

## College of the Holy Cross CrossWorks

---

Parnassus: classical journal

Classics Department

---

11-2017

# Parnassus: Classical Journal (Volume 5, 2017)

Neel Smith

*College of the Holy Cross*, [nsmith@holycross.edu](mailto:nsmith@holycross.edu)

Charlie Schufreider

*College of the Holy Cross*, [cjschu17@g.holycross.edu](mailto:cjschu17@g.holycross.edu)

Melody Wauke

*College of the Holy Cross*, [mawauk17@g.holycross.edu](mailto:mawauk17@g.holycross.edu)

Allyn Walker

*College of the Holy Cross*, [awalle18@g.holycross.edu](mailto:awalle18@g.holycross.edu)

Jason Steranko

*College of the Holy Cross*, [jdster17@g.holycross.edu](mailto:jdster17@g.holycross.edu)

*See next page for additional authors*

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

 Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Smith, Neel; Schufreider, Charlie; Wauke, Melody; Walker, Allyn; Steranko, Jason; Scannell, Corey J.; Seariac, Hanna; Kelley, Michael; Ciolek, Richard; Posillico, Thomas; and Hanley, Claude, "Parnassus: Classical Journal (Volume 5, 2017)" (2017). *Parnassus: classical journal*. 5.

<https://crossworks.holycross.edu/parnassus/5>

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**

Neel Smith, Charlie Schufreider, Melody Wauke, Allyn Walker, Jason Steranko, Corey J. Scannell, Hanna Seariac, Michael Kelley, Richard Ciołek, Thomas Posillico, and Claude Hanley

# PARNASSUS

CLASSICAL JOURNAL

COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS | VOLUME V | MMXVII

## **Journal Staff**

**Editor in Chief:**

Claude Hanley, '18

**Deputy Editor:**

Michael Raheb, '20

**Copy Editor:**

Hanna Seariac, '20

**Correspondence Editor:**

Melissa Gryan, '18

**Editorial Board:**

Richard Ciołek, '20

Melissa Gryan, '18

Michael Kelley, '18

Liam O'Toole, '20

Hanna Seariac, '20

Anne Thompson, '17

**Faculty Advisors:**

Prof. Timothy Joseph

Prof. Aaron Seider

27 August 2017

Dear Reader,

Five years ago, a group of Holy Cross students began assembling the first edition of this journal. In the years since, a small editorial board has continued to produce a new edition each year. These pages have become a reliable feature of the life of Fenwick 4: copies are presented to prospective students; faculty encourage their classes to submit papers; and each year, a new team of editors eagerly awaits the new issue. This journal has attained a dependable place in the life of our department – even if a less-than-diligent editor delays publication by many months.

When we assess submissions each February, the Board relies on two metrics. First, we assess intellectual or artistic quality, seeking out pieces which are characterized by rigorous analysis, clearly written, and offer some real insight into the Classical world and its reception. In recent years, we have considered a second metric, accessibility. Towards this end, we have tried to include poetry, short essays, and papers adapted to a more general audience – the sort of submissions which people with little knowledge of the Classical world might find engaging or thought-provoking. In the past few years, the best submissions have possessed both of these qualities; firmly rooted in the Classical world, they have managed to speak both to lasting human truths as well as to contemporary interests and concerns. The task of the Editorial Board has been to solicit and include submissions which possess both of these qualities. The following pages, I think, attest to how brilliantly they have succeeded.

When I thumb through old volumes of *Parnassus* (usually after midnight in the Fitzgerald Library, in dread of a looming exam), I am frequently struck by how the concerns of a particular moment bleed into the works of our contributors. This edition's preoccupation with rhetorical historical narrative, and political satire illustrate this tendency. It is no surprise that we, as writers and editors, often grapple with ancient texts in terms of contemporary problems. On reflection, it seems that this is one of the great strengths of our discipline.

The German scholar Friedrich August Wolf is said to have defined “Philology” as “knowledge of human nature as exhibited in antiquity.” Although not all of us will accept that definition, these pages attest to its enduring value. This discipline and the things we say about it offer a unique lens for understanding the present. On Mount St. James, *Parnassus* gives voice to that insight. A lofty description, indeed, and one that we may not always fulfill. At the very least, it is a goal to be obtained.

With that said, I must offer my thanks to all members of the Editorial Board, whose work this issue is. The now long-delayed publication of this journal in no way reflects their efforts. To the contrary, their work, particularly that of our deputy editor, is solely responsible for moving Volume V off of the editor’s hard drive and into print. With profound gratitude both to them and to our patient contributors, it is my honor to present this issue. I hope you enjoy the reading as much as I did.

Claude Hanley, ’18  
Editor-in-Chief

## Table of Contents

<b>Cover Art</b> Michael Raheb '20	
<b>Editorial Board</b>	ii
<b>Editor's Note</b> Claude Hanley '18	iii
<b>Ode on a Grecian URN</b> Prof. Neel Smith, Classics	1
<b>“Primitive” Satire: An Analysis of the Final Four Choral Songs of <i>Lysistrata</i></b> Charlie Schufreider, '17	3
<b>Denial of Physical Violence as Rhetoric in <i>Lysistrata</i></b> Melody Wauke, '17	14
<b>A Translation of <i>Iliad</i> 3.340-368</b> Allyn Waller, '18	28
<b>The Tradition of Amplificatio in Josephus's <i>Against Apion</i> 1.1-9</b> Jason Steranko, '17	29
<b>A Translation of <i>Iliad</i> 4.104-4.129</b> Corey Scannell, '18	41
<b>Herodotus, Euripides, and the Fetishization of Foreign Women</b> Hanna Seariac, '20	42

<b>Tricks and Treaties: The “Trojanification” of Turnus in the <i>Aeneid</i></b> Michael Kelley, '18	47
<b>“the piercing of glaucus,” <i>Iliad</i> 16.508-16.547</b> Jason Steranko, '17	56
<b>The Principate of Trimalchio: Imperium in the <i>Satyrical</i> of Petronius the Arbiter</b> Richard Ciołek, '20	58
<b>Petronian Comments on Parental Influence in Education</b> Thomas Posillico, '20	67
<b>A Translation of <i>Odyssey</i> 12.201-12.225</b> Michael Kelley, '18	75
<b>The Laughter of Democritus: Humour and Glory in <i>Satires</i> 10</b> Claude Hanley, '18	76
<b>Dido’s Last Day</b> Melody Wauke, '17	87



Ode on a Grecian URN

urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0012.tlg001.msA:1.1

Thou still abstract citation of a text,  
    Thou child of digital and human time,  
Tech librarian, who canst thus express  
    a poem's line more sweetly than our rhyme:  
What epic tale is hidden in thy ref  
    Of deities or mortals, or of both,  
    Before the Scaean Gate and walls of Troy?  
    What men or gods are these of doubtful troth?  
What keening cries of mourning wives bereft?  
    What din of battle, and what shouts of joy?

All links resolved are sweet, but those that last  
    Are sweeter: therefore, O ye Muses, sing;  
Not to the sensual ear, as in the past,  
    but now to future tech your voice let ring:  
No failing server can your song deceive,  
    Nor browser leave you with a 404;  
    Bold Reader, never, never canst thou pass  
Directly to the text, but do not grieve;  
    Thy reference cannot fade, and always lasts,  
    For ever canst thou find it, as before!

O URN! Fair attitude! with brede  
    of colons and of namespace overwrought,  
With arbitrary strings, as IDs need;  
    Thou, silent form, dost tease us out of thought  
As doth eternity: Cold Pastoral!  
    When old age shall this generation waste,  
    Thou shalt remain, in midst of other woe  
    Than ours, a friend to man, to whom thou say'st,

“Truth is citation — URN is all  
    Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.”

Neel Smith

Co-architect, Homer Multitext project

Co-designer, the CITE architecture: <http://cite-architecture.github.io/>

## “Primitive” Satire: An Analysis of the Final Four Choral Songs of *Lysistrata*

Charlie Schufreider, ‘17

While choral songs from the Greek tragedians are repeatedly labored over by scholars trying to extract every small thematic detail from the often-cryptic songs, it is a wonder why some choruses from Greek comedy are treated with little of the same zeal. Perhaps the difference is due to perceptions towards comedy as being less “serious” than its counterpart, but regardless it is certainly shocking to read K. J. Dover completely dismiss the final choral songs of Aristophanes’s *Lysistrata* as being nothing more than a “primitive joke.”<sup>1</sup> In truth, his opinion is based on a surface reading of the four songs (1043-1057, 1058-1071, 1189-1202, and 1203-1215) which all employ different domestic images and language to convey the same message: “if anyone wants to borrow anything from me, let him come to my house at once - and he’ll get nothing.”<sup>2</sup> In all four songs, the Chorus sings directly to the audience, promising in the first song to lend money, in the second to invite the audience to a banquet, in the third to give away dresses and other belongings, and in the fourth to dole out grain and bread.

An analysis of the similar structures in other Aristophanic comedy and of the symbolism behind the choral language can reveal that the final choral songs, rather than merely propagate a now-trite joke, allow Aristophanes to accomplish two distinct tasks. First, perhaps unsurprisingly, Aristophanes utilizes the final words of the Chorus to provide a disguised, yet acerbic, critique of Athenian government, particularly its inability to hold its promises when faced with limited resources. On the other hand, the final four strophes employ language that recalls, in many ways, the domesticization of the Acropolis inherent in *Lysistrata*’s plans and illustrates how these will fail. In other words, Aristophanes, through the Chorus, attempts to make clear that he by no means endorses women, whether or not they were in the audience, to take up a sex strike; the plot was merely an illustrative satire and should not be carried out beyond the limits of this fantastical play.

For a character to jokingly invite members of the audience to dine with the characters appears two other times in extant Aristophanic comedy, and its survival even into the plays of Plautus suggests that it was a fairly common trope in Greek comedy. Thus the accusation by Dover on the joke's overplayed nature here in *Lysistrata* may appear fairly strong. Still, there are striking similarities shared between the joke's use elsewhere in ancient comedy compared to its appearance here in *Lysistrata*. In Aristophanes's *Women in the Assembly*, a maid servant arrives at the very end of the play to escort the final Athenian to dinner. She exhorts the man to hurry along as well as any well-minded spectators and any judges who look their way to follow too (καὶ τῶν θεατῶν εἴ τις εὖνους τυγχάνει, / καὶ τῶν κριτῶν εἰ μή τις ἐτέρωσε βλέπει, / ἴτω μεθ' ἡμῶν.; *Assemb.* 1141-1143). In response, the man agrees that she is to invite any and all, "for dinner has been prepared for each and every person, if they go home" (τὸ δεῖπνον αὐτοῖς ἐστ' ἐπεσκευασμένον / ἀπαξάπασιν, ἦν ἀπίωσιν οἴκαδε. *Assemb.* 1147-1148). Here, it seems as if the joke is meant as a pseudo-bribe, hinting that favoring this play will win the audience and judge a free meal, when of course this would not happen. It is this mock-bribe that survives into the plays of Plautus where in both his *Pseudolus* and his *Rudens* the characters conclude the play by going off for a drink or dinner and absentmindedly inviting spectators in exchange for applause, with the catch that they are still not invited to follow the characters right now, but perhaps later on. (*verum si voltis adplaudere... in crastinum vos vocabo*, Plaut. *Pseud.* 1333-1335; *si voletis plausum... dare,/ comissatum omnes venitote ad me ad annos sedecim*, Plaut. *Rud.* 1333-1334). The joke, of course, is that such a meeting will never happen.

Only the second of the four ending choral songs concerns a feast (1058-1071), and still the invitation in *Lysistrata* bears few of those similar mock-bribery elements. While the Chorus is still addressing the audience, here simply addressed as "men" (ἄνδρες, *Lys.* 1044), the Chorus never actually goes off and has a feast; the Chorus is merely discussing a hypothetical situation where they intend to host some guests (ἐστιῶν δὲ μέλλομεν ξένους, *Lys.* 1058). Little attention is giving to the nature of the audience as spectators as compared to the blatant

“θεατῶν” and “κριτῶν” found in the *Women in the Assembly*, and it is noteworthy that the Chorus does not even take part in the later feast that will take place between the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors. So while the choral song bears similarity to other mock-invitation jokes seen in ancient comedy, the function clearly differs from other standard models.

If one model for understanding these four choral songs failed, perhaps another model can lend better understanding. One of the notable aspects of these four songs is that they share the same thematic content and metrical unity, yet the first two songs are separated from the latter two by 119 lines. In these intervening lines, the play reaches its final resolution and the conflict of the play comes to an end: the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors agree to terms of peace. Henderson notes that Aristophanes used a similar separation of a choral songs in *The Birds*.<sup>3</sup> There too four, separated choral songs appear towards the end of the play, and they bookend the final part of the main narrative when the conflicts of the play are put to rest: in the end the main protagonist, Pisthetaerus, manages to get the gods to agree to his demands and those of the birds.

The four, separated choral songs in *The Birds* (1470-1481; 1482-1493; 1553-1564; 1694-1705), just like their counterparts in *Lysistrata*, are interrelated, but the topic at hand is not mock-invitations as it was in *Lysistrata*. Instead, the birds that make up *The Bird's* Chorus sing of the various far-reaching places of the world they have visited and the strange things they have seen there. According to Nan Dunbar, the songs are not as pastoral or Herodotean as they first appear, and a close reading reveals each individual song to be a satire of some part of Athenian life, whether it be a specific citizen like Peisandros (the subject of the song from *Birds* 1553-1564) or the Athenians' general fear of superstitions (the subject of the song from *Birds* 1482-1493).<sup>4</sup> The thrust of this Chorus, that no matter where they fly, the birds can only see the sins of Athens, directly undercuts the thrust of the main narrative. Pisthetaerus began this whole chain of events by wishing to escape Athens and its evils, and the bird-Chorus's suggestion at the very end of the play that Athens is everywhere highlights that Pisthetaerus's initial attitude was flawed. By showing this at the very moment when

the final conflicts are being resolved, Aristophanes highlights that the very logic of the play is not applicable to real life, and that this play is nothing but a fantasy, caught in the “realm of an ‘airy nothing.’”<sup>5</sup>

Overall, the four, separated choral songs from *The Birds* are used both to allow for further Aristophanic satire as well as a way to highlight the absurdity central to the play’s own logic. The job now is to assess whether the language of the final four choral songs in *Lysistrata* reflect the function that is suggested by the similarly structured passage in *The Birds*.

As for the satire, Henderson notes that these final four choral songs come at a point in the play when one might expect Aristophanes to begin satirizing and attacking individual audience members, like the attack on Pisthetaerus in *The Birds* 1555. Clearly, though, no such individual attack happens in these four songs. Therefore, Henderson takes the Chorus’s profession to not bear any ill-will toward anyone of the citizens (*Lys.* 1043-1045) as evidence of the Chorus’s sincere change of heart following the reunion of the men and women.<sup>6</sup> In this reading, the songs continue to be read as meaningless jokes meant to signify the joy of newfound reconciliation both of the Chorus and later of the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors.

When Henderson comments on the fourth choral song concerning the failed promise of grain, however, he notes that grain (σίτος, *Lys.* 1203) was often used by leaders of the city during the Peloponnesian War to curry the favor of needy citizens. Henderson notes that the failed delivery of grain mentioned here *might* be an allusion to how leaders often failed to keep this promise to the citizens, leaving people hungry.<sup>7</sup> Although Henderson hesitates to fully ascribe to his own suggestion, the notion that these songs might be acerbic allows readers to reread these formerly meaningless songs in a new light, one in which each song satirizes some aspect of the Athenian government. In this way, these songs continue to mount some sort of attack on Athenians as Henderson claims we should expect, but Aristophanes cleverly lets the Chorus keep their promise, “to not say one libellous thing concerning anyone of the citizens, oh men” (τῶν πολιτῶν οὐδέν’ ὄνδρες / φλαῦρον εἰπεῖν οὐδέ ἔν *Lys.* 1044-1045). The Chorus will not be attack a

singular “οὐδέν’”, but rather all Athenian men (ὄνδρες, *Lys.* 1044) who, by the definition of democracy, have a role in the government. While Henderson reads the sincerity of a changed heart in this promise, the Chorus’s profession to not say *one* libellous thing could also be a tongue-in-cheek way of ensuring that the Chorus says many libellous things.

As for what each song satirizes, Henderson provides a great start with the fourth song by recognizing the connection between leaders’ promises of grain and those who would need it. This is brought out in the song since the promised grain is not merely grain, but finely ground little chaffs of wheat (λεπτὰ πυρίδια, *Lys.* 1206) which Henderson notes to have been more expensive than everyday barley. So while the donors are seen to be have some wealth and power given their choice of wheat, the benefactors of their generosity are the day-laborers (τῶν πενήτων, *Lys.* 1208), the working poor, exactly the people who would need the daily doling-out of grain Henderson alludes to. Yet, there is a dangerous dog near the house of the donor, so no one actually gets the grain (*Lys.* 1212-1215), satirizing the inability of leaders to supply grain.

In the first ode, the target of satire is the mishandling of the state’s funds. Notably, the currency involved in the first choral song is silver (ἀργυρίδιον, *Lys.* 1049), which is precisely what Lampito singles out as a significant contributing factor to Athens’ persistence in war (οὐχ ἄς... **τῶργύριον** τῶβυσσον ἢ πὰρ τᾶ σιῶ, *Lys.* 173-174). Furthermore it is the silver that Lysistrata tells the Proboulos that she and the women will now be in charge of (τὸ γὰρ **ἀργύριον** τοῦτ’ οὐκέτι μὴ καθέλωσιν... ἡμεῖς ταμιεύσομεν αὐτό, *Lys.* 492-493). This is not even the first time Aristophanes would be satirizing the mishandling of money in this play; the chorus of old women accuses the old men of squandering the money they had received from the Persian Wars (τὸν ἔρανον τὸν λεγόμενον παππῶν ἐκ τῶν Μηδικῶν / εἴτ’ ἀναλώσαντες, *Lys.* 654-655). It is clear that the play views men as being inept in the ways of managing money, and far too warlike, and this is reflected further in the first of the final choral songs when the chorus possibly satirizes the ability of the Athenian government to adequately manage their money. If one takes βαλλάντια in line 1053 to be a pun on the word βαλλάντιον

which can mean both “purse” and “spear,” then lines 1052-1053 can be translated as “so within there is [money] and we have purses” or “so within there is [money] and we have spears” (ὡς ἔσω 'στὶν / κᾶχομεν βαλλάντια). The latter translation would solidify further the connection seen already in the play between the mishandling of funds by the government because of their preoccupation with war, as exemplified by the spears.

