View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by College of the Holy Cross: CrossWorks

New England Classical Journal

Volume 44 | Issue 4 Pages -

11-2017

Full Issue

Follow this and additional works at: https://crossworks.holycross.edu/necj

Recommended Citation

(2017) "Full Issue," *New England Classical Journal*: Vol. 44 : Iss. 4 , .
Available at: https://crossworks.holycross.edu/necj/vol44/iss4/13

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by CrossWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in New England Classical Journal by an authorized editor of CrossWorks.

New England Classical Journal

Volume 44.4 November 2017

EDITORIAL BOARD

Carl Anderson	*Ann Arbor, Michigan*
Barbara Weiden Boyd	*Bowdoin College*
Lee Fratantuono	*Ohio Wesleyan Univeristy*
Anne Mahoney	*Tufts University*
Susan Setnik	*Tufts University*
Raymond Starr	*Wellesley College*

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF RATIO ET RES
Deborah R. Davies, Brooks School
1160 Great Pond Rd, North Andover, MA
ddavies@brooksschool.org

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Anne Wadlow Drogula, 15 French St.,
Rehoboth, MA 02769
asw5X@verginia.edu

MANAGING EDITOR
Ruth Breindel,
617 Hope St., Providence, RI 02908
rbreindel@gmail.com

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR
Jennifer Clarke Kosak, Dept. of Classics
Bowdoin College, 7600 College Station
Brunswick, ME 04011
jkosak@bowdoin.edu

CANE EDITOR
Rosemary Zurawel, 16 Northam Dr.
Dover, NH 03820
rzurawel@comcast.net

New England Classical Journal (ISSN 0739-1188) is a quarterly publication of the Classical Association of New England, issued in August, November, February and May. SUBSCRIPTION RATES for 2012-13, including CANE membership: USA Individual, $35.00; Domestic Institutions and Subscribers Abroad, $45.00.

Copyright © 2017 Classical Association of New England
Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.
All rights reserved.

Graphic Design: Niclas Nordensved
Produced by: Colonial Lithograph, Inc., Attleboro, MA 02703

New England Classical Journal

VOLUME 44.4 — November 2017 — ISSN 0739-1188
Reference Abbreviation: NECJ

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Caesar and Labienus: A Reevaluation of Caesar's Most Important Relationship in *De Bello Gallico*
Gregory P. Stringer 228

RATIO ET RES

Sailing Through Greek with Hanno of Carthage
Michael L. Koneiczny 247

REVIEWS 268

Lynn Kozak, *Experiencing Hektor: Character in the* Iliad
/ reviewed by **Joel Christensen**

John Taylor, *Greek to GCSE: Part 1. Revised edition for OCR GCSE Classical Greek (91)*;

John Taylor, *Greek to GCSE: Part 2. Revised edition for OCR GCSE Classical Greek (9-1)*;

Judith Affleck and Clive Letchford, *OCR Anthology for Classical Greek*
/ reviewed by **Brian T. Walsh**

Victoria Moul, ed., *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature.*
/ reviewed by **Anne Mahoney**

Richard Hodges, *The Archaeology of Mediterranean Placemaking: Butrint and the Global Heritage Industry.*
/ reviewed by **James Higginbotham**

Message from the President 281

Announcements 284

Books Received........ 292

New England Classical Journal 44.4 (2017) 228-246

Caesar and Labienus: A Reevaluation of Caesar's Most Important Relationship in *De Bello Gallico*

Gregory P. Stringer
Burlington (MA) High School

Titus Labienus served with distinction under Caesar for the entirety of the future dictator's 9 year governorship of Gaul. Labienus was indispensable to Caesar's success in Gaul. However, for reasons that can no longer be fully uncovered or understood, when civil war broke out between Caesar and Pompey in 49 BCE, Labienus sided with the latter against his former commander.[1] While scholars for more than a century have primarily focused on attempting to solve this intriguing question, Labienus can also serve as an interesting case study for approaching various questions about the work of literature that is, ultimately, our best source for knowledge of the man—Julius Caesar's so-called *De Bello Gallico*.[2]

For this study, I have chosen to largely ignore questions of Labienus' previous or subsequent political allegiance and, for the most part, other external ancient sources.

1 This has been the primary topic of interest about Labienus for scholars, receiving several dedicated studies in the first half of the 20th century, but relatively little interest lately. The most recent extended treatment of this topic remains Tyrrell (1972). Timeless and important is Syme (1938).

2 Although we do not know what Caesar actually called his works, most modern scholars are content to refer to this one by the designations *De Bello Gallico*, *Bellum Gallicum* or *Gallic Wars*. I have chosen to stick to either *De Bello Gallico* or *Gallic Wars*. On the topic of the traditional names of the works, see Kelsey (1905).

Instead, I focus primarily on what Caesar wrote in order to shed light on what was, ultimately, Caesar's most important military relationship in Gaul. In fact, the result of a close analysis of the phrasing, vocabulary and rhetoric used by Caesar when describing the actions of Titus Labienus, as well as what he included versus what he left out, has uncovered a relationship between the *imperator* and his chief lieutenant that was much more complex and variable than heretofore believed. By retracing the appearances of Labienus in the text of *De Bello Gallico* and the language Caesar uses both to address the man and describe his actions, a more accurate portrait of a volatile relationship emerges, one marked by cycles of estrangement and rapprochement, leading up to the final break in 49 BCE.

