is the one chopping down the tree, not Fortune, Fortune does not really have dominance over Caesar here. Yet, immediately after the episode, Lucan pulls back and explains that, “Fortune saves many who bring harm” (*seruat multos Fortuna nocentis*, 3.448). So while Caesar appears to be acting of his own free will, he is only allowed to do so because Fortune allows him to do so.

In a similar vein, Lucan seems to present Caesar at the height of his agency during the Battle of Pharsalus. He is first compared to god of war Mars (*veluti... Bellonas... agitans Mavors*, 7.568-569), and later Lucan writes that Caesar *himself* (*ipse*, 7.574) was managing the battlefield. Even in a passage where Caesar’s agency seem undeniable, Lucan begins by calling attention to the land where the battle was taking place, for there “Caesar’s Fortune clung” (*Fortunaque Caesaris haesit*, 7.547). To that same end, at the end of the passage, when it had become clear that Caesar’s tyranny was imminent, Lucan rebukes Fortune saying, “If you were giving a master to those born after these battles, you should have given them wars too.” (7.645-646). Both references to Fortune, surrounding a scene where Caesar appears dominant, create the effect that Fortune really was the one responsible for that day’s disaster, no matter how much it appears that it was Caesar’s doing. In the end, Fortune created the tyrant (*dominum*, 7.645) for Rome; Caesar just happened to be her choice of puppet.

While anecdotal evidence is helpful, a broader look at the use of *Fortuna* would give better insight into its role in the poem. Although a detailed analysis of Fortune’s role in all of Lucan is far beyond the scope of this paper, some generalized statistical evidence can be provided to support the conclusion that Fortune has agency all throughout Lucan’s poem. The word *Fortuna* appears 145 times in *Pharsalia*, and of those 145 uses, Lucan uses it 116 times (80%) as the nominative subject of the sentence. As subjects are grammatically the agents of main verb, it seems clear from the distribution of case usages that Lucan views Fortune as being an active, living force within his poem. That he also uses the vocative form 20 times further supports the theory that Fortune is a living entity. The opposite case would be supported if Fortune appeared as an ablative, such as an ablative of means. This would imply that some other agent,

such as Caesar, could accomplish something *by means of* Fortune. Tellingly, *Fortuna* never appears as an ablative in the entire poem.

While it is clear that Lucan presents Fortune as the powerful agent within his poem, it is not yet clear, from the examples provided, that Fortune's and Caesar's motives oppose one another. It is the storm in Book 5 which exposes Fortune as Caesar's master. The scene takes place after Caesar has already landed in Greece, but while he still needs further reinforcements before beginning his offensive. As his reinforcements are slow in coming, Caesar decides to sail back to Italy, in the hopes of "conquering waves that ought to be feared by fleets" (*fluctusque uerendos / classibus... sperat superare*, 5.502-503). As the word *Fortuna* appears eight times in this passage, it seems clear that the scene is paramount to understanding Fortune in Lucan.

Lucan's depiction of Caesar throughout this passage, as a small, lowly servant, only solidifies his true relationship with Fortune. For starters, Caesar is not even the captain of his own ship, but rather he is completely dependent on the kindness and knowledge of Amyclas, a local seafarer who has no affiliation with the Roman army. His reliance on Amyclas to accomplish his goal parodies his reliance on Fortune to accomplish nearly anything, for at least Fortune is a powerful goddess whereas Amyclas is a poor man (*pauper Amyclas*, 5.539) who sleeps on a bed of seaweed (*quem dabat alga toro*, 5.521). Furthermore, Caesar does not brave the sea decked out in his best armor, but Lucan writes that he is "covered by a plebeian garment" (*plebeio tectus amictu*, 5.538). He does not even set sail in a "ship" (*navis*), but Lucan only refers to the vessel as "the keel" (*carina*, 5.514; 5.534; 5.641) or "the stern" (*puppis*). The latter form appears eight times in the passage. Although both terms are technically examples of metonymy, using a part of the ship to represent the whole, Lucan seems to be highlighting the ship's small size by refusing to see it as anything other than just part of a real ship. This is only intensified by the adjectives used to describe it. It is both small (*parua... puppe*, 5.655) and weak (*inualida... puppe*, 5.673). Finally, Lucan's description of Caesar's initial departure from camp makes explicit the image of Caesar as servant. Lucan explains that Caesar was setting out and "preparing things that hardly ought to be dared by slaves" (*nix famulis audenda parat*, 5.509). Lucan refuses to celebrate Caesar's recklessness, and characterizes him as someone even below servants (*famulis*, 5.509).

Even the storm's description, particularly how it conquers Jupiter, highlights symbolically Caesar's powerlessness.

Lucan writes that as the storm approaches its climax, lightning ceases to be effective (*nec fulgura currunt / clara*, 5.630-631). Any time Lucan makes mention of Jupiter's lightning bolts, there seems to be an implicit reference to Caesar. For early on in the epic, Lucan draws a comparison between Caesar's all-powerful force and the force of Jupiter's lightning bolt. "Caesar takes delight in making a path through ruin, just like a lightning bolt" (1.150-151). So when Lucan writes of lightning's impotence, he is only confirming Caesar's impotence during this storm. That the fearsome light dies (*lux etiam metuenda perit*, 5.630) only spells doom for Caesar.

Despite the weak and servile imagery which surrounds Caesar, some scholars read this passage as an encomium for Caesar's power and proof of Fortune's will to save him. M. P. O. Morford argues not only that "his safe return to land is another example of Fortune's protection of her favourite" but he also states bluntly that, "through it all, Caesar is master." Morford seems to base his argument on the fact that Caesar believes Fortune is on his side. He says explicitly, "he disdains the power of the sea, for he knows that he is Fortune's favourite." Matthews, too, reads the passage as proof of the strong bond between Caesar and Fortune. There is no disagreement that Caesar certainly thinks he is Fortune's favorite. When trying to console Amyclas's fears about the coming storm, he tells him that not only do the gods never forsake him (*quem numina / numquam destituunt*, 5.581-582). Further he tells Amyclas that by means of the storm (*pelagi caelique tumultu*, 5.593) "Fortune is seeking out something which she can provide to me" (*quaerit... quod praestet Fortuna mihi*, 5.593-594). The first statement certainly reveals Caesar's utmost confidence in himself, and, when combined with the second, it reveals his belief that, even in the face of the sea's terrors, Fortune is always looking to serve him. As Matthews notes, Caesar believes the storm is just a way for Fortune to increase his status (*quaerit... quod praestet Fortuna mihi*, 5.593-594). Thus Caesar's beliefs are not to be argued against, but rather one can argue whether Caesar is correct in thinking Fortune is truly on his side.

Reading the passage as proof as Fortune's favor becomes difficult to support on two accounts. For one thing, if Fortune were truly on Caesar's side it is unlikely that he would fail to reach Italy as he wishes to do. Lucan writes that Caesar "knew from experience that rash actions turn out if a god is well-disposed" (*temeraria prono / expertus cessisse deo*, 5.501-502). Since clearly Caesar's rash actions do not come to fruition here, it is

only logical to believe that Fortune was not “well-disposed” (*prono*, 5.501). Additionally, Morford’s argument stands opposed to Lucan’s statement that when Caesar touches down on land, he “regains so many kingdoms, cities, and his own Fortune” (*tot regna, tot urbes / Fortunamque suam tacta tellure*, 5.676-677). If Fortune had always been at his side, why would he gain it back after his ordeal? Matthews tries to argue in favor of Morford’s point by noting that *recipio* in this context can mean something like “still had possession of his own Fortune,” implying that Fortune was there throughout the ordeal. This reading is difficult since *regna, urbes recipit* must translate as “he regains kingdoms and cities,” not “he continued to have possession of kingdoms and cities.” For when he was on the brink of death and powerless, he had command over no one. Matthews attempts to solve this by suggesting that *recipio* simply has two different senses within this sentence, but it is simpler to accept that the one word means the same thing throughout the sentence. Thus the most appropriate reading of this passage is that during the storm, Fortune was not on Caesar’s side.

Ahl argues that the episode presents Caesar with something that is “at worst, a stand-off,” and his assessment approaches the truth. Chiefly, Ahl recognizes that the episode is not an outright victory for Caesar. Still, even his reading fails to make explicit the idea that Fortune forsakes Caesar and even turns against him. That is, Ahl does not recognize that Fortune herself causes the storm. In fact, he and Matthews stand staunchly opposed to the idea. Ahl states that there is no indication that the “tempest arises from the intervention of any deity.” Since Ahl considers Fortune to be a “deity” later on in his book, he makes clear that Fortune is in no way responsible for the storm. Similarly, Matthews argues that Lucan uses the simile from lines 620-626, comparing this storm to a flood caused by Zeus and Neptune, in order to highlight the gods’ “ineffectualness in the actual narrative of his storm.” To be sure, Lucan gives no indication the storm arises from divine inspiration; it is the winds themselves that he chooses to apostrophize rather than the Olympians (*primus ab oceano caput exeris Atlanteo, / Core*, 5.598-599).

Even without Lucan’s explicit reference, Fortune’s true role in the storm can be understood by investigating Caesar’s dialogue during the passage. For one thing, although Caesar mistakenly thinks Fortune is causing the storm because she wants to provide for him in some way, he nevertheless admits

that Fortune is seeking something “by means of the tumult of the sky and sea” (*pelagi caelique tumultu*, 5.593).

Furthermore, even the placement of his two speeches during the storm helps reveal Fortune’s agency. His first speech (5.578-593) sees Caesar insult Fortune twice, and immediately after the speech the storm escalates. The second speech (5.654-671), delivered at the height of the storm, sees Caesar ultimately surrendering to Fortune and accepting death, yet Fortune saves him against his will. The mere structure of the passage, then, seems to indicate that Fortune, offended by Caesar’s words, creates the storm, and only pulls back when Caesar yields to her higher power. That a goddess should decide to inflict punishment because she is offended certainly fits well within the ethos of epic poetry where gods and goddesses frequently harm some heroes to aid whatever hero pleases them the most. Furthermore, there is no question as to whether Fortune could have the strength to conjure up such a storm. Earlier in the epic, a flood so massive that it covers hills (*iam tumuli collesque latent*, 4.98) plagues Caesar’s forces in Spain, yet Fortune does nothing to stop it. Only after a certain point, “satisfied with his small fear” (*paruo Fortuna... contenta pauore*, 4.121), does she decide to rejoin Caesar to the fullest (*plena redit*, 4.122) thereby causing the gods to cease the storm. The episode makes clear Fortune’s considerable power over nature, since her mere presence brought an end to the flood. It also serves as yet another example of Caesar’s utter dependence on Fortune, for without her, he surely would have died in the flood.

It is both Caesar’s inability to realize his dependence on Fortune and his subsequent opinion that she is *his* servant which prompt Fortune to unleash her power in Book 5. While this irony can be clearly seen when one contrasts Caesar’s arrogant speech against his lowly garb and puny boat, Caesar’s most jarring statement of arrogance comes before he even gets into a boat. Caesar warns Amyclas, “Don’t delay in providing your fates to a god wishing to fill your scanty *Penates* with sudden riches” (5.536-537). As Matthews rightly identifies, the masculine god (*deo*, 5.536) to whom Caesar refers cannot be Fortune, but Caesar himself. Fortune, whom at the beginning of the passage was his companion (*comes*, 5.510) has now been subjugated in Caesar’s mind. Still, up until Caesar’s first speech at sea, storm merely remains a threat (*minax*, 5.566) and the boat is only troubled by the winds (*vexata... puppe*, 5.575). It seems as if Fortune was willing to forgive this slight, but this will not hold for long. As the storm looks like it is about to break open,

Caesar tells Amyclas to not worry about the storm for Caesar is someone “from whom Fortune is owed next to nothing when she arrives after my prayers” (5.582-583). He closes his speech by declaring that by this storm “Fortune is seeking something which she can provide for me” (*quaerit... quod praestet Fortuna mihi*, 5.593-594). Matthews notes that *praesto* is often used to denote subservience, revealing Caesar’s perceived superiority over Fortune. For that matter, Caesar’s belief that Fortune is owed little (*male... meretur*, 5.582) when she arrives after he summons her (*post vota*, 5.583) reveals that Caesar views Fortune as merely his slave to be beckoned at any moment’s notice. That the storm drastically picks up following line 594 and actually cuts Caesar off from speaking more (*non plura locuto*, 5.595) seems to indicate that something in his speech caused the storm to escalate. If one agrees with Caesar that Fortune causes the storm, it becomes clear that it is Caesar’s arrogance that drives Fortune to let the storm rage.

Caesar’s final speech at sea also places Fortune at the forefront. Here though, Caesar seems to recognize the goddess as his adversary. Believing that he is about to die (*credit iam digna pericula Caesar / fati esse suis*, 5.653-654), Caesar relates his one regret before death: that he dies a mere private citizen (*privatum... mori*, 5.668). Matthews argues that the *privatus* here also hints at Caesar’s desire to become a king which will now never come to fruition. He finds some solace, though, in the fact that Fortune alone will know this regret (*nec sciet hoc quisquam nisi tu... Fortuna, mori*, 5.665-668). W. R. Johnson asserts that this brings him solace, but not because he will die with his “companion” (*comes* 5.510) knowing of his fate. Instead, Johnson argues that Caesar takes comfort in knowing that only his enemy knows his fate. Thus his one regret “is softened for him because only Fortune who has cheated him of his crown knows of his lust for it.” Whereas Lucan’s assertion that Caesar regains his Fortune after the storm (*Fortunam... recepit*, 5.677) shows that Fortune, at the least, was not supporting Caesar, Caesar’s apostrophe to Fortune here demonstrates a recognition that Fortune was not merely distant, but the active agent of this deadly storm.

It seems logical that if Fortune creates the storm, it was Fortune too who ultimately ends it. Still, this is by no means an “example of Fortune’s protection of her favourite.” In fact, Fortune’s action in saving Caesar actually subverts his power and his professed will to die. In his final speech, Caesar hubristically says that he has done enough great things (*sat magna peregi*, 5.660)

and is therefore happy to die knowing that he will always be feared (*metuar semper*, 5.671). As Morford rightly notes, Caesar believes that “his spirit is greater than his body.” By dying at sea, Caesar’s power will transcend even death. As Ahl points out, Caesar seems to think himself so powerful that any adversity can be seen as a way to improve his own status and he suggests that Caesar’s ultimate power lies in making every contest a victory. Yet Caesar’s grand hopes for transcendence do not come to fruition here. This is not a victory for him. Yes, he lives on, but only because Fortune “saves” him, thereby undermining his hopes and designs of haunting the world forever.

Perhaps it is possible that Fortune, offended once again by Caesar’s arrogance, decides to deny his death wish. Morford, however, suggests a more likely motive even though he does not agree that Fortune caused the storm. He argues that Caesar’s death “was being saved for the death he deserved.” This not only echoes Lucan’s later address to Brutus that Caesar does not yet deserve to die (*nondum... meruit fatis tam nobile letum*, 7.593-595), but it also echoes parts of Book 10 where Fortune is actually presented as preparing Caesar’s death. In one instance, Lucan writes about how Pothinus, Pompey’s murderer, also wishes to take Caesar’s life. There Fortune is seen as preparing to avenge fathers of Rome by pouring out Caesar’s blood ([*Caesaris*] *sanguine... quo Fortuna parat uictos perfundere patres*, 10.339). By the same token, when Pothinus is later executed, Lucan writes that Fortune does not consider his death to be enough vengeance for Pompey (*nec satis hoc Fortuna putat*, 10.525). For Fortune, “Magnus will be unavenged until the swords of the city’s fathers go into Caesar’s guts” (10.528-529). It seems clear in the context of the whole epic that Fortune saves Caesar at the storm in order that he may die a death more worthy of his crimes.

No matter why Fortune saves him, the storm scene ultimately highlights how Caesar is powerless in respect to deciding his own fate. Whatever plans Caesar makes, either to traverse the Adriatic or haunt the Earth after death, Fortune ensures that these plans are never accomplished. It is in this light that one must read Fortune’s reunion with Caesar after the storm. It seems clear that she is not acting out of altruism or as a servant to Caesar. Rather she controls him, stringing him along until the day that she can bring about his proper demise. Lucan’s strong contrast between Caesar’s appearance as a lowly passenger during the storm and his hubristic attitude work to reflect the true relationship between himself and Fortune. For

no matter where Caesar goes, he lives in the delusion that he has the power, while Fortune actually lies beneath even Caesar's most audacious actions. When Caesar vowed that he would follow Fortune throughout the war (*te, Fortuna, sequor*, 1.126), he firmly believed he was gaining an ally, a companion (*comes*, 5.510). In reality, Lucan reveals that all Caesar accomplished in courting Fortune was becoming her slave, for better and for worse.

Bibliography

- Ahl, F. (1976). *Lucan: An Introduction*. Ithaca, New York.
- Johnson, W. R. (1987). *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and His Heroes*. Ithaca, New York.
- Matthews, M. (2008). *Caesar and the Storm: A Commentary on De Bello Civile, Book 5 lines 476-721*. Bern, Switzerland.
- Morford, M. P. O. (1967). *The Poet Lucan: Studies In Rhetorical Epic*. Oxford, England.

Lucan's Tale of Two Leaders: Rhetoric and Syntax Preceding the Battle of Pharsalus

Margaret Jones '16

The Great Roman Civil war which was fought between 49 and 45 BC catalyzed the end of the Roman Republic and the eventual establishment of the Roman Empire. The war's contenders were Julius Caesar with his supporters and Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus (or Pompey) with his more conservative followers. After winning, Caesar became Rome's perpetual dictator. After Caesar's assassination in 44 BC, civil wars ensued with Caesar's son leading them, and ultimately ending the Republic. Marcus Annaeus Lucannus (Lucan) was a Roman poet who wrote over a century after Caesar and Pompey's civil war. He and his contemporaries lived in the Roman Empire, under the rule of a long line of emperors, so his telling of the civil war is retrospective.

In Book 7 of Lucan's epic poem *De Bello Civili*, the impending Battle of Pharsalus, the main event of his poem, is about to take place. Before the battle occurs, each leader, Pompey (in lines 85-150) and Caesar (in lines 235-329), gives a speech to his troops, as he realizes that one of the most pivotal moments in Roman history is about to commence. As Classicists debate how Lucan, writing over a century after the battle, intended to portray Pompey and Caesar, this event is an ideal one to draw legitimately based claims about his intentions from. In analyzing how each leader acts immediately before the premier event of the poem, we discover a dichotomy: Pompeian versus Caesarian. The two men are in the exact same situation, and how each one handles such a significant situation allows the reader to evaluate how Lucan characterizes them. These parallel scenes reveal Pompey as an apprehensive leader who cares for the Republic but has given up hope and Caesar as a selfish but charming and convincing leader who will doubtless come out on top.

Scholars like Berthe Marti acknowledge that this setting of the Battle of Pharsalus is critical on an interpretive level, with much to be extracted about the individual leaders and their legacies:

[Lucan] chose for the setting of his poem a crisis in Roman history close enough to his own time for the men involved to be vividly remembered, as giants perhaps, but also as real, living heroes; and one in which events had been of such proportions that some of these heroes had already become idealised types who had acquired universal significance. If the plot was limited in time and space, the real theme was eternal.

This work was important to its contemporary audience in how it conveyed the different types of “heroes”, from their inspiring attributes to their fatal flaws. These were the very men who catalyzed the tyranny under which Lucan’s contemporaries lived. The *Pharsalia* allows readers to get more from the work than just the historical facts of the war, or as Eva Matthews Sanford puts it, it conveys “a theme more than academic”. In reading Lucan the audience extracts meaning from motives, and answers to the question of *why* the war occurred instead of *how* it occurred. Sanford agrees that “the causes of the war...were futile and trivial after all compared with the war itself.” Lucan thought that the people deserved the causes and circumstances that created their political world.

From the outset of his speech, Pompey feels anxious about and unwilling to enter the battle. Before Pompey even begins his speech, Cicero gives a speech of his own just to convince him that action is necessary. Even after Cicero eloquently and passionately informs Pompey that the popular demand from his troops is for immediate action, Pompey reluctantly responds with a “groan” (*ingemuit*, 7.85), a sure sign of unwillingness. Now that Pompey knows the battle is inevitable, he has the opportunity to rally his men who clearly are ready to participate in this war. This moment is a golden opportunity to feed off their readiness and make the most of a fighting chance for the Republic.

Pompey opens his speech by separating his personal opinion from his troops, disuniting them in a moment when unity is most crucial. What, according to effective rhetoric standards, should be a powerful and purposeful *exordium* or introduction to a speech, is a feeble and uncertain conditional statement. On an interpretive level, this holds Pompey as a representative of Rome’s current state of affairs. Pompey says: “If this pleases you all, and if time needs Pompey the soldier, not Pompey the leader, I will not delay the fates further” (*si...morabor*, 7.87-88). The *exordium* is critical in speeches, since it establishes

the orator's credibility and conveys his passion to his audience, but here Lucan portrays Pompey as making no effort to excite his men. While Pompey is a leader who would rather represent what the majority wants regardless of personal opinion, and is thus democratic, there is weakness in the half-heartedness he conveys as he concedes to his own people, acting like he has been defeated by his own men. Pompey, "who [for Lucan] embodied Rome's last hopes of liberty," has grown weak and hopeless, with liberty growing weak and hopeless along with him. His unwillingness is nearly palpable. The opening of his speech in no way rouses his men for battle.

Caesar, on the contrary, is eloquent, cunning, and a master of rhetoric. He inspires his men with his *exordium*, a real example of a man who knows how to employ *pathos*, or an appeal to a particular emotion. "Conqueror of the world, soldier, the fortune in all my affairs is present, an abundance of battle desired so often" (*domitor...pugnae*, 7.250-251), cries out Caesar to his men. He instills confidence in them by presupposing them as the war's victors, and inspires them to fight by emphasizing that this is a war which they have wanted, establishing a sense of unity Pompey fails to arouse. He addresses his troops with the vocative singular (*domitor* and *miles*), stressing the importance of each individual as opposed to referring to them as a mass. This opening is sure to capture his troop's attention, excite them for the battle in which they are about to partake, and make them feel that Caesar is fully united with them. Why does Lucan, who resents what Caesar has created for him and his contemporaries, show his audience this brilliantly articulate Caesar, an admirable orator? Sanford suggests: "Caesar is hated as the conspicuous aggressor in the war, as the champion of a new and non-republican era, but that is no occasion for belittling his energy and prowess." In fact, this representation of Caesar almost makes it understandable how he was able to rise to power and start the monarchy; he has all the qualities of a successful and charismatic leader.

Caesar continues to speak in perfect Roman rhetoric, as he moves on to a *narratio*, which summarizes the events leading up to the point at hand. Pompey's *narratio*, while technically still a summary, does not contain the same modes of persuasion (*ethos*, *pathos* or *logos*) as Caesar's. Caesar reminisces on the crossing of the Rubicon, and links past events to what is about to occur. He seamlessly blends his *narratio* with his *partitio*, which contains the actions or events that the speaker believes should follow, whether on his own part or on the audience's part

. Lucan portrays him as brilliantly convincing, going so far to claim he is: “desiring to return to private life” (*ipse...vitae*, 7.266), a real example of humility and an employment of *ethos*, which appeals to his “good” character. Lucan shows his contemporary audience why so many people sided with Caesar and partook in the civil war that would result in tyranny. Caesar employed incredible sophistry. He convinces his men there is no wrong in their partaking in this war and that bloodshed will be minimal (*nec...petitis*, 7.269-270). He compares the other side of the civil war to barbarians, lessening the guilt they would feel about killing their countrymen, and reminding them why they need to defeat Pompey. Caesar, in his *narratio* and *partitio*, continues to strengthen the bond he has with his troops through his inspiring eloquence.