The imagery of the second song’s feast (*Lys.* 1058-1071) looks forward to the feast that will occur after a peace has been struck between the Spartans and Athenians (*Lys.* 1184) and possibly indicates a satire on the state’s inability to attain peace in reality. Like the later feast, attendants are encouraged to clean themselves (λελουμένους at line 1064; ἀγνεύσετε at line 1182) and in both cases emphasis is drawn towards the door which will be closed off to outsiders (ἡ θύρα κεκλήσεται at line 1071; ἄνοιγε τὴν θύραν at line 1216). The difference is that in the choral song’s feast, some of those who are invited are also considered outsiders, i.e. the door is closed to them. To strengthen the link being forged between these two feasts, the guests of honor in the Chorus’s hypothetical feast are the Karystians (*Lys.* 1059), the very same people who are named right before the actual peace feast begins (*Lys.* 1181). By strengthening the mental association between the actual sympotic feast and the failed hypothetical one, Aristophanes forges a connection between the two. Thus the choral song’s inability to host a proper feast for all those invited implies that the state in reality has been unable to acquire peace and therefore unable to hold a proper accompanying peace feast. Beyond just the connections to the later sympotic feast, the food used in the Chorus’s feast further bring out the importance of this feast as being possibly peace related. The manner in which the pig (δελφάκιον, *Lys.* 1061) has been prepared, not merely roasted but burned through a sacrifice (τοῦτο τέθυχ’, *Lys.* 1062), suggests an importance to this particular feast that is not present at a regular feast. Furthermore, the pea soup (ἔτνος, *Lys.* 1061) is seen in *The Archarnians* during the celebration of the rural Dionysia by Dikaiopolis when he believes that he has just secured peace (ἴν’ ἔτνος καταχέω τοῦλατῆρος τουτουί, *Arch.* 246), and in *The Women of the Assembly*, pea soup is among the



many dinner items included for the main meal which signifies the beginning of the new rule under the women's plans (χύτρας ἔτνους ἔψουσιν αἱ νεώταται., *Assemb.* 845). It seems, at least in Aristophanic comedy, that feasts that involve pea soup are those of large banquets celebrating great events. That the choral song promises such a dinner and cannot provide it, seems to indicate a satire on the government's inability to bring about peace which would lead to such a feast.

The last song to be discussed is the third song (1189-1202) which links the leaders of the state as being no better than the tyrants of the past. The Chorus promises to give out various clothes, dresses, and ornaments to all children, especially whenever someone's daughters becomes one of the official basket-carriers for the state (ὅποταν τε θυγάτηρ τινὶ κανηφορῆ, *Lys.* 1193). The position of κανηφόρος, or Basket-Bearer, was previously discussed in *Lysistrata* by the chorus of women (*Lys.* 645), but the more important association to make here is the relationship between the κανηφόρος and the tyrant of old Athens, Hippias, and his brother Hipparchos. Henderson notes that it was a great honor and "evidence of irreproachable character" to be chosen a κανηφόρος, but a "great humiliation to be denied."<sup>8</sup> Thucydides relates that fears of tyrannical oppression abounded in Athens at around the time when Aristophanes was writing this play, and therefore explains the story of Hippias and his brother. When Hippias was ruling, Hipparchos, among other things withdrew invitation to be κανηφόρος to a young girl, which sparked anger within two conspirators that led to the murder of Hipparchos (*Thuc.* 6.54 ff.) The murder of Hipparchos led directly to Hippias's tyrannical oppression of the Athenians, and thus the association between denying someone κανηφόρος and tyranny seems to have been formed by this story. Aristophanes play with this connection twice in *Lysistrata*. First, when he first references κανηφόρος in line 645, the chorus of men compare themselves to the conspirators who killed Hipparchos just ten lines previous (*Lys.* 630-635), thereby implying that the women are tyrants. Aristophanes's recollection of the tyrant's murder and the subsequent mentioning of the κανηφόρος should not be seen as coincidental but a conscious effort to remind the audience of the

association between the two. The second time Aristophanes plays with this connection is during the choral song of interest (1189-1202). Just forty-one line before the united chorus will promise to give clothes to the new κανήφοροι (1194), Lysistrata tries to urge the Athenians and Spartans together by reminding the Athenians how the Spartans helped to overthrow the tyrant Hippias (οἱ Λάκωνες... ἀπώλεσαν, / πολλοὺς δ' ἑταίρους Ἴππῖου 1150-1153). With the image of Hippias and his tyranny fresh in the audience's head, the Chorus's failed promise to honor new κανήφοροι seems to be a direct allusion to the failure of Hipparchos. By extension, the choral song seems to be satirizing the leaders of the city as being nothing more than new tyrants.

It seems clear that, like the four separated songs of *The Birds*, the four, separated choral songs of *Lysistrata* can be viewed as veiled critiques of Athenian government leaders, but still more these four songs can also be shown to undercut the main narrative thrust of the play. Previous scholarship on *Lysistrata* has argued that much of the play, like Lysistrata's speech reducing statesmanship to weaving, is concerned with trying to domesticate public life. Even the Acropolis itself turns from a purely political entity to a more homely environment, one where joyous feasting will take place. In the end, the domestication of politics ends up succeeding, and peace is made between Athens and Sparta.

Just as individual episodes of *Lysistrata* are fantastical, like the attempt by one woman to escape the Acropolis by riding a bird (*Lys.* 723-725), Aristophanes intended his play to be fantastical not a blueprint to women on how to secure peace. Previous scholarship has argued that the final agreement of peace where Athenians and Spartans are so engrossed with a woman's body that they cannot think rationally is meant to highlight that Aristophanes did not think Lysistrata's plan a rational way out of war.

The four, separated choral songs which bookend the final agreement of peace also work to dispel any possible thoughts of generalizing Lysistrata's to the real world. While I have already argued for deeper, satiric meaning in these songs, surface meanings reveal a concern for the everyday, domestic life: money, feasting, clothes, and bread. Further still, they show

a failure in domestic life. Taken as a whole, these vignettes of failing domesticity indicate that the power of domestication is not as strong as Lysistrata's plan seems to suggest, but are just part of Aristophanes's comedic fantasy.

Details from two of the songs demonstrate the mistrust audiences are supposed to have regarding a real life Lysistrata plot. The second song (*Lys.* 1058-1071) has already been discussed as having fairly close parallels with the feast Lysistrata will host for the Athenians and Spartans (*Lys.* 1181). By presaging the coming Lysistrata feast with the failed feast of the Chorus, Aristophanes forces the reader to question, given similar circumstances, whether one can really believe that the feast Lysistrata hosts can be successful. If one domestic feast has failed, why should Lysistrata's domesticity be any more successful?

Finally, the last song, which warns visitors to not come to the house of grain because a dog is on guard, contains an acute warning concerning the entire Lysistrata plot. Three of the five times that dogs in *Lysistrata*, they are seen as negative creatures, who seem to exist only to bite eyes (*Lys.* 298), testicles (ἄλλη σου κύων τῶν ὄρχεων λάβηται, *Lys.* 363), or just a person in general (εὐλαβεῖσθαι τὴν κύνα, *Lys.* 1215). At line 363, dog, which here is feminine (ἄλλη... κύων), is used by chorus of women to identify themselves as bitch who want to attack the chorus of old men before any other bitch gets the chance. This self-identification by the women is important because it raises an important question concerning the bitch at line 1215 who sits before the door (τὴν θύραν, *Lys.* 1212). As Lysistrata leads the men into the Acropolis for the feast, whose door is also referred to as a θύραν just four lines later at 1216, it seems natural to assume that the Aristophanes wants the reader to associate Lysistrata with the bitch of whom the audience must be careful. By drawing this connection between Lysistrata and a dangerous dog at the precise moment when the narrative conflict has been completely resolved, Aristophanes causes the reader to reevaluate the play's protagonist. Similar to how the four songs of the Chorus in *The Birds* caused the audience to pause and question the very logic of the play, the choral songs which end the main narrative of *Lysistrata* has the reader call into the

question the very logic of the play, that the domestic powers of women could actually do good for Athens rather than produce a pack of bitches.

It is rare in poetry, and comedy *is* poetry, that something would exist just to exist, and further it is even more unlikely that a skilled poet, as many think Aristophanes to be, would write fifty-six lines of poetry that amounted to nothing more than one long, repetitive joke. Hopefully this study, managed to rectify any damage done to Aristophanes by critics like K. J. Dover who deny any artistry behind the final four choral songs in *Lysistrata*. Rather than a joke beyond a modern reader's comprehension, the final songs present a hidden critique of life under the Athenian government as well as an attempt to dispel the audience from believing Lysistrata's plan to be workable in any real sense. Although Aristophanes's comedies live in a world of fantasy, Aristophanes the poet lived in world of realism whose pains packed themselves thickly in his poetry, even in places one might not expect.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Dover (1972). Page 154

<sup>2</sup> This summary also comes from Dover (1972) page 154.

<sup>3</sup> Henderson (1987) page 190

<sup>4</sup> A full analysis of these Choral songs is found in Dunbar's 1995 commentary on *The Birds*, page 688

<sup>5</sup> Halliwell (1998) uses this phrase to describe the Aristophanes's imagination in respect to *The Birds*

<sup>6</sup> Henderson (1987), page 190.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, page 207

<sup>8</sup> Henderson (1987) page 157.

## Denial of Physical Violence as Rhetoric in *Lysistrata*

Melody Wauke, '17

Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* depends heavily on the interactions between men and women. These opposing sides have several heated back-and-forth exchanges throughout the play in which they often resort to insulting and threatening the other side with claims of committing violence. However, these are for the most part empty threats which never come to fruition. This is not, however, due to actual violence being a foreign device in Old Comedy. On the contrary, Aristophanes includes violent acts in several of his works, including *The Birds*, *The Frogs*, and *The Clouds*. Nevertheless, throughout *Lysistrata*, Aristophanes repeatedly pits the men and women against each other with increasingly violent claims, yet never has them actually follow through with their own threats. He pairs this violent language with a blatant lack of physical violence in order to mirror the pairing of the women's teasing promises of sex and their refusal of it. With this, Aristophanes highlights the absurdity and impracticality of violence itself and in turn reinforces the importance of the women's efforts to end fighting.

A significant aspect to note concerning violence in *Lysistrata* is that it is an act which is largely expected of men. In the beginning of the play, as Lysistrata is attempting to convince the other wives to abstain from sex, one of the first concerns that Calonice raises is the fear that their husbands will try to force them (the wives) to have sex by dragging or beating them (ἐὰν λαβόντες δ' ἐς τὸ δωμάτιον βίᾳ ἔλκωσιν ἡμᾶς...ἐὰν δὲ τύπτωσιν, 160-3). This shows that the women assume violence from men, and especially from those who are their husbands. Lysistrata's advice in this matter is to "hold onto the door" (ἀντέχου σὺ τῶν θυρῶν, 161), or simply "bear the evils badly" (παρέχειν χρῆ κακὰ κακῶς, 163), rather than fight back. With this short exchange, Aristophanes sets up for the audience the understanding that men are naturally violent, whereas the women, under Lysistrata's command, are advocates of responding nonviolently. This, of course, fits in with the larger issue at hand of the women wanting the men to end the war.

Thus, straightway Aristophanes illustrates men as being violent towards women in his play as they do violence to men in the world outside his play. These associated characteristics continue to manifest throughout the remainder of the play.

The very first appearance of men in *Lysistrata* shows precisely this violent nature to which Calonice and the other women alluded. As the group of old men carry their logs and buckets of fire up to the Acropolis, their leader speaks of their plan to either batter down the door or burn it and smoke out all the women inside (308-11). Thus, the men characterize themselves as willingly violent toward women. Throughout the men's ascent towards the Acropolis, they lament the harshness of the smoke billowing out of their buckets, claiming that the smoke "bites their eyes just like a raving bitch" (ὥσπερ κύων λυττῶσα τῶφθαλμῷ δάκνει, 298). The fact that they intend to use this same smoke to harm the women displays their cruel and violent intentions. However, as is a recurring theme in the play, the men will never actually have the chance to enact their violent plan. Moreover, it is also crucial to note the use of the feminine *λυττῶσα* in this description of the dog. Even in the men's attempt at enacting violence, they are still thwarted by a feminine force. This theme of women overpowering men also persists throughout the play.

Once the male chorus at last approaches the female chorus, the insults commence and escalate rapidly. The women's chorus refers to the men as "entirely wicked" (πονωπονηροί, 350) in the very first line of their address to them. However, the first side to make an explicitly violent claim is the men. In response to the women "prattling on" (λαλεῖν, 356), the men question whether it is "necessary for [the men], beating [the women], to break their wood across them" (οὐ περικατᾶξαι τὸ χύλον τύπτοντ' ἐχρῆν τιν' αὐταῖς, 357). From here, both sides proceed to hurl violent threats at one another, with each claim being more ridiculous than the previous. As the exchange continues, the responses from both sides become shorter, quicker, and harsher. This builds the tension, as the audience anticipates when the two sides will resort to blows, as they so boldly claim they will.

However, it is significant to note that the women's violent threats are entirely conditional. That is, each of the injuries they boast they will inflict on the men is contingent on the men harming them first. The men also phrase their threats in the forms of conditionals, but theirs do not depend on the women attacking them first. This can be seen especially clearly in lines 360-367, in which the men voice the possible cruelties they will perform, while the women counter with what their retaliation will be if the men follow through with these claims:

ΧΟΡΟΣ ΓΕΡΟΝΤΩΝ. εἰ νῆ Δί' ἤδη τὰς γνάθους  
τούτων τις ἢ δις ἢ τρίς ἔκοψεν ὥσπερ Βουπάλου, φωνήν  
ἂν οὐκ ἂν εἶχον.

ΧΟΡΟΣ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΩΝ. καὶ μὴν ἰδοὺ παταξάτω τις:  
σταῖσ' ἐγὼ παρέξω, κοῦ μή ποτ' ἄλλη σου κύων τῶν  
ὄρχεων λάβηται.

X GE. εἰ μὴ σιωπήσει, θενών σου 'κκοκκιῶ τὸ γῆρας.

X GY. ἄψαι μόνον Στρατυλλίδος τῶ δακτύλῳ  
προσελθών.

X GE. τί δ' ἦν σποδῶ τοῖς κονδύλοις; τί μ' ἐργάσει  
τὸ δεινόν;

X GY. βρύκουσά σου τοὺς πλεύμονας καὶ τάντερ'  
ἐξαμήσω. (360-367)

CHORUS OF OLD MEN. If, by Zeus, someone had already struck their jaws two or three times, just like Boupalos' jaw, they wouldn't have the ability to speak.

CHORUS OF WOMEN. All right, then, let someone come strike me! I'll stand here and provide my jaw, and never again will another bitch grab your testicles.

MEN. If you don't shut up, I'm going to beat you and pluck out your old age.



WOMEN. Just come forward and lay a *finger* on Stratyllis.

MEN. And what if I pound you with my knuckles? What terrible thing could you do to me then?

WOMEN. I'd bite your lungs and tear out your guts.

Here, instead of the men saying that they will attack only if the women should be the first to strike, they claim that if the women so much as continue talking, they will begin to attack them. Further, the men provoke the women's violent language by asking them leading questions about what they would intend to do if the men harm them. In this way, the men are the instigators of the violent language, while the women respond only with conditionally violent claims. Additionally, when they do use conditional language, the men's justification for wanting to harm the women is not based on self-defense. With this first interaction between the men and women, Aristophanes further characterizes the men as being senselessly violent-minded.

This heated section ends with the men threatening to burn the women, upon which the women dump their pots of water on them (372-381). After nearly thirty lines of the two sides warning each other that they will commit such absurd and gruesome obscenities as biting the other's lungs and tearing out their guts (367), this outcome is decidedly anticlimactic. Water, while a surprise to the men, is by no means damaging or painful. However, this result coincides with the established characteristics of both sides. The men brandish fire, a destructive weapon, and make lofty claims of how they plan to attack the women. The women, meanwhile, possess water, which they use to disarm rather than harm the enraged men. In this way, the women and their props function as the pacifiers of the conflict, just as they are meant to in the larger story.

Further, it is significant to note that the men are technically the only side not to maintain their promises. Two separate times in this section, the men say that they will hurt the women if they do not stop talking. Obviously, the dialogue does continue, and the women are far from silent. However, despite

this, the men do not actually bring their hands against the women. In doing this, they break their promise. The women, on the other hand, stick to their stated plans. They maintain that they will resort to physical brutality if the men harm them first. Because the men do not follow through, neither do the women. Here, Aristophanes further presents the men in a negative light. As this scene shows, the men boast extreme actions, but are incapable of staying true to the rules and stipulations they set for themselves. Similarly, women are shown to do just as they say they will.

This is not the only instance of violent language in *Lysistrata*, however. Shortly after this scene, Lysistrata at last emerges from the Acropolis. There then follows another heated stichomythia, this time between the commissioner with his archers and Lysistrata. Once again, it is the men who initiate the violent language. The commissioner commands the archers to seize the women and bind their hands (ξυλλάμβαν' αὐτήν κώπίσω τὸ χεῖρε δεῖ, 434). Similarly to the previous exchange, this command is not a reaction to Lysistrata committing or even threatening to commit an act of violence. The commissioner's demand to have her, as well as the other women, bound is due to Lysistrata's boldness to say that the men should use "intelligence and common sense" rather than crowbars for prying open the doors to get to the women (οὐ γὰρ μοχλῶν δεῖ μάλλον ἢ νοῦ καὶ φρενῶν, 431). After the commissioner has commenced the violent language, Lysistrata and her female attendants then join in. However, just as with the last exchange, every violent threat the women use is conditional, depending on the men coming towards them or inflicting harm first:

ΛΥΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΗ. εἴ τάρᾳ νῆ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν τὴν χεῖρά μοι ἄκραν προσοίσει δημόσιος ὄν, κλαύσεται.

ΠΡΟΒΟΥΛΟΣ. ἔδεισας οὗτος; οὐ ξυναρπάσει μέσῃν καὶ σὺ μετὰ τούτου κἀνύσαντε δῆσεται;

ΓΥΝΗ Α. εἴ τάρᾳ νῆ τὴν Πάνδροσον ταύτη μόνον τὴν χεῖρ' ἐπιβαλεῖς, ἐπιχεσεῖ πατούμενος.

ΠΡ. ἰδοῦ γ' ἐπιχεσεῖ. ποῦ 'στιν ἕτερος τοξότης;

ταύτην προτέραν ζύνδησον, ότιη και λαλει.

ΓΥΝΗ Β. εϊ τάρα νη την Φωσφόρον την χειρ' άκραν  
ταύτη προσοίσεις, κύαθον αιτήσεις τάχα.

ΠΡ. τουτι τί ην; ποϋ τοξότης; ταύτης εχου.  
παύσω τιν' ύμων τησδ' εγώ της εξόδου.