RHETORIC IN *DE BELLO GALLICO*

Any reading of Caesar's *Comentarii* must address some fundamental questions about composition and authorial intent. In recent decades, the identification and explication of the subtextual rhetoric of Caesar's seemingly direct prose has become one of the main preoccupations of *Commentarii* scholarship and has shown that Caesar's Latin is not so "plain" or "straightforward" as once believed.[3] Therefore, before an analysis of the specific episodes involving Labienus, we will look at some of the main questions of the text in which consensus has, and has not, been reached.

Perhaps the most notable, and now universally recognized potentially insidious aspect of both the *Gallic War* and the *Civil War* is the author's consistent use of the third person. Caesar seemingly adopted the practice from Xenophon's *Anabasis* with the purpose of, in the words of Kenney, "giv[ing] an air of objectivity to what is a personal, autobiographical account."[4] However, Conte has seen the same feature rather as a tactic of "emotional detachment."[5] It may, indeed, be both. As this relates to Labienus, as will be seen, the third person narrator allows Caesar the author to put some interesting commentary about Caesar the commander in the mouth of his

---

3 E.g. see the comments of Gardner: "the *Gallic Wars* is perhaps not altogether a straightforward account of events." (1983a, p. 25).

4 Kenney (1983, p. 283).

5 Conte (2004, p. 227). It is also interesting to note that the use of the third person led some earlier readers to believe that the texts had been written by Suetonius, not Caesar. Likewise, evidently because it is such a well known feature of the work, neither the editor of the Loeb nor the Penguin edition felt the third person narration even worthy of comment.

lieutenant.[6]

Rhetoric in Caesar, however, goes far beyond the choice of narrator. In a 1956 paper Siedler identified no less than sixteen different rhetorical devices at play in Caesar's writings, including multiple and striking instances of alliteration, assonance, verbal symmetry, anaphora, asyndeton, and dramatic ellipsis, among others.[7] This was followed by Rasmussen's important if flawed 1963 study, *Caesars comentarii - Stil und Stilwandel am Beispiel der direkten Rede*, which focused on the use of rhetoric in the *oratio recta* of Caesar's works.[8] While Rasmussen succeeded in demonstrating that direct speeches were not later interpolations into the text, his attempt to use this discovery to prove synchronous composition falls flat.

A landmark in the study of rhetoric in Caesar was Rambaud's *L'Art de la Déformation Historique.*[9] As the title implies, Rambaud operates under the assumption that Caesar's works are entirely and intentionally distorted. Rambaud therefore interprets Caesar's every word about Labienus as an attempt to belittle or undermine his lieutenant's achievements so as not to interfere with the aggrandizement of his own deeds. Shortly after that followed Tyrrell's doctoral thesis, which collected all known relevant information about Labienus.[10] Unlike Rambaud, Tyrrell was reluctant to read into what is written in *De Bello Gallico* and generally reported whatever Caesar had written without scrutiny.

In the 1970s, 80s, and 90s, the study of Caesar largely turned to the deconstruction of various themes in his work. In a 1977 article, Murphy illustrated several textual themes he had detected through each of the books of the *De Bello Gallico* via the striking repetition of key vocabulary, such as "*persuasio*" and "*timor*" in Book I, "*perturbatio*" in Book IV or "*celeritas*" in Book VI.[11] In her introduction to the reprinted Penguin edition of *The Conquest of Gaul* [i.e. *De Bello Gallico*], Gardner introduced the thematic concepts of the "German menace" and "Gallic menace."[12] Gardner expanded on these ideas in a 1983 follow-up paper in which she argued that the central, guiding principle of the *De Bello Gallico* was, through a portrayal of

---

6 On Labienus' speech and its rhetorical significance, see below.

7 Siedler (1956).

8 Rasmussen (1963).

9 Rambaud (1966).

10 Tyrrell (1970).

11 Murphy (1977, pp. 235, 238, and 240).

12 Gardner, (1983a, pp. 25-26).

Caesar's actions in Gaul in the light of reasonable reaction to foreign provocation, to provide Caesar with the political justification he needed to escape prosecution and secure his second consulship.[13] In a 1998 study of Caesar's lieutenants, Welch attempted to balance earlier approaches to rhetoric in Caesar. While she did not refute the possibility of distortion, Welch believes that Caesar generally gave credit where credit was due, including to Labienus.[14]

In the succeeding years ever more detailed studies of Caesar's language and themes have followed, examining the author's use of specific words and constructions or the import of particular episodes. In this vein, Batstone's linguistic study of the use of *etsi*, which he called a "subtle and effective piece of rhetoric," leant support to Gardner's notion of the *Gallic War* as a work of political justification.[15] More recently, scholars have become increasingly creative (and increasingly tendentious) in their attempts to better understand Caesar via linguist theory, such as Erickson's unconvincing 2002 study of the sea battle with the Veneti via the lens of gendered language or Brown's unpersuasive 2004 exploration of Caesar's "superhuman ego" through a detailed analysis of the so-called "centurions contest" at *De Bello Gallico* Book V.44.[16]

A central and seemingly irresolvable issue lay at the center of many of these studies—the dates of composition and publication of the two works.[17] While the dates for the *De Bello Civili* are, for obvious reasons, less in doubt and more circumscribed, those of the *De Bello Gallico* remain an open question, often leading to circular arguments.[18] Some have proposed that internal contradictions and an evolution from "bare, unadorned style of the *commentarius*" towards one "that increasingly allows the typical ornaments of *historia*" supports the notion of annalistic composition at the end of each campaigning season, while others have used essentially the same evidence to assert that it was composed altogether in the winter of

13 Gardner (1983b).

14 Welch cites Holmes' assertion "Caesar gave all his lieutenants, and especially Labienus, full credit for their exploits" (1911, p. 230) but rightfully questions how we can know how much or how little credit he gave or how much they deserved (1998, p. 100).