Pompey, on the other hand, remains resistant. Any influence he has on his men is negative through his discouragement and disapproval. Instead of employing persuasive tactics, he admits that there is nothing for them to look forward to, that their fighting will avail to nothing: “I declare that Magnus has accepted the day on which all things will perish” (*testor...diem*, 7.91-92). Pompey knows that no matter what, the day of the war will be the end of everything as they know it. The decision has been made, seen by the perfect tense of *accipio*. This word choice furthers Pompey’s overly emphasized point that entering the war is not by his volition; he “accepted” the day, but he does not condone it. He continues by engaging in the opposite of good *pathos*, when he instills guilt on his own men, emotionally conflicting them and furthering their disunity: “This work of war might have ceased without slaughter from you” (*potuit...belli*, 7.92-93), he shouts. The use of *tibi* instead of *nobis* denotes Pompey’s separation from his troops. He asserts that they, unlike him, are to blame for the unfolding events. He adds insult to injury by calling them “blind men” (*o caeci*, 7.95), as if they are blundering idiots for their desire to fight. Pompey’s idea of a *partitio* is further questioning why they are entering this battle in lines 95 and beyond. At no point does Pompey show the slightest inkling of hope for his men, nor for Rome as a nation.

While both Pompey and Caesar make several references and allusions to fate (*fata*) and fortune (*fortuna*) as perpetrators, they view it in opposite lights. Pompey views these forces negatively and Caesar treats them positively. Bartsch explains the significance of fortune and fate: “Lucan’s much-bemoaned tendency to be repetitive in his choice of

vocabulary...is significant, bringing into play contradictory notions by using a noun in divergent senses in such proximity that the clash cannot but be noticed.” Pompey says to his men, “Let fortune envelop the nations in one downfall” (*involut...ruina*, 7.89), admitting that what happens is not up to him, but some higher power which is not on his side. By employing the jussive subjunctive, Lucan portrays Pompey as crestfallen and submitting to what will come. Later in his speech, he references fortune again, saying: “Does it please fortune to give up these prosperous things of the Republic, to submit the critical moment of the world to the sword?” (*placet...discrimen*, 7.108-109). Lucan depicts Pompey as frustrated with fortune for his audience. Pompey is horrified that fortune finds delight in the seemingly inevitable mass bloodshed. He desperately cries out to fortune one more time, “You had given me the Roman state to rule over, Fortune, take it now being greater and watch it during Mars’ blindness” (*res...tuere*, 7.110-111). Here, *fortuna* is in the vocative; this use of apostrophe brings fortune to life, and shows the audience how Pompey truly felt that fortune was intentionally working against him. Pompey he hopelessly attempts to command things of fortune which are clearly in vain. In this desperate moment, we feel Pompey’s pain and see (what Lucan thinks are) his true motives and thoughts about war.

While Pompey’s relationship with fortune seems like parasitism, with fortune feeding off of his failure, Caesar’s is more in line with commensalism, with Caesar thriving because of fortune. Things always seem to work in Caesar’s favor, as is evident from the very beginning of this passage, even before he addresses his men. Lucan describes Caesar as “having left his position on that day by chance” (*illo...relicta*, 7.235) when he sees Pompey and his men marching towards him. In his being at the right place at the right time “by chance” (*forte*), fortune allows for Caesar to prepare for battle and gives him adequate time to rally his troops. Lucan portrays Caesar as well aware that fortune is on his side, and acknowledging that this opportune moment is “the moment he sought for himself in a thousand prayers” (*potis...tempus*, 7.238-239). He continues this notion of fortune favoring him when he says, as mentioned above: “the fortune in all my affairs is present” (*rerum...adest*, 7.250-251), revealing the utmost confidence he holds in his fortune. In an interesting parallelism to what Pompey says to his men, Caesar shouts to his own, “Summon fate now with your sword” (*iam...ferro*, 7.252). As mentioned above, Pompey thinks fortune is

submitting by turning to the sword; Caesar thinks it is upholding itself by doing so.

A decent speech can be remembered as remarkable if the final points are able to resonate with the crowd. Possibly the most important part of a speech, the orator's final chance to leave any impression on a group of people, is the end, the *peroratio*. Lucan's Caesar seems aware of this importance while Lucan's Pompey remains steadfast in his indignation. In fact, Pompey's *peroratio* hardly differs from the rest of his pessimistic disquisition; he is true to his opinion that there is nothing right about the civil war nor is there any good that will come from it. Pompey goes so far as to convey that he would rather die than partake in the war. The only thing that stops him from fully wishing for it is knowing his party would disintegrate without him (*prima...feriat*, 7.117-119). He knows that regardless of who wins, Rome will be ruined. This realization causes his apathy towards winning, "for victory will not be happier for Pompey" (*neque...laetior*, 7.119-120). He concludes his speech, unsurprisingly, on a negative note: "All the guilt will be on the victor" (*omne...erit*, 7.123). Pompey is resolute (and correct) that whoever wins will carry the weight of the end of the Republic. As scholar Shadi Bartsch notes that through civil strife they paradoxically "destroy the system that gives them life."

Caesar's *peroratio* is full of *pathos* and *ethos*. It is a true example of Roman oratory, though his words are emptier than Pompey's, who stays to his beliefs. Having already established credibility through his convincing words about fate and fortune, Caesar seizes the opportunity to rally his men and to convince them that regardless of the substantially smaller number of men in their army, they can and will win. He has his men picture each other being crucified, and himself decapitated (*Caesareas...Campi*, 7.304-306), invoking fear about what will happen if they lose. His energy level is high, and he fully prepares them for the worst. His final words are, "We will pitch our tents in that rampart, from where their troops come about to perish." (*vallo...venit*, 7.328-329). The tenses in this final line are critical: the future tense of *tendo* conveys a sense of command without being as harsh as the imperative. The first person plural also ties together the entire speech's sense of unity. Caesar is one of them (contrasted against Pompey's aforementioned use of *tibi*). The use of *venio* in the present shows the audience that Pompey's men are coming right now; it is now or never. Finally, the future tense of *pereo* reveals that Caesar is confident about his

victory and Pompey's future. Everything about the end of his speech connects the important points he has made throughout it.

Though Pompey does not dazzle with his words, he does correctly predict that the civil war will be the end of Rome as it is. Sanford summarizes a point made by Sidonius when she says: "...the war between Caesar and Pompey, as Lucan told it, was made to seem a greater loss to Rome than all her former losses." In later lines, immediately before the battle commences, Pompey addresses his troops one last time, this time with more passion. He throws his prior words aside and desperately cries out words of encouragement to his men, but it is too late. In a crucial moment, Pompey already told his true thoughts to his men. They carry this hopelessness with them, namely the guilt and uncertainty he heaped upon their shoulders, as they lose the battle.

What is the purpose of these characterizations of Pompey and Caesar? For Lucan, by combining history and poetry, and using different rhetorical and grammatical tactics for each leader, he succeeds in creating "a double theme, the obvious historical one of the vicissitudes of the struggling armies and their generals, [and] the deeper and far more important one of the tribulations of humanity." As someone speaking out against monarchy, Lucan portrays its cause, Caesar, as a much more likable character than Pompey, but for good reason: "the war between Caesar and Pompey was waged indeed between the body and soul of the Roman state, and to lovers of the Roman past it seemed that the body could recover more readily than the soul." Caesar, the body, is able to thrive with fate on his side while Pompey, the soul and the Republic, cognizant that the Republic is on its way out, is destroyed. Thus, a strong, well-spoken Caesar and a weak, defeated Pompey are perfect characterizations of the overarching conflict in the scene of the Battle of Pharsalus.

Bibliography

- Bartsch, S. (1997). *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Bartsch, S. (1997). "Paradox, Doubling and Despair," in Bartsch (1997), 48-72.
- Lucan - O.A. W. Dilke - Printed for the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, by W.S. Maney & Son – 1971.
- Marti, B.M. (1945). "The Meaning of the Pharsalia," *The American Journal of Philology* 66: 352-376.
- Morford, M.P.O. (1967). *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic*. New York, New York.
- Sanford, E.M. (1933). "Lucan and Civil War," *Classical Philology* 28:121-127.

The Best-Laid Plans of Arms and Man
A Reimagining of Vergil's Aeneid, Book I.198-203

Michael Kelley '18

My best, unbeaten friends:
O conqu'rors of contrived trials,
May 'twixt our looming paths we see
In pain divine geometry!

And though we salt our wounds,
We cannot wound the salty sea,
The tow'ring rocks, Cyclopean heights,
And vicious Scylla's briny might!

Call back your wand'ring minds,
Dismiss your elegiac fears!
Perhaps the present tribulations
Will one day be our motivation!

Madness Unburied

The Use of *Condere* in Lucan's *Pharsalia*

Christopher Ryan '16

Scholars have long struggled to make sense of the conflicting messages in Lucan's *Pharsalia*. An analysis of the verb *condere*, however, can provide a cohesive storyline for the seemingly schizophrenic narrative. The story that *condere* reveals begins with Virgil's *Aeneid* and is carried on through Lucan. The twenty forms of the verb *condere* in the *Pharsalia*, I argue, can roughly be divided into three categories: before, during, and after *Pharsalia VII*. These divisions follow the movement of madness as it pushes nature into an unnatural hiding, desecrates her on the Thessalian field, and destroys the ritual of burial leading to a world of chaos. Without the full honors of burial, burning shades ceaselessly envelop Lucan's Rome, creating a self-perpetuating cycle of madness.

Our understanding of *condere*, and thus Lucan's message, must begin with its use in Virgil's *Aeneid*. The *Aeneid* is a story of foundation, cataloguing Aeneas' efforts to found a second Troy. It is no surprise then, that the word *condere*, the traditional Latin word for founding, should anchor the *Aeneid* at its beginning and end. When Virgil announces that he will sing of the man "until he founds the city" (*dum conderet urbem*, 1.5 *Aen*), the word *conderet* is used in its traditional sense. Its final use, however, dramatically subverts the standard use. Three lines before the end of Book XII, Aeneas "establishes his sword in his opponent's breast" (*ferrum aduerso sub pectore condit*, 12.950 *Aen*). To the Roman reader of 14 B.C.E., this use of *condere* with *ferrum* would have been startling. It is an inversion of *condere*'s meaning; what is normally employed to indicate beginning or establishment is now utilized to denote a death. Even more stunningly, it is through this death that Rome is born. According to the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, besides meaning "to establish" or "to found", the verb can also signify "to hide" and "to bury". "Establishing," then, seems an inadequate translation in the previous quotation; rather, the sense here is to "hide" the sword in the breast, or better yet, "bury" it. Even taken poetically, this sense surprises the Latin reader. In fact, the use of *condere* with *ferrum* was attested for the first time in all of extant Latin literature only three Books before, in *Aeneid* 9.347-8.

Recent scholarship has drawn attention to the surprisingly subversive nature of *condere*'s final use and its

meaning in the larger context of the *Aeneid*. Sharon James, among others, argues that the last use of the verb, indeed every use in the last three books, signifies a definitive shift in sense from its traditional use describing “slow, time-consuming acts” to its final use indicating “swift, violent acts of war.” Lee Fratantuono has taken this one step further, arguing that Aeneas has released madness in this founding act. Virgil, then, concludes his epic not with a foundation of peace, but with fury, in a manner appropriate to Romulus and Remus. It is this fury that Lucan attempted to harness some eighty or so years later in his epic *Pharsalia*.

There is no doubt that Lucan had Virgil’s work in mind when he was inspired to compose the *Pharsalia*. Fratantuono goes as far as to say that Lucan’s poem is a direct “commentary on the *Aeneid*.” If we are to accept Fratantuono’s statement, our analysis of *condere* in Lucan is surely justified. Indeed, Lucan not only employs the same verb, but pairs it with *ferrum*, a rare feat in Latin Literature, one which begins with Virgil. There is only one example of such a usage in Lucan, and at first, it seems surprisingly understated. It occurs in Book I, in a speech by Laelius, a minor character and officer of Caesar (1.377). Nevertheless, the unusual pairing tells us one thing for sure: Lucan is responding to Virgil. The question now becomes, according to Richard F. Thomas, whether Lucan is subverting or affirming the *Aeneid*.

Before Pharsalia VII

Lucan, like Virgil, wastes no time implementing the verb *condere*. It first appears on line 15 of Book I. Based on Lucan’s close connection with the *Aeneid*, one would hypothesize that the first use would either be “establishing”, as it was initially in Virgil, or that Lucan would pick up with the fury that Virgil ends with. Lucan, however, chooses to set an entirely new tone. He laments that, had it not been for waste of Roman blood and fury, Rome would have extended “to where the Sun comes and where the night hides the stars” (*unde venit Titan et nox ubi sidera condit*, 1.15). This is a poetic way of referring to cardinal directions: when the sun rises in the East, the stars vanish into the West. Rome could have, as Lucan predicts it, expanded from the farthest point East to the farthest point West. Wistfulness lingers in these lines, but so does fury. It is because of fury that the expansion failed to be accomplished, and thus Lucan does continue Virgil’s theme. But Lucan does not simply pick up where Virgil left off, instead he introduces a causal formula:

there is a hiding because of fury. It is crucial, moreover, to notice that in line 15, Lucan differentiates between the realm of Nature (*Titan, nox*) and the realm of Rome. By personifying night with the use of the transitive verb *condere*, Lucan hints that nature actively “hides” from Roman fury. When one considers that the Sun and the night are opposite each other yet constantly in motion, one begins to grasp the power of the image, namely that nature ceaselessly hides, or flees, from Rome. This image, indeed, becomes a literary trope for Lucan throughout the first five books of the *Pharsalia*.

Significantly, of the twenty instances of the verb *condere* in the entire poem, eight instances include the connotation of hiding. These instances, moreover, all occur in the first five books of the *Pharsalia*. At least five of these eight instances are directly related to Nature. Titan appears in connection with *condere* once more in Book I, when he “hid his burning chariots in black darkness” (*condidit ardentis atra caligine currus*, 1.541) as a result of rumors of coming war. The inclusion of the chariots invokes not only the Roman belief that the sun was driven in a circular motion by Titan, but also the sentiment that the sun is actively and ceaselessly retreating from the Roman world. This particular line is situated in the middle of a passage describing how nature retreats from an approaching Caesar, who has just crossed the Rubicon. It is Caesarian fury that drives nature into hiding.

Nature is seen as hiding with the verb *condere* again in *Pharsalia II*. In Pompey’s speech to his troops, he boasts of many accomplishments, including his victory over pirates, a feat which he accomplished “before Cynthia hid her circle twice filled out” (*ante bis exactum quam Cynthia conderet orbem*, 2.577). Cynthia is a name for the moon, and the poetic language is another way of saying that the moon waned twice. Before the reader judges that it is simply convention to use the verb *condere* to indicate a waning of the moon, let us first contextualize the line. Two lines before the word *conderet* appears, in response to the opinion that Caesar’s fury causes his enemies to flee, Pompey directly addresses an absent Caesar: “Oh foolish one! They do not flee you, they all follow me” (*heu demens! non te fugiunt, me cuncta secuntur*, 2.575). Thus, again the idea of fury causing flight appears just before the use of *condere*, and thereby colors it. This suggests more intention on the part of Lucan than mere conventionality.

In Book V, the verb *condere* is used twice. Although both usages carry the connotation of “hiding”, neither directly

applies to nature. Instead, they apply to the divine. Lucan first employs the verb when he gives a history, so to speak, of the Delphic Oracle. After Apollo defeated the monster Python at Mount Parnassus, Lucan says that he “hid himself in the sacred caves” (*sacris se condidit antris*, 5.84). The force of the verb *condere* is unmistakable here: it signifies “hiding”. Lucan seems to ask, where are the gods? This would explain why only two lines later, Lucan asks a seemingly obvious question (given the fact that he told us Apollo hid in the caves): “What higher power lurks here?” (*quis latet hic superum?*, 5.86). Thus, the verb *condere* is once more employed to denote “hiding”.

The second usage of *condere* in Book V occurs shortly thereafter, when Lucan compares the inspiration entering into the oracle with the heat of “Typhoeus having been hidden under eternal mass of Ischia” (*conditus Inarimes aeterna mole Typhoeus*, 5.101). The giant Typhoeus was defeated by Zeus, and then imprisoned underground for punishment. There is, therefore, the sense of “bury”, but one cannot escape the fact that he was hidden underground for negative purposes by Zeus. Thus, this usage remains in keeping with the overall negative undertones with the verb *condere*. There is one final employment of *condere* that has the sense of “hiding” before *Pharsalia VII*. During the sea battle of Massilia in Book III, Lucan displays the valor of a Massilian brother who, although maimed, “does not hide in the bottom of the ship” (*non conditus ima / puppe*, 3.618-9) but instead fights. Here too, the sense of *condere* is not only “hide” but also negative. It is important to note, however, that this is the only example of the negation of hiding in the *Pharsalia*. This supports the idea that it is nature who is hiding, and the men who are fighting.

Now that we have exhausted the situations in which *condere* denotes “hiding”, it is important to note one outlier. One of the significant uses of *condere* in the first five Books, which does not indicate nature hiding, occurs just after Titan hides in Book 1. Arruns, the seer of the town Luca, performs an extispicy on a bull (1.605- 37). But before he begins, Arruns gathers all the embers of an ominous lightning bolt and “buries them in the earth with a sorrowful murmur, and he gives sanctity to the place” (*terrae maesto cum murmure condit / datque locis numen*, 1.607-8). The translation “buries” for *condere* does not indicate formal internment so much as a temporary hiding place for religious reasons; the burying of the embers sanctifies the spot, or so Arruns thinks. The word *condit* here does carry with it Virgil’s sense of fury. Given the lightning bolt’s association with Caesar,

the burying of the embers beneath the sacrifice do not sanctify the land as Arruns believes but desecrates the land; not surprisingly, the extispicy fails to please the gods and goes awry. Although this use of *condere* does not conform to its pattern of denoting natural in hiding, this use with “bury” hints at the connotation to come following *Pharsalia VII*.

Pharsalia VII

Although there is only one usage of *condere* in Book VII, the usage undoubtedly deserves its own section. Book VII is clearly the climactic turning point of the *Pharsalia*, and likewise, it marks the watershed moment for the verb *condere*. Before the battle lines of Caesar and Pompey converge, Lucan declares: “It was clear to all that the day had come, which would establish the fate of human affairs into eternity, and that in that day’s war it would be decided what Rome was (*advenisse diem, qui fatum rebus in aevum / conderet humanis, et quari, Roma quid esset, / illo Marte palam est*, 7.131-3). For Lucan, this declaration is not a looming question; it is a thesis statement. Although he uses the subjunctive mood to indicate uncertainty, Lucan and every other Roman would have undoubtedly known what took place at Pharsalia in 48 B.C.E. Additionally, Lucan had already foreshadowed the outcome of the battle, and he previously acknowledged that Caesar was victorious. It would even seem, as Lucan tells it, that the soldiers present at Pharsalia know what the outcome will be (7.137-8). Why go to these lengths to repeat the obvious? The word choice sends a clear message. As Fratantuono notes, the implementation of the word *conderet* alludes to Aeneas’ plunge of fury into Turnus at the conclusion of the *Aeneid*. While Aeneas’ fury is certainly encompassed in this usage of *condere*, this statement is perhaps Lucan’s challenge of Virgil’s usage: that Rome, as Lucan and Virgil knew it, was not founded when mythical Aeneas plunged his sword into Turnus, but on the historic and hateful day of Pharsalia.

If the verb *condere* often denoted nature hiding in the Books preceding *Pharsalia VII*, it is certainly not used that way in Book VII. Nature, in fact, seems to come out of hiding before the battle in an effort to delay war, but ultimately fails to halt the conflict (7.151-213). The verb *condere* also does not mean “to bury” anywhere in Book VII, despite being the Book that accounts for most of the killing. Significantly, there is no proper burial in Book VII for the dead at Pharsalia. Instead, the bodies litter the field to such an extent that the earth is unable to be seen and the decaying bodies rot on the Thessalian plain (7.786-

824). Caesar leaves the dead unburied. For Lucan and the everyday Roman, this would have been unspeakable (*nefas*). Indeed, Pompey's wife will later lament: "Without any honor of funeral, the grave burns" (*sine funeris ullo/ ardet honore rogas*, 9.62-63). Proper burial was important for Romans. Yet, Lucan's paradoxical voice intervenes in the text, and he claims that "nature receives all in her calm bosom" (*placido natura receptat / cuncta sinu*, 7.810-11). Fratantuono interprets this as a way for Lucan to deny "Caesar's hopes" of adding more torment to the already dead. On the contrary, at least for now, nature is hidden. Lucan, moreover, calls the Thessalian plain "unhappy" (*infelix*, 7.847) because of the crime perpetrated against it.

It is this crime of unburial which in turn perpetuates the fury into eternity. How does Pharsalia establish (*condere*) the state of human affairs? The borders between the underworld and the living world become mixed, and restless shades begin to haunt the living (7.772-6). The shades are restless precisely because they were denied a full burial. One now begins to understand the self-perpetuating nature of fury. Caesar scares nature into hiding, as indicated by the verb *condere*. When it came time for the dead to be buried, out of fury Caesar forbid the honor. In doing so, Caesar desecrated nature with rotten bodies. Nature and the spirits of the unburied dead act supernatural out of revenge: nature allowed for spirits to remain above ground, to haunt the living and maintain the madness. The battle of Pharsalia established a new order of nature for man, in which the division between hell and earth is confused. It is, in effect, madness unburied.

After Pharsalia VII

After Book VII of the *Pharsalia*, the verb *condere* is used to mean neither "to hide" nor "to establish" On the contrary, it is implemented solely in connection with the meaning "to bury." To make matters more interesting, the verb is only used in reference to either the burial of Pompey or the lack of his burial. It is this new order which now draws our attention to the furious shade of Pompey.

Although it is not an unprecedented or even unusual usage, it is significant to note that the sense of *condere* following *Pharsalia VII* is always "to bury". Previously, "to bury" was used as only an exception. In Book II, it is used to refer to the husband whom Marcia, Cato's previous wife, had buried (2.333). The verb also appears with the same sense in connection to the prophesied tomb of Appius in Book V (5.231). Other than these

two instances, the verb *condere* does not mean “to bury” in any other use in the first seven books, despite the verb being used twelve other times during that period. In contrast, the uses of the verb *condere* after *Pharsalia VII* are all in connection with burial. Thus, there is a striking unity of use in the last three books of the poem.

After Book VII, the first time the reader encounters the verb *condere* occurs when the quaestor Cordus is hastily burning Pompey’s headless body. The poet’s voice adds sarcastic, yet prophetic, words: “the impious father-in-law will praise the buried bones of Magnus” (*condita laudabit Magni socer impius ossa*, 8.783). It is a capital point that Lucan applies “buried” (*condita*) to bones (*ossa*) and not to Pompey. The bones may be buried, but Pompey certainly is not. Caesar does indeed promise a full burial for Pompey, but as Lucan notes, this promise is feigned at best (9.1038-93). Caesar is likely not aware that Pompey’s headless body was even half-buried by Cordus. One has to wonder what Lucan intends: whether Caesar will falsely praise the lackluster and blasphemous burial, or whether he will praise the impiety of the burial? The adjective “impious” (*impius*) applied to Caesar is thus appropriate. To call Caesar the father-in-law (*socer*) exacerbates Caesar’s crimes; this is civil war down to the familial roots. Family should at least bury family. Cordus, however, was unable to give Pompey a full burial, in part because the body was headless and in part because the bones were only half burned (*semusta... / ossa*, 8.786-7). Thus the burial was incomplete, and the consequences will be disastrous for Caesar.