ΓΥΝΗ Γ. εϊ τάρα νη την Ταυροπόλον ταύτη πρόσει,  
έκκοκκιϋ σου τας στενοκωκύτους τρίχας.

ΠΡ. οϊμοι κακοδαίμων: έπιλέλοιφ' ό τοξότης.  
άταρ ου γυναικων ουδέποτ' εσθ' ήττητέα  
ήμιν: όμόσε χωρῶμεν αυταις ὧ Σκύθαι  
ζυνταξάμενοι.

ΛΥ. νη τῶ θεῶ γνώσεσθ' ἄρα  
ότι και παρ' ήμιν εισι τέτταρες λόχοι  
μαχίμων γυναικων ενδον εξωπλισμένων.

ΠΡ. αποστρέφετε τας χειρας αυτων ὧ Σκύθαι. (435-  
455)

LYSISTRATA. If, by Artemis, that public slave even  
lays a finger on me, he'll be crying.

COMMISSIONER. You there, are you afraid? Grab  
her by the middle, and *you*, bind her and get it done!

WOMAN A. If, by Pandrosos, you only even lay your  
hand on her, I'll stomp the shit out of you.

COMMISSIONER. Oh, get a load this, "you'll shit!"  
Where's the other archer? Bind her first since she keeps  
blabbering.

WOMAN B. If, by Phosphorus, you even bring a finger  
against her, you'll be begging for a cup soon.

COMMISSIONER. What's this? Where's the archer!  
Hold her! I'll stop one of you from coming out.

WOMAN C. If, by Artemis Tauropolos, you even  
approach her, I'll pull out your squealing hairs.

COMMISSIONER. Oh, what a miserable fate. My  
archer has failed me! But we must never be beaten by  
women. Scythians, let's get in order and advance toward  
them together!

LYSISTRATA. Well, by the gods, you'll learn that on  
our side there are four troops of warlike women armed  
and ready in there.

COMMISSIONER. Scythians! Twist back their hands!

With this second, even more bitter exchange, the women further make clear that beginning the violence is the role of men, not women. Except for Lysistrata's last comment, each woman's reply begins with "εἴ τάρρα νῆ τὴν [deity]." This repeated formula strengthens the association of women with conditional threats. The commissioner, meanwhile, commands the archers to bind Lysistrata and the others simply for talking. This is reminiscent of the earlier confrontation scene in lines 360-367.

However, this scene between the women and the commissioner is not entirely and explicitly devoid of physical violence. After the archers come forward to bind some of the women, Lysistrata calls upon her band of women to come out and overpower the men. She encourages them to "drag, smash, strike, rebuke, and be shameless" (οὐχ ἔλξετ', οὐ παίησετ', οὐκ ἀράξετε; | οὐ λοιδορήσετ', οὐκ ἀναισχυντήσετε;, 459-60). Though this harshness seems uncharacteristic of the women, it does not contradict the threats they have been making throughout the play. The archers, having been summoned by the commissioner, have presumably approached the women. This is one of the conditions under which the women said they would react violently (εἴ τάρρα νῆ τὴν Ταυροπόλον ταύτη πρόσσει..., 447). Moreover, in the line immediately following her command,

with no indication given of how much (if any) damage the archers suffered, Lysistrata calls off the women and tells them they should “withdraw and not despoil [the men]” (παύσασθ’, ἐπιναχωρεῖτε, μὴ σκυλεύετε, 461).

This is the only scene which possibly violates the theme of nonviolence in the whole play. However, it remains unclear what specifically the women do. Translators and commentators alike give vague suggestions for what might have happened on stage at this point. In Stephen Halliwell’s translation, the stage directions he provides here as the women route the men is “Various women appear and repulse the half-hearted attack of the archers” (Halliwell 111). In J. Hilton Turner’s commentary, he simply says that the archers are “driven out of sight” (Turner 67). Moreover, in his commentary on this scene, Jeffrey Henderson notes that “the occupying women defend themselves just as had the chorus of old women” (Henderson 123). Thus the physical opposition of the women is portrayed as neither unwarranted nor unnecessary. Rather, the women do exactly as they say they will in order to protect themselves. Thus, despite the menacing threats, Lysistrata ultimately seeks not violence, but moderation and mediation. This, once again, is consistent with her initial and driving concern throughout the play: to end excessive fighting.

Beyond this scene, there are even more sections which exhibit this same pattern of quick, heated, and absurdly violent threats from both the men and women (656-705, 797-828), only to result in no physical violence. As K. J. Dover notes in his book on Aristophanic comedy, in these scenes, the men and women’s “abusive words and threats of violence go on longer than (to our taste) humorous invention can be sustained” (Dover 154). Indeed, it seems tiringly excessive to have both sides speak at incredible length about abuse they will never end up enacting. Moreover, if the joke were simply that both sides were making empty threats, then surely one of these such scenes, rather than four, would be enough.

One might theorize that the reason Aristophanes includes the threats and leaves out the action is that he is averse to writing violent scenes in general. However, scenes from his other works rule out this possibility. In *The Birds*, Pisthetairus at

one point beats and chases off imposters, such as Meton (*Av.* 1012-1020). *The Frogs*, too, incorporates violence for comedic effect. Dionysus, dressed as Heracles, makes Xanthias, his slave, switch clothes with him out of fear that he will be punished by people who are angry with Heracles. However, Xanthias offers his “slave,” who is really his master, to Aeacus, saying, “take my slave and torture him, and when you convict me of wrongdoing, take me and kill me” (βασάνιζε γὰρ τὸν παῖδα τουτοῖ λαβὼν | κᾶν ποτέ μ’ ἔλῃς ἀδικοῦντ’, ἀπόκτεινόν μ’ ἄγων, *Ra.* 616-17). In the end, both Xanthias and Dionysus are beaten, as Aeacus attempts to figure out who is telling the truth. This violence is humorous, as it comes as a result of both Dionysus and Xanthias attempting to be clever and to outsmart Aeacus.

Further, *The Clouds* also contains violent language as well as outright physical violence visible to the audience. As the play draws to a close, Pheidippides turns his thoughts to violence. He asks his father if he beat him as a child (παῖδά μ’ ὄντ’ ἔτυπτες;, *Nu.* 1409), and when his father says that he did, Pheidippides questions whether it is just to beat his father in the same way (εἰπέ δὴ μοι, | οὐ κἀμέ σοι δίκαιόν ἐστιν εὐνοεῖν ὁμοίως | τύπτειν τ’, *Nu.* 1410-12). After this debate, Pheidippides then states that he will beat his mother as well (τὴν μητέρ’ ὥσπερ καὶ σὲ τυπήσω, *Nu.* 1444), an act which his father claims is an even greater evil (τοῦθ’ ἕτερον αὖ μείζον κακόν, *Nu.* 1445). His father then goes into a rage. He demands a torch and resolves to set fire to and destroy buildings with people still inside of them. When someone cries that he will destroy them (ἀπολεῖς, 1499), he says that that is what he wants (τοῦτ’ αὐτὸ γὰρ καὶ βούλομαι, *Nu.* 1499). This act of extreme brutality ends the play.

Thus Aristophanes, in several of his comedies, includes both violent words and deeds. Moreover, these acts of violence often serve some comedic or rhetorical purpose in the work. In fact, as Ian Ruffell argues, “one of the principal attributes of Old Comedy...is its aggression” (247, Ruffell). While *Lysistrata* is by no means lacking in verbal aggression, the absence of its physical counterpart becomes increasingly apparent each time it is withheld. The question the audience faces, then, is what reason

could Aristophanes have for repeatedly raising tension with abusive verbal attacks, while providing minimal physical relief?

One function this repeated denial of physical contact serves is that it mimics the tension and frustration the men and women are feeling due to the sex strike. As is made clear at several points, both the men and the women are strained by abstaining from sex. Lysistrata laments that the women are attempting to desert because they wish to have sex (*βινητιῶμεν, ἢ βράχιστον τοῦ λόγου*, 715). However, by using the first person plural form *βινητιῶμεν*, she indicates that she too feels the desire. On the men's side, Cinesias, when he comes to see Myrrhine, complains that there has been no joy in his life since she left the house, and that he cannot even enjoy eating, all due to his erection (865-9).

As mentioned above, when the sections of threats begin to build, they become fiercer, quicker, and more intense. In a similar way, the men and women provoke each other sexually and seek to inflame the other side. Especially in the later scenes, when the sex strike has been underway for days, the sexual tension is palpable. Thus, Aristophanes draws even more attention to this tension by teasing the audience into thinking there will be some sort of physical conflict, but always at the last minute snatches this possibility away. In the same way that Myrrhine taunts Cinesias relentlessly with promises of sex but never actually complies (870-953), Aristophanes dangles violence before the audience, but never quite lets them see it. In this way, the audience feels some of this deprivation of release that both the men and women in the play are also experiencing.

In a scene near the end of the play, Aristophanes sheds light on another reason why he has denied the audience any explicitly violent scenes. In this section, Lysistrata has convinced the men to reconcile with one another and has led them inside the Acropolis to swear an oath and celebrate. Outside, where slaves are sitting, an Athenian appears and orders them to clear the way. He threatens them, asking if he should burn them with a torch (*μῶν ἐγὼ τῆ λαμπάδι | ὑμᾶς κατακαύσω;*, 1217-18). Immediately after this, he then has an aside, directed at the audience, claiming that it is a “vulgar practice” that he “would rather not do” (*φορτικὸν τὸ χωρίον. οὐκ ἂν ποιήσαιμ’*, 1218-19).

In his commentary, Henderson notes that this would have then evoked some encouragement from the audience to carry out the act, so that the Athenian says that he will do it to appease them (Henderson 208).<sup>1</sup> As is expected by this point, he does not actually set fire to the slaves, as he is interrupted by the Spartans departing from the celebration.

Here, Aristophanes, through the character of the Athenian, refers to the act of burning someone as “vulgar” or even “clownish” (*φορτικόν*). In *The Clouds*, one of the chorus scenes expresses a similar idea. The chorus claims that when a play contains an old man who strikes another with a staff, this simply hides how poor the jokes are (*πρεσβύτης ὁ λέγων τᾶπη τῆ βακτηρία | τύπτει τὸν παρόντ’ ἀφανίζων πονηρὰ σκώμματα*, *Nu.* 541-2). They make clear that no such mindless violence will be included in the play, as it is “the wisest of all [Aristophanes’] comedies” (*ταύτην σοφώτατ’ ἔχειν τῶν ἐμῶν κωμωδιῶν*, *Nu.* 522). With these comments, the chorus equates wisdom and cleverness with the absence of foolish violence. Thus, in multiple works, Aristophanes expresses a resentment for violence that is unnecessary. He acknowledges that it has no purpose other than the fact that it pleases the crowd. This brief contemptuous aside could then apply to the other missed opportunities for physical violence throughout the rest of the play. Whereas in *The Clouds*, destruction functions as an end to the play, in *Lysistrata*, physically violent scenes would actually undermine the peace that the women are advocating. Thus, it is possible that Aristophanes saw no need to include physical violence, and due to his distaste for it, decided to draw attention to how unnecessary it is.

Lastly, it would be contradictory for the women to actively desire to fight with the men because their ultimate goal is to end fighting. As Daphne O’Reagan states, “the persuasion of *logos* and the agreement to use words instead of blows is key to the pact among citizens that founds community and to the laws and the practice of justice that preserve it” (O’Reagan 18-19). This is precisely what *Lysistrata* advocates when she attempts to talk to the men. Each ridiculous threat of violence that the men and women hurl at each other highlights the unproductivity and futility of fighting and threatening to fight. In



these sections of violent language, no progress is made toward peace. *Lysistrata* is eventually able to reconcile the men with reasoning, and not with violent claims.

*Lysistrata* is, at its core, about war and peace. The women, above all else, want their husbands to stop fighting, and it is this will which drives the whole play. As described in detail above, there are several scenes in which the men and women insult and threaten each other, but their words never materialize into the actions they boast. Aristophanes uses these opportunities to characterize the men in the play as overwhelmingly hot-tempered and irrational, while he at the same time characterizes the women as clever and more rational. While the women do engage in the abusive taunts and an unspecified degree of violence, they do this under the guise of self-defence. However, despite the practically endless talk, no one once gets struck in the jaw, nor does anyone get trampled upon. While this repeated pattern of empty threats may appear to be unnecessary, Aristophanes uses it rhetorically to heighten the point of the play itself. With respect to dramatic effect, he mirrors the strain of the abstention from sex with abstention from violence. It is through the denial of both that the men and women are eventually finally able to achieve peace. In addition, Aristophanes indicates that violence, and especially pointless violence, is foolish. Thus he purposefully and obviously leaves it out from the play, as if to mock the audience for enjoying and expecting it. By providing so many scenes of intense violent language with no actual physical confrontation, Aristophanes teases the audience just as the women tease the men and thereby highlights the foolishness of the claims and strengthens the necessity for peace over war.

## Bibliography

- Aristophanes, Hall, F.W., and Geldart, W.M. *Aristophanes Comoedia*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907. *Perseus Project*. Web. 01 May 2016.
- Aristophanes and Halliwell, Stephen. *Birds, Lysistrata, Assembly-Women, Wealth*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997. Print
- Aristophanes and Henderson, Jeffrey. *Aristophanes Lysistrata*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987. Print.
- Aristophanes and Turner, J. Hilton. *Aristophanes' Lysistrata*. Bryn Mawr, PA: Dept. of Greek, Bryn Mawr College, 1982. Print.
- Dover, K. J. *Aristophanic Comedy*. Berkeley: U of California, 1972. Print.
- O'Regan, Daphne. Rhetoric, Comedy, and the Violence of Language in Aristophanes' Clouds. Cary, US: Oxford University Press (US), 1992. ProQuest ebrary. Web. 2 May 2016.
- Ruffell, Ian. "Humiliation?: Voyeurism, Violence, and Humor in Old Comedy." *Helios* 40.1-2 (2013): 247-77. Web. 01 May 2016.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Henderson also notes that this is similar to the beginning of *The Frogs* in which Xanthias and Dionysus discuss the “staleness” of certain comedic routines (Henderson 208).

### **Iliad 3.340-368**

Allyn Waller, '18

And when they had armed themselves on either side of town, they strode into the street, looking mighty fierce. And all the folks were amazed, both the horse-wrangling Trojans and the Achaeans of the silver spurs. The two came together and paced off ten steps, each one twitching his fingers above his gun, each one holding a grudge against the other. Alexander was first to draw his pearl-handled pistol and shoot, and he struck Atresson's duster, made of thick cowhide. The lead did not burrow through, but stopped in the heavy leather. Then Menelaus Atresson drew his gun, and muttered a prayer to God the Father: "Lord God, grant that I bring a reckoning on the bastard who mistreated me first, 'Mister Alexander', and grant that I might bring him low with my own hands, so that the whole world might think twice before abusing the host who welcomed him." He prayed, aimed his gun, and fired. He struck Priamson's duster, made of thick cowhide. Through the leather it sped, and tore through his shirt right by his ribs, but Alexander leaned to the side and cheated the reaper. Then Atresson pulled out his belt knife and threw it, and aimed for the other's gut. But it struck his buckle, and shattered to pieces. Then Atresson cursed and cried to the blue sky: "Oh God, why have you forsaken me? I swore I would get revenge on Alexander for his crimes, but now my knife is broken and I fired at him in vain, and did not hit him!"

**The Tradition of *Amplificatio* in Josephus's *Against Apion***  
**1.1-9**

Jason Steranko, '17

The Jewish historian Josephus comes to write *Against Apion*, his final work, at the conclusion of the first century.<sup>1</sup> At the pinnacle of his career as a historian, he has honed his hand at writing history in the tradition of the Greeks through his record of the Jewish uprising in his *Jewish War* and then his reckoning of the entirety of Jewish history in his *Jewish Antiquities*.<sup>2</sup> *Against Apion* is markedly different, though, because it is not a history of an event or a people, but rather a critical analysis of anti-Jewish histories in circulation at the time and a self-presentation of the Jewish people to a Greek-speaking Roman audience well acquainted with the discipline Herodotus fathered. As an outsider, Josephus comes to the historiographical tradition fully aware of its tropes and expectations. One such convention is *amplificatio*, the magnification of events, deeds, and persons, which features prominently in *Against Apion*. Through a careful study of his magnifications (as well as a look into how exactly *amplificatio* traditionally works), we see that Josephus is able to use Greek historiography to critique Greek historiography. The genius of Josephus is that by weaving together something that is neither a Hellenized Jewish take on history nor a Judaized Greek one, he is reinventing the tradition through adherence to its expectations, as the Greeks believed all historians are expected to do.

The Latin term *amplificatio*<sup>3</sup> (“widening”) and its Greek equivalent *αὐξησις* (“growth”) are central to the Greek and Roman historiographical tradition. *Amplificatio* does not simply mean that historians in their work attempt to convince their readers that what they are writing is important and of interest. Every piece of argumentative writing attempts to do so, but not all argumentative writing is *amplificatio*. Rather, this term refers to the fact that historians magnify their subject material since persuading the audience of the history’s greatness and importance lends the historian authority. In the historiographical tradition dating back to Herodotus and Thucydides, *amplificatio* specifically demands that each historian present his subject matter as in some manner

qualitatively much greater or more crucial than what his predecessor historians have recorded. An exhaustive investigation of the development of *amplificatio* is far beyond the scope of this work, but a tracing of the tradition through several vignettes from Herodotus and Thucydides, the foundational authors of Greek historiography, will provide the background necessary for exploring how Josephus, an outsider to Greek history who is joining and adapting a tradition several centuries in the making, employs *amplificatio* in the first lines of *Against Apion*.