15 Batstone (1990, pp. 348-360). See nn. 18-19 below.

16 Erickson (2002). Brown (2004).

17 Conte (2004, p. 227).

18 Many of them, including several of the studies cited above, reading essentially like this: "if we imagine that *Bellum Gallicum* was written/published in 52/51, then we can read in them Caesar's self-justification to avoid prosecution and campaigning for the consulship, which thereby proves they were written in 52/51."

52/51 BCE, though perhaps from field notes gathered year by year.[19] In the absence of further external evidence, scholars are left to hypothesize about the date and nature of the composition and publication based on close readings of the texts themselves.

So while the dates of composition remain controversial, there is now an almost universal consensus that the *Commentaries* contain, as Grant puts it, "a good deal of distortion, not so much of the actual historical facts…but of motives, impressions and implications."[20] For example, it is difficult not to read Caesar's preemptive strike against the Helvetii in Book I of the *De Bello Gallico* as largely the result of provocative actions on the part of the Roman proconsul, recast in his *Commentary* as defensive measures.[21] Likewise, Book IV sections 20-38 give the strong impression of special pleading written *ex post facto* to explain both the motive for his aggressive first expedition to Britain and the reasons for its relative lack of success.[22] However, justification is always useful and therefore one need not necessarily read either of these episodes as anticipatory defenses against potential accusations, as Gardner and others have claimed.

Regardless, even if inclined to a more literal reading of the texts, one should certainly be aware of the fact that, as one of the day's leading speakers and a man of literary tastes, oratorical and literary rhetoric unquestionably informed Caesar's themes, grammar, syntax, and vocabulary. For example, Nordling, Grillo, and others have amply demonstrated that one need not adhere to some of the more extreme positions, such as Rambaud's, to recognize that the *Commentaries*, and especially the speeches imbedded within, are rich with rhetoric.[23] As an important and successful politician, Caesar's need for justification, for specific political goals or otherwise,

---

19 The comments are those of Conte who falls firmly in the first camp (2004, p. 227). He continues, "The interpretation is unquestionably a forced one that regards the latter [BG] as written and published for the purpose of supporting Caesar's candidacy for his second consulship," (2004, p. 229) in opposition to the opinions of Gardner (1983a, p. 24; 1983b, pp. 188-189) and Rasmussen (1963).

20 Grant (1977, pp. 216-217).

21 For example, the forced march to the frontier, the requisitioning of troops throughout Provence, and the destruction of the bridge at Geneva (*DBG* I.7).

22 Justification for aggression: *quod omnibus fere Gallicis bellis hostibus nostris inde sumministrata auxilia intellegebat*, and explaining the relative lack of success: *exigua parte aestatis reliqua Caesar, etsi in his locis … tamen in Britanniam proficisci contendit… et, si tempus anni ad bellum gerendum deficeret, tamen magno sibi usui fore arbitrabatur, si modo insulam adisset et genus hominum perspexisset, loca, protus, aditus cognovisset*. See also the aforementioned article by Batstone about the rhetorical nature of *etsi* and *tamen* constructions in Caesar (1990, *passim*).

23 Nordling (1991); Grillo (2012).

undoubtedly colored his writing. However, since there remains uncertainty as to when and how the *Commentarii* were composed and published, it would be unwise to give oneself over too easily to programmatic and dogmatic statements as to why they were published.

Therefore, although I am thoroughly indebted to the contributions of all of these scholars (and many others) for insight on how to read Caesar's *Commentarii* intelligently, upon close study of all of the passages which refer to Labienus in *De Bello Gallico*, I have found the few specific analyses of the relationship between Caesar and Labienus to be incomplete. For example, Tyrrell's preoccupation with Labienus' later career with Pompey, Rambaud's unwavering commitment to reading everything Caesar wrote in the most negative light possible, and Welch's attempt to generalize about Caesar's relationships with his subordinates has led to an imperfect understanding of Labienus as he is presented in *De Bello Gallico*. In fact, scholars seem to operate under a notion that the relationship between the two men during Caesar's proconsulship was essentially static.[24] Rather, a close reading of the text suggests quite the opposite —a dynamic and changing interaction with noticeable variations in what Caesar asked of his lieutenant and even how he asked.

LABIENUS IN THE SOURCES, ANCIENT AND MODERN

As stated above, most of what we know about Titus Labienus has been collected by Tyrrell.[25] The most salient facts for our purposes are that he was likely born about 99 BCE, making him nearly an exact contemporary of Caesar and, having probably reached the praetorship in 60 or 59 BCE, he would have held *imperium pro-praetore* while in Gaul with Caesar and probably entertained reasonable hopes of one day achieving the consulship.[26]

---

24 In the secondary literature I reviewed, I uncovered no references to difficulties between the two men prior to Labienus' departure. The statement of Welch is indicative: "We cannot assume from these narratives that Caesar had any inkling of Labienus' future disaffection. The chief legate continued to be trusted until the very end. Caesar is consciously demonstrating to his Roman audience the amount of cooperation and loyalty which existed among the high command in Gaul." (1998, pp. 99-100)