Only a few lines later, The poet’s voice interjects employing the verb *condere* to mean “bury” once more:

Is it pleasing to you, Fortune, to say that this grave is Pompey’s, to which place his father-in-law preferred that man be buried rather than be deprived from the earth? Reckless right hand, why do you impose a tomb on Magnus and imprison his wandering spirit? (*Placet hic, Fortuna, sepulchrum / dicere Pompei, quo condi maluit illum / quam terra caruisse socer? Temeraria dextra / Cur obicis Magno tumulum manesque vagentes / Includis?* (8.793-797)

Again, Lucan seems to be paradoxical. It is as if *condere* invokes a near-sighted fury here; Lucan cannot seem to make up his mind on whether the grave is fitting for Pompey. He thinks it humble enough for Pompey, while at the same time criticizing Caesar for

the impiety of the situation. Nevertheless, the above quotation demonstrates the connection between the burial (*condi*) and the shade (*manesque*). This relationship is critical. At the beginning of Book IX, the shade of Pompey leaps up from its half-burned corpse and flies directly into the breast of Brutus, the man who will eventually assassinate Caesar (9.1-18). As a result of Pompey's incomplete burial, his shade never entered into the underworld. It remains above ground to enact retribution and to perpetuate the madness. In this way, fury never dies.

There are three more uses of *condere* in the *Pharsalia*, and all of them serve to preserve the fury in Book IX. The first usage appears when Cornelia says that Pompey has left a message for her sons in her "buried thought" (*condita cura*, 9.86). As the message is one of violence, Pompey's fury lives on through memory. It is used a second time when one of Pompey's sons declares that he will fight "to bury the unburied shade" (*inhumatos condere manes*, 9.151) of his father. Again, the sense of *condere* is "to bury". This usage, moreover, perpetuates violence because his son is going to war "to bury" (*condere*). Finally, the previous usage demonstrates that Pompey is indeed not buried according to Roman standards. The final usage of *condere* in the *Pharsalia* is iconic. It occurs during the false promise of Caesar to bury Pompey. The reader, however, never knows with certainty if Pompey is buried. The burial of Pompey, like that of the defeated Turnus, is never told in the poem. Instead, Caesar commands: "You all bury" (*Vos condite*, 9.1089) his head. Could there be a more appropriate last use of *condere*? Who is the "you" in Caesar's question? For Lucan, it means the Roman people in the present; they still haven't buried the shades haunting, nor the madness swirling, or the hereditary Caesarian fury.

Conclusions

Madness is unfinished at the conclusion of Lucan's epic. For all the dystopia in *Pharsalia*, its readers can be certain that all that infinite madness provides the unity. Just as the verb *condere* anchors the *Aeneid* with its interlocking ring, it anchors the *Pharsalia* in permanent unrest. At the beginning of Lucan's epic, the verb *condere* was implemented in order to demonstrate the retreat of nature from Caesarian fury: this highlighted the role of men in the war and their consequential culpability. Yet, on the day of *Pharsalia* in 48 B.C.E., nature could escape Caesar's wrath no longer. Unburied bodies, decaying in open air, desecrated the Thessalian fields. This impious crime turned the

world upside down and abolished the natural laws of the universe, as the unburied remained, haunting the lands as shades and perpetuating violence. This new state of affairs was indicated by the verb *condere*. Following the battle, *condere* was used solely in reference to the unburied and vengeful shade of Pompey. From nature's retreat to Pharsalia and beyond, an analysis of the verb *condere* reveals surprising structure in the *Pharsalia*. In the end, time seems to stop in the epic, and one gets the sense that it never will begin again until Pharsalia is redeemed. Perhaps amid the madness, one can hear Lucan's last furious command to the Roman people: *Vos condite!*

Bibliography

- Deferrari, R.J., Sister Maria Walburg Fanning, Sister Anne Stanislaus Sullivan. (1940). *A Concordance of Lucan*. Washington.
- Fratantuono, L. (2007). *Madness Unchained: A Reading of Virgil's Aeneid*. Lanham, MD.
- Fratantuono, L. (2012). *Madness Triumphant: A Reading of Lucan's Pharsalia*. Lanham, MD.
- Fox, M. trans., Ethan Adams (2012). *Civil War*. London.
- Glare, P. G. W. (1969). *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford.
- James, S. L. (1995). "Establishing Rome with the Sword: Condere in the Aeneid," *The American Journal of Philology* Vol. 116, No. 4: 623-36.
- Lombardo, S., trans. (2005). *Aeneid*. Indianapolis/Cambridge
- Mandelbaum, A., trans. (1971). *The Aeneid of Virgil*. New York.
- Tarrant, R., (2012). *Aeneid Book XII*. Cambridge.
- Thomas, R. F. (2001). *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge.

Immortalitas Poetica

Steven Merola '16

Catullus, *Carmen* 1: *Cui dono*

Whom shall I give this charming little book,
New made and just touched up with arid rock?
To thee, Cornelius, for oft thou looked
On as a poem what was but idle talk;
Then thou had dared, in Italy alone,
An age's span in three short sheets to shew
(Three sheets, by Jove, much shewing and bemoaned!).
So for thyself have these my poems few,
Whate'er they are. Oh patron maid! May it be
The keep a while and perish not with me!

Propertius, *Elegia* 1.19: *Non ego nunc vereor*

I do not fear, Cynthia, the sullen shades
Nor grudge the fates my final dust to pay.
But let my death not be without thy love:
That grieves me more than does my final day.
For not so light does Cupid touch mine eyes
That with thy love forgott'n my ash could lie.

There in wasted lands the hero's shade
Could not forget his pleasing wife's embrace
And driv'n to grasp these joys with hands not hands
He came a ghost into his former place.
Whate'er I'll be, my likeness shall be yours:
Great Love even can land on death's dark shores.

There let the graceful maids in choir come out,
Whom Trojan plunder gave to Argive men;
No grace of theirs delights me more than yours,
Cynthia, for (just Tellus permit it) when
Thy fated end is stayed by length of years
My bones will ever darken with thy tears.

May you know this, alive, when I am ash;
Then in no place will death possess its sting.
Yet how I fear, Cynthia, my urn contemned,

Some hateful love thee from my ash shall bring.
And thee unwilling force thy grief to spurn:
When driv'n by constant threats a sure girl turns.

So while we can let us each other love!
For never can a love be long enough.
Horace, *Carmen* 3.30: *Exegi monumentum*

I've raised a monument more fixed than bronze,
Than a tomb in royal fashioning higher.
Which raging storm and North Wind strong
Cannot destroy, nor the chain unnumbered
Of fleeting years, nor e'en the flight of time.
I'll not completely die and much of me
Shall shun the Deathly Queen. Always I'll climb
Made young by future praise, whilom the priest
With Vestal Virgin mute Jove's mount ascends.
I'll be said, where th'Aufid river roars
And dry Daunus o'er a country folk attends,
From nothing raised the first man to have borne
Aeolic song into Italian verse.
Take up the pride by merits won and sought
And round my head, Melpomene, disburse
With joy the laurel flow'rs from Delphi brought.

A Passage to Oblivion: Memory in *Odes* Book 2

Claude Hanley '18

Book I of the *Odes* ends with an explicitly private, sympotic poem -- I.38. Book III begins with the explicitly public, political Roman Odes. In the intervening twenty poems, Horace's voice and persona artistically shift in a variety of ways. Prominent among these artistic developments is the poet's artistic re-remembering of his own political past. A sense of personal pain and grief, as well as political pragmatism, motivate a kind of poetical forgetting. Driven by these factors, Horace banishes his love for Republicanism from his poetry, and replaces it with hostility. The poet enacts his own oblivion through the themes of lyric -- wine, love, and poetry. This forgetting serves as artistic preparation for the Roman odes. Motivated by both personal pain and political caution, Horace poetically forgets his Republican past through the sympotic themes of Book II of the *Odes*, which ultimately allows him to poetically engage the political world in which he finds himself.

I. Motivations

Emotional pain most strongly motivates Horace to forget his politics. For one thing, the personal losses he suffered during the Civil War receive significant attention in Ode 2.1. Following the martial storm of stanza 5, a single image emerges: the "undefeated spirit of Cato."¹ Cato alone stands forth from the terror of war, unconquered in his Stoic *virtus*. The image both displays the poet's admiration for the old Republican, and implies how his death would impact the poet. Second, language of death and burial permeates Odes 2.1. In line 28, Horace describes his Republican comrades as "Inferias Iugurthae," funeral offerings to Jugurtha.² In the poem's final stanza, Horace warns his Muse to sing of lighter subjects, in order to escape the "Caeae neniae."³

In stanzas 8 and 9, a series of rhetorical questions gradually immanetize Horace's losses. The fields of battle are "fatter with Latin blood."⁴ A few lines later, the image becomes even more personal: blood stains the "Daunian sea," a reference to Horace's fatherland, Apulia.⁵ Civil wars does not rob faceless soldiers of their lives; these are the poet's own countrymen. Finally, at the end of the series, the poet laments "What shore now lacks our blood?"⁶ Gone are the Latins and the Apulians. A plaintive "we" replaces them. The blood that stains the shores

of Greece and Italy belongs to the poet, too. Personal language of death and loss indicates the degree of Horace's personal pain -- a pain he longs to forget, as the end of 2.1 indicates.

Beyond the pain which the memory of the wars causes, Horace's metaphors for civil war invoke sheer terror. In the 5th stanza of 2.1, the "flash of arms" and "thunder of horns" simulate the the flash of lightning and the roar of thunder.⁷ The visual and auditory implications of the description of battle stir up a thunderstorm within the poem. This storm of words picks up the image of the flood, which Horace uses elsewhere (Odes 1.2), and which he will use of the Republican faction in Odes 2.7. The images of water for civil war find expression in 2.1 as well: the slaughter of Roman citizens stains the seas in the 9th stanza.⁸ The literal flood of blood, one of the images which expresses Horace's pain, evokes the fear he feels almost as strongly. Finally, in lines 31 and 32, the poet describes the "noise of Hesperia's downfall."⁹ The wars effect the West's thunderous collapse. The phrase evokes the sound of "a collapse, as of a building or other structure."¹⁰ This auditory force supplements the power of the already terrifying notion of a Roman defeat. It is the same effect that most of the images of terror bring about. It is evident that Horace felt both fear and pain enough in his memories of the wars that he might long never to remember them.

II. Representations of Forgetting

In Odes 2.1, Horace develops a dichotomy of remembering, but longing to forget. Throughout the ode, he recalls various aspects of his Republican past. His allusion to Cato, and buried allusions to other Republican leaders jog memories of a lamented war.¹¹ The imagery of implicit storm and explicit flood evoke the pain and fear of all the bloodshed.¹² Horace seems poised to continue in this vein, recalling and commenting explicitly on the events of the past wars.¹³ However, after building the pain and pathos so brilliantly throughout the poem, Horace turns aside at the final stanza, in order to "seek limits on a lighter string."¹⁴ Horace seeks to escape such painful memories. Notably, the memories which seem to bring the most pain are all tainted, in one way or another, by Horace's old political sentiments; all that Horace wants to forget are tied intrinsically to the Republican ideology. Horace longs to forget not only the past, but the allegiances it represents. Indeed, Horace's longing to forget finds no better representation than his plea to Pollio to "let [his] Muse be absent only a little from the theatre."¹⁵ Horace not only portrays why he

wants to forget in 2.1, but also takes the first steps in that forgetting.

Horace's exhortation to Pompeius in *Odes* 2.7 explicitly warrants Horace's poetic forgetting of his past. The exhortation, while addressed to his friend, might as well apply to Horace for a few separate reasons. It was Pompeius "with whom...[Horace] broke the delaying day with Malobathrian wine."¹⁶ As Horace reminds his friend, they both nearly died together when Brutus led them at Phillippi.¹⁷ Horace notes that "with you I experienced Phillippi and swift flight."¹⁸ They both fought, faced death, and fled from Phillippi. Given that the officers suffered the toils of war together, it is evident that they shared similar political opinions. They only differed in that Horace managed to escape the horrors of war, while Pompeius was "sucked back" into the grips of civil strife. Now, after Pompeius has been granted amnesty, he finds himself in a similar situation to Horace after he was rescued -- that is, the loser in an ideological conflict, miraculously rescued from death, and seemingly without a conception of how to face his new world. While not the same, the two are extraordinarily similar -- similar enough for the advice Horace now gives Pompeius to be formed from Horace's own experience. The parallels between the two link Horace's poetic persona to the advice he gives Pompeius.

Horace's exhortation to Pompeius lays out the program for his own forgetting of the past. It is at this point, the exact midpoint of the three books of odes, that Horace fulfills the dreams of expressed in 2.1. He commands Pompeius to lie down beneath the Laurel tree.¹⁹ This setting of peace provides a respite from the memories of war, much as the "lighter string" did in line 40 of Ode 2.1. This flight from reality represented in the poem is the first stage in forgetting. Horace's use of "oblivioso...Massico," forgetful Massican wine, is the most crucial piece of evidence. Commager argues that "oblivioso suggests...that the time has come for Pompeius to forget...his militant Republicanism, as Horace himself had done" (Commager 171). In a setting of peace, through wine, Horace's poetic companion will forget his old politics -- the same old politics which haunt Horace the man. Horace the man can never forget what he experienced; but Horace the poet, in the location symbolic of the inner world of poetry, through a wine which he mentions repeatedly in that poetry, can forget it. Horace urges his friend to lay out a feast owed to Jove.²⁰ It seems likely that Jove here represents Augustus, especially since Horace has a habit of representing Augustus in the form of

various gods. This being the case, the instruction to prepare a sacrificial banquet for his greatest enemy implies a forgetting of that enmity.

Horace's treatment of various Republican figures provides strong evidence for his poetic forgetting. In Ode 2.1, Horace had shown vast respect for the figures of the Republican side -- even mourned them. Cato alone emerged from the storm of civil war, distinguished by his "atrocem animum."²¹ Indeed, Fraenkel asserts that Horace never lost his admiration for the old senator.²² His description of the "descendants of the conquered" in that same Ode is an allusion to Quintus Metellus Pius Scipio, whose forefathers were consistently victorious in Africa.²³ His comparing Scipio to an "inferia Iugurthae" implies the tragedy of his death. The "whirlpool" and "floods" of Odes 2.1 refer to Sextus Pompey, the last great Republican hero.²⁴ In short, 2.1 takes a tone of real respect and reverence for Republican figures, significant or not.

It would be difficult to find a figure more strongly associated with Republicanism than Marcus Brutus: his forefathers had cast out the Tarquins; his dagger had helped lay Caesar low; he had commanded the Republican forces at Phillippi along with Cassius. Thus one might expect Horace to treat him with the same respect and reverence he pays to Cato, Scipio, and Sextus Pompey. Horace owed more to Brutus than to any of them: Brutus had raised him up, commanded him in war, and fought with him in battle. However, Horace treats his mentors' memory with flagrant disrespect. Nisbet and Hubbard suggest that the "deducte" of line 2 implies incompetence on Brutus' part.²⁵ Similarly, they suggest that Horace's use of "bruto" suggests the adjective "brutus, -a, -um," meaning "stupid, slow-witted."²⁶ Moreover, Horace had treated the philosophy of those leaders, Stoicism, with some respect; after all, Stoicism had made Cato "atrocem," which might be translated as "unconquerable." However, in the version of Phillippi that Horace presents in 2.7, Brutus' Virtus, and the philosophy which aimed at it, lie shattered on the field of battle.²⁷ There is a sense of mocking irony here as well. Brutus, after all was characterized by unbending stoicism, just like Cato, the great Republican. Brutus died on the field at Phillippi, because he would not bend. Horace gave way, and still lives to cherish his beloved Massican wine. In sum, Horace has lost the reverence and respect for his old cause that characterized his style at the beginning of the book. With his credo of forgetfulness has come the artistic embodiment of that

forgetting, for Horace has banished the ideology and leaders of his old political party from his memory.

Horace's use of flood imagery, and the changing meanings thereof, complement his portrayal of Republican leaders. In Odes 2.1, the imagery of water and flood is mostly neutral, with a slight tendency towards republican support. For the most part, Horace uses images of flood and water to highlight the grief and pain which the civil wars cause, as in "Quod mare Daunia, non decoloravere caedes."²⁸ Here, the blood of Horace's countrymen stains the sea -- but there is no implication of which side they fought on. As mentioned above, Nisbet and Hubbard suggest that the language of the sea alludes to Sextus Pompey, the admiral who led the last remnants of the Republican faction until his death.²⁹ While this seems correct, it only slightly hints at Republicanism, and lacks the ardent Republican sentiment of Horace's description of Cato, or even the tragedy of Metellus Scipio's death. While the allusion might be intentional, it is by far the weakest of the three. Hence, while there is a very slight strain of Republicanism in the language of sea and flood in Odes 2.1, the imagery is mostly neutral.

By contrast, Horace's image of the sea 2.7 is less ambiguous. The poet writes "A wave swallowing you with raving swells carried you back into the war."³⁰ Much like the language of 2.1, this image of the ocean might pick up on the role of Sextus Pompey. However, unlike the neutral role of 2.1, here the sea is explicitly hostile. The sea robs Horace of his first and dearest friend.³¹ Moreover, it is characterized by "aestuosis fretis." "Aestuosis" connotes storminess, commotion, and anxiety.³² The sea, here, is a starkly negative force. However, given that Horace and Pompeius faced the same challenges, and Horace found himself delivered from the storms of war, its tide cannot be called irresistible. Horace accepted defeat, embraced the Augustan regime, and so found peace, the poem claims.³³ No physical circumstance drew him back into the war; why, then, should physical circumstance have drawn back his closest friend, who fought, fled, and surrendered by his side? It could not have. Only an internal force, a stronger sense of ideology could make Pompeius keep fighting. The tide, then, is no whirlpool of war, sucking Pompeius back into itself. Instead, it is the ideological current of a stronger Republicanism that leads Horace's friend back into the war. The characterization of the flood has not only become hostile; it has become hostile explicitly to Republicanism. Instead of an unfortunate aspect of the scene, the flood has a force of its own. The fact that Horace

sets his patron Mercury, who elsewhere represents Augustus, in opposition to this hostile flood emphasizes the identification of the raging wave with republican sentiment.

The imagery of the sea reflects Horace's forgetting of his Republicanism. It began as a relatively neutral image in 2.1, with a slight favoritism towards the republican side. In 2.7, Republicanism become a raging, stormy vortex that robs Horace of his friend. Only Augustus' intervention saves the poet from the same maelstrom. "Rursus" lends a sense of regression to the image. Republicanism is not only dangerous; Horace suggests that it is politically backwards, antiquated, and outpaced. The fact that Horace ever held republican sentiments is artfully forgotten; the idea that he ever admired the great Republican leaders is lost. The forgetful Massican wine consigns Horace's memories of his old politics to oblivion.

III. The Nature of Misremembering

Horace's forgetting of his past is an explicitly artistic, poetic construct. Clearly, it cannot be autobiographical; memory of the past informs Horace's poetry far too much for him to ever forget it. In Odes 2.1 and 2.7, the poet elucidates his reasons for longing to forget, and then forgets his past in the context of the poetry. He forgets his Republican ideals were ever his own, that he admired the principled Republicans he mocks in 2.7, and even that he had any enmity towards Augustus, whose imperial program brought about the final death of the Roman Republic. Each of these forgettings on a poetic level serves also as a renunciation.

The nature of these memory-based renunciations is essentially sympotic. It is through the conceits of Lyric poetry that Horace as the poetic voice is able to first escape, and then wholly forget, his republican past. This idea finds its expression in the final stanza of 2.1, when Horace "[seeks] limits on a lighter string."³⁴ At the very start of Book II, light, lyrical poetry provides an escape for the poet. Not until 2.7, though, do sympotic themes find their full, forgetful force. In urging Pompeius to forget, Horace asks him to lie down beneath the laurel tree, in a scene starkly similar to Odes 1.38.³⁵ Once in peace, Horace orders Pompeius to drink the forgetful wine, and pour out perfumes from their containers.³⁶ The perfumes, particularly when supplemented by Horace's mention of Venus later in the poem, draw an element of the erotic into the symposium. Ultimately, Horace implies that poetic forgetting is

effected through the traditional themes of lyric poetry -- wine, women, and song.

Importantly though, these are not mere recantations of the ideology Horace once professed. For one thing, Horace is motivated to forget by a combination of pain, grief, and fear. Recanting his views might well have appeased the fear Horace's poetic persona feels. However, it cannot eradicate the grief of losing his comrades, or the pain of watching his country tear itself apart, the pair of which most strongly motivate his poetic forgetting. Merely rejecting the ideology of a dead Cato does not break Cato's hold over the poetic voice. In 2.1, while still retaining traces of Republicanism, Horace has certainly begun to question the validity of the ideology. Yet, there remain traces of Republicanism in 2.1, like his admiration for Cato, expressed by the ambiguous "atrocem animum." Only by forgetting these in the context of the poetry can Horace remove the taint of Republicanism from his poetry. In order to lay out a feast for his savior, Pompeius must first drain the memory-wiping Massican wine, and forget his enmities. The poetic voice of Horace must do the same.

Motivated by both pain and fear, Horace uses the traditional themes of lyric poetry to effect an artistic forgetting of his Republican sentiments. The first Ode of Book 2 expresses the personal pain and grief that drive the poet. Onomatopoetic images of destruction showcase the fear which complements grief. Horace's first ode of Book 2 expresses Horace's longing to escape the pain of his memories; the seventh ode of the same book enacts that vision. Book I of the *Odes* at least tolerated Republican interpretations, and did not shy from criticisms of Augustus. Book 3, however, begins with six panegyrics to Rome and to the Augustan state. By 3.4 and 3.5, Augustus has become a god on earth, guarded by the Muses, and distinguished for clemency and kindness. There is no suggestion of subversion in Book 3 as there had been in Book 1. The forgetting of past politics effects this change. The politics of *Odes 1* have drowned in the wine of *Odes 2*. Subdued to the demands of the state, the politics of *Odes 3* are little more than lifeless nationalism.

Bibliography

“1: To Pollio Writing of the Civil Wars.” In *Horace: Epodes and Odes*, ed. Daniel H. Garrison, 70-71. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991.

“7: A Happy Return.” In *Horace: Epodes and Odes*, ed. Daniel H. Garrison, 77. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991.

Commager, Steele. *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1962.