Herodotus begins the tradition of *amplificatio* at the opening of his *Histories* with his implicit attack on the Homeric tradition. In the first sentence of the work he announces his plan to record the great deeds of the Greek and non-Greek worlds and also the reason for the hostilities between them (Hdt. 1.1.0), specifically the recent Persian War. Assuming that the Trojan War will immediately come to mind in his readers, Herodotus very briefly treats the series of kidnappings, culminating in that of Helen, claimed to be responsible for the Trojan War (1.1.1-1.5.3). Since in his research, however, Herodotus has discovered that the Persian and Phoenician accounts disagree on how the kidnappings played out, he stops his discussion of the Trojan War immediately and begins the history of Greek and non-Greek animosity with Croesus and the history of Lydia (1.6.1) because he decides to start his *Histories* with undisputed events. The historiographical choice leads him to pass over the Trojan War, *the* history that occupied his authorial predecessors. This choice serves in turn to amplify the unprecedented level of warfare in the Persian Wars by diminishing the significance of the Trojan War as judged by the lack of accuracy and disagreement on its events. In short, he implicitly demands that a greater portion of fame, the all-important κλέος, be given to his *Histories* than has been given to the *Iliad*.<sup>4</sup>

In Book 7 Herodotus offers a more explicit example of *amplificatio* in his analysis of Xerxes' invasion, in which he states in grand terms that the army he is writing about is the largest ever known:<sup>5</sup>

στόλων γὰρ τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν πολλῶ δὴ μέγιστος οὗτος ἐγένετο, ὥστε μήτε τὸν Δαρείου τὸν ἐπὶ Σκύθας παρὰ τοῦτον μηδένα φαίνεσθαι, μήτε τὸν Σκυθικόν, ὅτε Σκύθαι Κιμμερίου

διόκοντες ἐς τὴν Μηδικὴν χώραν ἐσβαλόντες σχεδὸν πάντα τὰ ἄνω τῆς Ἀσίας καταστρεψάμενοι ἐνέμοντο, τῶν εἵνεκεν ὕστερον Δαρεῖος ἐτιμωρέετο, μήτε κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα τὸν Ἀτρεϊδέων ἐς Ἴλιον, μήτε τὸν Μυσῶν τε καὶ Τευκρῶν τὸν πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν γενόμενον, οἱ διαβάντες ἐς τὴν Εὐρώπην κατὰ Βόσπορον τοὺς τε Θρήικας κατεστρέψαντο πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴόνιον πόντον κατέβησαν, μέχρι τε Πηγιοῦ ποταμοῦ τὸ πρὸς μεσαμβρίας ἤλασαν. (7.20.2)

“For of all the armies of which we know, this was by far the greatest, inasmuch as no army seemed to amount to anything compared to this one. Not Darius’s army against the Scythians. Not the Scythian army, which, pursuing the Cimmerians, fell upon the land of the Medes, and subdued and possessed nearly all of Upper Asia (on account of which Darius was attempting to exact vengeance). Not the army of the sons of Atreus against Ilium according to the tales. Not the army of the Mysians and the Teucrians before the time of the Trojans, who crossed into Europe over the Bosphorus, subdued all the Thracians, went up to the Ionian Sea, and drove south down to the Peneus River.”

The rhetorical choice of the heightened superlative (πολλῶ δὴ μέγιστος) and the high density of words meaning “nothing” (παρὰ τοῦτον μηδένα φαίνεσθαι) or “everything” (πάντα τὰ ἄνω τῆς Ἀσίας καταστρεψάμενοι ἐνέμοντο... τοὺς τε Θρήικας κατεστρέψαντο πάντας) overwhelms the reader with the concept of greatness. Herodotus’ *amplificatio* derives its strength from the renown of past state-of-the-art forces, and since the Persian military completely puts them to shame, the more Herodotus magnifies the power and achievement of the Scythians, Mysians, and Teucrians, the more persuasive his assertion that the Persian Wars were the greatest wars of all time becomes. In sum, through its use of superlatives and favorable contrast with past examples, this vignette from Herodotus is a model example of how *amplificatio* would come to be used in the Greek (and later Roman) historiographical tradition.

In his *Peloponnesian War* Thucydides employs *amplificatio* in a similar way, also marked by the appearance of superlatives and the comparison of the Peloponnesian War’s greatness to that of all that came before it. His opening remarks

provide an excellent example:

Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων, ὡς ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀρξάμενος εὐθύς καθισταμένου καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων, τεκμαιρόμενος ὅτι ἀκμάζοντές τε ἦσαν ἐς αὐτὸν ἀμφοτέροι παρασκευῇ τῇ πάσῃ καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ὄρων ξυνιστάμενον πρὸς ἐκατέρους, τὸ μὲν εὐθύς, τὸ δὲ καὶ διανοούμενον. κίνησις γὰρ αὕτη μεγίστη δὴ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἐγένετο καὶ μέρει τινὶ τῶν βαρβάρων, ὡς δὲ εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀνθρώπων. τὰ γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἔτι παλαιότερα σαφῶς μὲν εὐρεῖν διὰ χρόνου πλῆθος ἀδύνατα ἦν, ἐκ δὲ τεκμηρίων ὧν ἐπὶ μακρότατον σκοποῦντί μοι πιστεῦσαι ζυμβαίνει οὐ μεγάλα νομίζω γενέσθαι οὔτε κατὰ τοὺς πολέμους οὔτε ἐς τὰ ἄλλα. (Thuc. 1.1.1-3)

“Thucydides the Athenian wrote down the War between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians, as they began to war against each other, and he started immediately when war came. He hoped the war would be great and more memorable than those that preceded it, having judged that both sides in the war were in their prime, in all their power, and having seen each Greek faction joining either side, some immediately and others intending to join. For this was the greatest movement among the Greeks, as well as a certain portion of the barbarians, and even among the majority of humans, so to speak. For the events before these ones and the events older still cannot be clearly found out on account of the lapse of time, but from the evidence that I trust from examining as far back as possible, I do not think that great events, either in wars or in anything else, had happened.”

Here Thucydides is clearly responding to Herodotus’ use of *amplificatio*, but instead of simply mimicking Herodotus, Thucydides has raised the stakes. These three opening lines feature four superlatives (ἀξιολογώτατον “most worthy of mention”; μεγίστη “greatest”; πλεῖστον ἀνθρώπων “the majority of humans”; μακρότατον “as far back as possible”) alongside phrases that approximate superlatives by implication (“ἀκμάζοντές “in their prime”; παρασκευῇ τῇ πάσῃ “in all their power”). Furthermore, the terms in which he compares his history



to past histories are much more sweeping than Herodotus' phrasing. For Thucydides, nothing, when compared with the Peloponnesian War, can be called great at all (οὐ μέγιστα νομίζω γενέσθαι), not the Persian War that was so highly lauded by his predecessor, and definitely not Homer's mythical battles.

By responding to Herodotus' claims of greatness with his own heightened stress on *amplificatio*, Thucydides ensured that the rhetorical technique would be a foundational trope for the emerging discipline of historical composition. The generations following Thucydides employed *amplificatio* in new ways: Theopompus and the historians of Alexander focus on the magnification of an individual's greatness (Philip II and Alexander the Great, respectively)<sup>6</sup>, but following the establishment of Roman hegemony over the Mediterranean, authors like Polybius amplify the universality of their histories.<sup>7</sup> Instead of grounding their histories in a single subject, these authors use the new and unprecedented unity of the Mediterranean to focus on the interconnectedness of the events and peoples of the civilized world.

Josephus himself, in his earlier history of the Jewish revolt against Roman occupation, adopts a universal focus in his *amplificatio*, as we see here in the opening lines of the *BJ*:

Ἐπειδὴ τὸν Ἰουδαίων πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον συστάντα μέγιστον οὐ μόνον τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ ὧν ἀκοῆν παρειλήφαμεν ἢ πόλεων πρὸς πόλεις ἢ ἐθνῶν ἔθνεσι συρραγέντων...(BJ 1.1)

“Since the war made by the Jews against the Romans was the greatest not only of the wars among us but nearly also of the wars which we have ascertained by hearing, wars fought between either cities or nations...”

Marincola sees in Josephus's treatment of the Jewish revolt the historian “following in Thucydides' footsteps,”<sup>8</sup> which is certainly evident; these lines harken back to Thucydides specifically through the use of μέγιστος and the comparison to all previous combat referenced broadly and vaguely. However, the influence of Polybius' universalizing influence is also palpable in the ensuing lines, which, with their rapid-fire succession of

peoples and localities,<sup>9</sup> bring the entirety of the known world into view and into the war. Therefore, Josephus at the very beginning of this work and therefore his histories as a whole establishes himself as having the historiographical chops to join the classical tradition, a skillful and necessary maneuver given his outsider status as a Jewish freedman living in Rome.

Given the Greek historiographical tradition and Josephus's aforementioned addition to it with his *Jewish War*, it is no surprise that *amplificatio* features prominently in his later *Against Apion*, considered the most refined and polished work in Josephus's oeuvre.<sup>10</sup> He focuses his employment of *amplificatio* in the introductory and concluding sections of the two-book work. Within the first ten lines of the book, Josephus constructs a four-part *amplificatio* of his subject matter, the Jewish people and society, by magnifying the age of his people (παλαιότατόν, 1.1), the newness of Greek history-writing (νεωτάτη σχεδόν, 1.7), the antiquity and reliability of the Eastern historical tradition (ἀρχαιοτάτην τε καὶ μονιμωτάτην, 1.8), and by appealing directly to the best of the Greek historiographical tradition (ἀξιοπιστοτάτοις, 1.4). Since *Against Apion*, though not a typical history à la the *Jewish War*, is an *apologia* by means of historical criticism, Josephus's magnifications are crucial to the efficacy of his argument.

Josephus's first display of *amplificatio* comes in the first line of *Against Apion*, a summary of his objectives in his earlier *Jewish Antiquities*. Since Josephus both sets up *Against Apion* as an extended apologetic addendum to his *Antiquities* and also ensures it is readable as a stand-alone *apologia* in its own right, the restated thesis of his *Antiquities* also becomes the thesis of *Against Apion*. For that reason, though his first magnification occurs in material specifically about the *Antiquities*, passing over it here would be a mistake. Summing up his earlier work in a tricolon, Josephus states that his *Antiquities* in his estimation have made it clear "that [the Jewish people] is most ancient, that they had from the start a distinct identity, and how we began to settle the land we now possess" (ὅτι καὶ παλαιότατόν ἐστι καὶ τὴν πρώτην ὑπόστασιν ἔσχεν ἰδίαν, καὶ πῶς τὴν χώραν ἦν νῦν ἔχομεν κατώκησεν, 1.1). The magnification "most ancient" (παλαιότατόν) is so striking not only because it occurs so early in

the text but, more importantly, because it is the very first claim in *Against Apion* that Josephus makes about the Jewish people (περὶ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, 1.1). Underscoring the importance of the magnification, Josephus constructs it without eliding the verb ἔστι, keeping the clause fully intact, and though his claim is bold enough, the presence of the καὶ signals that there is still more to come.

The more traditional claimant to “a most ancient” people in the Greek imagination would be the Egyptians, a sentiment that we begin to see in Herodotus’ *Histories*,<sup>11</sup> in which the Egyptians believe they are the first people (πρώτους...πάντων ἀνθρώπων, Hdt. 2.2) and in which an account occurs of the Greek historian Hecataeus tracing back his family only sixteen generations in contrast to an Egyptian priest tracing his ancestry back three hundred and forty-five generations (Hdt. 2.143). Josephus is likely operating under the assumption that his readers would naturally associate the designation of “oldest” with the Egyptians and not the Jews, especially because the prevailing view in the first century CE was that the Jewish people were originally a group who splintered off from the Egyptians,<sup>12</sup> a view Josephus spends a large part of Book 1 of *Against Apion* (1.219-320) refuting in specific and vehement terms (1.252-3; 278; 313-314). This reading of the magnifier παλαιότατον is supported by the following clause, “that [the Jewish people] had from the start a distinct identity” (τὴν πρώτην ὑπόστασιν ἔσχεν ἰδίαν, 1.1), in which the word ἴδιος carries the connotation of ethnic distinctiveness and independence.<sup>13</sup> In light of this purported Egyptian origin story, then, Josephus’s magnification sets Judea on the same plane as Egypt; just the unadorned statement “they are most ancient” (παλαιότατον ἔστι) Josephus anticipates the whole of his extended argument against an Egyptian origin for the Jewish people later in the work.

Although it might seem plausible to construe the superlative παλαιότατος as meaning “the oldest people of all,” Josephus’s *amplificatio* does not require it to mean so, and moreover, Greek grammar hints that it does not. According to Smyth, “the superlative expresses either the highest degree of a quality (the *relative* superlative...) or a very high degree of a quality (the *absolute* superlative, which does not take the

article...).”<sup>14</sup> With the absence of an article, Josephus’s designation of *παλαιότατος* appears to be an absolute superlative. If it were otherwise, we would expect him to include sections within *Against Apion* in which Josephus explicitly argues that the Jews are the original people and in which he contrasts their age to the peoples thought of as oldest. However, Josephus never makes the specific argument that the Jews were the first people. Moreover, the nature of Jewish ancestry is complicated in *Against Apion*. He reports the various beliefs that the Jewish people came from the Arabians (1.82-83) and from the Indians (1.179) without contradicting either of them. In Book 1 he identifies the Chaldeans as the ancestors of the Jewish people (*ἀρχηγοί*, 1.71), citing the Jewish records (*ἀναγραφαῖς Ἰουδαίων*, 1.71), in all likelihood referring to the Torah’s claim that Abraham was from “Ur of the Chaldeans” (Gen. 11:31), but he uses the same term *ἀρχηγός* in calling Noah “the founder of our race” (*ὁ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἀρχηγός*, 1.130). What the magnifier *παλαιότατος* does unquestionably get across is that the Jewish people date back to time immemorial, and consequently, in a classic example of *amplificatio*, their old, old age is so great that Josephus must write about them.

Josephus stands at a crossroads of Greek and Jewish thought, and this position comes into play in his *amplificatio* of Greek historiography itself, in which he contrasts when the Greeks began to write history with how long Eastern peoples have kept records:

πάντων δὲ νεωτάτη σχεδὸν ἐστὶ παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἢ περὶ τοῦ συγγράφειν τὰς ἱστορίας ἐπιμέλεια. τὰ μέντοι παρ’ Αἰγυπτίοις τε καὶ Χαλδαίοις καὶ Φοίνιξιν, ἐῷ γὰρ νῦν ἡμᾶς ἐκείνοις συγκαταλέγειν, αὐτοὶ δὴπουθεν ὁμολογοῦσιν ἀρχαιοτάτην τε καὶ μονιμωτάτην ἔχειν τῆς μνήμης τὴν παράδοσιν (1.7-9).

As in the examples from Herodotus and Thucydides, here Josephus collects superlatives (*νεωτάτη*, *ἀρχαιοτάτη*, *μονιμωτάτην*) and rests his *amplificatio* upon a contrast between the Greek historiographical tradition and the histories of the East, magnifying both in different ways. The sentiment is similar to the way in which Herodotus magnifies Xerxes’ forces by doing the same to the great armies that came before him, but Josephus

employs a different methodology. Here, he magnifies the newness (νεωτάτη) of Greek history-writing, and at the same time he magnifies the antiquity (ἀρχαιοτάτην) and lasting quality (μονιμωτάτην) of Eastern histories. In the list of Eastern peoples Josephus conspicuously omits the Jews and mentions that he will at a later time; since Josephus has not yet established his people's antiquity in this text or the methodology of their record-keeping, he cannot yet name the Jewish people among peoples the Greeks themselves (αὐτοῖ) respect as historical authorities. But it is exactly through the explicit lack of naming them, through this *praeteritio*, that Josephus applies his magnification of Eastern history to the Jews, and the inclusion of “for now” (νῦν) suggests that by the time he has finished, the Jewish histories will be shown to be worthy of just as much respect as those of Egypt. His *praeteritio* anticipates 1.29, where he moves to his argument that of these “most ancient” and “most stable” Eastern historical traditions, the best (πλείω, 1.29; μετὰ πολλῆς ἀκριβείας, 1.29) is Jewish history due to the character of its priestly authors (1.30-6) and its constant composition by eyewitness (1.37-8). In performing this maneuver, Josephus maintains the expectations of Greek historiography while at the same time drawing on the authority of an older, better preserved tradition, and, if he is to be believed, one that is even more respected by the Greeks than their own.

The final example of *amplificatio* in the opening lines of *Against Apion* is one of the most striking. Josephus adds to his program a direct appeal to the authority of the Greek historiographical tradition:

χρήσομαι δὲ τῶν μὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ λεγομένων μάρτυσι τοῖς ἀξιοπιστοτάτοις εἶναι περὶ πάσης ἀρχαιολογίας ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κεκριμένοις, τοὺς δὲ βλασφήμως περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ ψευδῶς γεγραφότας αὐτοὺς δι' ἑαυτῶν ἐλεγχομένους παρέξω (1.4-5).

“I will employ as witnesses to my statements those who have been judged by the Greeks to be the most trustworthy concerning all antiquity, and I will show that those who have written slanderously and falsely about us are refuted by themselves.”

The scene Josephus presents is rich with court imagery: the

historian has summoned the Greek-speaking historians who have written on ancient history as his “witnesses” (μάρτυσι), and of the many words that could mean “believed” or “thought” or “considered” here, Josephus uses a form of κρίνω, one with judicial connotations. In a sense, then, these authors have already had their trial by the Greeks (ὕπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κεκριμένοις) and have been found “the most trustworthy” (ἀξιοπιστοτάτοις), and though Josephus is here prosecuting the slanderers and deniers (1.5), his identity as a historian associates him with his witnesses. *Against Apion* is on the offense in its refutations of writers like Apion, but as an *apologia* it is also on the defensive, especially in a world after the Jewish revolt failed. In much the same way, then, Josephus is also pleading his case as a historian of the Jews, hoping to be judged “most trustworthy” as well.

The *amplificatio* of the Greek historiographical tradition through his invocation of the Greek historians means that Josephus is sharing in their tradition. However, as a participant in the tradition, he is not simply rehashing the findings of his predecessors or following their methods to the letter. Rather, as Marincola summarizes, every historian “[distinguishes] himself from competitors, even if at the same time portraying himself as a continuator of some great and worthy predecessor. By such a process of contrast and continuity he seeks to mark out for himself a place in the historiographical tradition.”<sup>15</sup> Therefore, when Josephus calls the historians as his witnesses, he is not just raising himself to their level, but since he is compiling and comparing their work, Josephus is improving upon their work and adding to the tradition. The historical criticism to follow within *Against Apion* by itself clearly demonstrates the power Josephus as a current historian wields over the works of his predecessors, such as Hecataeus or Chaeremon, since through his analysis he can affirm or refute what has been passed down. By critiquing Greek historiography with its own standards, Josephus demonstrates here in the introduction to *Against Apion* that though it is an intensely traditional and conservative discipline, Greek historiography is in a perpetual state of refinement, expansion, and growth.

## Bibliography

- Barclay, John M.G. "Against Apion." In *A Companion to Josephus*, edited by Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers, 75-85. Malden: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2016.
- Barclay, John M.G. *Flavius Josephus: Against Apion: Translation and Commentary*. Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Lanham, Richard A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Marincola, John. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*. Boston: American Book Company, 1920.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> See Barclay (2013) for a more comprehensive chronology of the *Jewish Antiquities*, the *Jewish War*, the *Life*, and *Against Apion*.

<sup>2</sup> Though a Jewish author, Josephus is commonly thought to be writing in the classical historiographical tradition due to his style and devices. For the examples of the monographic form of the *Jewish War* and Josephus's modeling (at least in name) of the *Jewish Antiquities* on Dionysius of Halicarnassus's *Roman Antiquities*, see Marincola (2003), 17.