25 Tyrrell (1972).

26 Tyrrell (1970, p. 425). There remains some question about Labienus' praetorship. Since Caesar only refers to Labienus with this title, I am prepared to accept the conjecture of others that Labienus had held one of the at least 8 unknown praetorships of either 61, 60, or 59 BC; for comparison, Caesar had been praetor in 62, meaning that if Caesar was indeed born in 100 and Labienus in 99, then Labienus had in

The most extensive information about Labienus comes from what Caesar wrote about him, both in *De Bello Gallico* and in *De Bello Civile*. However, the manner in which Caesar describes the man and his actions naturally differs markedly between the two works, since the second was composed after Labienus' departure to Pompey in 49 BCE.[27] Although all of Caesar's lieutenants are confined to a pronounced secondary role, as we will see, Labienus is the only person apart from Caesar to appear in every book of the *Commentarii* and he is the Roman (other than Caesar) whose name appears most frequently. He is also the only one of Caesar's officers who is given a further description beyond *legatus* (he is specifically designated *legatus pro praetore*) and the only one who is ever directly assigned a subordinate officer.[28] Furthermore, Caesar addresses Labienus, directly and indirectly, in ways reserved only for him and entrusts him with unique commands.[29] The text of *De Bello Gallico* makes clear that Labienus was an important figure in (and even outside of) Caesar's camp.

As to Labienus' time in Gaul from sources other than Caesar, Labienus appears occasionally in the letters of Cicero, although almost entirely after his break from Caesar, in Plutarch's biographies of Caesar and Pompey, and in the historians of Imperial times who, by and large, did little more than retrace the steps of Caesar.[30] Cicero makes frequent reference to Labienus' abilities, but unfortunately adds no new details to his service record in Gaul. Writing much later, Plutarch calls Labienus "one of Caesar's greatest friends" and, along with Appian, gives him a greater share of the credit for the victories over the Helvetii and the Germans in Book I than Caesar does.[31] Finally, the later historians Dio, Orosius, and Frontinus add nothing that had not already appeared in Caesar, whereas Florus at one point inexplicably confuses

---

fact been following a similar career trajectory as Caesar. On Labienus' hopes for the consulship, see the extended discussion in Syme where he treats the issue with his customary confidence in the authority of his own assumptions (1938, pp. 113-125, especially pp. 121-123).

27 For a discussion of Labienus in *De Bello Civile*, see Tyrrell (1970, pp. 424-440).

28 Labienus is so designated at *DBG* I.21 and assigned a subordinate, Marcus Sempronius Rutilus, at *DBG* VII.90.

29 See below.

30 See, for example, Cicero *Att*. 7.13a.1 and *Fam*. 16.12.4; Suetonius, *Divus Iulius.*

31 On "greatest friend," see Plutarch, *Caesar* 33. On Labienus' share of the victories, see Plutarch, *Caesar* 18; Appian, *Gall*. 1.8. Tyrrell also rightly points out that Caesar in 58 BC is not the Caesar of later campaigns - his army and his officers were new to him and relatively untested so this may account for some of Caesar's reliance of Labienus in Book I (1970, p.18).

Labienus with Dolabella.[32]

As Tyrrell records, modern historical opinion of Labienus has generally been negative.[33] Mommsen's scathing criticism of the man, largely centered on his decision to support Pompey over Caesar in the civil war, set a precedent which has never been fully overturned.[34] Syme was more measured, arguing that Labienus was most likely returning to an allegiance with Pompey that predated his friendship with Caesar, whereas Tyrrell prefered to interpret that Labienus, although somewhat embittered by slighted ambition, merely "joined the legitimate government in its struggle against a revolutionary proconsul who placed his own *dignitas* above his country."[35] Welch declined to comment on Labienus' motives, although she did note that "it is probable that Caesar felt his generosity as an author as well as his patronage as a general had been betrayed dreadfully when Labienus deserted him for Pompey in 49."[36] It would seem that this estimation, of disenchantment resulting from ambition stunted by Caesar, still prevails today.[37]

LABIENUS IN *DE BELLO GALLICO*

So leaving aside his posterior decision to fight with Pompey, who is Titus Labienus in the pages of *De Bello Gallico*? First, as stated above, he is clearly distinguished from any of Julius Caesar's other subordinates in terms of the number of references and the amount of text dedicated to him. Second, Labienus' commands are unique for their size, type, and importance. And finally, he is differentiated by the actual words and phrases which Caesar uses to describe him. We will look at each of these three elements in turn.

Labienus is, after the *imperator* himself, the Roman who appears most frequently in the seven books of *De Bello Gallico* ascribed to Julius Caesar, referenced by

---

32 Florus I.45.

33 Tyrrell (1972, p. 439). Holmes stands somewhat apart - among many other laudatory statements he concludes that "the genius of Labienus has not been adequately appreciated." (1911, p. 161). However, he also felt that Caesar had recognized his services: "but it needs little insight to see that Caesar placed him in a class by himself" and that, nevertheless, "Caesar's was the directing mind." (1911, pp. 161-162).