Fraenkel, Eduard. *Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

Nisbet, R.G.M., and Margaret Hubbard. *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Porter, David H. *Horace's Poetic Journey: A Reading of Odes 1-3*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Notes

- ¹ Eduard Fraenkel, *Horace*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), 236.
- ² Horace, Odes, 2.1.28
- ³ Ibid. 2.1.38-40
- ⁴ Ibid. 2.1.29
- ⁵ R.G.M Nisbet and Margaret Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book 2*, (Oxford:Clarendon Press, 1978), 28.
- ⁶ Odes, 2.1.36
- ⁷ Ibid. 17-20
- ⁸ *mare...decoloravere caedes*, Horace, Odes 2.1.34-35
- ⁹ Ibid. 31-32
- ¹⁰ Oxford Latin Dictionary 1666
- ¹¹ Horace Odes 1.2.21-24
- ¹² Ibid. 17-20;
- ¹³ David H. Porter, *Horace's Poetic Journey: a Reading of Odes 1-3*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987), 110-111
- ¹⁴ Horace, Odes 2.1.40
- ¹⁵ Horace, Odes 2.1.9-10
- ¹⁶ Horace, Odes, 2.7.6-8
- ¹⁷ 2.7.1-2
- ¹⁸ Ibid. 9-10
- ¹⁹ Horace, Odes 2.7.17-18
- ²⁰ Ibid. 17
- ²¹ Fraenkel, *Horace*, 236.
- ²² Ibid. 236.
- ²³ Horace, *Odes*, 2.1.25-26.
- ²⁴ Nisbet and Hubbard, *Commentary on Horace's Odes*, 28.
- ²⁵ Ibid.110.
- ²⁶ Ibid. 110
- ²⁷ Horace, Odes, 2.7.11
- ²⁸ Horace, Odes, 2.1.34-35. Translated earlier
- ²⁹ Nisbet and Hubbard, *Commentary on Horace's Odes*, 28.
- ³⁰ Horace, Odes,2.7.15-16.
- ³¹ Horace, Odes, 2.7.5.
- ³² Oxford Latin Dictionary page 73
- ³³ Horace, Odes, 2.7.13-14
- ³⁴ Horace, Odes, 2.1.40
- ³⁵ Ibid. 2.7.18-19
- ³⁶ Ibid. 2.7.21-23



“Dido”
Melissa Gryan '18

On the Tragic Tension of Actor and Spectator in the *Trachiniae*

Michael Kelley '18

Immediately noticeable in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, a play marked by the psychological exploration, downfall, and death of Heracles and Deianeira, is the profound oppositeness of the two main characters. Deianeira is chaste, static, and apprehensive, while Heracles is promiscuous, itinerant, and confrontational. In addition to being counterparts in marriage, however, there is another major distinction between them in the play: the portrayal of Deianeira as a spectator and Heracles as an actor. Throughout the play, Deianeira draws associations with imagery of looking and watching from the chorus, yet often fails to meet qualifications of good spectatorship. Heracles, on the other hand, is treated as the center of attention, but possesses a self-consciousness unbefitting of an actor. In both characters there is an internal conflict between spectator and actor, prompting each, tragically, to act outside of their prescribed roles.

Through an ambiguous description of a woman watching a battle from a hill, the chorus tacitly compares Deianeira to a spectator watching a spectacle of the exploits of Heracles. On line 517, the chorus mentions some “εὐὼπις ἄβρῶ,” or “delicate, fair-eyed girl,” sitting on a hill that is “visible from afar,” or “far-shining” (τηλαυγεῖ). The female watching the scene is somewhat ambiguous, considering the mention of Aphrodite earlier in the chorus. While it is unlikely, since the fight in question is between Heracles and Achelous, that it refers to Iole, Heracles' alleged concubine from Oechalia, she would be fresh in the mind of the audience after the announcement of her affair with Heracles. This mentioning of an unnamed spectator, while it most likely refers to Deianeira, invites the reader to consider the similarities between Deianeira, Iole, Aphrodite, or spectators in general. The adjective “τηλαυγεῖ,” according to the commentary of Easterling, provides emphasis “on Deianeira's remoteness from the scene of the duel, rather than on her ability to watch it.”¹ Deianeira's distance from the spectacle in the poetic description of the fight from the chorus parallels Deianeira's fear and emotional detachment from the fight in her own account of it at the beginning of the play.

The fight between Heracles and Achelous, as told by Deianeira herself, is an instance in which Deianeira fails to be a

spectator, overcome by fear at the sight. She says “I would not be able to explain fully the manner of their fighting, but whoever was watching, unshaken by the spectacle, could tell it.”² There is no mention of a hill in this account of the story, as the site of the duel is not specified, but, considering Achelous’ status as a river god, was probably assumed to be at a river. Greek theaters, however, were often placed on hillsides, as the slopes would allow row upon row of seats to ascend above the stage. The effect of looking upon the stage from high up in the audience would most likely feel similar to looking down upon something from atop a hill.³ Taking place in a theater and being watched by spectators, Heracles’ duel with Achelous can be seen as a play within a play. With distance being an obvious handicap on one’s ability to watch a show, Deianeira’s refusal of a front-row seat for the duel is a self-handicap and rejection of her spectatorship. Taking James H. Butler’s interpretation of the purpose of the Greek dramatic chorus, that it “provides symbolic action that reinforces the relationship”⁴ between characters, etc. the Chorus elucidates through imagery of spectatorship Deianeira’s lack of mobility and inability to interfere with the actions of the actors. However, as the reader knows from Deianeira’s account, when given the opportunity, she shies away from up-close spectatorship.

Deianeira’s immobility and passivity further illustrate her role as a spectator, and cause her great frustration. Deianeira stays within the confines of the palace for the entire play, onstage until her death. Her motionlessness stands in contrast to the other characters, who go back and forth as messengers for her, and Heracles, who is offstage until after her death. While it would most likely be unexpected at the time for a matron to venture away from home and leave behind her domestic duties, Deianeira only begrudgingly accepts her domesticity, and expresses great apprehension over her ignorance of Heracles’ fate. “Nobody knows where he has gone, except that he departs from here delivering to me sharp fits of longing.”⁵ Her desire to know what she cannot know and intervene in Heracles’s affairs leads her to transgress her role as a spectator. When the procession of conquered women, which could be interpreted as a spectacle in itself, passes through, Deianeira’s perception of them calls to mind the duel scene. Filled with pity, she begs Zeus that she never look upon (εἰσιδοῦμι) a child of her own suffering like the captured women do,⁶ and then remarks, “so much I am afraid, looking upon these girls.”⁷ Again surfacing is this language of fear and an unwillingness to look upon harsh sights,

further illustrating the tension between her desire for knowledge and her reluctance to watch. She singles out Iole and wishes to know her background, but Iole is silent. Deianeira, the spectator, is unable to speak to or interrupt the actions of the one putting on the spectacle, no matter how much she would like to.

Deianeira's outlook on life expressed at the outset of the play is incompatible with the standards for good spectatorship, as understood through Samuel Taylor Coleridge's emphasis on "suspension of disbelief" when reading and interpreting literature. In his *Biographia Literaria*, Coleridge explains that, in order to have "poetic faith," we must "transfer from our inward nature a human interest and a semblance of truth sufficient to procure for these shadows of imagination that willing suspension of disbelief for the moment," when reading a work that involves "supernatural, or at least romantic," characters, themes, and incidents.⁸ While these supernatural characters and events are not literally present, real, or even sometimes possible, they are intended to appeal to the emotions of the audience, so that the spectators relate to the characters' experiences and feelings. At the beginning of the play however, Deianeira states, "I know my fate before I go to the House of Hades, living a harsh and oppressive life."⁹ In being so tenacious in this assertion, one would expect that she hardly be emotionally affected by the events of the play. In holding that she knows how her life is and will end, she would probably doubt anything could alter the nature or course of her life. This attitude is comparable to that of one who is unmoved by a play, having learned its outcome beforehand. If good spectatorship presumes that the audience suspends its disbelief, an emotionally disinterested spectator such as Deianeira fails to visualize the play as it was intended by its author.

Despite Deianeira's expectation that her life will end badly, her emotions hang on every piece of news she hears, while the concerns of the chorus likewise revolve around the well-being of Heracles. Taking again from James Butler's description of the tragic chorus, he describes its function as that of an "ideal spectator," which "focused the attention where it needed to be directed,"¹⁰ in this case, on the suffering of Heracles more than that of Deianeira. In the first choral passage, the chorus begs the all-seeing sun for the whereabouts of Heracles, but, in an almost reproachful tone, characterizes Deianeira as "expecting a bad fate."¹¹ The chorus is more explicit in its reproach with the following line, "Finding fault with these things, I will extend you due respect, but I will speak

on the contrary... pain and joy revolve around all.”¹² The chorus’s attitude toward Heracles, however, is sympathetic and reverent. “The many waves buffet him here, exalt him there.”¹³ Translating “αὔξει” as “exalt” at Easterling’s suggestion, it is as if nature, oppressing him with endless labors, is simultaneously praising him.¹⁴ Heracles is the center of attention in the thoughts of Deianeira, the chorus, Hyllus, the messengers, and even nature itself. In the same way that he is the actor in the spectacle Deianeira watches from the hill, he is an actor with the rest of the world watching his play.

Judging by his frequent address of himself in the third person, it is almost as if Heracles, too, is a spectator unto himself. His final words are, “This is the final end of this man, Heracles.”¹⁵ He also refers to himself as “τόνδ’ ἄνδρα” on line 1073. While these lines do demonstrate the egotism he has acquired from being the most famous demigod, a son of Zeus, and the subject of myriad myths, poems, and plays, they suggest further that he has internalized the attention he receives. He considers himself the center of attention like an actor is in a play. Eulogizing himself for much of his time on stage, he incorporates several dramatic techniques, most notably his apostrophe to his shoulders, chest, and arms from lines 1090-1100, in which he recounts their glorious feats. Given that these body parts are attached to his body, this speech is simultaneously an apostrophe and a synecdochic self-congratulation, mourning himself as if he were a spectator at his own funeral.

Heracles’ self-centric, overly self-conscious way of thinking in this passage, however, is hardly characteristic of an exemplary actor. In his essay, “Understanding Acting,” Richard Hornby outlines the qualities of a good actor, first of which is reacting rather than thinking.¹⁶ “Acting, like all artistic creation, is a largely unconscious process; the outer results are not caused by conscious, rational choices, but by inner stimuli of which the artist is only dimly aware.” At the beginning of his address to Hyllus, Heracles confides in him his fear of being seen weeping, displaying a self-consciousness unfit for Hornby’s standards of good acting: “I who am crying just like a young woman... no one could say that he had ever seen this man doing this before.”¹⁷ Overcome by his concern for others’ perception of him, Heracles calculates his actions rather than simply reacting to his environment. While treated by himself and the rest of the world as an actor, Heracles’s fear of spectators prevents him from acting properly.

Having expatiated Deianeira and Heracles' failure to act within the bounds of their prescribed roles, it must be explained what is tragic about the actor-spectator dynamic between the two. In sending the love charm and unwittingly killing her husband, Deianeira successfully intercedes in the life of Heracles, as if she were inserting herself, the spectator, into the play. In refusing her duties as a spectator several times and attempting to change the course of Heracles's play, Deianeira reveals a desire to be an actor and not a spectator, despite the chorus's diagnosis of her as a spectator. In an essay outlining several schools of thought on the essence of tragedy, especially regarding *hamartia*, Mark Morford summarizes John Crossett's definition of *hamartia* as "double mindedness."¹⁸ Taking from the LSJ definition of ἁμαρτία as a "failure," "fault," or "error of judgment," often with the association of causing a hero's downfall in a dramatic context, Crossett's "double-mindedness" would be Deianeira's conflicting mindsets of actor and spectator. Deianeira yields to the former, despite being expected to conform to the latter. Deianeira's *hamartia*, then, is the action born from her internal conflict of actor and spectator: sending the robe that causes both her and Heracles' death.

Heracles undergoes a similar conflict of double-mindedness in his simultaneous acting and self-spectatorship. Not wanting to be seen weeping so as to uphold his reputation for strength and virility, Heracles acts outside of his assigned role as actor, and the desire to be spectator conquers his inclination to act. In her essay contrasting Heracles and Deianeira, Kasey Hicks demonstrates the conflict between Heracles' interior and exterior: "The super-masculine inscription of Heracles' identity precludes the idea of an inner life or private self: such a level of interiority is antithetical to his essential, rugged *outwardness*."¹⁹ While Hicks employs her analysis of Heracles to illustrate the influence of gender roles on Heracles and Deianeira's relationship, I argue this point is applicable to the role of spectator and actor as well. Hick's description of Heracles' outwardness, constituted of his "victories in battle, sexual conquests, bouts of drunkenness and gluttony" coincide with Hornby's description of a good actor, one who simply acts and reacts rather than overthinking.

This description of Heracles, however, only accurately characterizes himself before Deianeira's love charm and his weeping at the end of the play. In admitting on line 1075 that he "has been discovered a wretched woman instead of this man,"²⁰ Heracles acknowledges that he is no longer playing the part of

the “rugged” man he has always played, and has therefore stopped acting. Heracles and Deianeira’s assumptions of opposite roles serve as complements to each other: when Deianeira crosses into acting territory, Heracles ceases to be an actor.

The duality of Heracles and Deianeira’s actor-spectator dynamic is further illustrated by the manner in which the characters would have been staged: it is likely that the two characters were played by one actor. In her essay, Hicks notes that “in accordance with the conventions of Athenian tragedy, the male actor who played Deianeira subsequently reappeared as Heracles in the same production,”²¹ made possible by the fact that the two are never on stage at the same time. The presence of an actor who plays both Heracles and Deianeira adds another layer to the double-mindedness of both characters: the double identity of the actor who plays them. It is as if they are two parts to one, tragic entity. When Deianeira has committed her hamartia and paid the price for it, Heracles immediately resumes her double-mindedness. Overstepping her bounds as a spectator and taking the role of an actor by intervening in the affairs of Heracles, Deianeira actually becomes an actor; she becomes Heracles.

The practice of the double actor sheds some light upon the nurse’s account of Deianeira’s suicide. Before Deianeira plunges the sword into her side, she first “loosens her robe at the point which the gold-wrought pin extended from her breasts, and uncovered her whole left side at her elbow.”²² Stripping herself at her side would probably allow herself to better evaluate a point at which to stab her sword, but her action also takes on a metatheatrical purpose. Her removal of her garment is symbolic of the actor’s removal of Deianeira’s costume, in order to put on the Heracles costume. This change of costume would have also happened backstage, from whence the nurse comes running after witnessing Deianeira’s suicide. The nurse’s actor would have literally seen Deianeira’s actor removing the Deianeira costume for good, marking her death and the subsequent removal of the character Deianeira from the play. Another noteworthy piece of the passage is the description of her weapon on line 930. The nurse calls it the “ἀμφιπλήγι φασγάνῳ,” meaning “double-edged sword.” The double-edged sword calls to mind the double-minded characters, played by the double-actor, and marks the double death of husband and wife. Deianeira’s suicide is not simply the checkpoint at which Deianeira leaves and Heracles takes over, it alerts the audience to

the intertwined relationship of Deianeira and Heracles and the physical process the actor undergoes in switching from the former to the latter.

The *Trachiniae* is undoubtedly a play of dualities and opposites, but easily unnoticed is the double relationship of spectator and actor between Heracles and Deianeira. In his essay on the dramatic unity of the *Trachiniae*, Gordon M. Kirkwood notes that past scholarship has explained such contrasts as “between the stationary existence of Deianeira and the roving life of Heracles,” “between the constancy of Deianeira and the unfaithfulness of Heracles,” and “of the essential maleness of Heracles as contrasted with the femininity of Deianeira.”²³ However, in order to fully understand their relationship, it is essential to understand how Sophocles uses the medium of theater to express it. Through the symbolic intercessions of the chorus, the audience understands Deianeira’s role in the play as being comparable to that of a spectator watching a spectacle, and that of Heracles as the man in the middle. When invited to evaluate their prowess in spectating and acting, however, Deianeira’s fear and dogged expectation of a bad outcome prove her a poor spectator. Heracles, on the other hand, is merely a “poor player, that struts and frets his hour upon the stage.”²⁴ The tragedy is that they are not both meant to be the actor; the beauty is that the actor is meant to be both of them.²⁵

Bibliography

- Butler, James H. *The Theatre and Drama of Greece and Rome*. N.p.: n.p., 1972. Print.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE." *Biographia Literaria*. N.p., n.d. Web. 17 Dec. 2015.
- Hicks, Kasey. "The Heracleian Absence: Gender Roles and Actors Roles in the "Trachiniae"" *Pacific Coast Philology* 27.1/2 (1992): 77-84. Print.
- Hornby, Richard. "Understanding Acting." *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* 17.3 (1983): 19-37. Print.
- Kirkwood, Gordon M. "The Dramatic Unity of Sophocles' Trachiniae." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 72 (1941): 203-11. JSTOR. Johns Hopkins University Press. Web.
- Morford, Mark. "Hamartia: The Concept of Error in the Western Tradition." *The Classical World* 79.5 (1986): 353-54. JSTOR. Johns Hopkins University Press. Web.
- Seale, David. *Vision and Stagecraft in Sophocles*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 1982. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. "Macbeth, Act V, Scene 5 :|: Open Source Shakespeare." *Macbeth, Act V, Scene 5 :|: Open Source Shakespeare*. N.p., n.d. Web. 17 Dec. 2015.
- Sophocles, and P. E. Easterling. *Trachiniae*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982. Print.
- "Structure of the Greek Theater." *Structure of the Greek Theater*. N.p., n.d. Web. 17 Dec. 2015.

Notes

¹ From p. 524 of the Cambridge Green and Gold

² καὶ τρόπον μὲν ἂν πόνων οὐκ ἂν διείπομι': οὐ γὰρ οἶδ': ἀλλ' ὅστις ἦν θακῶν ἀταρβῆς τῆς θέας, ὅδ' ἂν λέγοι (lines 21-23)

³ This is from a website at the following url:

https://www2.cnr.edu/home/bmcmanus/tragedy_theater.html
“Ancient Greek theaters were very large, open-air structures that took advantage of sloping hillsides for their terraced seating.”

⁴ *The Theater and Drama of Greece and Rome* p. 59

⁵ κείνος δ' ὅπου βέβηκεν οὐδεις οἶδε: πλὴν ἐμοὶ πικρὰς ὠδῖνας αὐτοῦ προσβαλὼν ἀποιχεται (lines 40-42)

⁶ μή ποτ' εἰσίδουμί σε πρὸς τοῦμόν οὔτω σπέρμα χωρήσαντά ποι (lines 303-304)

⁷ οὔτως ἐγὼ δέδοικα τάσδ' ὀρωμένη (line 306)

⁸ Chapter XIV of *Biographia Literaria*

⁹ ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν ἐμόν, καὶ πρὶν εἰς Ἄιδου μολεῖν, ἔξοιδ' ἔχουσα δυστυχή τε καὶ βαρύν (lines 4-5)

¹⁰ Also on p. 59 of *The Theatre and Drama of Greece and Rome*

¹¹ κακὰν δύστανον ἐλπίζουσας αἴσαν (line 111)

¹² ὧν ἐπιμεμφομένα σ' αἰδοῖα μὲν, ἀντία δ' οἶσω... ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πῆμα καὶ χαρὰ πᾶσι κυκλοῦσιν (lines 122-131)

¹³ πολλὰ... δὲ τὸν Καδμογενῆ στρέφει, τὸ δ' αὔξει (lines 112-117)

¹⁴ On p. 89 of the Cambridge Green and Gold

¹⁵ αὕτη τελευτὴ τοῦδε τάνδρὸς ὑστάτη (line 1256)

¹⁶ Hornby's essay, on p. 19 of *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* edition of Autumn 1983, focuses more on modern stage acting, but, this piece of advice, I think, would be applicable to most, if not all, acting traditions.

¹⁷ ὅστις ὥστε παρθένος... καὶ τόδ' οὐδ' ἂν εἷς ποτε τόνδ' ἄνδρα φαίη πρόσθ' ἰδεῖν δεδρακότα (lines 1071-1073)

¹⁸ The name of the essay is *Hamartia: The Concept of Error in the Western Tradition*, and it's on p. 353 of *The Classical World*, volume 75 No. 5. I would cite the original Crossett rather than Morford's summary of his argument, but I could not get access to Crossett's writing, which Morford does not directly cite. However, there is a book of essays in honor of Crossett called *Hamartia: The Concept of Error in the Western Tradition: Essays in Honor of John M. Crossett*, so I assume his view on hamartia was highly-regarded and well-disseminated.

¹⁹ From the essay "The Heracleian Absence: Gender Roles and Actors Roles in the "Trachiniae," on pp. 77-84 of *Pacific Coast Philology* Vol. 27, No. 1/2

²⁰ νῦν δ' ἐκ τοιοῦτου θῆλος ἡῶρημαι τάλας (line 1075)

²¹ This is because of the tendency in Sophoclean plays to use three actors, playing multiple parts.

²² λύει τὸν αὐτῆς πέπλον, ἢ χρυσήλατος προύκειτο μαστῶν περονίς, ἐκ δ' ἐλώπισεν πλευρὰν ἅπασαν ὠλένην τ' εὐώνυμον (lines 924-926)

²³ From essay *The Dramatic Unity of Sophocles' Trachiniae* on pp. 203-211 of *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Volume 72

²⁴ From Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, Act V, Scene 5, lines 2380-2381

A Preliminary Analysis of *Coincidentia
Oppositorum* in Euripidean Drama:
The Case of *Hecuba*¹

John Panteleimon Manoussakis
(College of the Holy Cross and Australian Catholic
University)

The Structure of the Play

The structure of the play has caused some considerable troubles to its critics.² It seems as if Euripides had brought together two different stories, namely, the one staging Polyxena's sacrifice and the other narrating Polydoros' murder.³ And indeed, the play in its present form is a kind of stitching together of these two pieces⁴ and the exact point of their seam can be unmistakably found in verse 658 when, for the first time, the serving-woman begins to speak, after her return from the shore, and carrying in her hands Polydoros' corpse, announces to Hecuba the bad news of her son's death. From here on, Polyxena disappears and Polydoros' dead body haunts the stage; the sacrificed daughter gives precedence to the murdered son.⁵ Furthermore, some characters appearing in the first half of the play, like Odysseus and Talthybius, are not even mentioned in the second half; while Polymestor, the *causa malis*, stays on the stage for as many as 342 verses, up to the end of the play. However, the dichotomy of the play becomes more obvious through the development of the characters. During the play's course the initial depiction of each main character suffers its uttermost alteration (μετάστασις, 1266).⁶ After these characteristics of the play's structure are taken into consideration, there is no wonder why generations of classicists are at pains to resolve this annoying "defect" which splits Euripides' *Hecuba* into at least two different components. The majority of them propose that the figure of Hecuba be seen as the connecting link between the play's two halves.⁷ They have not paid enough attention, however, to the fact that Hecuba's personality is the one which changes more dramatically and deeply than any other. Thus, we have to turn elsewhere in our search for the reason of such emphatic duplicity.⁸

Change and instability in every aspect is the only real theme of this play. Playfully, we can say that the play's narrative tends to escape our attempts to transfix it into one particular theme like the sand of the shore (ἀκτῆ, ἐπ' ἀκταῖς, 28, as in the

play's opening scene). And, moreover, it is not the escape of a theme that matters here, but rather the inability to grasp such a fixed point in the narrative; the fluidity itself that permeates the play's development and gives shape to whatever we might like to call the topic, or even the motif of the play. This impossibility prevails over the play. *Hecuba* is νόμος (song/melody) composed by the νόμοι (laws/rules) not of harmony, but rather of counterpoint. Like a fugue every theme presented here, soon or later, will be overcome by its counter-theme. Theme and counter-theme are interdependent and interrelated. This double character—the duality itself as the play's norm (νόμος) provides the wider *exemplum* in, and according to, which the characters, their actions and their language follow this flux of perpetual change.