<sup>3</sup> See Lanham (1991), 8-9 for analysis of the term's rhetorical methodology.

<sup>4</sup> See Hdt. 1.1.0, where Herodotus has written his *Histories* "lest the great and wonderful deeds done by both the Greeks and the barbarians go without fame" (μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, τὰ μὲν Ἑλληνισι τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεῖα γένηται).

<sup>5</sup> Translations provided are original excepted when noted otherwise.

<sup>6</sup> Marincola (2003), 36.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.

<sup>8</sup> Marincola (2003), 38.

<sup>9</sup> Besides the Jews and the Romans, Josephus manages to name the Euphrates River, the Gauls, the Celts, the Greeks, the Parthians, the Babylonians, the Arabians, and the Assyrians all in a breath or two (*BJ* 1.4-6).

<sup>10</sup> Barclay (2016), 75.

<sup>11</sup> The Homeric tradition precedes Herodotus, but of the two words Josephus uses for "old" or "ancient," *παλαιός* and *ἀρχαῖος*, the former appears in the positive degree exclusively except in Book XXIII and is used to describe the age of individuals, not entire peoples, while the latter word does not appear. Therefore, I turn to Herodotus as the earliest authoritative source that addresses the issue of the earliest people.

<sup>12</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 5.3.

<sup>13</sup> For a similar use of the word, see Hdt. 4.18, where Herodotus analogously characterizes the anthropophagi as "a separate nation and definitely not Scythian" (ἔθνος ἴδιον καὶ οὐδαμῶς Σκυθικόν).

<sup>14</sup> Smyth (1920), 282.

<sup>15</sup> Marincola (2003), 218.



### Iliad 4.104-4.129

Corey Scannell, '18

Athena spoke, and swayed the thoughts within the foolish man,  
So then he grabbed his polished bow – a horn of nimble goat,  
Which he encountered once as it descended from a bluff:  
He crept in ambush underneath, when off a rock it stepped,  
From down below he struck its chest and sent it sprawling back,  
And from the supine goat he took the horns, ten feet in height.  
Some craftsman wrought them, smoothed them good, and clasped the  
two ends tight,  
And then he laid the crooked horn, now burnished bright, in gold.  
Pandarus planted one end firmly, bent upon the earth,  
And strung the bow; his trusty friends arranged their shields in rows  
In case Achaean boys, so fearsome, dashed upon him now,  
Before he got to hit Atrides, warlike Menelaus.  
So then he stripped the quiver's cap, he took an arrow out –  
A new one, winged, soon to deal out pain in dark-black bouts  
He fastened, next, the keen-edged arrow, tight against the string,  
Implored Apollo, Lycian born, who's foremost with the bow,  
That once he makes the journey home to holy Zeleia,  
He'll sacrifice one hundred lambs – a prize to heap on fame.  
He grasped the arrow's notch along the ox-hide string, and pulled...  
He drew the bronze tip to the bow, the string back to his chest  
And when he strained the giant weapon, bent it in an arc:  
Zing! the bow, the great string hissed, the arrow leapt away,  
The barb flew through the tangled crowd and tracked to meet its prey.  
But blessed gods, immortal ones, had not forgotten you,  
Menelaus, but soon the daughter of Zeus, the one who stores the loot  
Stood in front, and warded off the sharply shooting arrow.

*Iliad* 4.104-129

## Herodotus, Euripides, and the Fetishization of Foreign Women

Hanna Seariac, '20

Helen, the symbol for Greek femininity and beauty, often represents the ideal wife. Besides her white arms, unparalleled beauty, and other charms, Helen is Greek, which gives more value to her than anything else. Ironically, other women in Greek literature are not flat characters, but instead are sultry sex symbols slaying enemies for bloodlust; they are violent versions of Helen but they lack Helen's key attribute of Greekness. The Greek male obsession with women extends to "barbarian" women, preferring women of their own race to be more of the traditional flat characters. Medea and Amastris ensnare men in the same way as Helen did with their intelligence, cunning, sexiness, hysteria, and exoticness. Herodotus and Euripides assert that Greek citizens lust after the archetype of a soldierly sex symbol and even develop minimal respect for their warrior ways, but strongly advocate for marriage within Greek blood. While Herodotus and Euripides show how captivating foreign females are, they strongly profess that marriage outside of Greek blood leads to fear, misery, emasculation, and suffering for all those even somewhat involved.

While the Greeks rarely respect their women, Herodotus and Euripides develop respect and admiration for the exotic Medea and Amastris because of their cleverness and masculine capabilities as warriors. Females in Greek society were not citizens and served the purpose of marriage and childrearing. Patriarchal tendencies reinforced the ideas and practices that held women as inferior and subordinated them by severely curtailing their rights/autonomy. In terms of mythology, the supposed Greek warrior women such as Athena, Atalanta, Enyo were either mythological, not Athenian, second to men eventually, virgins due to piety (meaning their sexuality is irrelevant), or not perceived as threat. (Especially with the prophecy given to Zeus that if Metis had a son, the son would overtake him, but a daughter would not). A true Greek hero or even antihero did not

exist nor did a Greek warrior woman thus foreigner warrior women suffice. After Medea articulates her plan, she concludes that “I treat my friends with kindness and come down hard on the heads of my enemies. This is the way to live, the way to win a glorious reputation”, marking the shift between her role as the wife of Jason to the warrior woman, hell bent on his destruction (Euripides 36). Medea’s concern with defeating her enemies and attaining fame highlights the switch from feminine to masculine. Later, Euripides even goes as far to depict her in a chariot with the bodies of her dead children, standing above Jason (Euripides 56). By placing Medea above Jason, one of the Greek greatest heroes, Euripides shows the respect that the Greeks have for Medea as someone with the cunning and capability to route her foes. Likewise, Herodotus invokes the same warrior imagery by describing how Amastris “cut off her [the wife of Masistes] breasts and threw them to the dogs, then cut out her nose, ears, lips, and tongue and sent her back home horribly mutilated” (Herodotus 719). Herodotus and Euripides establish these two women’s ruthlessness and masculinity to qualify how Greek men could possibly respect them.

The respect that Greek society has for Medea and Amastris fosters the Greek fetishism for them. Most can agree that Medea’s decision to kill her children, the king, and Jason’s new princess and Amastris’ form of revenge on the wife of Masistes raise some concerns about the ability to admire their feminine virtue. While Medea and Amastris are both ruthless warriors who avenge in the worst way possible, the Greeks also develop fascination with them. Euripides describes how Jason wants to put Medea up in a house and still take care of her, but Medea refuses (Euripides 25). Jason and Medea came to Corinth in exile and the fact that she was not Greek lowered his rank and that is why he claimed to want a more socially advantageous marriage, but at the same time, Medea was considered physically attractive and intelligent, which attracted Jason. Similar to this situation, Herodotus describes how Amastris controls her anger and does not immediately take vengeance, but instead she strategically arranges a calculated plan (Herodotus 719). In this respect, both of the women are valued for their intelligence, but also are applauded because they are not Greek women. Medea in

particular is more sexualized than Amastris. Medea's objectification her, shows that Greek men were aroused by this type of women. Nevertheless, their desirability comes at a price.

Herodotus and Euripides maintain that whenever a true Greek man marries a foreign woman, not only do they suffer considerably by watching their close ones die or feel pain, but they also come to know their own lack of intellectual power and are subsequently emasculated. The importance of an oath comes into play as both women think to use oaths to set up their plan. Medea asks Aegeus to swear an oath of protection, which ensures that she will have a place to go after she follows through with her plan (Euripides 34). Additionally, Medea had Jason swear an oath to the gods at the time of their marriage, a departure from Hellenic tradition (Euripides 4). Amastris manipulates Xeres to swear an oath to give gifts to the Persians, which means he has to give the wife of Masistes to Amastris (Herodotus 719). By using oaths, both Medea and Amastris were able to intelligently ensure that their plan worked out. Furthermore, Medea and Amastris were able to emasculate their men. Medea proclaims that Jason "will die an evil death, struck on the head by a fragment of the *Argo*", which contrasts with the heroic life that Jason led (Euripides 60). In one sweeping plan, Medea took away Jason's masculinity to make certain that his death would remove all of the glory that his "heroic" deeds brought him. Amastris emasculates Xeres by using his bodyguards to mutilate the body of the wife in addition to the fact that she utilizes his duty as king to emotionally scar his own brother. Amastris and Medea both use their cunning in order to make their men understand that women have a similar amount of power.

After acknowledging the tantalizing and traumatic effect on men that Medea and Amastris possess, Herodotus and Euripides show that a Greek woman would not behave in such a way. The hypersexualization of Medea and the cunning of Amastris enthrall Greek men, but the concept of Greek women is completely different. Marriage in ancient Greek society was predicated upon the business transaction between a man seeking to marry a woman and that woman's father. Taking this as the Hellenistic ideal of marriage, neither Amastris' nor Medea's

marriage came from this. Medea abandoned her fatherland in order to marry Jason, not with her father's permission or decision (Euripides 22). Medea's father did not perform the traditional business transaction, so that his daughter can marry Jason. On the nature of their union alone, their marriage does not fit into Hellenistic society. Then, examining the chorus of women (the women of Corinth), even though the chorus sides with Medea, the chorus warns Medea that her plan is not favorable. Throughout the play, the chorus discusses how they know exactly how Medea feels, but then they go on to say "Since you have brought this plan to us, and since I want to help you, and since I support the laws of mankind, I ask you not to do this" (Euripides 36). The key aspect that the Corinthian women bring up is the idea that laws govern behaviors. As Greek women, these women understand that there are laws to follow and that absence of laws takes away their Greek identity. Medea, who is not Greek, does not have the same worry even though she lives in a Greek society. Furthermore, Herodotus shows how when Xeres cheats on his wife and then kills Masistes without any consequence of law. Additionally, Amastris has no consequence from law despite the fact that she horribly mutilated someone (Herodotus 720). Medea and Amastris do not have the same awareness and fear of law that Greek women would have. Herodotus and Euripides show that these barbarian cultures breed this type of women because there are no laws to contain them. Herodotus and Euripides conclude that barbarian women wreak havoc on Greek society and that men must actively avoid their allure. Therefore Greek men's maintain the belief that the only fitting type of woman is Greek.

Herodotus and Euripides show that Greek men develop a fetish and fear of barbarian women. Greek society is structured is to promote and applaud the Greek race as the master race. In particular, the way that men treat women shows this. Despite lusting after sexy, exotic women, Herodotus and Euripides remind Greek men of the laws that their society has and that these laws protect them from engaging in acts with lawless, destructive women. Both their militarism and intelligence differ from the passive nature of Greek women, which fosters the intrigue that the men have. However, this intrigue, as Herodotus

and Euripides would argue, is acceptable as long as it remains intrigue. Their tales of exotic wives show that taking a barbarian woman home and integrating her into culture is not only a bad idea, but will also end in one's demise. Using women as a vessel to prove that racial purity is most important, Herodotus and Euripides show the negative effects of beautiful barbarians.

## Tricks and Treaties: The “Trojanification” of Turnus in the *Aeneid*

Michael Kelley, ‘18

In a poem characterized in large part by human intercourse with the divine, one of the most enigmatic augury passages of Virgil’s *Aeneid* occurs in Book XII, in which Juturna delivers an omen to incite the Latins toward breaking their treaty with the Trojans. The augury passage is, at a superficial level, a deceptive exhortation addressed to the Latins, but on a meta-textual, intra-textual, and inter-textual level, a foreshadowing of the downfall of Turnus and the Latins. In this paper, I will begin by illustrating how the deception within Juturna’s rhetoric and linguistic allusions to deception in the eagle apparition indicate a true meaning which supersedes Juturna’s intended trickery. Then, in demonstrating inter-textual and intra-textual paradigms for Turnus, I will explain how the omen, and the associations called for therein, actually anticipate Turnus’s impending, sacrificial death. Finally, I will address the implications of my claim, presenting an interpretation of a sympathetic Turnus and a pathetically deceived Juturna.

While the omen which follows is not necessarily false, Juturna’s rhetoric, spoken in the guise of Turnus’s charioteer Metiscus,<sup>1</sup> is marked by several rhetorical techniques that are, ultimately, fruitful in inciting the Latins toward combat. Attempting to invoke their better reason, Juturna begins the speech with several rhetorical questions that appeal to their sense of honor and their devotion to Turnus.<sup>2</sup> Her description of the Trojans as a *fatalis manus*, translated by Tarrant as “a troop protected by fate,”<sup>3</sup> is most likely sarcastic, referencing what she deems a self-important insistence on prophecy from the Trojans. Conington correlates *patria amissa* on line 236 to Andromache’s use of *patria incensa* in Book III, line 325, perhaps suggesting a feminine rhetorical formula within the elided ablative absolute.<sup>4</sup> Prompting Tolumnius and the Latins to rush forth into battle, Juturna’s rhetoric is certainly effective.

Linguistic allusions to deception within Virgil’s description of the Rutulians’ reaction suggest, however, that

Juturna herself is also deceived. Regarding the use of *incensa*, Tarrant notes that *incendere* “attains the status of a semi-technical term in Cicero’s oratorical writings, to describe the emotional effects of which he was so fond.”<sup>5</sup> Her rhetoric, therefore, capitalizes on the upheaval of the Rutulians’ emotions. Aeneas also employs *incendere* in his rebuttal to Dido’s speech in Book IV: “Desine meque tuis *incendere* teque querelis.”<sup>6</sup> From this line, in which Aeneas claims Dido’s rhetoric inflames both him and Dido, it follows that *incendere* inflames the emotions of both the orator and the addressee. In addition to the deceptive emotional arousal of Juturna’s rhetoric, the phrase *serpitque per agmina murmur* is marked by language of harm and deception. *Serpere* is etymologically related to *serpens*,<sup>7</sup> and, as Tarrant notes, adopts a connotation of “spreading rumour” and is “a natural metaphor for harmful things.”<sup>8</sup> Tarrant also points to Book II, line 269, in which *quies* and *dono divom gratissima* take the verb *serpit*, perhaps infusing it with a positive connotation. However, within the context of the passage, the *quies* ends up as an opportunity for the Greek soldiers, hiding out in the mechanical horse, to emerge and launch a surprise attack on Troy, a deceptive and ruinous “gift” for the Trojans after all. Associating the *qui* clause on line 241<sup>9</sup> with a similar *qui* clause used by Virgil to describe Sinon’s trickery of the Trojans,<sup>10</sup> Tarrant notes the pathos, rhetoric, and deception shared by the two passages. In the same way that Sinon’s gift is ultimately a gift, albeit a negative one, Juno’s omen likewise is a legitimate omen, the meaning of which has been debated.

In his article, *Two Passages from Book Twelve of the Aeneid*, William S. Anderson advocates an interpretation that the omen bears no veracity and is conjured up only to deceive the Italians, yet such an interpretation misjudges Virgil’s multilayered language of deception and interplay with previous similes. The obvious interpretation for a false omen, which Anderson supports, is that the eagle represents Aeneas, who, upon being hindered by the rest of the Rutulians, fails to snatch up Turnus, represented by the swan that is dropped by the eagle and falls into a river. Anderson constructs his argument from observations of Homeric auguries, contending that the Homeric



poems “do not offer any valid parallels for the omen,” as the omen is unlike Homeric auguries, in which “such natural events as the behavior of birds... are expected to be true, and hence they serve to foreshadow future events.”<sup>11</sup> Additionally, Anderson does not regard Juturna as capable of producing truly realized omens, arguing “When Zeus creates omens, he means them to point unflinchingly to the future... However, no effort to prove the likeness of Zeus and Juturna could succeed.”

The key to combating Anderson’s argument, then, lies in drawing parallels between the eagle apparition<sup>12</sup> and like similes within the *Aeneid* and the *Iliad*, the similarities of which reveal the deceptive nature of the omen. The closest parallel to the omen comes from Book XV of the *Iliad*, in which Hector, darting at the ships of the Greeks, is compared to an eagle chasing several different kinds of river birds.<sup>13</sup> The two eagles even have similar adjectives modifying them, *fulvus* and αἶθων respectively. If this omen is taken as possessing some higher truth, then the eagle could not symbolize Aeneas, as Aeneas is ultimately successful in defeating Turnus. Also, an association between Aeneas and the markedly Trojan Hector is curious in a book in which, as Richard Thomas argues, Aeneas takes on the role of Achilles.<sup>14</sup> Within an understanding of Aeneas as a second Achilles, an interpretation in which Aeneas parallels Hector is incongruent given the role-reversal.

Having established that Aeneas cannot be the eagle in an omen that accurately exhibits future events, the most plausible alternative interpretation lies in Michael Putnam’s analysis. In his article, *Tragic Victory*, Putnam argues that “the eagle is the feeling of hostility and violence roused by Juno against Aeneas and the Trojans.”<sup>15</sup> Putnam arrives at this conclusion by citing an augury in Book I, ultimately a true foreshadowing, in which “Venus shows her son... twelve swans, who had also been the prey of an eagle under the open sky, who now seem to gain land in safety, in the same way as Aeneas’ ships, harassed by Juno and her followers, have come through their trial safely to the harbor of Carthage.” Taking Putnam’s argument into account, Juturna’s augury passage also contains elements indicative of a meta-narrative in which Virgil foreshadows the success of Aeneas and downfall of the Latins through an unaware Juturna.

Tarrant is keen to note that the phrase *vivusque per ora feretur*<sup>16</sup> “has the sense ‘kept alive in memory,’” perhaps an allusion to the spread of Turnus’s fame through Virgil’s epic, convincing the Rutulians falsely that Turnus would live on in memory due to his success in battle.<sup>17</sup> Putnam’s interpretation of the eagle as the wrath of Juno ties together the multilayered deception hinted at in Virgil’s language and the similes that elicit comparison to the omen.

Having expatiated on Putnam’s argument painting Aeneas as the swan and the wrath of Juno the eagle, there are several ways in which Turnus can be interpreted, all of them pointing to Trojan figures. In Book IX, Turnus, killing Lycus as he hangs from the wall of the Trojan camp, is compared to an eagle, killing either a rabbit, or, more relevantly, a swan.<sup>18</sup> While Putnam argues that the wrath of Juno is the eagle, Turnus, being on the side of Juno, ought to be considered an exemplar of the eagle in the omen as well. After Aeneas has been understood as an Achilles figure, it would follow that, Turnus, Aeneas’ counterpart, is a Hector figure. The closeness of Hector and Turnus is strengthened by the *Iliad* Book XV simile in which Hector, heading after the Greek ships, is compared to an eagle chasing river birds. Turnus, likewise pursued but was unable to destroy the Trojan ships in Book IX before, like the swan in the Book XII simile, they fell out of his grasp and sank beneath the water.<sup>19</sup> Finally, Hector dies at the hands of Achilles, while Turnus eventually dies at the hands of Aeneas. Both deaths spell out the impending loss of the army in each affair, forging an association between the Hector figure and devastation in war.