34 Mommsen (1958, p. 392).

35 Syme (1938, pp. 113-125); Tyrrell (1972, p. 439).

36 Welch (1998, pp. 100-101).

37 See, for example, Goldsworthy (2006, p. 383).

name a full 51 times, on 45 distinct occasions, and referred to obliquely in a handful of other places.[38] These references are somewhat unevenly distributed, as Labienus appears seven times in Book I, but then virtually disappears until Books V, VI, and VII, in which he is named 15, 9, and 14 times, respectively. Despite being less prominent in Books II, III, and IV, he nevertheless remains the only legate mentioned in all seven books. For comparison, the next most frequently named *legati* are Quintus Tullius Cicero and Quintus Titurius Sabinus, who appear about half as much, on 23 and 20 occasions respectively. Cicero only appears from Book V on and Sabinus is absent from Book I and killed in dramatic fashion in Book V.[39] Moreover, the vast majority of the references to Cicero (20 of 23) occur in Book V, scene of his dramatic hold-out and eventual rescue by Caesar and all but two of the mentions of Sabinus occur during his two prolonged adventures in Books III and V.

Caesar further distinguishes Labienus in *De Bello Gallico* by the commands with which he was entrusted, in terms of their nature, size, and importance. Whereas, at least from what Caesar shares with us, rarely are the other *legati* given anything more than the responsibility of a single legion's winter camp, Labienus was on several occasions put at the head of multiple legions, such as when he commands the united winter camp of all the legions after the first season's campaigns in Book I or when Caesar has him lead four legions against the Parisii and Senones in Book VII.[40] Likewise, Labienus is one of only a few soldiers sent on independent missions and is the only legate which Caesar ever specifically instructs to "make plans as he sees fit."[41] Finally, the importance of Labienus' commissions is generally of the highest order, although this does seem to vary over the course of the war, as will be discussed below.

As noted previously, while Labienus is the most consistently appearing actor in the *Gallic Wars* other than Caesar, he nevertheless nearly disappears for long stretch-

---

38 Labienus is referenced by name at *DBG* Book I.10, 21, 22, 54; II.1, 11, 26; III.11; IV.38; V.8, 11, 23, 24, 27, 37, 46, 47, 48, 53, 56, 57, 58; VI.5, 6, 7, 8, 33; VII.34, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 86, 87, 90.

39 Cicero first appears at V.24 and Sabinus dies at V.53.

40 In charge of the winter camp, I.54; against the Parisii and Senones, VII.34. While Dio (41.4.3) obviously over-generalizing from Book I that Labienus always was in command of all the legions when Caesar was gone at the end of the campaigning season, Caesar explicitly tells us otherwise at the end of each book. Tyrrell suggests that Caesar did not repeat this experiment after the first year for fear of the familiarity and affection it would have perhaps allowed between Labienus and Caesar's legions (1970, pp. 22-23).

41 Labienus is instructed to *consiliumque pro tempore et pro re caperet* at V.8.

es of the work. For example, after his aforementioned important contributions in Book I, Labienus is almost wholly absent from Books II, III, and IV, despite, according to Tyrrell and others, having made important contributions to the war with Belgae (the subject of Book II) and the overall heightened presence of Caesar's legates in Book III, as illustrated by Welch.[42] At the opening of Book III Caesar sends (*mittit*) Labienus to the Rhine with only some cavalry in order that he prevent (*prohibeat*) the Germans from crossing.[43] Tyrrell suspected, and I agree, that this assignment hints at a demotion, as these types of assignments were typically reserved for the youngest officers.[44] Although we do not know how serious the German threat at that moment really was, it is difficult to see how Labienus, with only a small detachment of cavalry, could have truly kept them in check if they indeed attempted to cross in force.[45] Caesar did not record the result, so we can only imagine that Labienus was successful in preventing a German incursion. If so, perhaps it was because the threat never actually materialized or had not really existed in the first place.

After being sent to the Rhine at the beginning of Book III, Labienus again goes missing from the text until the final paragraph of Book IV when he is once again entrusted with multiple legions to subdue the Morini.[46] If there had been a falling out between Caesar and his lieutenant, it evidently had been resolved by this time. Caesar reports that Labienus was successful, but he does so with a *caveat* of the type that Rambaud feels is indicative of Caesar's belittling of his subordinates and, in this particular case, explaining away his own failure to conquer the same people in the preceding year's campaign: "The enemy had no place of retreat, by reason of the dryness of the marshes, their refuge in the previous year."[47] Or, in other words, yes, Labienus won, but so would have Caesar, had it not been for the weather.

---

42 Welch (1998, pp. 91-94).

43 *DBG* III.11.

44 Tyrrell (1970, pp. 21-22). Cf. *DBG* I.52 in which Publius Crassus is sent with a detachment of cavalry and he is explicitly described by Caesar as *adulescens*: *Id cum animadvertisset P. Crassus adulescens, qui equitatui praeerat, quod expeditior erat quam ii qui inter aciem versabantur, tertiam aciem laborantibus nostris subsidio misit*. Publius Crassus was born somewhere between 86-82 BCE, making him between 23 and 28 at that time. Labienus, on the other hand would have about 41 or 42 years old, or consular age, and had almost certainly held the praetorship.

45 Tyrrell (1970, pp. 21-22).

46 *DBG* IV.38.

47 *DBG* IV.38. Rambaud (1966, p. 297). Tyrrell (1970, p. 29) disagrees.