The Setting of the Play

Speaking of the play's setting, critics have noticed its sinister character.⁹ It has been characterized as a “haunted” place. Within the ten first verses the identity of the place has been explicitly stated: we are in τήνδ' ἀρίστην Χερσονησίαν πλάκα Θρηκίου ξένου (7-8). Thrace, this Thrace, must be placed beyond the boundaries of proper geography. It is the place of no-where, an almost utopian landscape. It lies between two renowned places, Greece and Asia, but it does not belong to either. The time is lapsing to the same category: before the return to homeland (πρὸς οἶκον εὐθύνοντας, 39), and after the capture of Troy (ἐπεὶ δὲ Τροία ἀπόλλυται, 21).¹⁰ The time of the play fills the gap between these two crucial events of the epic tradition. We are introduced to that place and time by two ghosts: Polydoros and, through Polydoros' speech, Achilles; the latter representing the honors of the heroic past and the former the hopes of a peaceful future, now of course, both lost. Two tombs frame the play as well: Achilles' tomb in the beginning and Hecuba's cenotaph in the end. Anticipating the play's plot, Polydoros announces in the prologue that his mother is about to face two deaths, the murder of her two children and thus two corpses (δυοῖν δὲ παῖδων δύο νεκρῶ κατόψεται, 45). In this way, the play is split into two distinct dimensions: the realm of the dead (Achilles, Polydoros, and soon after, Polyxena) and the realm of the living (Odysseus, Agamemnon, Polymestor).¹¹ Therefore, duplicity penetrates the setting which is literally haunted by the number two.

Stagecraft

The stagecraft directions, as they are indicated by the text itself, provide the persons on the stage with no less or more than two pairs of option: left or right (in the horizontal axis), and up or down (on the vertical axis). In the play's prologue, Polydoros is floating in the air above his mother (ὑπὲρ μητρὸς φίλης/Εκάβης αἰσσω, 30-1) having first descended to the chthonic realm of the underworld's gods (τοὺς γὰρ κάτω σθένοντας ἐξηιτησάμην, 49). The same vertical gesture is suggested by the Chorus when it exhorts Hecuba to invoke for help both the gods above and the gods below (κήρυσσε θεοὺς τοὺς τ' οὐρανίδας/τοὺς θ' ὑπὸ γαίας, 145-6).

It appears that this “up-and-down” movement, when it occurs, testifies to something more poignant than being merely an accidental description: in the peak of his anxiety, Polymestor, after having seen his children killed and himself having been blinded, expresses the wish to fly up to the high of the stars (ἀμπτάμενος οὐράνιον ὑσιπετές ἐς μέλαθρον/Ωαρίων ἢ Σείριος, 1100-1), or to descend down to Hades (ἦ τὸν ἐς Ἄϊδα/μελάγχρωτα πορθμὸν ἄϊζω τάλας; 1104-5). The same up-and-down movement will be enacted by Hecuba herself when, according to Polymestor's prophesy, she will trace this double direction, perhaps as a part of a ritual, before she meets her apotropaic fate (κρύψηι μὲν οὖν πεσοῦσαν ἐκ καρρησιῶν...αὐτὴ πρὸς ἰστὸν ναὸς ἀμβήσηι ποδί, 1261, 1263).

Ascending to a high point to be followed by a dramatic fall seems to prescribe a standard “movement” in the course of human affairs in general. It is almost a νόμος (norm/law) of the human condition. It certainly describes the fate of both Hecuba and Polyxena, as well as that of all other Trojan women, inasmuch as in the past they reached the zenith of their prosperity and fortune, and in the present they are lying in the depths of their misfortune, being thus deprived of all things once dear to them.¹² “Up-and-down” is the most profound meaning for that enigmatic verb which Polydoros uses in order to describe the fate of his mother upon her first arrival on the stage: ἀντισηκώσας (57). The double motion which the verb expresses is fully developed in the two *rhesis*; the first delivered by Hecuba (verses 154-168), and especially that of Polyxena's address to Odysseus (verses 349-367). In the case of the latter, Polyxena gives an account of her previous status: she was almost “equal-to-gods” (ἴση θεοῖσι πλὴν τὸ καθανεῖν μόνον, 356), while now she finds herself beneath the human status since she

is a slave. Therefore, she chooses exactly the thing that in the past differentiated her from the gods: τὸ κατθανεῖν.

Up-and-down, but also right-and-left. Horizontal locomotion is governed by the same duality as well. In moments of great anxiety, the characters on the stage can see only two possible ways: left or right. Hecuba, after having learned the bad news of the Greeks' decision concerning her daughter's sacrifice, bursts out saying: "What road am I to walk, either this or that?" (ποιάν ἢ ταύταν ἢ κείναν/στείχω; 162-3). In a similar condition of grief and anger, Polymestor duplicates Hecuba's gesture towards a two-fold escape asking: "Which way shall I change to, this or that?" (ποιάν/ἢ ταύταν ἢ τάνδ' ἐξαλλάξω; 1059-60). And few verses later he repeats the same exclamation: "Where am I to turn myself, where make my way to?" (ποιῖ τραπόμαι, ποιῖ πορευθῶ; 1099).

Language

Euripidean vocabulary in *Hecuba* seems, and not without good reason, to put an emphasis on terms and words of duplicity. So, we must listen again—and this time more carefully—to the text itself

What I hear now is always already double! Like the words spoken from a mountain's rock, Echo duplicates them (Ἥχῳ διδοῦσα θόρυβον, 1111).¹³ If we re-narrate Hecuba's story so that the twin leitmotif can be clearly heard (imagine it as two knocks on your door repeated over and over) then, the text's double rhythm should be something like this:

This is Hecuba's story; the story of a *δύστηνος* woman. She suffered the cruelty of seeing the *two* corpses of her *two* children (δυοῖν δὲ παιδοῖν δύο νεκρῶ, 45). Polydoros, her son, was murdered and abandoned in the *double* motion of the sea's waves (διαύλοις κυμάτων, 29); her daughter, Polyxena, was sacrificed in Achilles' tomb, because the *two* sons of Atreus (δισσοὶ τ' Ἄτρεϊδαί, 510) persuaded the Greek Army to offer her as the honor-prize to the hero's tomb. They did so by the false power of their *double* arguments (δισσῶν μύθων, 123). Hecuba then, wished to die along with her daughter so that the hero may be more satisfied by a *double* portion of blood (δὶς τόσον πῶμ' αἵματος γενήσεται, 391). However, Odysseus refused such an option and Polyxena was slaughtered. Hecuba learned about Polyxena's death by a messenger, named Talthybios, to whom, even the narration of Polyxena's sacrifice caused a *double* amount of tears (διπλᾶ με χρήζεις δάκρυα,

518). At that moment, Hecuba discovered her son's dead body and in the midst of the uttermost pain, she decided to take revenge for the *two* dead (*διπτύχους νεκρούς*, 1287). So, she invited Polymestor, the person who had killed her son in order, as he said, to rid the Achaeans of a *double* labor (*πόνον ἀπαλλάσσω διπλοῦν*, 1197), and after stripping him of his *two* lances (*διπτύχου στολίσματος*, 1156), she blinded his *two* eyes and killed his *two* sons (*παίδων τε δισσοῶν σώμαθ' οὓς ἔκτει' ἐγὼ*, 1051). After that, she was about to take care of her *double* anxiety (*δίσοῃ μέριμνα*, 896), and bury her two children before she joined the remainder slaves and the Greek army in their sail back to Greece.

Calling attention to duality and to the twofold-character of the play is achieved to a greater degree by a consistent double repetition. Euripides calls forth every linguistic technique and the echoing duplicity resounds even more effectively. We can provide three different groups of duplicated language. In the first, and larger, category belong words repeated twice successively and in the same form: *ἀπ' ἐμᾶς ἀπ' ἐμᾶς* (96), *ἀπωλέσατ' ὠλέσατ'* (167), *ἔξελθ' / ἔξελθ'* (173-4), *οἶαν οἶαν* (175 and 199), *μᾶτερ μᾶτερ* (177), *δειμαίνω δειμαίνω* (184), *τέκνον τέκνον* (186, 684, and again 694), *μάνυσόν μοι, μάνυσον* (192-3),¹⁴ *φίλους φίλους* (328), *ἔσθλός ἐσθλός* (597), *ἄπιστ' ἄπιστα* (689), *καινὰ καινὰ* (689), *κακὸν/κακὸν* (903-4), *δορὶ δὴ δορὶ* (908), *ὀλέθριον ὀλέθριον* (1031), *ἀκέσαι' ἀκέσαιο* (1067), *βοᾶν βοᾶν* (1092), *δεινὰ δεινὰ* (1097). In the second category belong those words which are followed immediately by the same word but in a different case or number: *γοερὸν γοεραῖς* (84), *Δαναοὶ Δαναοῖς* (138), *δειλαία δειλαίου* (156), *δειλαία δειλαίω* (203), *δειλαία δειλαίαν* (206), *κακῶν κάκ'* (233), *κακῶν κακοῖς* (588), *ἕτερα δ' ἀφ' ἐτέρων* (690), *κακὰ κακῶν* (690), *νόμος νόμοι* (800), *τυφλὸν τυφλῶι* (1050), *πῆμα πήματος* (1168). In the third category the effect of repetition is attained either by words followed by a synonym—e.g., *ἄκλαντος ἄταφος* (30), *ἄνυμφος ἀνυμέναιος* (416), *ἀστένακτος ἀδάκρυτος* (691)—or by words followed by the same word in a negative form—e.g., *γάμος οὐ γάμος* (947), *ἀπώλεσ' οὐκ ἀπώλεσ'* (1121), *νύμφην τ' ἄνυμφον* (612), *παρθένον τ' ἀπάρθενον* (612).

Characters

From studying of the development of the characters, it is instantaneously noticed that attributes of a character match,

resemble or confront characteristics of another to such an extent that becomes especially difficult, if not impossible, to analyze a character individually. Rather, we need to look at both, to place the one next to the other, to compare them so that we may enable ourselves to comprehend the context of their actions. The characters of this drama are interrelated; they could not exist, at least in the way they do, on their own. The other is always needed; it is through their other that their actions are prompted, as they always speak and behave in always response to this other.

In consistency with the profound dual quality of the drama, I think that the characters should be discussed in couples, that is, in units of two. Since every person imitates, anticipates and reacts to the actions of another, we need to consider both of them as a single unit which functions in this or that way within the broader development of the play. These units, however, are not firm; two persons come together, let's say under the same label, but only in regard to a certain aspect or on the basis of a specific concept (e.g., revenge, sacrifice, nobility). Therefore, treating the characters as two-fold entities allows us to get a more complete picture of the dynamics followed by the drama's discourse. The suggested couplings of characters are the following: 1) Polymestor and Polydoros, 2) Polyxena and Achilles, 3) Polymestor and Hecuba, and 4) Hecuba and Hecuba.

1. Polymestor and Polydoros:

Both, Polymestor and Polydoros, the victimizer and the victim, have been united under the powerful sign of crime. Murder has bound them eternally together. Their relationship appears to be quite stronger than that between a lover and a loved one. I am not saying this as a mere metaphor. Who doubts that death and especially murder have sexual overtones?¹⁵ Moreover, Polydoros' identity cannot be fixed in any stable category. He is only defined as a being "carried about" all binary oppositions. He is φορούμενος (29). He belongs to that ambivalent space; to the gray area; to whatever occupies the space in between: "between Hades and the living, between sea and land, between life and death."¹⁶ This ambiguity, profoundly infecting his status, must be applied, I think, to every aspect of his identity and thus to his sexuality as well.

This is the picture: Polymestor has penetrated the young body of Polydoros by his sword¹⁷ (σιδαρέωι τεμῶν φασγάνωι, 717). Polydoros met his fate naked (ἄθησον σῶμα γυμνωθέν

νεκροῦ, 679). There is something emphatically pederastic here which cannot be avoided. Wasn't the body of Polydoros, after all, taken as a girl's body? Hecuba in the process of *anagnorisis* (670-80) assigned two possibilities, first Polyxena and then Cassandra, as the possible identity for Polydoros' corpse. We have to imagine him, therefore, as bearing potentially effeminate characteristics.

Later the roles between Polydoros and Polymestor were reversed. Polymestor met his fate while stripped of his garments as well (γυμνὸν μ' ἔθηκον, 1156). Naked. But not only that. It would not be enough. He was also blinded. Blinded of his *two* eyes! Eyes: this metonymic image of one's testicles. Polymestor has crossed the defined boundaries of the sexes. This enables him to prophesize; uttering the dark prophecies about Hecuba's metamorphosis and Agamemnon's murder he was masquerading as Tiresias, the famous seer and androgyne. Tiresias was also blind. Polymestor was castrated and thus feminized.¹⁸

Segal has drawn attention to the fact that Polymestor's character, his name, his cannibalistic fury and his desire for revenge enact the mythical realm of Homer's Cyclops and especially Polyphemos.¹⁹ However, Zeitlin alone examines this parallel on the grounds of a Euripidean play which deals with the same theme, namely the *Cyclops*.²⁰ Unfortunately, she misses the allusion to the pederastic passion, so obvious and self-evident in Euripides' aforementioned play. As a small example, we can offer a representative passage in which Polyphemos says: ἦδομαι δὲ πῶς/τοῖς παιδικοῖσι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς θήλεσιν (583-4). Therefore, if there indeed exists a parallel between the Thracian King and the blinded Cyclops, we should list under their common characteristics, besides the violation of *xenia*, the anthropophagy and the blindness, the pederastic desire as well.²¹

Polymestor described himself as a ship "carried about" on the sea's waves (φέρομαι...ναῦς ὅπως ποντίοις, 1075, 1080). The corpse also of the boy, who had never become a man, was found on the seashore (ἐπ' ἄκταῖς, 28, 36, 697). What exactly is a seashore? Isn't this the ambivalent space in which the sea is mixed with the land? To what dominion then does the seashore belong? To the sea's? To the land's? What is the realm to which Polydoros belong? Is he a male or a female? Is he alive or dead?

We will understand more completely how this fatal couple functions if we turn to the second unit of our analysis, that of Polyxena and Achilles.

2. Polyxena and Achilles:

If with Polydoros and Polymestor we have entered the realm of Eros and Thanatos, with Achilles and Polyxena we will conclude it. What is the element that has brought these two persons under a single heading? If crime unites the previous unit, nobility (and later on, sacrifice) is the common ground for this one. The epithet ἄριστος is attributed only two times to two different persons in the course of the entire drama. Achilles is characterized as “the best of all the Danaans” (ἄριστον Δαναῶν πάντων, 134), and Polyxena is said to have “noble spirit” (ψυχὴν τ’ἀρίστην, 580). Nobility, the most prevailing component of the heroic world, sustains its meaning in the deeds of a dead hero—therefore idealized by his companions—and in the decision of a young girl to die early enough so as not to be corrupted by the unstable postwar conditions.

According to Bataille, sacrifice is nothing else but the “sacred” side of murder’s coin. Achilles appears to have demanded Polyxena as his κλέος. But the only evidence of this is found in Polydoros’ prologue. Hecuba seems to ignore (or, at least, to pretend to ignore) such an explicit demand, focusing individually on Polyxena; that explains, *inter alia*, her attempt to convince Odysseus that Helen or any other of the Trojan women could be a potential victim as well. But that is quite not the case. Achilles’ nobility ought to be honored with an equally noble victim. Therefore, Polyxena’s nobility has anticipated her fate. Like a mark, a sign, “a marvelous stamp of distinction” (δεινός χαρακτήρ κάπσημος, 379) on her skin, nobility has distinguished her from the beginning and has made her the appropriate sacrificial victim. Polyxena is doomed to die because of her nobility; her noble character opens the unavoidable way to death. On the sacrificial altar she fulfills her destiny: she takes in marriage the worthiest husband that she could have ever dreamt of, an equally noble man, Achilles himself.

Polyxena’s sacrifice recalls in our minds the death of another virgin, namely, Iphigeneia; but the latter—at least in the Euripides’ account—was not sacrificed; she had escaped death, at the last moment, by being substituted by an animal. Polyxena, however, was sacrificed, and her position was nothing but the one appropriate to a beast. We have an case of a human sacrifice (ἀνθρωποσφαγεῖν) there where the sacrifice of an animal (βουθυτεῖν) ought to have been appropriate (260-1). Polyxena’s replacement of the traditional bestial victim opens a twofold potentiality: the sacrifice of a human being instead and in the place of an animal “is answered by a transformation of human

murders into their bestial equivalent.”²² The scheme has as follows: either a human being sacrifices an animal or a human being is sacrificed as an animal and therefore it is the victimizer who turns to play the role of the victimized animal. Here, we face another aspect among the many which demarcates the multiple crossing of the human/animal boundaries.

If the attitude of the Greek soldiers, standing there and illicitly watching her, has something of voyeurism, that is because a sacrifice bears always a certain resemblance to sexual intercourse.²³ Polyxena’s sacrifice has a little more. She herself exposes her body and strips her body naked, so beautiful to be compared only with a statue. And then, on the one hand we have the violence of the sword penetrating her naked body, violating her virginity, and on the other, her blood which saturated the ground of Achilles’ tomb, an eloquent image of her hymeneal blood. She was given. She willingly offered herself to Death.²⁴ She became a bride of the dead Achilles. Hence the “anomalous status of her virginity”²⁵; she is a virgin no more, no longer a maid (νύμφην τ’ ἄνυμφον παρθένον τ’ ἀπάρθενον, 612), for at the moment of death she is given to him. According to a well-known legend,²⁶ Achilles, during his life, had been in love with Polyxena; if this is the case, then the unfulfilled desire became truth (Achilles had made Polyxena his wife), through death, or better, because of death, at the very moment of her sacrifice.

3. Polymestor and Hecuba:

Our decision to form the characters of the play into two-fold units can be justified and moreover, manifested in the most explicit way, in the case of Polymestor and Hecuba. At last, the necessity which forces such a combination will reveal itself in all its sharpness. For even Polymestor and Hecuba are nothing more but a simple variation on the same theme; two instant appearances of the same character; two inseparably halves of the same horrific mask; a single person named differently.²⁷

This *coincidentia* reigns over the whole Euripidean drama. It is the most frightening point of his thought. It strangles to death our least effort of understanding; before anything else, the *coincidentia* has rendered any hope for meaning useless, nonsensical and vain. And that because our thought needs both division and opposition in order to classify things and understand them. *Coincidentia* denies to our thought the privilege of these bipolar oppositions; it is not so much that it disturbs every potentiality of order, but rather, it marks the limits of

order itself by putting it in question. It is impossible to think of something coinciding in two opposite categories at the same time; of something “negative” and simultaneously “positive”—a contradiction to itself. This *coincidentia* is Euripides’ final statement on the politics of his time. More about all this later.

Back to Hecuba’s and Polymestor’s case. Close your eyes now and imagine. Recall for a moment in your mind Hecuba’s first appearance on the stage. She has just left Agamemnon’s tent, she is a helpless woman, with her city and all her previous prosperity lost; she was once a queen and now a slave, her friends proved to be her most bitter enemies; moreover, she has to face the death of her two children, she does not know where to stand, where to go.

Let me start again: Close your eyes and imagine. Recall now the moment when Polymestor enters the stage for the second time. He has just left Hecuba’s tent. Do you notice any essential difference? He is a helpless man, deprived of his city and with all his previous prosperity lost; he was once a king and now almost a slave, his friends proved to be his most bitter enemies; moreover, he faced the death of his two children, he does not know where to stand, where to go.

Euripides is “cheating” his audience by making his drama start and end with the same gesture. It is not difficult to imagine him laughing up his sleeve; he made Hecuba and Polymestor appear like the King and the Queen of the same playing-card, the only difference is how you look at it. Whatever has been said about Hecuba is equally accurate for Polymestor as well.

But let us take a close look at their similarities. Hecuba suffers the loss of her children but so does Polymestor. Both wish nothing more than to take revenge on those who had hurt them. Both approach bestiality; Hecuba will be transformed into a dog (κύων γενήσῃ, 1265) and similarly Polymestor describes himself as a hunted beast which is eager to rend and devour the flesh of its hunter (σαρκῶν ὀστέων τ’ ἐμπλησθῶ/θοίναν ἀγρίων τιθέμενος θηρῶν, 1071-72). Agamemnon, the traditional enemy of Hecuba, has proved himself a friend, while he treats Polymestor, his traditional friend, as an enemy. Both, Polymestor and Hecuba, share, to a certain degree, an association with Dionysus; the former appears as the god’s prophet (ὁ Θρηϊξὶ μάντις εἶπε Διόνυσος τάδε, 1267), while Hecuba—besides the double connection of her name with ivy (3 and 398)—decides and accomplishes her dreadful deed under Bacchic influence (κατάρχομαι νόμον/βακχεῖον, 685-6), and as a bacchant of

Hades (1076). Throughout the play, Hecuba makes an extended use of her skills in sophistry and rhetoric (at least once she weaves the encomium of Persuasion (814-819) while later, she accuses Polymestor for being a sophist himself (1187-1194). However, the pleas of both, Hecuba's towards Odysseus and Polymestor's towards Agamemnon, failed to achieve their purposes. They both experience the double condition of the victim and the victimizer; they are both, deceivers and deceived. Summarizing it in a single phrase: "the opposites become twins."²⁸

4. Hecuba and Hecuba:

The omnipresent phenomenon of duplicity enables us to speak of a double or even of two Hecubas.²⁹ Within the ever-changing character of the drama, Hecuba suffers a dichotomy inside her own personality. On the one hand, we have the submissive, patient, nobly suffering Hecuba; she is singular and feminine; we can call her as the "Polyxeniian" Hecuba. But next to her, the figure of another Hecuba stands; she is distinguished as wild, masculine and plural; she "will do anything to obtain revenge,"³⁰ this is the "Polydorian" Hecuba. The former is the old Queen who appeals to justice and seeks the νόμος who condemns sophistry and desperately wishes the maintenance of the present world and its order because she honestly believes that after all "that a virtuous man is never anything but virtuous, his nature uncorrupted from misfortune but always good" (ὁ δ' ἐσθλὸς ἐσθλὸς οὐδὲ συμφορᾶς ὑπο/φύσιν διέφθειρ' ἀλλὰ χρηστός ἐστ' αἰεί, 597-8). The only kind of reciprocity acceptable by her is that of χάρις; it is the mutual exchange of favors which preserves personal relationships and human societies.

"Polydorian" Hecuba destroys the law for the sake of a "new" law, the law of a new order, the order of a different world; her world.³¹ Now she places herself on the side of sophistry, and there where the old idol of the insufficient law used to stand, now she erects a new, dreadful image, of a new deity: Persuasion the Queen, created after the image and the likeness of this new Hecuba. The only kind of reciprocity, known to her, is that of revenge.

Now, it was Hecuba herself who gave birth to this monster: namely Hecuba. It was the seed of revenge inside her brain that was fed by both the wrong actions and the egoism of the others. These attitudes form a kind of a womb in which the monstrous fetus was growing. This is the vengeful baby: Hecuba's new child. She had conceived it and she carried it

inside her head. The world is ready to accept it, since the “new order” has prepared the world for it; the world in its harsh reality functions as a disfiguring mirror; Hecuba’s reflection in it, (her de-formed, or rather, trans-formed idol), is deadly. Her gaze, like Medusa’s, petrifies whoever will dare to look at it. By the verse 736, the malicious baby is a “human being” already; Hecuba addresses it and names it: it is Hecuba again. She duplicates herself—as its dark twin.

The point of the intersection between the two distinct and opposite Hecubas is to be found in verses 736-751. Eight verses which, as the *stichomythia* between Hecuba and Agamemnon, mark the play’s turning point.³² Euripides has illustrated the event in a unique and brilliant way: the new Hecuba addresses the old one: “Hapless!—it is myself I speak of when I speak of you, Hecuba...” (δύστην’, ἐμαυτὴν γὰρ λέγω λέγουσα σέ./Ἐκάβη..., 736-7). Segal points out that “by naming herself ‘unfortunate,’ she is naming a different Hecuba, one who will no longer be the savior or mourner of a child but the avenger of a child.”³³

In other instances, Euripides has anticipated this duality within his heroine; Hecuba suddenly starts to refer to herself with participles of plural number and also in a masculine gender (e.g., ἐρωτῶντας, 237; θανουμένους, 511; ἄτεκνοι, 514; εἰδόσιν, 670, and so on).³⁴ She has become a “collective personality,” she embodies all the miseries, the sufferings and the injustices which have been faced and experienced by all the unprivileged ones throughout the centuries; she will act on behalf of all those and, in their name, she will take the most harsh revenge.