Perhaps Turnus’s character owes more to Laocoon, whose death and the episodes surrounding it contain many similar elements to the augury passage in Book XII. Both passages involve a nature omen, and are followed by hasty misinterpretations that lead to a major shift in combat. Turnus and Laocoon’s placement on altars substantiates their status as the ones performing a sacrifice, while Laocoon, killed by the snakes on the altar, represents a sacrificial victim as well. Turnus himself is not killed by the distant omen, but Juturna’s use of the verb *dovovere*, which Tarrant points out “evokes the Roman concept of *devotio*, in which an individual voluntarily endures

death to save his people,” foreshadows a later, perhaps sacrificial death.<sup>20</sup> In addition to *ara*,<sup>21</sup> the verb *serpere* and the noun *agmen* likewise appear in both. The aforementioned *serpit* on line 239 of the augury passage is somewhat curious given that the succeeding omen features birds rather than snakes. Even more peculiar, however, is the appearance of *agmine* on line 212 of the snake passage, given that, according to the Lewis and Short Latin Dictionary, it applies, in general, to “a collected multitude.”<sup>22</sup> The *Thesaurus Latinae Linguae* explains the use of *agmen* to describe only a pair of snakes by suggesting that it refers to the force or movement of the snakes’ bodies,<sup>23</sup> although it is also possible Virgil employed a lesser-known use of the noun to align it with other animal similes and the overall theme of war expressed in nature. The two uses in Book XII are clearer, referring to the battle lines of the Latins on line 239, and the flock of birds on line 249, clearly prompting an association between the birds in the omen and Turnus’s army.<sup>24</sup>

The relationship between Turnus and Laocoon, however, is deeper than mere linguistic coincidences, and lies primarily in the similes used to describe them. Earlier in Book XII, Virgil compares Turnus to a bull,<sup>25</sup> playing eagerly in the sand before a battle, while Laocoon is compared to a wounded bull fleeing from an altar,<sup>26</sup> shaking an axe from its neck, which is curious given that Laocoon does not actually escape from the snakes. This simile recalls a simile at the beginning of Book XII in which Turnus is compared to a lion which breaks off the hunter’s spear which was lodged in its neck.<sup>27</sup> What is unclear, however, is why the lion is *saucius*. While it could refer to the weakened morale of the Latins before the arranged duel, it more likely is used to bear an association between Turnus and Laocoon. The bull captures the sacrificial nature of the two, but it does not explain why Laocoon’s bull escapes while Laocoon dies. The escape could suggest a transfer of the Laocoon paradigm, the ill-starred victim to whom a mighty omen is displayed, to Turnus.

One of the most enigmatic aspects of the augury passage, however, is the absence of Turnus, the alleged subject of the omen, in the words and actions throughout. In place of Turnus, the augur Tolumnius interprets the omen, misjudging it to favor the Latins. A silent, and therefore passive Turnus,

foregrounds Juturna as the active party within the passage. Juturna's delivering her brother from the duel provides another connection to the Laocoon passage. In lines, 229-230, she begins her speech asking, "Does it not shame you to throw away this one soul on behalf of this entire army?"<sup>28</sup> In encouraging the Latins to break the treaty, she disrupts and delays the course of the Laocoon paradigm, in which the Trojans simply look on as Laocoon and his two sons are killed by the snakes.<sup>29</sup> Virgil's play on the name of Tolumnius, which Tarrant argues "would almost certainly evoke memories of Lars Tolumnius of Veii, another treaty breaker,"<sup>30</sup> designates him the treaty breaker, much like Sinon's name designates him the deceiver,<sup>31</sup> and thereby removes any culpability for the broken treaty from Turnus. Turnus addresses Juturna following Queen Amata's suicide,<sup>32</sup> telling her that he recognized her artifice all along. Asking her if she came "so you might see the cruel slaughter of your wretched brother,"<sup>33</sup> he suggests that he knows that he must die, yet was markedly complacent and passive during the omen. The Turnus of the augury passage, as demonstrated by his Trojan counterparts Laocoon and Hector, faces unavoidable death, yet accepts his lot, drawing sympathy from the audience.

Much of Book XII is characterized by inversions of victims and victors, and likewise of Trojans and Greeks. Somehow, the vicious, confrontational warrior of the second half of the *Aeneid* becomes a passive, Trojan figure, while the Trojan hero comes to represent Achilles, the warrior who led the charge against his home city. While I do not deny an interpretation of the *Aeneid*, and in particular Book XII, which recognizes the fluidity of character roles, I argue that the inter-textual and intra-textual paradigms to which Virgil invites comparison in the eagle apparition signify and foreshadow Turnus' role within the book. It is difficult to envision Turnus as a Laocoon figure during his *aristeia*,<sup>34</sup> yet within the augury passage, Virgil leaves several textual clues that indicate Turnus's similarity with Trojan paradigms. Given the end of the Trojan War and the brutal death of Laocoon, the indirect Trojan characterization of Turnus within the omen draws immediate association to sacrificiality, death, and loss in war. It is a testament to the power of Virgil's poetry

that a passage which largely occludes Turnus unveils a new, seemingly inverted interpretation of Aeneas' rival.

## Bibliography

- "Agmen." *Thesaurus Latinae Linguae*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. 1340. Print.
- Anderson, William S. "Two Passages from Book Twelve of the Aeneid." *California Studies on Classical Antiquity* 4 (1971): 49-65. *JSTOR*. Web.
- Andrews, E. A., William Freund, Charlton T. Lewis, and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary, Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary. Rev., Enl. and in Great Part Rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975. Print.
- Feeney, D. "The Taciturnity of Aeneas." *The Classical Quarterly* 33.1 (1983): 204-19. *JSTOR*. Web.
- Fratantuono, Anthony. *Madness Unchained: A Reading of Virgil's Aeneid*. Plymouth: Lexington, 2007. Print.
- Maronis, P. Vergili, and John Connington. *Opera*. Lond: Whittaker, 1858. Print.
- O'Hara, James J. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan, 1996. Print.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. *The Poetry of the Aeneid*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1988. Print.
- Tarrant, R. J. *Aeneid Book 12*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012. Print.
- Thomas, Richard F. "The Isolation of Turnus." (n.d.): 271-302. Web.
- Wacht, Manfred. *Concordantia Vergiliana*. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 1996. Print.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Book XII, Lines 229-337.
- <sup>2</sup> *Non...sumus* lines 229-231.
- <sup>3</sup> Tarrant, 149.
- <sup>4</sup> Connington, 427.
- <sup>5</sup> Tarrant, 151.
- <sup>6</sup> Book IV, Line 360.
- <sup>7</sup> *Lewis and Short Latin Dictionary* II.B.
- <sup>8</sup> Tarrant, p. 151.
- <sup>9</sup> *Qui sibi iam requiem pugnae rebusque salutem sperabant*
- <sup>10</sup> *Captique dolis lacrimisque coactis quos neque Tydides nec Larisaeus Achilles* (Book II, lines 196-198)
- <sup>11</sup> P. 52 of the journal mentioned in the Works Cited section
- <sup>12</sup> Book XII, line 244-256
- <sup>13</sup> *Iliad* Book XV, lines 690-695
- <sup>14</sup> P.278 of *The Isolation of Turnus*: “The relationship of Achilles and Aineas in the *Iliad*... reflects on that of Turnus and Aeolus – and Aineas – in the *Aeneid*.”
- <sup>15</sup> On p. 166 of his book, *The Poetry of the Aeneid*
- <sup>16</sup> 12.235.
- <sup>17</sup> Tarrant, 150.
- <sup>18</sup> 9.561-566.
- <sup>19</sup> 9.107-122
- <sup>20</sup> Tarrant, 150.
- <sup>21</sup> 2.203, 2.223; 12.234.
- <sup>22</sup> Lewis and Short, 1.A.
- <sup>23</sup> TLL column 1340, lines 78-79.
- <sup>24</sup> Tarrant, p. 153.
- <sup>25</sup> Book XII, lines 103-107;
- <sup>26</sup> Book II, lines 223-224
- <sup>27</sup> Book XII, lines 3-8
- <sup>28</sup> My translation in part derived from Tarrant’s note, p.149.
- <sup>29</sup> Book II, lines 228-231
- <sup>30</sup> Tarrant p. 155
- <sup>31</sup> James O’Hara, in his book, *True Names*, presents two possible instances of wordplay for Sinon’s name: either it derives from *sinus*, *sinuo*, etc. and is “linked to the image of the serpent,” or it is derived from the Greek verb σίνομαι, which means to “harm” or “hurt.” (pp. 131-132)
- <sup>32</sup> Book XII, lines 632-649
- <sup>33</sup> Line 636: *An fratris miseri letum ut crudele videres?*
- <sup>34</sup> Approx. lines 311-382

**the piercing of glaucus**  
**Iliad 16.508-16.547**

Jason Steranko, '17

terrible grief seized glaucus when he heard the dying voice,  
his heart was struck he could not save Sarpedon.  
he grasped his own throbbing arm and pressed hard,  
his wound wearying, the wound that teucer had dealt  
when from the high wall he let his arrow fly,  
defending his comrades from the lycian attacker.  
glaucus prayed to far-shooting apollo:

'hear me, lord, wherever you may be, back in rich lycia,  
or here at troy: you are a god who hears from all directions  
the cries of grieving men: grief has come to me.  
a grievous wound overwhelms my arm, too deep to dry.  
it weighs down my shoulder and deadens my hand,  
too weak to take up my spear, too weak to avenge Sarpedon.  
he, our best man, the son of zeus, lies dead on the ground,  
abandoned by his father.  
lord apollo, heal this mighty wound of mine,  
lull my pains and grant me might that i may fight  
and marshal the scattered lycians and that i  
may guard what once was Sarpedon.'

he spoke his prayer and apollo listened.  
he soothed the throbbing arm and dried black  
the dark and deep wound with his gleaming hand.  
the aching heart of glaucus surged with strength.  
the mortal knew it was the touch of the god,  
the quick touch of apollo, who heard his prayer.  
glaucus arose and inspired the leaders of lycia,  
gathered from across the battlefield,  
to surround their prostrate king, fallen Sarpedon.  
with purpose he marched to the trojan troop,  
to polydamas, son of panthous, and shining agenor.  
to aeneas and hector, armed in bronze, the lycian  
aimed his winged words and said:



‘today, hector, you have forgotten your allies entirely.  
because of you they are far from home and from their friends,  
and because of you they are losing their lives.  
where is proud Hector as they fall?  
there lies the leader of the lycian shields, Sarpedon,  
whose judgment and strength preserved my people, whom  
ares has laid low with the bronze spear of patroclus.  
friends, trojan and lycian,  
stand by him whom you stood by in life;  
let indignation guide your hands, let wrath fill your hearts –  
or the myrmidons will strip off and plunder  
his armor and ravage his corpse in vengeance  
for the dead danaans heaped on their nimble ships,  
the men we slew with our spears.’

## The Principate of Trimalchio: *Imperium* in the *Satyrical* of Petronius the Arbiter

Richard Ciołek, '20

Trimalchio, the eminent host of the *Cena* in the *Satyrical* of Petronius, seems to control the proceedings of his guests and household with autocratic authority. With rich diction and a sweeping array of allusions, Petronius seems to, thus, portray the power wielded by the balding host as akin to that of the Roman emperors'. Yet, Trimalchio's handling of his power is depicted as irrational, impulsive, and wholly improper. This depiction, therefore, suggests that Trimalchio may have been a vessel for Petronius to critique the principate and the specific mishandling of power on the part of Nero. Indeed, it is nearly impossible to divorce the *Satyrical* from the age of Nero as there appear to be a significant number of allusions to his reign. However, allusions to the reigns of other emperors suggest that Petronius may have intended to critique the institution of the principate itself. After assessing of Nero's reign, his handling of *imperium*, and a discussion of Petronius's audience in order to provide context for the climate in which Petronius wrote in, this essay will establish that Petronius: employs a parlance to describe Trimalchio that conveys his almost absolute power over his household; colors Trimalchio's threats of execution as frivolous, thereby establishing grounds for abuse of *imperium*; and develops several motifs emblematic of Imperial authority to portray Trimalchio's power as synonymous with that of the emperor.

### **Nero's Rome Assessed**

After the so called *Quinquennium Neronis* (54-59 B.C.E.), the reign of Nero is characterized by murder, paranoia, financial mismanagement, and, according to the conservative senator, cultural degradation. *Maius imperium*, wielded by the *princeps* and exercised through control of the military, granted Nero the authority to conduct himself in this manner.<sup>1</sup> *Imperium*, in its most literal sense, is the power to command. Roman domination of the Mediterranean was based on the concept that provincials would submit to the command of magistrates

subservient to the senate during the Republic, and to the emperor and his subordinates during the principate. Control over life and death, specifically the authority to condemn a Roman citizen, represented the ultimate exercise of *imperium*.<sup>2</sup> *Maius imperium* (literally “greater command”) gave the emperors *imperium* that superseded that of other Roman commanders, and allowed this power to be wielded within the city of Rome itself.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, Nero would have been able to exercise command over his citizens in a reckless manner without any legal challenge to his authority.

Thus, Nero and his indiscriminate condemnation of various Roman citizens to death represent the absolute abuse of *imperium*. Suetonius reports in his *Life of Nero* that Nero killed his aunt for seemingly no reason other than to take her estates (34.5). He also writes that the Emperor had Antonia, the daughter of Claudius, killed on fabricated charges of rebellion because she would not marry him. (35.3) These indiscriminate killings of Roman citizens, many of whom were members of the Imperial family and court, likely would have alarmed senators and high ranking officials, including Petronius. Nero’s severity and injustices provided context for his own condemnation in literature—both covertly by his contemporaries, and openly by later writers.

Although criticizing Nero in such a political climate was dangerous, Petronius’s subtleties and careful selection of his audience ensured him a platform to mock him. Walsh notes that the *Satyrical* is often suggested to be a type of “court entertainment,” and had nuanced this view by asserting that courtiers who were present at such readings would have been small circles of Petronius’s trusted confidants. Walsh argues that Nero would not take criticism lightly, and is thus these small gatherings needed to be constrained.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, despite the present dangers of criticizing Nero, it is not unreasonable to infer that Petronius was still able to include critiques of Nero or the principate in his work.

### **The Parlance of Autocracy**

There is a constant pattern of words which convey and establish the power and tyranny of Trimalchio. Frequently, Trimalchio’s authority is made evident through his statements.

For instance, the very first words the Roman reader would hear from Trimalchio's mouth insinuate at his autocratic control over the *Cena*. Trimalchio, having entered the *triclinium*, apologizes for his absence, and states he decided to finally arrive "lest my long absence be a delay for you all any longer" (§33). Aside from implying that Trimalchio's absence delays all festivities, demonstrating his central role in the *Cena*, Petronius's use of "long absence" is rather peculiar. The Latin of this phrase, *absentivus*, is its only appearance in extant Latin. This suggests that it would have been a rather rare word, and underscores that Petronius made a deliberate selection. *Absentivus* is stronger than a similar word such as *absens*, and more accurately means "absent for a long time." Therefore, Petronius's intended audience, would infer that Trimalchio could keep his guests waiting for a long duration of time. Such an observation suggests the dominion Trimalchio has over his guests and household. Trimalchio later goes on to say to his guests "permit the games to, nonetheless, be finished" (§33.2). The mood of "permit" here is odd. It cannot be a command because it is indicative, yet, in the context of the passage, the phrase appears to be a command. Thus, Trimalchio is either stating a fact—that is, the guests have already given up their own power over themselves to Trimalchio and he is merely declaring what is to come—or he is asking a rhetorical question. If it is the latter, he doesn't seem to give the guests much time to respond as the board games are immediately brought in. Either way, Trimalchio is undoubtedly in command. In Latin, *permitto* may also mean "give in" or "surrender." Thus, Trimalchio is indicating that his guests must surrender to him. Petronius's choice of both the verb and its mood subtlety suggests Trimalchio's supremacy.

In another situation, Trimalchio's power brought to life by another's description of him, and is not quite as subtle. Later in the *Cena*, when Trimalchio stands up to relieve himself, Encolpius, states, "we obtained our freedom without the tyrant" (§41.9). Petronius stresses Trimalchio's authority in the use of the verb "obtain", the meaning of which insinuates that Encolpius and the rest of the guests do not free themselves, rather are granted freedom momentarily. "Tyrant", a word highly

suggestive of autocracy, further underscores the scope of Trimalchio's power, and hints at his abuses.

### **The Abuse of *Imperium***

At several points in the *Cena*, Trimalchio threatens his slaves with executions over trivial matters. These passages seem to suggest a connection between many of the senseless killings carried out during Nero's reign, and Petronius's wording accents their absurdity and hollowness, thereby critiquing the *Princeps*' mishandling of *imperium*.

One may note this when Trimalchio orders a slave boy who dropped a cup to "quickly" be killed "because [he] you are stupid" (§52). "Quickly" suggests the pointlessness of the affair as it indicates that Trimalchio himself concedes to the frivolity of the matter (and would, thus, want to get it over quickly). It also implies that Trimalchio has taken the decision without much thought, an indication that Trimalchio is exploiting his ultimate power. "Stupid," moreover, also highlights the pointlessness as that Latin word, *nugax*, is literally defined as "frivolous." Thus, Trimalchio, again, concedes that this is a pointless affair. Something of note is that Petronius seems to directly connect this episode with the Julio-Claudians. An anecdote told just prior to this incident by Trimalchio in which the Emperor killed a craftsman of an indescribable glass cup (§52). The location of this anecdote and its similarity to Trimalchio's outburst make it unlikely that its inclusion was an accident. However, the emperor referred to in the story was Tiberius not Nero. This indicant, may then, either be a censure of all the Julio-Claudians, or perhaps Petronius used Tiberius as a vessel to attack Nero (as Tacitus seems to criticize Hadrian in the *Annals* whilst describing the reign of Nero).<sup>5</sup>

Trimalchio's reckless use of *imperium* is further implied in a later passage, where he has one of his slaves display his funerary garbs. He commands his slave to ensure that "moths and mice [not] touch this [cloak]" (§77.7), otherwise "I will burn you alive" (§77.7). Petronius's diction here amplifies how absurd the punishment is. Mice and moths are rather small and petty creatures, and perhaps allude to the small and petty nature of the crime (if it even is one). Moreover, Trimalchio threatens death if

the smallest of animals merely “touch” his garb. In having Trimalchio specify his method of execution, Petronius juxtaposes a rather meaningless crime with a draconian punishment which highlights the absurdity of the interaction. Trimalchio threatening to immolate his slave also establishes a direct connection with the Nero, who is infamous for his persecution and immolation of Christians. For instance, Tacitus reports in the *Annals* after the burning of Rome, many Christians were affixed to flaming crosses (44). Such a reference would fit in well with the rest of the *Satyrica*. Rose contends that, while many of the allusions in the novel are uncertain, most of them refer to events extant in our literature between 64-65 A.D.<sup>6</sup> The burning of Rome, in 64 A.D. and the subsequent persecution of Christians in the same year fit in nicely with his assertion. Petronius, thus, not only demonstrates Trimalchio’s absurd abuse of *imperium*, but also directly implicates the Emperor.