The relationship still shows evidence of strain at the opening of Book V. Although Caesar once again decides not to take Labienus with him to Britain, which in and of itself is perhaps noteworthy, he does leave an important commission for his marshal—to defend the ports and acquire grain for the armies.[48] It is also significant that Caesar entrusts Labienus to "make plans as suiting the moment and the situation," a phrase that Caesar does not use elsewhere for any other legate and is perhaps indicative of a greater level of trust in Labienus' independent military judgement.[49] Furthermore, when Caesar needs ships to return to the continent he "writes to Labienus" (*Labieno scribit*) that he build as many ships as he can.[50] There are only two other occasions on which Caesar uses the verb *scribere* in reference to his communication with one of his legates, instead of the his more usual *iubere* or *mittere* - to Labienus, as will be discussed below, and to Quintus Cicero, where Caesar is not giving orders to his legate, but is instead encouraging him to maintain his valor until help arrives.[51] It is significant that Caesar reserves this more polite tone of conveying his wishes only for Labienus.[52]

Caesar was disappointed in his rediscovered trust in Labienus. Most of the requested fleet never arrived and Caesar does not hide his displeasure upon not receiving the ships: "for which Caesar waited in vain for quite some time."[53] The words *aliquamdiu* and *frustra* carry a distinct negative thrust. This is followed immediately by the re-division of winter assignments and whereas previously Caesar has always listed Labienus' assignment first; here he is fourth, after Fabius, Cicero, and Roscius, and he is only given one legion to command.[54] It is hard to imagine that these slights

---

48 *DBG* V.8.

49 Ibid. *consiliumque pro tempore et pro re caperet*.

50 *DBG* V.11: *Labieno scribit, ut quam plurimas posset eis legionibus, quae sunt apud eum, naves instituat*.

51 *DBG* V.48: *In litteris scribit se cum legionibus profectum celeiter adfore; hortatur ut pristinam virtutem retineat*.

52 Caesar most commonly refers his orders to his legates via the verb "*iubere*": thrice to Labienus (II.11, VI.33, VII.90), thrice to Publius Crassus (III.9, III.11, V.46) and once each to Sabinus (II.5), Decimus Brutus (III.11), Publicus Sulpicius Rufus (IV.22), and Lucius Plancus (V.25) and once in reference to all his gathered legates (V.24). In contrast, although he often refers to himself as *imperator*, the verb the verb "*imperare*" is almost exclusively used for the Gauls, hostages, or Gallic towns, or occasionally the Roman troops *en masse*. In fact, Caesar never uses it toward Labienus but does use it twice to named Roman subordinates (Crassus at III.26 and Gaius Fabius at V.47).

53 *DBG* V.23: *Quas cum aliquamdiu Caesar frustra exspectasset*.

54 *DBG* V.24.

are incidental.

Nevertheless, it is undeniable that Labienus was Caesar's best general and Caesar often relied on his abilities. The later events of Book V bring this into stark relief and Labienus returns spectacularly to prominence after the long tale of Sabinus' demise. That said, although Caesar undoubtedly highlights some of Labienus' achievements here, the narrative is not without internal tension. As he begins to make plans to relieve Quintus Cicero's besieged camp, Caesar "writes" to Labienus that he come "if he could do so in a way that was of advantage to the state."[55] This is the same phrase that Caesar reports that the Senate had used in their request to him in Book I and that Caesar himself will use again when encouraging (*hortatur*) Labienus and Trebonius to return to him to make new plans in Book VI.[56] Labienus writes back that he is unable to return safely, one of only two occasions on which a legate disobeys Caesar's orders and the only occasion on which it did not result in disaster.[57] In hindsight, the qualifying phrase of "only if … it was of advantage to the state" Caesar attaches to his command may be some Monday morning quarterbacking, either to cover for an error in Caesar's judgement or at least to make Labienus' direct refusal of Caesar's orders less obvious.

Caesar essentially confirms this in the following paragraph which he begins with the words "Caesar approved of his plan," but he is then quick to point out that it is the news of his own victory which forces the Treveri to retreat and makes it safe for Labienus to move again.[58] This in particular seems to be an obvious interpretative interjection by Caesar, as it is utterly unclear how Caesar the man (as opposed to Caesar the omniscient narrator) could have possibly known of Indutiomarus' aborted plans to attack Labienus' camp on the following day (if indeed he had such a plan) or that news of Caesar's victory forced him to retreat, especially since the chieftain was killed in battle, presumably taking any battle plans and motivations with him to

---

55 *DBG* V.46: *Scribit Labieno, si rei publicae commodo facere posset, cum legion ad fines Nerviorum veniat*.

56 Senate to Caesar, I.35: *si non impetraret, sese, quoniam M. Messala, M. Pisone consulibus senatus censuisset uti quicumque Galliam provinciam obtineret, quod commodo rei publicae facere posset, Haeduos ceterosque amicos populi Romani defenderet, se Haeduorum iniurias non neglecturum*. Caesar to Labienus and Trebonius, VI.33: *Labienum Treboniumque hortatur, si rei publicae commodo facere possint, ad eum diem revertantur, ut rursus communicato consilio exploatisque hostium rationibus aliud initium belli capere possint*.

57 *DBG* V.47. Cf. the results of Sabinus' disobedience in Book V.

58 Caesar approves: *consilio eius probato…* (*DBG* V.48). Caesar's victory occupies the next 4 chapters (*DBG* V.48-52) and news of it reaches Labienus at V.53.

the grave.[59]

Be that as it may, it is worth noting that Labienus again displays a freedom of will denied to Caesar's other legates when, of his own auspices, he requisitioned more cavalry and launched a successful counter-strike. It is here that Caesar injects the infamous phrase "fortune supported the man's [Labienus'] plan" (*comprobat hominis consilium fortuna*) which Rambaud saw as particularly derisive.[60] We are not obligated to read it as such; Caesar, like Sulla Felix before him, recognized the importance of good luck.[61] Welch argues that that particular phrase is nothing more than a commonplace of Caesarian commentaries, but conjectures that Caesar was nevertheless equally able to diminish the impact of Labienus' victory by splitting the account of it over two books.[62]

Perhaps more indicative is how Caesar chose to end Book V: "And after this was done, Caesar found Gaul a little bit quieter," (*pauloque habuit post id factum Caesar quietiorem Galliam)*.[63] Therefore, directly after the lengthy account of Labienus' successes, the last three words in readers' eyes or listeners' ears would have been "*Caesar quietiorem Galliam*." This cannot be accidental and the choice of a sentence, with Caesar as the subject and with this specific word order, seem intended to confound as to who is the doer of these deeds and nevertheless to remind all as to who is ultimately the subject and the star of these commentaries.