But by doing so, she becomes herself a wrongdoer; acting unjustly leads to more injustice, violence to more violence. By returning the suffering with suffering, she perpetuates and reinforces the existence of evil. Consequently, she is doomed to fight herself; she is condemned to become alienated from herself; “she will become literally a stranger to herself.”³⁵

Notes

¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented under the title “Overcoming Metaphysical Polarity in Greek Literature” at the meeting of the *International Association for Philosophy and Literature* (IAPL) in the Erasmus University of Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 3-8 June 2002. I use the text and the translation (whenever the translation of the Greek is given, unless otherwise

noted) as published by Christopher Collard, *Hecuba*, (critical text, introduction, translation and commentary), Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd, 1991.

² Probably the oldest example (1831) of such a critique in the modern times was expressed by Herman (quoted by D. Kovacs in *The Heroic Muse*, [Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1987], p. 80): “stories joined in time but not in substance.” Conacher, in *Euripidean Drama, Myth, Theme, and Structure* (Toronto, 1967) says *inter alia*, “the play falls into two clearly distinguished parts” (p.146). Kovacs agrees that “the shape of the play...fall[s] into two parts,” and asks: “why has Euripides chosen to combine two stories that do not have anything essential to do with one another?” (*The Heroic Muse*, p. 79). Rabinowitz inherits the same tradition: “the problem that has most consistently bothered critics about *Hecabe* is its apparent lack of unity or coherence” in *Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993, p. 106).

³ “In the symmetry of the play’s bipartite structure, the action moves from Polyxena to Polydorus,” Charles Segal, “Violence and Dramatic Structure in Euripides’ *Hecuba*” in *Violence in Drama* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 37. Also, Luschnig, speaking of the Polydorus’ prologue, points out that it is a dramatic device which “connects the two actions of the drama...which in a purely rational sense are unrelated” (“The Time is Out of Joint” in *The Classical Journal*, 71 [1976], pp. 193-243, at 227).

⁴ Aristotle suggests that a single plot is more effective and artistically elaborated: “[n]ecessarily, then, a plot that is fine is single rather than (as some say) double...” (*Poetics*, 1453a12; translated by Richard Janko, Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett, 1987, p. 16). This observation seems to contradict an earlier statement of his, namely that “the construction of the finest tragedy should be not simple but complex” (1452b31-2, p. 16). The difference lies, I think, on the terms *μῦθος* [plot] and *σύνθεσιν* [composition]; the plot must be a single one, while its composition complex. *Hecuba* obviously violates, at least, the first rule.

⁵Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz estimates that the play follows this chiasmic structure: Polydorus/Polyxena-Polyxena/Polydorus which “gives way to Polydorus” (*Anxiety Veiled*, pp. 107-8).

⁶ The term *μετάστας* is borrowed from the context of Hecuba’s physical transformation which could be taken as a term describing, or visualizing, the broader “transformation” of the

play itself. The term, however, occurs only five times in the whole of the exact corpus of Greek dramas. The normal term for change in the play's plot is what Aristotle uses in his *Poetics*: μεταβολή. See also note 15 below.

⁷ "According to the first (main line of defense of the play's unity) the real unity of the play lies in the person of Hecuba. Thus Hecuba is said to 'experience' both actions..." Conacher, *Euripidean Drama*, p. 152. Charles Segal also observes "commentators generally find what unity they allow to the play in the figure of Hecuba" (in "Violence and Dramatic Structure in Euripides' Hecuba," p. 38). The problem of the play's unity, as the attempt to ground such unity on a single character, was known to the ancient critics. Aristotle, for example, writes in disagreement that: "[a] plot is not unified, as some suppose, if it concerns one single person. An indefinitely large number of things happens to one person, in some of which there is no unity. So too the action of one person are many, but do not turn into a single action" *Poetics*, (1451a16-17, p.11).

⁸ "Even if there are two plots, might we not still look at the juxtaposition of the deaths of two children as simply *doubling* Hecabe's pain?" (Rabinowitz, *Veiled Anxiety*, p. 107, my emphasis).

⁹ Froma I. Zeitlin, *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*, (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996), pp. 172-3.

¹⁰ Charles Segal, *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow: Art, Gender, and Commemoration in Alcestis, Hippolytus, and Hecuba*, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993), p. 157.

¹¹ Where should Hecuba be placed? Among the dead or among the living? While being alive, she declares herself, several times, dead. For example: οὐκέτι μοι βίος/ἀγαστός ἐν φάει (167-8), τέθνηκ' ἔγωγε πρὶν θανεῖν κακῶν ὕπο (431), ἀπωλόμην, φίλαι (440), ἀπωλόμην δύστηνος, οὐκέτ' εἰμί δῆ (683). Although, such expressions are expected in moments of great anxiety, however, the frequency and the explicit nature in which they are uttered do not allow me to place Hecuba neither to the realm of the living, nor to the realm of the dead. Moreover, it is interesting that these expressions occur only in the first half of the drama. The last such expression is found in the verse 638 which is exactly at the point of Hecuba's "revelation." Perhaps, we can suggest that it is the old, "Polyxenian," Hecuba that dies just before the new Hecuba put her plans for revenge in action.

See the section on “Hecuba and Hecuba” under the analysis of characters below.

¹² On Aristotelian terms these are the consequences of μεταβολή [change]; however, the Euripidean text focuses on a more in-depth understanding of this term. Aristotle perceives μεταβολή simply as a deprivation of a character’s previous prosperity and happiness—this fact itself functioning as a factor for περιπέτεια [reversal] along with ἀναγώρισις [recognition], see *Poetics*, 1452a22 and 1452a31). But *this* kind of μεταβολή—the one that Aristotle has in mind—lies beyond or before our play itself. The only μεταβολή to be found here, that is, within the play’s scope, is the one taking place inside Hecuba’s mind and will manifest itself immediately afterward as the μετάστασις of her form.

¹³Among the many examples that will occur later in the course of this essay of transformation and σπαραγμός, we have to allow a place for Echo as well. According to the myth, Pan fell in love with Echo who refused his sentiments. Pan, then, “maddened the shepherds so that they tore her to pieces, leaving only her voice. She, too, was changed into a stone, a cliff echoing back her voice,” Carl A. P. Ruck and Danny Staples, *The World of Classical Myth: Gods and Goddesses, Heroines and Heroes*, (Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 1994), p. 133.

¹⁴ Up to this point the repetitions are found exclusively in the lyric parts of the play, while now they begin to invade the dialogue as well. More specifically, the iambic trimeters which include such repetitions are the following verses: 233, 328, 588, 597, 800, 903-4, and 1168.

¹⁵For a complete study of the connections between the violence of death and the violence of sex see: Georges Bataille, *Eroticism: Death and Sensuality*, translated by Mary Dalwood, (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1986).

¹⁶ Segal, “Violence and Dramatic Structure...” p. 42.

¹⁷ For the sword as a phallic symbol, especially in art, see: Smith (1985), 205.

¹⁸ The two themes, that of blindness and that of castration have joined each other several times and in various places; as an example I offer here a citation from Jorges Luis Borges’ “Blindness.” In this text, Borges traces his blind ancestors in the “gallery of Western literature,” after having mentioned Homer, Milton and Joyce he continues: “Democritus of Abdera tore his

eyes out...Origen castrated himself? (from *Seven Nights*, translated by Eliot Weinberger, New York, 1984, p. 119). Although these two phrases seem irrelevant to each other, their connection is obvious enough to need any further explanation. For a discussion on the connection between blindness and castration, see Jacques Derrida, *Memoirs of the Blind: The Self Portrait and Other Ruins*, translated by Pascale Branet and Michael Naas (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), pp. 33-6.

¹⁹ Segal, *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow*, pp. 162 and 182-5. Note also the identical structure and the similar meaning of the two names: Poly-mestor/Poly-phemos.

²⁰ Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, pp. 195-7. She is the first scholar, as far as I know, who suggests that the *Cyclops* is the satyr play to *Hecuba's* trilogy.

²¹ William Poole has analyzed the topic of homosexuality to a sufficient extent in his essay "Male Homosexuality in Euripides" in Anton Powell (ed.), *Euripides, Women and Sexuality*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1990). However, he does not make any mention to the possibility of seeing Polymestor as a pederastic character.

²² Segal, *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow*, p. 180.

²³ Bataille, again, writes: "a sacrifice is a novel, a story, illustrated in a bloody fashion. Or rather, a rudimentary form of stage drama reduced to the final episode where the human or animal victim acts it out along until his death" (*Erotism*, p. 87). In the performance of the sacrifice a) the prohibition of murder is violated and the violation of the prohibition sanctified by the society and because of the society and b) the spectators of the sacrifice experience a sort of identification with the victim (or the victimizer), in a similar way to the identification that takes place in theater (between actors and spectators), an identification which for Bataille is purely sexual. In regard to the first point, about the sanctification of the violation of a strong prohibition, we can point out the following: the death of Polyxena does not actually affect Hecuba to the extent that the discovery of Polydoros' dead body does. Her daughter's death causes pain or suffering, perhaps a few lines of praise for her heroic attitude, but it is the son's death and this alone that demands action, reciprocity, revenge. The son's death must be paid by blood. However, this is not a matter of gender controversy. Polyxena's death took place through a legal process, a sacred ritual which did not threaten the stability and the coherence of the society

(on the contrary, it may improve it). Polydoros' death violates two very crucial notions of the Greek thought: the duty of *xenia* and that of funeral rites.

²⁴ Sometimes the virgin-victim of a sacrifice is given not only to death but also to every male participant of the sacrifice. Walter Burkert suggests that Polyxena's name indicates such a possibility, especially on the support of Pindar's testimony (fr.121.1), who uses the interesting term "πολύξεναι νεάνιδες" in order to name (after Polyxena's example?) all the analogous cases of girls who were not only sacrificed, but also sexually abused (*Homo Necans: An Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, translated by Peter Bing, [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983], p. 67). Polyxena's eagerness to meet her sacrificial death and her remarkable beauty, remarked upon quite explicitly, make us suspicious of such an association.

²⁵ Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, p. 177.

²⁶ Hyginus, *Fabulae*, 110; see also, *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1996), 1213.

²⁷ Both Segal and Luschnig have drawn attention to the similarities between Polymestor and Hecuba. They focus, however, on two or three common characteristics and in a more loose way than the one employed here.

²⁸ Segal, *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow*, p. 185.

²⁹ G.M. Kirkwood, "Hecuba and Nomos" in *TAPA* 78 (1947), pp. 61-68, at 66.

³⁰ Segal, *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow*, p. 201.

³¹ "Revenge, for Hecuba, is the *nomos* that fills the place left by the collapse of the old. We do not know that it is the only possible replacement; but it is, clearly, her replacement. 'I shall place everything in good order,' she tells Agamemnon, as she inaugurates her scheme" Martha Nussbaum, *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 409.

³² That is a "point of revelation" for Hecuba. She begins to understand a "new reality (or a new order/νόμος). But this new understanding is caused by what Aristotle calls ἀναγνώρισις [recognition]. Ἀναγνώρισις is again a kind of μεταβολή [change], but, this time, from ignorance to knowledge either for friendship or for enmity: "[a] recognition, as the word itself indicates, is a change from ignorance to knowledge, and so to either friendship or enmity among people defined in relation to good fortune or misfortune" *Poetics*, 1452a30-32, (p. 14).

³³ Segal, *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow*, p. 203.

³⁴ Collard in his commentary states that this phenomenon happens “where a woman generalizes about herself or other women she normally uses the masc. plural” (p. 144). Although, this seems to be the case of ἐρωτῶντας (237), in the case of θανουμένους (511) it is hard to consider the participle as a general statement since Hecuba alone had expressed previously the wish to die along with her daughter (396), and she now expects that the coming of the messenger may fulfill her wish. Besides, in both instances, where she expresses the desire to die, she shifts to the singular number: πολλή γ’ ἀνάγκη θυγατρὶ συνθανεῖν ἐμέ (396) and ὦ φίλτατε, ἄρα κάμ’ ἐπισφάζαι τάφωι (505). Why we should take these statements as generalizations? I have the impression that it is Collard who generalizes at this point.

³⁵ Segal, *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow*, p. 186.

Ancient Justice

Thomas Krueger '16

He who tried to put the Gods in their place,
and instead found his own.
Tempered and tested, after being ruined,
crew and all, dashed against the rocks.

Braving the House of Hades,
consorting with shades against all odds.
Those burnt out humans husks, once great.
A warning first, and counsel second.

Stabbed through to the core,
his mother's longing, a tragic ending.
As the greedy shades drink,
against all odds, sadness brings hope.
Homecoming not destined, but to be fought for.

Everything lost, delivered bare and naked
on the shores of Ithaca shrouded in mist.
Oh world-weary man, grey-eyed with age
work your cunning one last time.

A careful plan, like a blossoming bloodstain.
Ending in the savage blood of massacre.
Crimson adorns the floors, breathing back the life
into the island, corrupted by the desire of man
who oversteps his bounds, xenia disgraced.

Now, the wrongs righted in sanguine fashion
lay down your bow and beggar's rags.
The blood will settle where it may.
Most cunning of men, now wisest.
Well turned by the world, and still turning!
Warrior here and wanderer there,
ever enduring Odysseus returns home,
glad at heart at last.

Utilizing Athenian History in the *De Corona*

Lawrie Whitmore '16

Abstract

The *De Corona*, given by the famous Athenian orator Demosthenes, depicts him battling against his fierce rival Aeschines. While the speech's goal was to defend a fellow Athenian being prosecuted for awarding Demosthenes for his services to the city, Demosthenes attempts to justify his award by defending his actions against Philip and his son Alexander the Great of Macedonia and mainly focuses on his personal rivalry with Aeschines. Considered one of the greatest orations in history, one of the main strategies utilized in the *De Corona* by Demosthenes is an appeal to past Athenian history, such as the Persian Wars. Through this strategy Demosthenes explains how he deserves praise for his actions taken against Macedonia.

One of the greatest criticisms of Demosthenes made by his rival Aeschines is how he pales in comparison to other famous Athenians of the past. In fact, a large part of Aeschines' speech *Against Ctesiphon*, sections 178-188, is dedicated to how Demosthenes is in no way fit to be compared to the great Athenian forefathers, bringing up famed statesmen such as Themistocles, Miltiades, and Aristides. Aeschines states, "But I by the Olympian gods do not think it is fit to remember those men on the same day as this monster!" (ἀλλ' ἔγωγε μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς Ὀλυμπίους οὐδ' ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἡμέραις ἄξιον ἠγοῦμαι μεμῆσθαι τοῦ θηρίου τούτου κάκεινων τῶν ἀνδρῶν, Aes. 3.182). While this invective would seem to discourage Demosthenes from referencing Athenian history, he still constantly discusses it throughout his speech, especially the events of the Persian Wars and Themistocles, who led the city for a large part during this time period. Using these historical references, Demosthenes attempts to create a parallel between Athens' conflicts with foreign powers in the Athenian past, specifically with Persia, and their recent conflict with Philip of Macedon, as well as compare himself to famous statesmen such as Themistocles. By doing so, Demosthenes is able to defend his actions taken against Philip, particularly the Battle of Chaeronea. However, he must be cautious about how he goes about doing this, as referencing the wrong historical moment or in an inappropriate way will do much more harm than good.

The first mention of the Persians by name occurs about two-thirds through the speech, in which Demosthenes shows the historical precedent of Athens being offered safety in return for allowing another state to take control of Greece:

τίς γάρ οὐκ οἶδεν Ἑλλήνων, τίς δὲ βαρβάρων, ὅτι καὶ
παρὰ Θηβαίων καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἔτι
τούτων πρότερον ἰσχυρῶν γενομένων
Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ **παρὰ τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως**
μετὰ πολλῆς χάριτος τοῦτ' ἂν ἀσμένως ἐδόθη τῇ
πόλει, ὅ τι βούλεται λαβούση καὶ τὰ ἑαυτῆς ἐχούση
τὸ κελευόμενον ποιεῖν καὶ **ἂν ἕτερον τῶν Ἑλλήνων**
προεστάναι;

For who of the Greeks, who of barbarians, does not know that from Thebes, from the Lacedaemonians being stronger still before them, and from the king of the Persians, this would be given gladly with every grace to the city, taking whatever it wishes and keeping what it already had, to follow this order and allow another to rule over the Greeks? (18.302).

Here Demosthenes alludes to an episode documented by Herodotus, in which Xerxes promises to allow Athens to retain its possessions if they assist the Persians with their fleet against the rest of Greece.¹ However, the Athenians ultimately reject this offer, choosing to go to war with Persia rather than submit to them. Demosthenes purposefully references this event due to how relevant it is to their ordeal with Philip, and he shows the similarity of the two conflicts when he states, “What was fitting that the city should do, having seen Philip arranging an empire and tyranny over the Greeks for himself?” (τί τὴν πόλιν, Αἰσχίνη, προσήκε ποιεῖν ἀρχὴν καὶ τυραννίδα τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὁρῶσαν ἑαυτῷ κατασκευαζόμενον Φίλιππον; 18.66). Just as the Persians, Philip was seeking to form a hegemony over not just the Athenians, but all of Greece. The refusal of Xerxes’ proposed terms by Athens mirrors the same sentiments of Demosthenes’ policy against Philip. Kochin mentions how “it was therefore fitting for the Athenian demos more than any other Greek city to resist Philip... present actions must be worthy of the city’s past.”² By choosing a policy in line with the strategy of the past which Athenians had adopted against a foreign aggressor, he shows how he embodies the ideals of their ancestors in a similar dilemma.

In one of the most striking passages of the *De Corona*, Demosthenes invokes the Athenian veterans of several famous battles from their history:

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἡμάρτετ', ἄνδρες
Ἀθηναῖοι, τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀπάντων
ἐλευθερίας καὶ σωτηρίας κίνδυνον ἀράμενοι, μὰ τοὺς
Μαραθῶνι προκινδυνεύσαντας τῶν προγόνων, καὶ
τοὺς ἐν Πλαταιαῖς παραταξαμένους, καὶ τοὺς ἐν
Σαλαμίῳ ναυμαχήσαντας καὶ τοὺς ἐπ' Ἄρτεμισίῳ,
καὶ πολλοὺς ἑτέρους τοὺς ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις
μνήμασιν κειμένους ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας, οὓς ἅπαντας
ὁμοίως ἢ πόλις τῆς αὐτῆς ἀξιώσασα τιμῆς ἔθαψεν,
Αἰσχίῳ, οὐχὶ τοὺς κατορθώσαντας αὐτῶν οὐδὲ τοὺς
κρατήσαντας μόνους. δικαίως: ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἀνδρῶν
ἀγαθῶν ἔργον ἅπασιν πέπρακται: τῇ τύχῃ δ', ἦν ὁ
δαίμων ἐνειμεν ἐκάστοις, ταύτη κέχρηται. (18.208)

But there is no way, no way in which you were wrong, Athenian men, having chosen danger for freedom and salvation for all, by those of the forefathers who took risks beforehand at Marathon, and those who lined up at Plataea, and those who fought on the sea at Salamis and those at Artemisium, and many other brave men buried in public tombs, all whom the city, having deemed them worthy of the same honor, buried them the same, Aeschines, not only those who succeeded and prevailed. Rightly so. For the deed which was the duty of brave men was done: but they met fate itself, which a daimon dealt out to each individual.

Again, Demosthenes relates the conflict with Philip to the Persian Wars, listing off four separate battles in which not only did the Athenians fight their foreign aggressor, but also defeated them. However, Demosthenes wisely does not describe the Athenians as victors in these battles, just how they fought in them and faced the dangers. In order to successfully compare their conflict with Philip to the Persian Wars, it is important not to say how the Athenians of the past were successful because that would contrast with how Demosthenes' strategy was ultimately unsuccessful. This is highlighted by how he mentions that all Athenians who fought bravely deserve the honor of a public burial, even those who lost, as long as they were valiant. Yunis states, "...he adds this further layer of explanation that has nothing to do with utilitarian considerations, but which creates

in the audience an emotionally resonant awareness of the rightness of the action.”³ The rightness of the action was not the success of the Athenians over the Persians, it was what motivated them to fight in the first place. Additionally, Ober discusses how it was important not to insult the audience when discussing history, saying, “when using historical and poetic examples, the orator must avoid taking on the appearance of a well-educated man giving lessons in culture to the ignorant masses.”⁴ The Athenian assemblymen know the outcomes of these battles, so it is unnecessary for him to explicitly state they were victorious. Demosthenes is not attempting to compare the outcomes of the separate conflicts, but rather the sentiments which motivated Athens to pursue a defiant strategy against its aggressors, which certainly appeals to the good-natured, patriotic assemblymen. Again, Demosthenes compares the ideals and values present in both conflicts.

Another important aspect of the Persian Wars that Demosthenes alludes to is the Battle of Thermopylae. Thermopylae is first mentioned near the beginning of the speech, when Demosthenes discusses Aeschines’ conduct during the crisis with Philip. He proclaims, “That there was no need to make an uproar on account of the crossing of Philip within Thermopylae?” (ὡς οὐ δεῖ θορυβεῖσθαι τῷ παρεληλυθέναι Φίλιππον εἴσω Πυλῶν, 18.35). The Battle of Thermopylae during the Persian Wars was vital for the Greeks, as it bought Athens enough time to evacuate the city, however it was still technically a victory for the Persians. Thermopylae is significant due to how it is one of the only ways to get into the mainland Greece from the North, so a foreign aggressor easily passing through was an ominous sign for the safety of Greeks, considering how Athens was razed to the ground the last time this happened. This reference to Thermopylae criticizes Aeschines, for he does not recognize the historical precedent of an enemy, undisturbed, crossing through this area. Thermopylae again is mentioned later on towards the end of the speech, when Demosthenes claims that no Greeks on either side of it would be in trouble if there had been someone like him in Thessaly or Arcadia (οὐδένες οὔτε τῶν ἔξω Πυλῶν Ἑλλήνωνοῦτε τῶν εἴσω τοῖς παροῦσι κακοῖς ἐκέχρηντ’ ἄν, 18.304). Again, the significance of Thermopylae is stressed by Demosthenes, except he recognizes how it is a vital area in terms of defending against enemies.

While there are numerous references to the Persian Wars, it is noticeable how there are no real mentions of another

important conflict in Athenian History: the Peloponnesian Wars. Why would Demosthenes not want to directly mention their conflict with their old rival Sparta and remember certain battles from this time? Referencing the Peloponnesian Wars would most likely weaken Demosthenes' speech considering that Athens ultimately lost to Sparta, who ended up ruling over them for a period of time. The Peloponnesian Wars included great failures such as the expedition to Syracuse, in which Athens' navy was entirely devastated. Additionally the plague struck Athens during this time period, which is definitely not a pleasant memory. While the Persian Wars are filled with memories of victory and vanquishing a foreign enemy, the wars with Sparta are filled with bad memories of suffering and great losses. The Peloponnesian Wars also would not serve as a helpful comparison to Athens' conflict with Philip because it was centered around a heated rivalry between the two powerful city-states. Jealousy and personal hatred between cities does not align with how Demosthenes portrays the conflict between Athens and Philip. Plus, Demosthenes argues that personal rivalries should be put aside in a conflict like this, which is reflected in how he negotiated an alliance with the Thebans who had been their enemies for many years. Demosthenes policy against Philip is based upon achieving salvation and freedom by fighting a foreign aggressor, not fighting with a fellow Greek nation over a heated rivalry.