#### Imperial Ascendency: Emblems of Power

While there are certain instances where Petronius alludes to the power of the Caesars in various anecdotes, he links Trimalchio’s power to Imperial Power through avid use of motifs. Petronius used specific symbols which were emblematic of the Emperor’s authority, typically in passages regarding Trimalchio. In this way, Petronius establishes a direct connection between the *princeps* and Trimalchio.

For instance, the entrance of the *triclinium* is decorated with several objects which convey a sense of majesty and power held by the Roman Emperor. The entrance was rather impressive, and our narrator was “particularly amazed” (§30). He then goes on to note that, “on the posts of the dining room were *fasces*” (§30). The *fasces*, which was a bundle of rods around an axe that symbolized a Roman magistrate’s literal power to condemn, appears to be suggestive of the Caesars. Magistrates other than the emperor held *fasces*, and those on Trimalchio’s wall are not described with the typical imperial laurel. However, given the several instances of Trimalchio threatening death to members of his household, and the *fasces* being a symbol closely associated with capital punishment, they seem highly suggestive of Nero’s power. Petronius’s court

position and the variety of other references to Nero make it rather unlikely that they refer to someone else.

Encolpius continues his description of the wall; he describes a “bronze ram of a ship” (§30). This, again, may serve as an allusion to the Julio-Claudians. Schmeling contends that the rams are perhaps supposed to represent the “naval victory” of Trimalchio’s success as a merchant.<sup>7</sup> However, there may be another reading to the ship’s rams. Following the Battle of Actium, Augustus constructed a war memorial at his command post in Nikopolis. This memorial still exists, and in an influential study, Murray concludes that a series of sockets on the memorial would fit the bronze rams of ships.<sup>8</sup> Zanker contends that the use of beaks of ships as a symbol of Augustus’ victory would have been popular, for it is an easy to produce image. He cites multiple marble sculptures of rams outside of Rome.<sup>9</sup> Thus, following Actium, if a ship’s ram was on display in cities across the Empire, it might have become a symbol easily identifiable with Augustus and the power he wielded. As the *Satyrical* was likely read to close associates of Petronius, they would, because of their position, be surrounded by displays of the emperors’ military victory and glory. Thus, it seems plausible that Petronius’s audience would have associated ship’s rams specifically with Augustus, his victory, and (most importantly) his power; it serves to create a direct connection between the power wielded by Trimalchio and the *princeps*.

Though many of these motifs allude to the concept of the *maius imperium* held by the *princeps* rather than Nero specifically, it seems unlikely that Petronius had another emperor in mind. Walsh has concluded that there are simply too many parallels between Trimalchio and Nero for the plethora of allusions to the Emperor to be incidental.<sup>10</sup> Rose seems to agree with this assessment.<sup>11</sup> If this is indeed the case, then it would also seem unlikely that symbols of imperial authority would not be referring to Nero. Especially the *fasces*, which, coupled with Trimalchio’s utter abuse of execution, seems to parody Nero’s *imperium* perfectly. Furthermore, had Petronius intended to criticize another Emperor, he wouldn’t have to be nearly as clever and subtle in the matter. Seneca’s *Apocolocyntosis* is proof enough that an author, especially a trusted confidant of

Nero, could explicitly criticize a dead emperor (even if they were deified). Thus, the motifs are most likely referring to Nero's own mishandling of power.

### **Conclusion**

Petronius employs diction and symbolism which suggest a direct criticism of Nero and the principate. The images of the ship's ram and *fasces*, imperial authority personified, juxtaposed with a brash mishandling of *imperium* indicates a scathing criticism. The *Satyrica* includes other allusions and critiques of Nero's *imperium* that are beyond this scope of the essay. Nero's philhellenism and his desire to make a new Rome in his image seems to be similar to Trimalchio's odd habits and rather liberal interpretation of the Trojan War (a story critical in Rome's origin myth). This desire, it may be argued, is an abuse of Nero's power as *princeps*. Petronius's concern with the abuse of power and autocracy is something that parallels growing concerns in recent years on the rise of authoritarianism in some European states and, most recently, the United States.



## Bibliography

- Lintott, A. (1993). *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration*. New York, New York.
- Rose, K.F.C. (1971). *The Date and Author of the Satyricon*. Leiden, Netherlands.
- Schmeling, G. (2011). *A Commentary on the Satyrica of Petronius*. Oxford, UK.
- Walsh, P.G. (1970). *The Roman Novel: The Satyricon of Petronius and the Metamorphoses of Apuleius*. Cambridge, UK.
- Zanker, P. (1990). *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> OCD Imperium.

<sup>2</sup> Lintott (1992) 22-23.

<sup>3</sup> OCD Imperium.

<sup>4</sup> Walsh (1970) 70.

<sup>5</sup> Rose (1971) 77.

<sup>6</sup> Schmeling (2011) 102-103.

<sup>7</sup> Schmeling (2011) 102-103.

<sup>8</sup> Murray and Petsas (1989) 95-113.

<sup>9</sup> Zanker (1990) 82-85.

<sup>10</sup> Walsh (1970), 71.

<sup>11</sup> Rose (1971), 77.

## Petronian Comments on Parental Influence in Education

Thomas Posillico, '20

“My education was interrupted only by my schooling.”-Winston S. Churchill,

In his unique style, Petronius offers his opinion on how life ought to be lived. Education and schooling are rightly at the forefront of such discussions. In appealing to his audiences, Petronius harkens to the importance of an education that burdens itself with the improvement of life through learning, and he extolls the educator who tends to draw out inherent interests from the individual. In his *Satyrice*, Petronius focuses sharply on the efficacy of schooling in its goal of offering an education. Lauding the practices that successfully extract the student from himself, he calls attention to the most beneficial of these practices in his satire of the least beneficial ones. Thus, the weighty fist of his reproachful satire lands its fair share of hits on the corrupting parental influence in education. This is most evident in the contemptuous discussion of teaching rhetoric in the opening chapters of the *Satyrice* and the later conversation between Agamemnon and a fellow dinner guest, Echion. In both passages, Petronius pegs the parent as the wedge driving this break from honest education.

In the fiery baptism of the novel's initial action, Petronius wastes no time in immediately introducing his uniquely presented thoughts on education. This first scene sees a dispute erupt between Agamemnon, a rhetorician who teaches at the local school, and Encolpius, one of Agamemnon's pupils. While Encolpius rants passionately and illogically about his schooling (something students often do well), Agamemnon offers an unclouded and mature voice when he airs reasonable grievances concerning the faults of education. Agamemnon's extensive education and resulting expertise provide Petronius with a seaworthy vessel for his own ventures. Agamemnon proves he is above prejudice by assigning fair blame to teachers for the shortcomings Encolpius previously cited. He compares his fellow educators to “contrived sycophants” (*ficti adulatores*, 3.2) who, rather than teach what ought to be taught, cater to the

wants of their student's parents, because they would otherwise lose those students to another teacher. However, Agamemnon diverts the full burden of responsibility away from the teacher (*nil mirum in his exercitationibus doctores peccant*, 3.3, "no wonder teachers are guilty of these [mal]practices") and affixes most of it on the confining circumstances in which the teacher often finds himself. He explains that, by the nature of the system, teachers cannot attract pupils "unless they entertain what the young men approve of" (*nisi dixerint quae adulescentuli probent*, 3.4). This pandering is justified by the clear certainty that "[teachers] will not otherwise obtain what they seek [i.e. students to teach]" (*nec aliter impetrabunt quod petunt*, 3.4). Agamemnon renders the predicament of the teacher, as only a rhetorician can, when he elucidates: "A school master..., as if a fisherman, sets the particular bait on hooks which he knows the little fish are about to approach, or he will wait on a rock without hope of a catch" (*sic...magister, nisi tanquam piscator eam imposuerit hamis escam, quam scierit appetituros esse pisciculos, sine spe praedae morabitur in scopulo*, 3.4). The teacher is hand-cuffed. He struggles to maintain a sufficient following without compromising the integrity of his teaching. Literally stuck between a rock (*scopulo*, 4.1) and a hard place, the teacher relinquishes the brunt of responsibility for educational limitations to his unfortunate situation.

Having proved the teacher is not wholly at fault for the ineffectiveness observed by Encolpius, Agamemnon continues and readily applies this blame to the nosey parent. He overtly calls out the parental propensity to interfere with and thus obstruct filial learning. When Agamemnon rapidly reels off the consequences of such an interference (4.1-4.4), Petronius exposes the irony in the consequence of parental action, which often opposes original parental intent. For example, the student who suffers from a parent's overprotectiveness is often unable to "profit from stern discipline" (*severa lege proficere*, 4.2). Similarly, this peripheral manipulation regularly results in an insufficient and incomplete education. The parent's greed "for ambition" (*ambitioni*, 4.2) regularly "hurried" (*properant*, 4.2) the "immature" (*cruda*, 4.2) student through what ought to have been a gradual and worthwhile progression of his studies. The

parent's impatience is hyperbolized when Agamemnon describes the students being hurried along as "just being born" (*adhuc nascentibus*, 4.3).

Having tasked his audience with interpreting the indirect message present in his sarcastic criticism, Petronius entreats his readers with the outright unveiling of his ideal method of schooling. He proclaims his sentiment through the words of Agamemnon: "...that studious boys were steeped in serious reading, their minds formed by wise sayings, their pens relentless in digging out the right word, their ears giving a long hearing to pieces they wished to imitate..." (*ut studiosi iuvenes lectione severa irrigarentur, ut sapientiae praeceptis animos componerent, ut verba atroci stilo effoderent, ut quod vellent imitari diti audirent*, 4.4). In expressing his endorsement, Petronius makes evident his subscription to the ideal education in which the student can become immersed and with which he can become one.

Over the courses of a famous dinner, Agamemnon's presence again prompts a discussion related to his profession. Echion seeks out Agamemnon to boast of his young son's learning to such a respected educator. Here, Petronius mocks the inclination of a father to live vicariously through his son, and the resulting obstruction of the child's education. In his usual style, Petronius boldly spells out his reproach for parental partiality through absurd exaggeration.

Petronius makes Echion's excessive pride in his son Primigenius abundantly apparent in this discussion with Agamemnon. Echion advances the assured observation that Primigenius is "already" (*iam*, 46.3) well ahead of his contemporaries and on an accelerated pace to becoming an educated man, much like Agamemnon. In a most telling line of dialogue, Petronius points out the incongruence of a son's genuine interests and a parent's ambition when Echion condemns the passions of his son: "[Primigenius] is clever and of good character, even if he is crazy about birds" (*ingeniosus est et bono filo, etiam si in aves morbosus est*, 46.5). Attempting to retain the positivity of his pitch to Agamemnon while noting

what he considers to be a fault of his son, Echion asserts that the pursuit of unconventional interests is incompatible with intelligence. In effect, the weighty “even if” (*etiam si*, 46.5) independently portrays the disapproval of Primigenius’s honest and genuinely led out desires. In his roundabout way, Petronius prompts his reader to condemn the actions of a condemning father.

Furthermore, the braggadocious manner with which Echion validates Primigenius’s early academic success leads one to question whether Echion speaks truly or speaks in exaggeration in order to impress. Echion explains that Primigenius “thrust a kick” (*calcem impingit*, 46.6) to his more childish readings in favor of more mature ones. The reader is left to decipher whether Primigenius truly desires to begin more advanced studies or only does so at his father’s command. This ambiguity completely disappears with Echion’s use of the first person (*volo*, 46.7, “I wish...”) when describing his wishes for his son. Regardless of the material Echion wishes Primigenius to become proficient in, the parental manipulation of education is made bitingly clear in the explicit expression of Echion’s desires, inconsequential to the desires of his son. Regarding his son’s material of study, Echion expresses his wish that Primigenius become educated in the ways of a profession that “has bread” (*habet panem*, 46.7), meaning one that will keep Primigenius from the clutches of a breadless poverty. By stating this wish, Echion indirectly asserts his neglect of his son’s studious interests, which he makes directly clear when he later explains he is “determined” (*destinavi*, 46.7) to see his wish through to fruition even “if Primigenius resists” (*si resilierit*, 46.7). This paternally forced compromise is the ultimate corruption of true education. Petronius further highlights his contempt of parental encouragement for professional studies in Echion’s loudly ironic comment: “For [Primigenius] is contaminated enough by books” (*nam litteris satis inquinatus est*, 46.7).

However, knowing no ultimate boundary, Petronius makes his criticism more apparent with a further procession into absurdity when he continues with the polysyndeton in Echion’s

listing of possible breadwinning skills that his son could pursue (*aut tonstrinum aut praeconem aut certe causidicum*, 46.7). In keeping with his tendency to exaggerate, Petronius augments this fatherly ignorance and the decibel level of irony. Echion, per his own assurances, reminds Primigenius every day that “whatever you learn, learn for yourself” (*quicquid discis, tibi discis*, 46.8), when all the while he has failed in giving Primigenius’s desires proper consideration.

As though this prolonged exaggeration is insufficient in substantiating a critical tone, Echion also exhibits certain qualities that undermine his credibility. Classicist Beth Severy-Hoven notes how many linguistic errors in the quotation of Echion, such as the improper active formation of deponent verbs (*loquere...loquis*, 46.1), contribute to the conclusion that Echion has not benefited from a decent education himself.<sup>1</sup> This, in conjunction with the brief description of Echion as a “clothes seller” or “fireman” (*centonarius*, 45.1), concretely cements the characterization of Echion as someone hailing from the lower ranks of Roman society. While this may offer a possible explanation as to why Echion holds so resolutely to the importance of an economically nourishing job, it discredits him. How can a man so poorly educated stake the audacious claim that his judgment, as it pertains to his son’s educational fulfillment, is best?

Echion’s low standing on the social ladder, might also suggest why there appears this aspiration for the graduation of Primigenius from his father’s rung. Classical rhetoric professor Lamp accuses the sort of mobility that Echion wishes for his son as guilty of being the *Satyrica*’s central criticism, especially evident in the satirical presentation of the character Trimalchio, a gaudy and flamboyant dinner host. She describes the showiness of the social climber as an effect of unsophisticated imitation. Lamp reveals a further correlation of this imitation with the imitation that had taken root in schooling and that spoils education.<sup>2</sup> Thus the teaching that Echion forces upon Primigenius is of the spoiled sort that hinders original thought and promotes imitation.

In the inspection of Agamemnon's early discussion with Encolpius and the indirect inspection of his later discussion with Echion, Petronius's ideal schooling is revealed as one that draws honest ideas from the student. He proclaims a message that implores students to find within themselves what it is they truly desire, while also beseeching parents to let this happen without bias and influence. His exceptional voice still ought to be heard. The strength and pointedness of his words would likely shake loose the failings of a still imperfect system.



## Bibliography

- Arbiter, P. (1913). *Satyricon* (Translated by M. Heseltine & W. H. Rouse; Edited by E. H. Warmington). *Loeb Classical Library* 15: 6-9. Retrieved November 30, 2016, from *Digital Loeb Classical Library*.
- Kennedy, G. (1978). "Encolpius and Agamemnon in Petronius," *The American Journal of Philology* 99(2): 171-178.
- Lamp, K. S. (2014). "False Copies: Education, Imitation, and Citizenship in the *Satyricon*," *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 17: 43-52.
- Severy-Hoven, B. (2011). *The Satyricon of Petronius: An Intermediate Reader with Commentary and Guided Review*. Norman, Okla.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Severy-Hoven (2011) 127.

<sup>2</sup> Lamp (2014) 46.

**Odyssey 12.201-12.225**

Michael Kelley, '18

Just as we left the island in our wake,  
I spied the mist and mighty swell, and heard  
The roaring of the sea. At such a sign,  
Oars flew from frightened hands, and slipped into  
The tide with splashing sound. Our ship stayed put,  
But, making rounds, I roused my comrades o'er the ship,  
Approached each man with tender speech, and spoke,  
“Now now, old friends, we are well-versed in woes!  
Indeed – this misery is dwarfed by that  
One time the Cyclops caged us in his cave —  
That hollow den — with overbearing force.  
But, even then, by me, my excellence,  
My plan, my mind, we made it out alive.  
I do believe someday we'll reminisce  
On these things, too. But come on, now! Let's all  
Obey whatever I command—take heed!  
You all will sit in rows and strike  
The dive-deep surf of salt, in case  
Zeus grant, perhaps, that we escape and flee.  
But you, o steersman, I entreat you thus—  
Take it to heart when you direct the helm  
Of this our hollow ship—avert the mist  
And stay these waves outside our walls. Do sail  
Abreast the cliff—let not your eyes desist—  
Lest you, the ship hard-hurting off that way,  
Propel us straight to terrible dismay.”  
I spoke and swiftly did they heed my speech,  
But not a word I spoke of Scylla, that  
Unconquerable calamity, lest they –  
My comrades – filled with fear because of me,  
Cease rowing and safeguard themselves inside.

## The Laughter of Democritus: Humour and Glory in Satire

### 10<sup>1</sup>

Claude Hanley, '18

#### Introduction:

Early on in Satire 10, Juvenal compares the laughter of Democritus with the tears of Heraclitus. He praises the one, but brushes off the other. From the beginning, the elements of laughter and philosophy haunt the 10th Satire, perhaps the most “philosophical” of all satires in the Juvenalian corpus. Nowhere is this clearer than in the *gloria* passage, which runs from 10.133 to 10.187. A broad study of the word *gloria* indicates that Juvenal connects it closely with images of food, the comedic value of which had a long history in Roman literature. In Section II, closely analyzing each example of *gloria* in Book 10 discovers both subtle and obvious ways of making a joke of glory. This paper traces a few of those specific jokes, but does not intend to be an exhaustive litany of them. The final section of this paper turns toward the philosophies mentioned or referenced in Satire 10, and discusses the validity of an “Epicurean” reading of Satire 10. Ultimately, while Juvenal might seem to condemn glory from a philosophical perspective, a broad philological analysis of the word, along with a close reading of the *gloria* passage in Satire 10 make clear that comedy, not philosophy, is the essential element of his satirical attack.