As Welch had already pointed out, at the beginning of Book VI Caesar picks up what is in fact the second part of Labienus' same campaign in 53 BC.[64] Labienus is still apparently acting largely of his own initiative, but Caesar halts the account to insert a speech in direct discourse (*oratio recta*), one of only two given to a legate and the only one that is positive in tone and outcome.[65] It is in this oration that Cae-

---

59 *DBG* V.58.

60 *DBG* V.57. Rambaud (1966, p. 298).

61 See the discussion of *fortuna* in Grant where he cites Lucan, *Pharsalia* I.148-149 and *De Bello Africano* 10 (1974, p. 18). Similarly, Cicero discusses the importance of *felicitas* to a good commander at *Leg. Man.* 47-48.

62 Welch (1998, pp. 98-99).

63 *DBG* V.58.

64 Welch (1998, pp. 98-99).

65 The other speech in the mouth of legate is that of Sabinus at V.30 and can hardly be considered flattering. In it, Sabinus' pouts and attempts to deflect blame for the coming defeat and slaughter onto his associate Lucius Aurunculeius Cotta. Caesar, not surprisingly, is nowhere to be seen in this speech. For more on speeches in Caesar, see Dalström (2015).

sar puts into Labienus' mouth a reminder that they are fighting for Caesar: "display under our command the same valor that you have often displayed in the presence of the *imperator*."[66] As others have discussed, whether or not Labienus ever said words to this effect is unlikely and unknowable, yet the presence of almost the exact same exhortation by Labienus in indirect discourse (*oratio obliqua*) later in Book VII certainly makes it suspect.[67] Nevertheless, by the presence of this speech, Labienus clearly had been restored to a leading place among Caesar's legates. The next time Caesar addresses him, he is again in command of multiple legions and Caesar exhorts (*hortatur*) him, along with Trebonius, also sent with three legions, to return in seven days so that they can formulate upcoming strategy. This command is again qualified by the statement *si rei publicae commodo facere possint*.[68]

Toward the end of the campaigns in Gaul, Caesar occasionally placed his newest legate, Gaius Trebonius, on seemingly equal footing with Labienus.[69] Yet it is worth noting some subtle differences in the commands they received. Trebonius did in fact twice receive command of three legions, at V.17 to gather food for the legions, and at VI.33 to ravage the lands of the already defeated Atuatuci.[70] However, only Labienus ever gets more than three legions, and the magnitude of his missions - independent attacks against the Menapii (VI.33) and the upcoming decisive campaign against the Parisii (VII.34, 57) - clearly distinguishes these commands from those of Trebonius. Finally, on both of the occasions in which Trebonius had command of three legions, Labienus was also in command of three or more legions. Therefore, although Trebonius clearly received Caesar's favor in the later years of the Gallic campaigns, he never quite eclipsed Labienus' importance in the camp.

In fact, when Labienus returns midway through Book VII, Caesar sends him against the Senones and the Parisii with four legions plus cavalry, the biggest single force ever entrusted to a subordinate in the *De Bello Gallico*.[71] Caesar's praise of La-

---

66 *DBG* VI.8: *praestate eandem nobis ducibus virtutem, quam saepe numero imperatori praestitistis, atque illum adesse et haec coram cernere existimate*.

67 Cf. *DBG* VII.62: *Labienus milites cohortatus ut suae pristinae virtutis et secundissimorum proeliorum memoriam atque ipsum Caesarem, cuius ductu saepe numero hostes superassent, praesentem adesse existimarent*.

68 *DBG* VI.33.

69 Trebonius joined Caesar in Gaul in 54 BCE, following his loyal service to the triumvirs during his tribunate of 55.

70 Caesar had already crushed the Atuatuci at their fort in Belgium in 57 BCE (*DBG* II.33).

71 *DBG* VII.34. Other legates had been given command of three legions on other occasions. Gaius

bienus actions at Lutetia seems authentic, although he seems to undercut some of the lieutenant's victory, once again inserting himself into the narrative via a speech attributed to Labienus.[72] On this occasion it is delivered in indirect discourse and although the phrasing has changed slightly, the words and meaning are nearly identical: "And remember Caesar himself, in whose presence you have often conquered enemies and imagine that he is present."[73] Following the speech Labienus fades to the background of Caesar's prose and it is the troops and the lesser tribunes who carry out all the actions and receive all the credit win the day: "when the tribunes of the Seventh Legion were told what was afoot on the left wing, they brought out their legion in the rear of the enemy and attacked."[74]

The final two acts of Labienus in Caesar's portion of the *Gallic Wars* confirm his high standing which in turn has led to the endless speculation as to why he would have broken with Caesar in 49. However, Caesar's reporting of these events exhibits his same tendency to steal the scene. At the final battle at Alesia, Labienus intervenes at a crucial moment and even offers tactical advice to Caesar, something unparalleled in all of the *De Bello Gallico*, but Caesar immediately whisks the audience back to himself who "speeds on so that he can be in the battle."[75] If that was not enough, Caesar punctuates the change of focus in dramatic fashion in very next line: "his [Caesar's] arrival was known from the color of his cloak, which he was accustomed

---

Trebonius received command of three legions twice: to gather food for the legions (V.17) and to ravage the lands (VI.33) of the already defeated (*DBG* II.33) Autatuci. Only Labienus ever gets more than three, and the magnitude of his missions - independent attacks against the Menapii (VI.33) and the Parisii (VII.34, 57) - clearly distinguishes these commands from those of Trebonius. Furthermore, on both occasions on which Trebonius has command of three legions, so does Labienus.