As well as to the events of the Persian Wars, Demosthenes also makes references to the great Athenian statesman and general Themistocles. He first mentions him by name around the middle of the speech, in which Demosthenes explains how no other policy was possible in dealing with Philip, and resisting him was in line with the values held dearly by their ancestors:

τίς γὰρ οὐκ ἀνάγασαιτο τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων τῆς ἀρετῆς, οἳ καὶ τὴν χώραν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐκλιπεῖν ὑπέμειναν εἰς τὰς τριήρεις ἐμβάντες ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ τὸ κελευόμενον ποιῆσαι, τὸν μὲν ταῦτα συμβουλευσάντα Θεμιστοκλέα στρατηγὸν ἔλομενοι, τὸν δ' ὑπακούειν ἀποφηνάμενον τοῖς ἐπιταττομένοις Κυρσίλον καταλιθώσαντες, οὐ μόνον αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αἱ ὑμέτεραι τὴν γυναικ' αὐτοῦ. (18.204).

For who would not rejoice on account of the excellence of those men, who dared to leave behind the land and the city embarking

onto the triremes in order to not follow a command, having chosen Themistocles, who proposed these things, as general, having stoned Cyrsilus, advising them to yield to those giving commands, not only him, but also your women stoned his wife.

Just as the Athenians back then chose Themistocles as their leader and followed his strategy, the Athenians during the crisis with Philip chose Demosthenes as their leader and followed his policies. Both leaders were able to convince Athens to do a difficult task: Themistocles persuaded the Athenians to abandon their homes⁵ and Demosthenes persuaded them to forget old rivalries and forge an alliance with the Thebans, both proposals seen as the only chance of achieving salvation. Demosthenes hopes to create a parallel between himself and Themistocles, and as Frost states, “the memory of the great man was such that all factions within the fourth-century democracy evoked his name to support their arguments.”⁶ This parallel is also supported by mentioning his opponent Cyrsilus, who can be seen as representing Aeschines in this comparison. Just as the Athenian men stoned Cyrsilus to death for proposing that Athens should submit to Persia, Demosthenes hopes that the Athenian jurymen will condemn Aeschines and other statesmen for being corrupted by Philip.

Another passage which may allude to Themistocles and his policies concerns Demosthenes’ discussion of trierarch laws which he implemented himself:

πάντα γὰρ τὸν πόλεμον τῶν ἀποστόλων γιγνομένων
κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν ἐμὸν,
οὐχ ἰκετηρίαν ἔθηκε τριήραρχος οὐδεις πόποθ’ ὡς
ἀδικούμενος παρ’ ὑμῖν, οὐκ ἐν Μουνιχίας ἐκαθέζετο,
οὐχ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστολέων ἐδέθη, οὐ τριήρης οὔτ’ ἔξω
καταλειφθεῖς ἀπόλετο τῇ πόλει, οὔτ’ αὐτοῦ
ἀπελείφθη οὐ δυναμένη ἀνάγεσθαι. (18.107).

Throughout the whole war, with all the expeditions being according to my law, no trierarch at any time placed a suppliant's branch at your foot on account of being wronged, or was sitting in Munichia, or was imprisoned by the naval magistrates, and no trireme was abandoned out at sea or lost to the city, or was left behind here, not being able to be put to sea.

One of Themistocles’ greatest achievements was convincing the Athenian populace to use the silver found in the mines of

Laurium to finance a new fleet of triremes to fend off Persia, and eventually Sparta. Normally when Athens obtained a large amount of silver, it would be distributed amongst all of the Athenian citizens, however Themistocles successfully persuaded the Athenian populace to instead follow his own ambitious naval policy.⁷ Demosthenes in this passage discusses the successes of his own naval policy, attempting to create another parallel between him and the famed Athenian statesman.

However, Demosthenes at times seems to claim that he is even greater than Themistocles in some aspects, especially in respect to his building program. Demosthenes towards the end of his speech gives a few details about it, saying, “I proposed these things in defense of Attica, as much as it was possible by human calculation, and therewith I fortified the whole country, not just the ring around Piraeus or the citadel.” (ταῦτα προὔβαλόμην ἐγὼ πρὸ τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ὅσον ἦν ἀνθρωπίνῳ λογισμῷ δυνατόν, καὶ τούτοις ἐτείχισα τὴν χώραν, οὐχὶ τὸν κύκλον τοῦ Πειραιῶς οὐδὲ τοῦ ἄστεως, 18.300). By mentioning a wall around Piraeus and the citadel, he is referring to the building program of Themistocles, another one of his greatest accomplishments. But Demosthenes says how his is much more impressive considering he built walls around the whole country. He also criticizes Themistocles for how he enacted his building program, which was done in secrecy.⁸ Frost mentions this criticism, saying how he “also claimed that the rebuilding of the walls by Conon was a greater accomplishment than the original construction by Themistocles, because the latter had worked by stealth.”⁹ While Themistocles is certainly a great Athenian statesman and Demosthenes attempts to be seen as an equal to him, he also shows how he is in some ways even greater than him.

While there are many references to Themistocles in the *De Corona*, there do not appear to be any references to another famous Athenian leader, Pericles. Again, just like the Peloponnesian Wars in general, Pericles’ leadership does not fit with the image of the conflict with Philip Demosthenes attempts to create. Pericles was an incredible leader for Athens, but he was a leader during the Golden Age, a time in which Athens was a great power in the Mediterranean. In contrast, Athens during Demosthenes’ time is much weaker than the empire it once was, and this is referenced when he discusses the lack of allies and tribute Athens had when Philip attacked: “In respect to strength, the city had the islanders, not all, but only the weakest: for neither Chios nor Rhodes nor Corcyra were with us: a tribute of

45 talents, and it was collected beforehand.” (δύναμιν μὲν τοίνυν εἶχεν ἡ πόλις τοὺς νησιώτας, οὐχ ἅπαντας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀσθενεστάτους: οὔτε γὰρ Χίος οὔτε Ῥόδος οὔτε Κέρκυρα μεθ’ ἡμῶν ἦν: χρημάτων δὲ σύνταξιν εἰς πέντε καὶ τετταράκοντα τάλαντα, καὶ ταῦτ’ ἦν προεξιλεγμένα, 18.234). Compared to the large tributary system Athens had in place in the late 5th century, Athens during Demosthenes’ time was much weaker. Pericles is seen by some critics as a demagogue or populist, relying heavily upon the support of the Athenian populace. One institution that Pericles introduced was the system of public fees, discussed by Plutarch in his *Life of Pericles*, which he says led the people to adopt bad habits.¹⁰ The direct democracy utilized by Pericles certainly helped individuals prosper with these public allotments, yet the vices that afflicted the Athenian people definitely hurt the state as a whole. Demosthenes does not advocate for the same type of radical democracy that Pericles does, especially if it led to the weakening of the state. In Section 298, Demosthenes explains how he never advised Athens like Aeschines and other corrupt statesmen, “leaning like a scale towards personal gain.” (ὄσα συμβεβούλευκα πώποτε τουτοισί, ὁμοίως ὑμῖν ὥσπερ ἂν τρυτάνη ρέπων ἐπὶ τὸ λῆμμα συμβεβούλευκα, 18.298). Demosthenes does not seem to be in favor of these public fees, and Pericles does not fit the parallel he is trying to create.

While Demosthenes clearly references the Athenian past throughout his speech, one passage near the end of the speech conflicts with this strategy:

εἶτα τῶν πρότερον γεγενημένων ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν μέμνησαι. καὶ καλῶς ποιεῖς. οὐ μέντοι δίκαιόν ἐστιν, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τὴν πρὸς τοὺς τετελευτηκότας εὐνοίαν ὑπάρχουσαν προλαβόντα παρ’ ὑμῶν πρὸς ἐκείνους ἐξετάζειν καὶ παραβάλλειν ἐμὲ τὸν νῦν ζῶντα μεθ’ ὑμῶν. (18.314).

Then you remember the good men of the past. And you do this rightly so. But this is not just, Athenian men, taking advantage of the goodwill accrued towards the dead from you to compare me to those men and to examine me, now living with you.

If Demosthenes says it is unfair to compare himself to past Athenians, why does he do it anyway? Aeschines, by bringing up in his own speech how Demosthenes does not deserve to be compared to their Athenian forefathers, in a way has actually

benefitted his rival. As long as Demosthenes does not overtly say he is as great as statesmen such as Themistocles and Miltiades, he can still make implicit comparisons. Additionally, Demosthenes turns this invective right back onto Aeschines, asking, “Then you say that I am not similar to those men? Are you like them Aeschines? Is your brother? Is some other of the orators now? For I say not one.” (εἶτα λέγεις ὡς οὐδὲν ὁμοίος εἰμ’ ἐκείνοις ἐγώ; σὺ δ’ ὅμοιος, Αἰσχίνῃ; ὁ δ’ ἀδελφὸς ὁ σός; ἄλλος δέ τις τῶν νῦν ῥητόρων; ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οὐδένα φημί, 18.314). Demosthenes claims that because Aeschines brought up these famous statesmen first, he is attempting to compare himself to them, which is rather arrogant and would not be received well by the audience. Since Aeschines first brought up the question of whether or not his opponent was worthy to mention the Athenian past, Demosthenes is free to use past references.

Although Aeschines tries to use the Athenian history to his own advantage, claiming his rival does not even compare to the great Athenians of the past, nevertheless Demosthenes refers to the history of Athens throughout the *De Corona*. Referencing past history appeals to the patriotic and good-natured Athenian assembly, but Demosthenes also attempts to create a parallel between the conflict of Philip and conflicts of the past, especially the Persian Wars, as well as compare himself to the great Athenian forefathers, especially Themistocles. Demosthenes uses historical precedent to justify his own actions during the crisis with Philip, as well as to criticize the actions and judgments of Aeschines. However, in order to create a beneficial parallel, it is important to choose the correct historical references, which is why Demosthenes shies away from mentioning the Peloponnesian Wars or Pericles, which both do not fit the image he wants to make. By utilizing Athenian history, Demosthenes is able to align himself and his strategy against Philip with victorious Athenians of the past, and ultimately defeat his rival in this trial.

Bibliography

Frost, Frank J. "Themistocles' Place in Athenian Politics."
California Studies in Classical Antiquity 1 (1968)
University of California Press: 105-24.

Herodotus. *Histories*

Holland, Tom. *Persian Fire: The First World Empire and the
Battle for the West*. New York: Doubleday, 2005.
Print.

Kochin, Michael Shalom. "Time and Judgment in
Demosthenes' De Corona." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*
35.1 (2002) Penn State University Press: 77-89.

Ober, Josiah. "Ability and Education: The Power of
Persuasion." *Mass and Elite in Democratic
Athens* (2009) Princeton University Press: 156-191

Plutarch. *Life of Pericles*

Thucydides. *The History of the Peloponnesian War*

Yunis, Harvey. "Politics as Literature: Demosthenes and
the Burden of the Athenian Past." *Arion* 8.1 (2000)
Trustees of Boston University: 97-118.

Notes

¹ Hdt. 8.140-143

² Kochin, Michael. "Time and Judgment in Demosthenes' *De Corona*." p.84-85

³ Yunis, Harvey. "Politics as Literature: Demosthenes and the Burden of the Athenian Past." p.384

⁴ Ober, Josiah. "Ability and Education: The Power of Persuasion." p.298

⁵ "What precise heights of oratory he attained, what stirring and memorable phrases he pronounced, we have no way of knowing...only by the effect it had on the assembly can we gauge what surely must have been its electric and vivifying quality—for Themistocles' audacious proposals, when put to the vote, were

ratified. The Athenian people, facing the gravest moment of peril in their history, committed themselves once and for all to the alien element of the sea, and put their faith in a man whose ambitions many had long profoundly dreaded." (Holland, Tom. "Persian Fire.").

⁶ Frost, Frank J. "Themistocles' Place in Athenian Politics." p.109

⁷ Plut. Them. 4

⁸ Thuc. 1.90

⁹ Frost, p.109

¹⁰ Plut. Per. 9

The Un-Amused Muse

William Weir '18

Upon the peak o' 'Lympus' golden crest
The marble stoops and floral mangers tressed
Do kiss the tips of the clouds cast soft in blue
Whence ancient God and 'desses bathed in dew.
Their glazed breasts turn milky collars red
Of mortal men whose hearts give rise to head,
For human lives doth ne'er seen such sights
But mangy actors, playing Gods, in tights.
So e'ery scribe of apes' adopted word
Must use Prometheus' fire for means absurd.

The Muse I'm called, in name Calliope,
The greatest judge of epic poetry,
But I am snatched from all mine reverie
By each and every poet's vanity.
All suppose of heaven I was born,
But no, my start derived from Grecian porn
For Zeus, my sire, therein fair Mnemosyne
Believed his Comb of Cocks would sate his sin.
Because in youth nine sons we loved arts,
That sexist boor told all his sons were tarts.

And so I write this poem, humanity,
This tome that spurns its words away from glee.
But promise this, I do in rhymed time,
Mine Godly prayers go with you in this rhyme.
A tragedy is stable at the start
But comedy doth steady on depart.
In their honored form with tear in eye
A laughing grin becomes the strange reply;
O, on thine mask I see no turned skin,
But in good time, you'll laugh, you'll fear, you'll grin.

Your many words, although they dance on lips
Tie on a bun and drown in contrite sips.
So please I beg you, halt your blinding eyes!
The arm of Hercules bore much less size.
The Nemian Lion 'twas not so fierce a fight
But pretty lady puss slain at middle night.
Now all the stories chant of trophied fur,
Yet in all truth, Herc brought that daughter's purr
To greater heights that night with moon most high.
'Till Herc, in her sheets, fled from her father's cry.

On Trojan beaches laced with sunlit streaks
Apollo, flaming, burnéd cheeks of Greeks.
And waves lulled in on diamond azure tides
To kiss Achilles' heels 'tween saucy strides.
His sandy toes danced light upon the gold
As blood sprayed hotly from a soldier bowled.
"Chick-fwap, chick-fawp" became the sound of doom
When thonged¹ Achilles flopped into the room.
"Chick-fwap, chick-fwap," sounds not of warful passion
But of tannéd warrior's pathetic fashion.

I'm Muse of word, so vaunt in charity
I've grown molested by thine scribbled spree.
To hell, to hell! My Grecian heart shall fly
And throw the bird to all thine Gods on high!
For they have cursed me with this painful charge
Whose weight would capsize Charon's ancient barge.
For I must listen close to worse and worse
Poems of nitwit "authors" spewing verse.
Milton holds he knows the truth of hell,
But truest hell begins when humans spell.

Note

¹ A pair of toe-splitting sandals.

Goliath of Troy Motifs of the Trojan War in I Samuel 17

Nicholas Guarracino '18

Few stories of the Old Testament are as influential and as vital to our understanding of the Biblical timeframe as the tale of David and Goliath. Set in a time of disarray, for both the Hebrews and for the Bronze Age world in which they lived, this story of a “boy who would be king” who vanquishes his foreign enemies and saves his people still represents the idealized victory of the virtuous few over the corrupt many. However, the story stands out as an exception, not an example, in the story of the Hebrew people’s conquest of Canaan. After conquering the Canaanites, the Hebrews find a new enemy in the Philistines. There is no explanation as to where or why they landed on the shores of Canaan. Goliath himself, a giant measuring “six cubits and a span”, is an outlier as well. According to Genesis, the Nephilim (giants) were the “mighty men that were of old, the men of renown” (Genesis 6:4, JPS), yet here one stands against Israel. The Bible does not explain Goliath and his Philistines and they seem to have no part in the Bible. This is until one examines not only the Levant but also the Eastern Mediterranean region as a whole. The story of Goliath fits into the mythic context of the ancient Mediterranean. The myth of David and Goliath is not the only tale of the Bronze Age to reach the modern ears; one can find the Homeric in the Abrahamic, and Goliath finds a double at Troy. Indeed, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Goliath and his death at the hands of David are influenced by the mythic duel between Hector and Achilles at Troy, a story not unlikely known to the Philistines and their champion.

To understand the Eastern Mediterranean in the time of King David, one must understand the Sea Peoples. They were many disparate peoples and tribes who wandered the Mediterranean, seeking riches and often acquiring them by force. They often worked as mercenaries, as the Egyptians recorded. According to the Egyptians, “the earliest [Sea Peoples], named in the fourteenth-century Amarna Letters... are the Denyan, Lukka, Shardana, and Shekelesh... The Danyans are often identified with the Danaans... the Lukka live in Lycia... the other two have been identified tentatively as Sardinians and Sicilians.”¹ As can be seen in the Amarna letters, the Sea Peoples

were a varied group from all over the Mediterranean, with ports as far West as the Italian isles.

Although their origin is unknown, it is known that the Philistines found employment in the Levant, and serving alongside various other tribes. According to scholar Emily Vermeule, the Philistines were one of these Sea Peoples, fighting wherever they could find employment. Indeed, “inscriptions tell us that the Danaans had been... fighting the Egyptians by the side of the Peleset (Philistines), [and] the Alasa (Cypriotes)”.² So here is proof enough to state that the Philistines of the Bible did in fact interact peacefully with the Danaans, a name commonly used in the classical world to refer to the Greeks and the Greeks at Troy. The Greeks and Philistines fought together, as allies, perhaps sharing harbors, campfires, and stories of past victories. These myths reveal connections between the Trojan civilization and the Bible.

During the transition from the Bronze to the Iron Age, many varied Mediterranean civilizations were crumbling. Cities and citadels from Greece to the Levant emptied and depopulated, and war was the norm. For the purposes of a hypothesized connection between Troy and Goliath, the most important of these sacked cities was Troy itself. According to archeological evidence, “Troy”, as it was discovered by archeologist Heinrich Schliemann, is thought to have fallen between 1334-1135 B.C.³ This dating fits perfectly within the timeframe of the Bronze Age Collapse and the founding of David’s Israel. Not only does this timeframe give the warriors and mercenaries who fought at Troy ample time to resettle and return home, but it gives time for the myth and story of the Trojan War to spread. In Vergil’s much later *Aeneid*, the Trojan Aeneas arrives at Carthage to find that news of Troy’s fall is already widespread. Perhaps there is truth to this famous legend of how quickly news can spread, especially if the far-flung Sea Peoples like the Danaans (who, as recorded by the Egyptians, were allied with the Philistines), or possibly even some of the Philistines themselves, participated in the war.

As the myths in the Aegean tell of wayward sailors like Ulysses returning home, the Philistines found one for themselves. One explanation for their settling in Canaan is that “an unsuccessful assault on Egypt had carried them into the Southern part of the Palestinian coastal plain.”⁴ What truly matters is what remains of their settlement: the Philistine Pentapolis of Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Ekron, and Gath. Scholar Mario Liverani attests to the Philistines having Aegean

names. He also explains that that their sites contained Mycenaean pottery, before the development of a closely related style of native Philistine pottery.⁵ Moreover, what little can be gathered of their language supposedly holds clues to their origins and influences; the Philistine word for lord or king, *seren*, possibly being related to the Greek word for the same title, *tyrannos* (compare with the word for lord in Hebrew, *adonai*).⁶ Though not much is left of the Philistine settlement, what remains attests to an Aegean heritage.

The Old Testament also alludes to an Aegean origin of Philistine culture, and the Hellenistic myths they might have carried. Twice in the Bible, the Philistines are said to be from Crete. In Genesis, God mentions “the Caphtorim [Cretans], whence the Philistines came forth” (Genesis 10:14), and in Amos, God says to the titular prophet that “I brought Israel up from the land of Egypt, but also the Philistines from Caphtor”. (Amos 9:7, JPS) Whether the Hebrews themselves knew the homeland of the Philistines was debatable, but it cannot be denied that twice in the Bible the Philistines are said to have originated in the Aegean.

Having connected the Aegeans to the Philistines, Troy and its legend can be connected to Goliath. And if one breaks down both Goliath’s and Hector’s stories into their components it becomes possible that some aspects of the Hellenistic myth of Troy made their way into the writing of I Samuel 17. The three main motifs that connect the stories of David and Goliath and of Achilles and Hector are thus: the description of the challenger, the challenger calling out the challenged, and the desecration of the fallen challenger.

Goliath’s description is in I Samuel 17, the same book in which he dies. “A champion of the Philistines forces stepped forward; his name was Goliath of Gath, and he was six cubits and a span tall. He had a bronze helmet on his head, and wore a breastplate of scale armor, a bronze breastplate weighing five thousand shekels.” (I Samuel 17:4-5, JPS) Notice how the Biblical author describes not only his height, but his armor. The author gives special attention to the helmet, which is said to be bronze. This aligns very well to what is seen in the Iliad, Book II, when Hector is described by Homer as “tall Hector with helmet flashing”. (Iliad II. 927) Not only the height of the challenger, but also the garb match. The helmet is a strong indicator of the connection between Hector and Goliath, as the description “Hector with helmet flashing” is distinctive to his character, one which Homer transformed into one of his most famous epithets.

That Goliath as well is described as being armed with a bronze helmet is very telling, as the two champions share this linking attribute.

The next motif is the challenging, which again matches. Goliath strides out of the fortified hilltop encampment of the Philistines and declares, “I herewith defy the ranks of Israel. Get me a man and let’s fight it out!” (I Samuel 17:10, JPS) Hector, likewise, follows a similar (if more complex) trajectory. After motivating himself in the book prior, telling himself that it would be “better by far for me/ to stand up to Achilles, kill him, come home alive/ or die at his hands in glory out before the walls” (Iliad XXII. 129-131), Hector meets Achilles in battle in Book XXII of the Iliad. Leaving his fortified sanctum, he goes out to meet the Danaan warrior “furious to fight Achilles to the death.” (Iliad XXII. 40) Here we see a similar image: the armored champion leaving his well defended safe-haven to challenge and defeat his enemy.

The final motif is that of the desecration of the body; specifically, the challenged threatens the challenger with dishonoring the corpse, before following up on his word. In I Samuel 17, David is forthright, claiming to Goliath that he will “kill [him] and cut off [his] head”. (I Samuel 17:46, JPS) After bringing down Goliath with his sling, David “grasped [Goliath’s] sword and pulled it from its sheath; and with it he dispatched him and cut off his head” (I Samuel 17:51, JPS). Just as he promised, David slew Goliath, and lifted up the champion’s head for all to see. Achilles, driven by vendetta against Hector, is far less open with his threat to Hector. When Hector asks Achilles to observe the Hellenistic tradition of honoring the bodies of the fallen for funeral, Achilles simply claims that “there are no binding oaths between men and lions - /wolves and lambs can enjoy no meeting of the minds - / they are all bent on hating each other to death.” (Iliad XXII, 310-312) Achilles’s threat befits the enraged state he is in at the moment, while also serving as a portent of what is to come. Achilles defiles the corpse of Hector. Later, like David, he turns the fallen warrior into a trophy to display before the defeated. “Piercing the tendons, ankle to heel behind both feet,/ he knotted straps of rawhide through them both,/ lashed them to his chariot, left the head to drag”. (Iliad XXII. 467-469) Victorious, David and Achilles both show off their prize to their enemies.