#### Part I: Glory and Comedy Across the Satires

Each time *gloria* appears outside of Satire 10, the poet mentions it in connection with food. The speaker laments the miserable meal served to him, and declares “once upon a time, the glory of giving was regarded greater” (*olim maior habebatur donandi gloria, 5.111*). This, the only positive depiction of *gloria* in all 16 of the *Satires*, claims that true glory *gives away* food, and does not hoard it. Juvenal invokes *gloria* twice and then, shifts to a wholly negative contextual of it when he writes “what will, however so much glory, be to Serranus and to emaciated Saleius, if it is only glory” (*Serrano tenuique Saleiio /*

*gloria quantalibet quid erit, si gloria tantum est, 7.81*). The speaker here denounces poetic or rhetorical fame and glory, because the poet is poor. So starved is he that even a lion's appetite seems smaller (*leviori sumptu, 7.77*), while the poet's gullet is parasitically voluminous (7.78). When it next occurs, at 7.118, *gloria's* association with food has only grown more prominent. The lawyer "bursts his liver" so that he might win green palms, the "the glory of stairs" (*scalarum gloria, 7.118*) for his doorpost. However, the honour comes at a cost: he eats only (*siccus patasunculas et vas pelamydum aut veteres...bulbi 7.119-7.120*). Bypassing Satire 10, Juvenal uses the word *gloria* on only one other occasion: at 13.98, where the speaker condemns a runner, because he cannot actually eat the wreath he wins. Images of eating and food are invariably found wherever *gloria* appears.

This undeniable association with food makes a joke of glory and robs it of any serious weight. Food and appetite are stock tropes in Roman comedy. Anecdotally, Plautus's *Menaechmi* makes this point abundantly clear. The play's first speech alone contains no fewer than seven jokes about appetite, the slavery of hunger, and different kinds of food. This, of course, is anecdotal evidence. More systematically, however, the stock characters of Plautine comedy prove the same point. Plautine comedy gives ample space to the parasite (*Bacchides, Persa, Captivi*, and a great many others) and the cook (*Mercator, Miles Gloriosus, Aulularia*), whose humour rests in their connections to food. Additionally, invented foods make for some of the finest wordplay in the *Menaechmi*. *Glandionidam* and *pernonidam*, for instance, pun on the Latin patronymic; A.S. Gratwick renders them splendidly as "Miss Piggy Sweetbreadson" and "Master Porky Baconnson." Food provides a space for much of the humour of the *Menaechmi*, and Plautine comedy in general.

The usage of food in Juvenal exists within this tradition and draws much humour from it. Satire 5, for instance, concerns itself with the life of the parasite. The speaker mocks Trebius as *parasitus*, setting Satire 5 in the line from the food-jokes of Roman comedy. Similarly, the *patasunculas* and *pelamydum* of Satire 7, with their ridiculous, broken rhythm practically ooze

contempt. The mere names for types of food become jokes of their own. It is important to note, however, that the point is not whether Juvenal explicitly draws inspiration from Roman comedy; certainly, *pelamydum* is not directly related to *pernonidam*. The comical predecessor is important because it bears witness to what the Romans thought was funny: parasites, appetites, and wordplay, to name but a few. Food, since it is intimately connected to both verbal humour and stock characters, retains its implicit comedic value in Juvenal's satires. Food is historically funny; its association with *gloria* reduces the thirst for glory to a lust for the bathetic.

Juvenal, however, does not rely merely on the comic history of food; each occurrence of *gloria* becomes its own kind of joke. The poet's longing for glory, for instance, becomes an exercise in prostitution. Courtney's comment is insightful. He argues that Juvenal's *promisit diem* at 7.82 "is characteristic of the whore or bawd," while "female friends" (*amicae*, same line) is "the first hint of the sexual imagery which follows, and which conveys that Statius has to prostitute his talent." Glory makes the poet a hungry whore; this is simultaneously cruel and comical. Nor is the lawyer spared. His wreath is described as the "glory of the stairs" (*scalarum gloria*, 7.118). The successful attorney has no house of his own, but lives in a room at the top of the steps. Juvenal's runner, if he is really sane, wishes for gout (*locupletem podagram*, 13.96), because he cannot eat an olive-wreath. The irony of a successful athlete longing for gout is difficult to overstate. The runner Ladas gives his life in pursuit of something which he does not even want; indeed, he wants the very opposite. In different fashions -- bawdiness, absurdity, and irony in particular -- the poet turns every pursuit of glory into a farce.

Ultimately, a philological analysis of the usage of *gloria* throughout the Satires yields a simultaneously generalized and specific critique. Invariably, glory and food appear together. Comestibles make for excellent comedy, historically speaking; the works of Plautus attest to that. The presence of gluttony calls glory's worth into question, and allows the reader to laugh at it instead. The poet then puts his finger on the baseness, absurdity, or irony of each specific situation. Laughter grounds the poet's thinking on glory; it is always the occasion for mockery,

derision, or both. This insight informs any intelligent reading of the *gloria* passage in Satire 10.

## **Section II: Gloria in Satire 10**

To begin, it must be noted that this section will not attempt to catalogue every joke in the *Gloria* passage; instead, it will point out a few particulars, trusting that these will be enough to make the point.

The particular *exempla* of glory in Satire 10 develop the preceding critique in distinct ways. The attack on Hannibal, the longest of the three *exempla*, draws peculiar power from the image at its center. Hannibal declares “” (*acti nihil est, nisi...media vexillum pono Subura 10.155-10.156*). The Subura is not the Capitoline Hill; it was Rome’s equivalent of a red light district. At line 5.106, the Subura is directly related to its overflowing sewer. Hannibal’s Glory is nothing until it claims the human sewer; that is the Carthaginian’s great desire, the end of all his conquest. It is a picture which the speaker calls *digna quali tabella*, worthy of some kind of cartoon (10.157). Already, the picture of Hannibal’s advance is a highly comical one.

It becomes even more comical with the line *cum Gaetula ducem portaret belva luscum* (10.158). Of particular importance are the words *belva* and *luscum*. Both suggest a kind of physical monstrosity. *Luscum*, which roughly means “blind,” appears only at two other points in the Juvenalian corpus. In one, it describes a statue of a Lawyer in a chariot, missing one of its eyes, in a threatening pose with its bent spear (7.126-128). Ferguson calls it “a ludicrous statue of a lawyer.” At another point, Juvenal applies it to an old man who is practically falling apart, envied by the other old men because he has one eye, rather than zero (10.228). In either case, it calls attention to humorous physical decay. Its application to the great general undermines his status as a military chief, and implicitly compares him to a broken old man or crumbling statue. *Belva* brings out another dimension of the physical image. It appears six times in Juvenal’s works, always describing animals of particularly great size: fish (4.121, 4.127); lions (7.77) and elephants (10.158; 11.126; 12.104). The explicit sense of the Latin is “a beast, distinguished by size or ferocity.” It carries with it a sense of

uncommon monstrosity, as the case of the turbot in Satire 4 suggests. The result is an absurd physical picture: the decrepit man riding the enormous beast, in order to set his standards in the sewer of Rome. Glory makes a general into an absurdist caricature; by laughing at him, Juvenal condemns him more effectively than *indignatio* ever could.

The example of Alexander the Great develops an element of degrading condescension within the comical vision. Most importantly, when he describes Alexander's death, Juvenal declares *a figulis munitam intraverit urbem* (10.171). Per Courtney, the image of walls fortified by potters "is hardly a flattering description of the brick walls of Babylon." He explains that, for one thing, it parodies the poetic convention, which was fond of such descriptions; for another, the phrase suggests how miserable and paltry was Alexander's end. Juvenal reduces one of the ornaments of the world to the produce of a potter's kiln (*figulis*). Upon Alexander's death, the poet declares *mors sola fatetur quantula sint hominum corpuscula* (10.172-173). The double diminutive is piercingly amusing: the body is so small and weak in death that it needs to be diminished twice. There is a certain tone of condescension here, too, as if the reader looks down upon and sneers at what remains of the body. This is the end of another long pursuit of glory: a tiny corpse, in a city made in a potter's kiln, worthy only of a bit of sneering.

While the preceding section directly ridicules the meanness and indignity of in which the quest for glory ends, the final *exempla* is characterized by a series of consciously hyperbolic images. They make a mockery of the Persian conquest and undermine Xerxes's achievement. The section begins, *creditur olim / velificatus Athos et quidquid Graecia mendax / audet in historia* (10.173-175). The sentence turns around the image of *sailing* Mt. Athos, a reference to Xerxes' digging a canal to bypass the Chalcidicean promontory. The image, however, sounds as though the ships were literally sailing *up* the mountain. Digging a canal is both a boring and believable image; Juvenal transforms it into an immensely entertaining picture which does not fall remotely within the realm of credibility. The words *creditur olim* and *mendax* make the hyperbole inescapable, for the speaker himself suggests that the



claim is manifestly false. The reader is encouraged to laugh both at Xerxes sailing up a solid stone mountain, and at the mendacious Greek historian who claims he actually did it.

In the next line, both of these comments become even sharper. The speaker snarls, *altos defecisse amnes epotaque flumina Medo / prandente* (10.176-178). Again, we have a comically absurd physical picture: a single Mede, guzzling away at the rivers of Greece. The contrast of the plurals *amnes* and *flumina* with the singular *Medo* is skillful satire: one person drains river after river dry. More amusingly, the Mede does not merely drink from the rivers; the participle *prandente* suggests “lunching at,” as though he were making a quick meal of the *amnes* and *flumina*. Both the contrast between singular and plural, and the participle *prandente* introduce the traditional comical elements of appetite and food. We laugh at this image for the same reasons we laugh at the parasite in Roman comedy, or the hungry poets of Satire 7. Finally, the entire statement depends upon *credidimus*, much like the image of Athos being sailed up. The speaker does not believe it himself -- indeed, it’s so ridiculous that he rather suspects the historians lied. Like the image of Mount Athos, this peculiar detail laughs at both hyperbole and its implicit untruth, while it also plays with a bit of traditional comestible-comedy.

The particular *exempla* of Satire 10 enrich the comic model of *gloriae* laid out in Satires 5, 7, and 14. The speaker describes Hannibal in comical, dehumanizing terms that make him into a malformed monstrosity. Alexander warrants only a bit of brief condescension, while Xerxes’s accomplishments are first made impossible, then brushed off as lies. *Gloria* makes her devotees into mere jokes, and in the process strips them of their dignity. The comical impulse grounds a robust critique of *gloria*; it implicitly de-elevates and demystifies its subjects. From this vantage, the irony, inconsistency, and folly of their behaviour becomes obvious.

### **Section III: The Philosoph(ies) of Juvenal**

At first glance, it seems as though Epicurean philosophy provides another window into the meaning of Satire 10. Ferguson, for instance, claims that “the Tenth Satire is hardly to

be understood without an awareness of Epicurean philosophy.” A number of elements in the *gloria* passage seem to bear out this claim, of which I shall only sketch a few. For instance, the speaker declares, *causas discriminis atque laboris / inde habuit* (10.139-10.140). *Inde*, Ferguson observes, refers rather obviously to military glory. This seems like an Epicurean sentiment. Epicurus taught that only those pleasures should be pursued which are not outweighed by the pain they entail. A philosophical reading would make Juvenal a good Epicurean, for the speaker’s objection to glory is the labour and danger which it entails. This appears to be a classical case of weighing pleasures. The conclusion, where “much-sought glory exacts punishments” makes a similar point: the proposed object of pleasure will really cause more pain, and therefore should be shunned. There are others: the lines *opposuit natura Alpemque nivemque* (10.152) might be explained through the Epicurean notion that desires which oppose nature are anathema, as Ferguson suggests. On the basis of these three passages, the critique of *gloria* might be rooted in Juvenal’s Epicurean ethics.

Juvenal, however, is not writing Satire 10 in isolation; intertextual allusions complicate the apparently straightforward “Epicurean” tones of the poem. Now, the shortest of *exempla gloriae* is Alexander the Great, second in the sequence of three. Alexander is mentioned at only one other point in Juvenal’s satires, in line 14.311. That alone should be enough to establish a solid connection, but there are other echoes which connect 14.308-14.321 with the *gloria* passage. Most notably, the word *sitis*, thirst, occurs only in two places: 10.140, where it is connected with *famae*; and at 14.318, where the speaker is introduced as an opposite to Alexander’s desire to conquer the world. Finally, both passages deal with similar themes -- how much should suffice for a human being, and the objects of human desire. Even if one could critique the link that *sitis* provides, the identical character and similar themes make the connection undeniable. Satire 10 should be read in context of this allusion to 14.

The allusion to Satire 14 undermines any attempt to read Juvenal’s critique of *gloria* as straightforward Epicurean ethics. At first, it seems like the speaker might merely be confirming his

Epicurean influences: he references Epicurus by name, after all, and he reflects, in Ferguson's phrase, "a proper appreciation of Epicurus's cult of the simple life." The allusion to Alexander, however, is not directly connected to Epicurus. Instead, Alexander encounters Diogenes the Cynic (14.308-14.312). Diogenes is practicing his ethics in the public square, in line with the teachings of his school. By contrast, the Epicureans thought the ideal ethical life was one of withdrawal and seclusion from the affairs of the city. The allusion links Alexander with a philosopher whose entire life was a rejection of Epicurean ethics. As the Oxford Classical Dictionary notes, the Epicureans frequently polemicized against the Cynics. The two schools were clearly at odds with one another; the allusion therefore forecloses any straightforwardly Epicurean reading of Satire 10.

As the examination of lines 14.308-14.321 continues, the poet's philosophical leanings, or lack thereof, become clear. The speaker, whomever he may be, sets forth his own opinion: *mensura tamen quae / sufficiat census, si quis consulat, edam* (14.316-14.317). He proceeds to lay out the philosophers whose vision of the moral life he approves of. There follows a citation of Epicurus, and, in the succeeding line, and invocation of Socrates (14.319 - 14.320). Both are called as witnesses to the value of the simple life, against excessive wealth. In the line after that, the speaker declares, *numquam aliud natura, aliud sapientia dicit* (14.321). Ferguson observes that "the Stoics were always insisting, '*secundum natura vivere.*'" In the space of 3 lines, the speaker invokes an equal number of philosophical schools. Each of these, he suggests, nearly matches his own opinions. Cynic, Epicurean, Socratic, Stoic -- each of these offers a coherent and correct moral opinion. This allusion is eclectic, not Epicurean.

This allusion destabilizes the attempt to read Satire 10 as a treatise of Epicurean ethics. It is as undeniable as it is eclectic: Alexander only appears twice in the Satires, as does *sitis*. This is not a coincidence, nor are the thematic similarities between the two passages. Each of the philosophical schools alluded to in 14.308-14.321 could account for philosophical elements of Satire 10. The Stoics insisted on life in accord with nature, in respect to which Hannibal failed abysmally (*opposuit natura*

*Alpemque nivemque*, 10.152); the Cynics, as Ferguson notes, were notoriously distrustful of military virtues; Socrates lived a simple life. Critically, each of these schools or their figureheads advocated a public, ethically involved life. None of them would have retired to gardens to seclude themselves from the city. Neither does the satirist; he must be involved in the world, for he practices an urban art. No good Epicurean could be a good satirist. On the grounds of that fundamental dissonance, and the strength of the allusion to Satire 14, the “epicurean” understanding of Satire 10 should be dismissed.

### **Conclusion**

A broad philological analysis of the word *gloria* throughout Juvenal’s work and a close reading of the specific *exempla* in Satire 10 indicate that the critique of *gloria* relies on comedy, not philosophy. *Gloria* is contested with laughter, not debate. Satire 10 is perhaps the most serious and philosophical of all of them; if it needs to be understood in terms of humour rather than dogma, so does the entire collection. In that sense, Democritus offers one of the keys to the Juvenalian corpus: the Satirist may never weep; he must always laugh. He may never withdraw; he must always engage. When the poet takes over the podium in the first ten lines of Satire 1, he wants to entertain. That element never disappears; in fact, it grounds the entire work.

## Bibliography

- Charlton Lewis and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary*. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1879.
- Courtney, Edward. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London: The Athlone Press, 1980.
- Ferguson, John. *Juvenal: The Satires, Text and Commentary*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1999.
- Gratwick, A.S. *Plautus: Menaechmi, Text and Commentary*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 4th Edition*. Esther Eidinow, Simon Hornblower, and Antony Spawforth, eds. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 2011.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> All definitions of words are from the Lewis and Short Latin Dictionary, while the Oxford Classical Dictionary has been consulted for general background about ancient philosophical schools.

## **Dido's Last Day**

Melody Wauke, '17

I took you in, a shipwrecked stranger. I should've let you die.  
Or sent you off, straight away, to go seek your precious fate.  
How did you not see? Me, wretched, consumed by the fire,  
while you wandered through my city, ignorant of my wound.  
All this time, I've been sick, infected by your false love.  
How is it that I burned for you? You! Cold and incapable of care.  
I had long ago meant to swear off harboring care  
inside my swollen heart. I'd expected that side of me to die  
along with Sychaeus, snatched by savage fate.  
Then you appeared and I thought, perhaps, a fire  
warmed me once more. Desire? No, just a wound  
that spread silently inside me and I called "love,"  
while you devised plans to desert me. You claim that our love  
was imagined, that I possess a one-sided care.  
Tell me, when did all your compassion die?  
Was it when you abandoned your will to blind fate?  
If only, while beloved Troy burned and bled in furious fire,  
you too could have suffered some fatal wound  
and spared me from this pointless pain. Now I've wound  
up betrayed again, this time by the object of my love.  
Yet you, pitiless, but so proud in your piety, care  
so carefully about unclear prophecies, just so you can die  
with a glorious name. And truly now the gods fate  
me to die neglected, my former fame reduced by your fickle fire.  
Yes, you, reckless, have brought ruin and set fire  
to my Phoenician land. You depart, leaving a permanent wound  
on this city, once shining and cherished by the love  
of Juno. Our lofty walls now wither from neglected care  
and Carthage feels the sting of its queen, left to die  
by a coward, all too enamoured of his Italian fate.  
So this is it—now I come to learn my own fate:  
To heap up this pyre and at last, light on fire  
these vain gifts, eternal reminders of the wound  
left by an unfeeling man who defiled sacred love.  
If ever we meet in the realm of Dis, I'll be the one to care  
less about you, so careless, who let love and a lover die.

Sail away! Prove you don't care. Love  
your fate more than me. I, Dido will die by  
the fire, curing one wound with another.



## Submissions for Next Year

*Parnassus* welcomes submissions from Holy Cross faculty and students of any major or class year. 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 emailed to the editors beginning in the fall semester. Pieces will be reviewed and vetted by the editorial board, and authors of accepted articles will continue to work on their pieces with editors once decisions have been made.