The argument made for allusions to Troy in I Samuel 17, the issue remains as to how a Hellenistic myth influenced a Jewish text. Indeed, this is perhaps the greatest hurdle for the

argument to overcome. To this problem there are three plausible answers. The first is emulation. The well-armed warrior Goliath could very well have been emulating a hero of his myths: Hector of the flashing helmet. If this is true, then the myth of Troy did influence the Bible, but the motif of the victor showing off his trophy is a similarity, not a correlation.

The second is both the hardest to prove and the one least involved with the actual events of I Samuel 17 and the history of the region: that the authors of I Samuel 17 did not encounter the raw myth of Troy from the Philistines, but the far more refined *Iliad* of Homer. Again, this is the hardest explanation to prove, but not impossible; Homer predates the writing of the Deuterocanonical Histories, so his work existed at the time of the writing of Samuel. The rest is speculation as to how or why it could have influenced the Deuterocanonical Historians. If there is any merit to this theory, it is that it helps to better explain the shared motif of desecrating the fallen warrior as a trophy.

The third possible explanation is absorption of the Philistines and their myths into the Kingdom of Israel, and this one best helps the argument. It is a known fact that the Hebrews absorbed the pagan Canaanites into their society after their conquest. Indeed, after the successes of David and Solomon, many Philistines would have found themselves to be members of a Hebrew Kingdom, with their myths intermingling with theirs before eventually being recorded as one. This solution is perhaps the best at fully explaining the background of the story. Not only does it support hypothetical Trojan allusions in the fight between David and Goliath, it best explains the shared motif of desecrating the fallen, and also reflects the Hellenistic origin of the Philistines. It also melds well with the first proposition; that Goliath was emulating one of his heroes.

There exists one other possible hindrance to this theory; Goliath appears two other times in the Bible, and in one of those instances he is killed by someone other than David. Indeed II Samuel 21:19 says that a man named Elhanan killed Goliath. Moreover, I Chronicles 20:5 says that Elhanan killed Goliath's brother Lahmi. These claims are short and passing, and are never mentioned again. It is possible that "Goliath-slaying" might have been a motif of regional heroes, or that Elhanan's myth is a corruption of David's. Whatever the reason, it can be agreed that Elhanan's stories do not hold a candle to David's when it comes to sheer thematic and dramatic detail; David's story tells us far more concerning Goliath and his death, and is

by far the more remembered. David's is clearly the story that the Biblical authors put care in, not Elhanan's.

And so, having explained the Hellenistic origins of the Philistines and breaking down the famous duel scenes between David and Goliath and Achilles and Hector, the connection between the Trojan and Davidic myths becomes clear. However, that this does not take away from the importance of King David, nor does it stand as an attack against the sanctity of the Bible. Far from it, this foreign connection between Troy and Israel would fit well in the Bible, which has proven to be a universal book with universal influences. Just as myths of Babylon, symbology of Egypt, and vocabulary of the Stoics are found and justifiably belong in different parts of the Bible, enlivening it and giving the modern world a better picture of the ancient one, so too do the shadows of the heroes of Troy belong in the Bible.

Bibliography

- Vermeule, Emily. *Greece in the Bronze Age*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 1964. Print.
- Noth, Martin. *The Old Testament World*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966. Print.
- Hayes, John H., and J. Maxwell Miller. *Israelite and Judean History*. London: SCM, 1977. Print.
- Liverani, Mario. *Israel's History and the History of Israel*. London: Equinox, 2005. Print.
- Coogan, Michael David. *The Old Testament: A Historical and Literary Introduction to the Hebrew Scriptures*. New York: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- Wiseman, D. J. *Peoples of Old Testament times*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1973. Print.
- Berlin, Adele, Marc Zvi Brettler, and Michael A. Fishbane. *The Jewish Study Bible: Jewish Publication Society Tanakh Translation*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Print.
- Homer, Robert Fagles, and Bernard Knox. *The Iliad*. New York, NY, U.S.A.: Viking, 1990. Print.

Notes

¹ Vermuele, p.271

² Vermuele, p.273

³ Vermuele, p.276

⁴ Noth, p.78

⁵ Liverani, p.37

⁶ Wiseman, p. 62

modernity

Alexandra Larkin '18

helen wears M.A.C. ruby woo
and scrolls through instagram
watching eggshell impressions
of herself, starving

niobe preys herself
to men at bars to get enough drinks
for every dead child
half between drowning
in alcohol, or tears

achilles holds patroclus's hand
in the gym and
deadlifts more than
agamemnon and hector
ignores the stares, but still scared

odysseus downloads
tinder and bumble and grinder
and locks his iphone (rose gold)
with a fifteen-letter passcode
so penelope won't catch him but
she does, with divorce papers

jason talks to medea
through prison glass
she curses him, hexes that
don't work anymore
but *he comes for the kids*
gotta keep up appearances

medusa runs a women's support group
for rape victims
with daphne and chryseis and ariadne
handing out pamphlets and handmade cookies
and little pink plastic tasers
crying, for what they all lost

cassandra keeps telling
hector to be careful in bar fights
and paris to stop
hitting on menelaus's girlfriend
they don't listen, anyway

hector holds andromache,
her wary eyes on the subway
saying *please*
don't leave me
don't leave me

Spenser as Daedalus *and* Icarus:
Art, Nature, and Moderation in the *Faerie Queene*

Corey Scannell '18

Introduction

Classical influences dominated early English literature. In fact, some of these pioneering English writers were so thrilled with the Classical world that they would actually write in Latin verse (like Milton's *Elegia Prima*, or Campion's *Poematum Libellus*, for example).¹ Along with this influence came a continued conversation with ancient authors. The most daring of these poets took on the highest style, using Classical conventions to compose epics in English. Around two centuries before Milton or Campion, during the early development of our language, Edmund Spenser published his magnum opus, *The Faerie Queene*. The poet recreated many Classical and epic tropes in this work – most notably his newly minted “Spenserian Stanza” – but he also relied on my epic themes. For instance, the plotline follows extraordinary heroes who fend off superhuman foes amidst divine intervention, offering a commentary on the poet's contemporary government all the while. Although Spenser intended to include twelve books in *The Faerie Queene* (in truly epic fashion), his sprawling poem only amounted to six. In this essay, I will focus on the end of Book 2 from a strictly classical perspective. Book 2 centers around the endeavors of Sir Guyon, a hero on a mission to destroy the “Bower of Blisse,” where evil Acrasia dwells. The trip is no joke; along the way, Guyon and his companions face foes and natural tests that recall the epic feats of old. In particular, Spenser alludes to Ovid in ways that illuminate his characters, and his own role as an author.

Canto 12 in Book 2 of *The Faerie Queene* cautions for restraint and moderation like we see in Ovid, facilitated by a discussion of art and nature. Although this canto shares similarities with much of the *Metamorphoses*, it pertains specifically to two stories: Daedalus and Icarus, and Arachne and Minerva. As Guyon's ferry sails to the Bower of Blisse, Spenser describes moral vices with spatial distinctions, just as Ovid did. On the ferry, the character's surroundings provide a warning for moderation, like we see in Daedalus' speech to his son. Then, once the ferry reaches land, depictions of art and nature mirror

the contest between Arachne and Minerva in Book 6 of the *Metamorphoses*. The same warning for moderation exists in Arachne's downfall; the girl attempts to surpass natural boundaries with her art, and the gods ruin her for it. Unlike the *Metamorphoses*, the artists of Spenser's Bower of Blisse never warrant a mention – that is, until Spenser mentions his own role in the artistry. Intriguingly, the artwork in Spenser's Bower of Blisse would warrant a punishment in Ovid's universe. Just like Icarus, who flew too high, and Arachne, with her heavenly crime, Spenser surpasses his natural boundaries and “makes new the nature (*naturam novat*)” (Ovid, *Met.* 8.189) of his art. In Canto 12 of Book 2, Spenser advocates for moderation by alluding to the natural boundaries evident in Icarus and Arachne's stories; in the second half of the canto, he defies these very boundaries with his own artwork, and equates himself to Ovid in the process.

Many of Ovid's tales in the *Metamorphoses* deal with humans who strive to do too much, and meet a miserable end because of their audacity. No characters exemplify this better than Daedalus and Icarus in Book 8. Just like in Arachne's contest, the story's sad ending depends on the characters' reckless imitation of Nature. Although Icarus takes on the avarian role, and “goes the higher way, dragged by a lust for the sky (*caelique cupidine tractus, altius egit iter*)” (Ovid, 8.224-225), Daedalus and his artwork are also responsible for the great fall. Ovid states that Daedalus' artwork is unprecedented, suggesting its danger, “he set his mind upon unknown arts, and recreated nature (*ignotas animum dimittit in artes naturamque novat*)” (Ovid, 8.188-189). Later, once Daedalus sees his son's wings floating in the ocean, he doesn't curse the boy's reckless behavior, but his own artwork (“*devovitque suas artes,*” 8.234). Ironically, Daedalus prefaces the flight with a caution: “I warn you to fly in the middle route, for, if you should go lower, the sea will weigh down your wings, and if you go higher, the sun will burn them (*medio ut limite curras, Icare, moneo, ne, si demissior ibis, unda gravet pennas, si celsior, ignis adurat*)” (Ovid, 8.204-206). Icarus symbolically and literally flies too high with his audacious wings (“*audaci...volatu*” 8.223) and dies because of it. But the fact is that neither Daedalus nor Icarus takes the middle route; both father and son reach too high by testing the boundaries of the natural world, Icarus as a bird, and Daedalus as its creator. Strikingly similar warnings for moderation appear in Canto 12, in Book 2 of the Faerie Queene, where Spenser represents the flight with a boat ride.

Just like in Daedalus' warning, spatial distinctions represent moral vicissitudes in Stanzas 6, 7 and 8 of Canto 12. As is typical in the *Faerie Queene*, Spenser takes his analogy a step further than Ovid did, by assigning vices to two improper paths: the Gulfe of Greedinesse and Rocke of Reproach. Although editors traditionally equate these two obstacles to Scylla and Charybdis,² I posit that the language in these stanzas, and Spenser's Ovidian allusions later on, suggest that Guyon's ferry is more representative of Icarus than an Odyssean ship. The Gulfe of Greedinesse parallels Ovid's ocean that swallowed Icarus: the only rhyming word that Spenser repeats in stanza six is "deepe," metonymically describing the water. After "deepe's" second mention, the remaining two lines conclude with "descent" and "drent."³ Not only do repetition and rhyme scheme emphasize the Gulfe's association with the ocean, but the stanza's end reflects Icarus' watery death, with the words "falles," "descent," and "drent." In sharp contrast to the Gulfe's low and deep position, the Rocke of Reproach occupies a loftier local, described in stanza eight as "this hight," that attracts "Meawes," "Seagulles," "Cormoyrants" and "birds of ravenous race." The Rocke's winged victims act "in wanton joys, and lustes intemperate" (stanza seven); Icarus, who wore wings, also experiences joy and lust on lines 223 ("*gaudere*") and 224 ("*cupidine*"). The only way to get past the Rocke and the Gulfe is right down the center, as Daedalus called the "*medio limite*" (Ovid 8.204), but what Spenser calls "an even course" (2.12.3). This comparison shows just one of the ways Spenser mimics Ovid's natural boundaries, though with little mention of the ways humans surpass those limitations, which he discusses in the second half of the canto.

The Rocke and the Gulfe aren't the only metaphors in Canto 12 that recall Ovidian-style moderation. For example, Guyon faces impulsiveness in Stanza 14 with the false islands, "unthriftyhed" in Stanza 18 with its quicksand, and covetousness of the singing girl in Stanza 33. In each instance, Guyon has to practice his restraint to succeed, opting for moderation instead of indulgence. This theme of moderation, though most famously exemplified with Ovid's Daedalus and Icarus, actually recurs throughout the *Metamorphoses* too. Humans pay the price for reckless audacity in Book 5 (with the daughters of Pieros), Book 6 (Apollo and Marsyas), Book 11 (Pan and Midas), and more. In short, both Spenser and Ovid use metaphorical stories to advocate for the middle path ("*medio limite*" Ovid 8.204). Just about halfway through the canto, at stanza 42, Spenser combines

these cautionary metaphors with a discussion of art and nature that persists throughout the rest of Book 2. In his depiction of visual art, Spenser uses language reminiscent of the Arachne and Minerva story, and continues his conversation with Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In addition to the thematic parallels in Icarus and Arachne's failures, both stories share salient textual similarities, which Spenser recreates in turn.

Ovid's Arachne is a lowly country girl, who displays art's connection to nature when she enters into a tapestry-making contest with Minerva, the goddess of weaving. Despite her obvious disadvantage, Arachne agrees to the challenge and does surprisingly well. When she examines the tapestries, Minerva finds no fault in the girl's, "neither Minerva nor even Envy (personified) could slander her work (*non illud Pallas, non illud carpere Livor possit opus*)" (Ovid 6.129-130). But before we learn the verdict, Arachne tries to hang herself out of fear of Minerva's wrath, when the goddess graciously transforms her into a spider. During the contest, Ovid describes the benchmark of artistic success as a close representation of the natural world, like we saw in the perfectly natural wings that Daedalus constructed ("for he arranged the feathers in order...so you might think they grew on a slope (*nam ponit in ordine pennas...ut clivo crevisse putes*)" Ovid 11.189). Similarly, Arachne weaves a scene, "so that that you might think it was a true bull and true waves (*verum taurum, freta vera putares*)" (Ovid 6.104)." In a rare direct address, Ovid uses the second person subjunctive form of *puto* to equate good artistry to the natural world in both these passages; Arachne and Daedalus' creations are beautiful because they resemble what we might see in nature. As Arachne toils away, Ovid says that "she returned the very likeness of the scenes (*suam faciemque locorum reddidit*)" (Ovid 6.121-122). The word *reddidit* stands out here because of its contrast with the verbs that Ovid usually uses in the story.⁴ Lewis and Short cite this exact line, saying that "reddo," in this instance, means, "to give back a thing according to its nature."⁵ The word, then, implies that Arachne wove scenes according to their natural appearance, and that there is little distinction between *ars* and *natura* in her work.

Nature determines the epitome of perfection for Arachne's tapestry and for the Bower of Blisse. When Ovid talks about Arachne and Minerva's skill, he describes transitioning colors in the tapestries, deeming the transition good if it resembles a rainbow: "She wove...like when an arc is wont to stain the vast sky after rainfall, when the sun refracts into a wide curve

(*texitur...qualis ab imbre solent percussis solibus arcus, inficere ingenti longum curvamine caelum*)” (Ovid 6.63-67). With this simile, Ovid designates the natural world as the model of perfection, which the women will strive to recreate. In the *Faerie Queene*, Nature becomes the measure of successful art as well. Describing the Bower of Blisse in stanza 42, Spenser writes, “A place...that Natures worke by art can imitate.” As the art at the Bower of Blisse becomes more alluring, it enters into a contest with the natural world, and settles with equality: “One would have thought/...that nature had for wantonnesse ensued/ Art, and that Art at nature did repine;/ So striving each th’ other to undermine...so differing both in willes, agreed in fine” (Spenser 2.59). Like the Bower, Arachne strives to exceed a mere imitation of nature with her art, and tests the limits of artistic ability with her “reckless audacity (*furialibus ausis*)” (Ovid 6.84). Spenser never attributes a reckless artist to his ekphrastic artwork, but scenes on the Bower of Blisse exhibit the same superhuman capabilities as Arachne’s tapestry.

Ovid describes Minerva’s tapestry first, so that we have something to compare Arachne’s to; Minerva’s scene sets a divine standard that Arachne could strive to emulate, but would be foolish to equal or surpass. The goddess’ tapestry is planned and orderly, with all the Olympians in the middle, four scenes in the corners, and a decorative olive-vine border around the edge. In a word, we can clearly picture the artwork in our heads. Then, Arachne foolishly tries to outdo the goddess by testing the limits of possibility. Within her tapestry, she depicts motion, emotion, and metamorphoses. See her representation of Europa, for example: “She seemed to look back at the abandoned land, and to call her companions, to lift up her foot, and to fear the dashing water’s touch (*Ipsa videbatur terras spectare relictas et comitas clamare suas tactumque vereri adsilientis aquae timidisque reducere plantas*)” (Ovid 6.104-106). Arachne somehow represents numerous figures who move, think and even transform within the tapestry. In a similar ekphrasis, extending across two stanzas, Spenser describes impossible visual art in a similar way: “And therein all the famous history/ of Jason and Medea was ywrit/ her mighty charms, her furious loving fit/...his falséd faith, and love too lightly flit” (Spenser 2.44). In Ovid and in Spenser, perfectly constructed visual art can be impossible to imagine, with elements like fits of passion, false faith, and fear. The artists of both scenes seem to possess otherworldly talent, so as to create unimaginable artwork. In the *Metamorphoses*, at least, this excessive behavior spells trouble for Arachne.⁶ As the Canto

progresses, Spenser's intentions to mimic Ovid – or rather, to imitate Arachne – become only clearer.

Linguistic and thematic similarities aside, nothing says *Metamorphoses* like metamorphosis itself. At the end of Book 2, the Palmer performs a transformation à la Ovid, where he turns beasts into men. Like the *Metamorphoses*, a deity had transformed them into animals that suited their temperaments, “now turned into figures hideous/ according to their mindes like monstrous” (Spenser 2.12.85). The transformations underpin a recurring lesson in the canto, that humans are destined to err, and we have to take cautions to avoid our vices. The one metamorphosed man who wants to remain a beast, named Grill, plays the role of a human who gives into temptation; he eschews the middle path, like Icarus who flies too high, and Arachne who exceeds her boundaries. However, Spenser takes this last opportunity to advocate for restraint one more time. Grill complains “that had from hoggish forme him brought to natural” (Spenser 2.12.86). At this point in the canto, it is safe to regard nature as the epitome of perfection, suitable to strive for but not to surpass. But though Spenser calls for moderation in his metamorphoses scene, he depicted a heedless excess of natural boundaries just earlier. In stanza 77, Spenser describes a “wanton Ladie, with her lover lose,” whose beauty entices the men. In reference to the woman's good looks, Spenser says, “more subtle web Arachne cannot spin” (2.77). Given Arachne's punishment for her nearly immaculate tapestry, one might wonder who created this attractive facade, which surpasses the boundaries that Ovid laid out. According to Ovid, Spenser's rules for moderation should collapse as soon as art begins to compete with nature in Stanza 52.

Since Spenser never actually names an artist of his Bower, he leaves no one to take the credit besides himself. In the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid removes himself from the boundary-breaking art by putting the tools in his characters' hands. By the end of Book 2, we still have no indication as to where the Bower's art came from; however, we need not look far to see Spenser pick up the tools himself. In just the third stanza in Book 3, Spenser refers to himself as the artist of his work, defining his role in terms of visual art, “cannot your glorious pourtraict figure plaine/ that I in colourd shows may shadow it” (3.3). He grabs our attention here because he so rarely speaks in the first person, and he assigns himself the role of Book 2's missing artist. The theme of audacious artists only arises once we pair our reading of Spenser with Ovid, his inspiration. Although

it seems obvious that Spenser should be the artist of his own work, it wouldn't warrant a comment without a paired reading of the *Metamorphoses*; with Ovid's help, though, it becomes clear that Spenser takes on the role of an artist like Arachne and Daedalus. Consider the way Daedalus erred: "he set his mind upon unknown arts, and recreated nature (*ignotas animum dimittit in artes naturamque novat*)" (Ovid, 8.188-189)." In the *Faerie Queene*, Spenser adopts Ovid's art form – namely, epic poetry – and recreates it ("*novat*") with his own form, the Spenserian stanza.⁷

In many ways, Spenser takes on the role of Ovid's successor. Both authors wrote sprawling epics that rely on familiar tropes – moralizing themes, divine intervention, idealistic heroes – but also transform the genre, by incorporating numerous short stories instead of a single, continuous narrative. Spenser leaves no doubt about his intention to mimic Ovid, especially in Book 2.12. The theme of moderation features heavily in the canto, as Guyon dodges the moral traps that Icarus could not avoid. Besides that, Spenser dictates artistic perfection by means of nature, like Ovid did for Arachne and Daedalus. Not only do the two epics share thematic similarities, but their language is almost identical at times.⁸ As if his intentions were not clear enough, Spenser integrates Ovid right into the canto, with retellings of Ovidian tales in canto 52, the mention of Arachne in 77, and even metamorphoses in 86. However, Spenser and Ovid's epics certainly aren't identical. In 2.12, Spenser distinguishes himself from Ovid by inserting himself into the poem via the first person; in doing so, he tags himself as the artist even Arachne cannot surpass (2.12.77). Spenser ventures into unknown arts ("*ignotas...artes*" Ovid 188) and reinvents Ovid's epic form, inserting himself as a character who reaches too high. This time, though, Minerva yields and the clouds recede, making way for the artist whose wings have yet to melt.

Bibliography

- Binns, J. W. *The Latin Poetry of English Poets*. N.p.: Routledge, 2014. Print.
- Lewis, Charlton T. *A Latin Dictionary: Founded on Andrew's. Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary = Lewis and Short*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1996. Print.
- Ovid, Frank Justus. Miller, and G. P. Goold. *Metamorphoses*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1984. Print.
- Spenser, Edmund, Hugh Maclean, and Anne Lake Prescott. *Edmund Spenser's Poetry: Authoritative Texts, Criticism*. New York: Norton, 1993. Print.

Notes

- ¹ “The Latin Poetry of English Poets”. Routledge Revivals. 2014
- ² Cf. “Norton Critical Edition” page 210, footnote 5.
- ³ Glossed as “drowned” in the NCE.
- ⁴ Words for paint, depict, or represent were limited to a concrete list of vocabulary up until this point in the story: *pingit, inscribit, facit, dat, addit*, and cognates.
- ⁵ *A Latin Dictionary* by Lewis and Short
- ⁶ Arachne’s excessive behavior and overall boundary breaking manifests itself in her ivy border, which Ovid describes as a “*tenui limbo*, a thin boundary” (6.127); puzzling, because Minerva’s frame was just any old width. This, again, is why Ovid lets Minerva go first: to give Arachne a leader to follow, whom she ignores anyway, by pushing the “boundary.” Recall another character who didn’t follow his leader? “The boy began to rejoice in his audacious wings, and deserted his leader (*puer audaci coepit gaudere volatu deseruitque ducentem*)” (Ovid 223-224).
- ⁷ James Joyce, another pioneer in narrative form, also found inspiration in the Daedalus-Icarus story. In fact, the epigraph to Joyce’s bildungsroman is this same passage, from Ovid 8.188-189. The protagonist – and Joyce’s persona – Stephen Daedalus, breaks down boundaries too, but that’s a discussion for another essay.
- ⁸ It’s hard to compare languages of course, but like we saw, the authors’ word choice sometimes overlaps: both use the

imperative to call for the middle path (Spenser 2.12.3; Ovid 8.204), both cite joy and lust as ways to stray from that path (Spenser 2.12.7; Ovid 8.223-224), and both use the second person subjunctive to stress art's perfection (Spenser 2.12.44; Ovid 6.104 & 11.189). And all these connections come exclusively from Spenser 2.12 and Ovid 6 & 8; there are many more overlaps, I imagine, but one could spend his whole life looking and still miss most of them.

Submissions for Next Year

Parnassus welcomes submissions from Holy Cross students of any major. For next year's journal, students from the class of 2016-2020 are eligible to submit. Pieces should relate to the study of the ancient world and should be understandable to a wide audience. Essays, poems, translations, creative pieces and artwork are all eligible for publication.

Submissions can be e-mailed to HCclassicsjournal@gmail.com, beginning in October 2016. Pieces will be reviewed after February 2017, and authors will be notified of acceptance at the beginning of March 2017. Authors of accepted articles will continue to work on their piece with an editor in the following month.