72 *DBG* VII.62.

73 Ibid. The preceding phrase *ut suae pristinae virtutis … retinerent memoriam* also echoes Caesar's own words to his troops *uti suae pristinae virtutis memoriam retinerent* at II.21, and Caesar's earlier exhortation in a letter to Cicero *ut pristinam virtutem retineat* at V.48 (without an explicit mention of Caesar, perhaps since he is quoting from his own purported letter), and Labienus' own words *praestate eandem nobis ducibus virtutem* at *DBG* VI.8. See above, n. 45. Furthermore, the phrase is attested in Sallust, *Cataline* 58 (*memores pristinae vitutis*), so we can imagine that it might have been something of a commonplace at the time.

74 *DBG* VII.62: *cum septimae legionis tribunis esset nuntiatum quae in sinistro cornu gererentur, post tergum hostium legionem ostenderunt signaque intulerunt*.

75 *DBG* VII.87: *Labienus, postquam neque aggeres neque fossae vim hostium sustinere poterant, coactis una XL cohortibus, quas ex proximis praesidus deductas fors obtulit, Caesarem per nuntios facit certiorem quid faciendum existimet. Accelerat Caesar, ut proelio intersit*.

to use in battles as an insignia."[76] The narrative is all Caesar, his common soldiers, and the Gauls from then on out.

Labienus appears one final time before the close of Book VII when he is ordered to the territory of the Sequani for the winter.[77] He is again the first legate named and he even has a subordinate assigned—another unprecedented honor.[78] Therefore, at the end of the Caesarian portion of *De Bello Gallico*, Labienus is back where he began, first among equals of the always secondary Caesarian legates.

As an epilogue, when Hirtius picks up the story of the following year in Book VIII, things have changed dramatically. Mark Antony is now the first legate named and Labienus is actually asked to send back one of his two legions.[79] It is unclear how much of this is merely a shift in emphasis due to hindsight, since Hirtius wrote this appendix long after the events he recounts and certainly after Labienus had joined Pompey.[80] Nevertheless, scholars have traditionally accepted the general truth of what Hirtius recorded regarding the movement of Caesar's armies in Gaul and therefore, even if Caesar did eventually put Labienus in charge of the province, ordering the return of a legion seems to represent yet another dip in the constantly fluctuating relationship of the commander and his most able and successful lieutenant.[81]

In conclusion, although most scholarship on Labienus has focused on the intriguing question of why he left Caesar after such a successful career with him, these arguments have traditionally been based largely on the other contemporary or posterior documents such as the letters of Cicero or successive histories. It now seems clear that Labienus' departure from Caesar cannot simply be due to pre-existing allegiances to Pompey as Syme argued.[82] Instead, a re-evaluation of their time together as revealed in the pages of *De Bello Gallico* exposes a relationship that was

---

76 *DBG* VII.88: *eius adventu ex colore vestitus cognito, quo insigni in proeliis uti consuerat*.

77 *DBG* VII.90.

78 Ibid.: *Titum Labienum duabus cum legionibus et equitatu in Sequanos proficisci iubet: huic Marcum Sempronium Rutilum attribuit.*

79 Hirtius, *DBG* VIII.2, 6.

80 For the date of Hirtius' composition, see especially the discussion in Holmes (1911, pp. 824-825).

81 Labienus in charge of the province, Hirtius (*DBG* VIII.52). This too, could be seen as an attempt to remove Labienus from the theater of action as to not allow him to share any credit for the ultimate victory and pacification of Gaul. Caesar undoubtedly remembered and was perhaps attempting to avoid a situation similar to that when Pompey had usurped some of Crassus' glory for putting down the slave rebellion of Spartacus by swooping in and finishing off those detachments not defeated by Crassus in the main engagement in Lucania in 71 BCE.

82 Syme (1938).

very complicated, with a an evident series of estrangements and reconciliations. While Labienus never openly broke with Caesar while in Gaul and he did, as others have said, "everything Caesar asked of him," there are evident signs of tension in their relationship, visible even through the lens of Caesar's writings, which make the rupture of 49 easier to understand. Therefore, scholars would do well to reconsider the tension between Caesar and Labienus and the mutable and sometimes volatile nature of their relationship revealed here as instructive when approaching larger questions about the nature of Caesar's command in Gaul, his relationship with all his subordinate officers, the formation and dissolution of his alliances in the build up to the Rubicon, and even the degree of rhetorical distortion present in the *Comentarii*.

Works Cited

Batstone, W.W. "A Tendentious Hypotaxis in Caesar's Plain Style," *The American Journal of Philology* 111.3 (1990): 348-360.

Brown, R. "'*Virtus consili expers*': An Interpretation of the Centurions' Contest in Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* 5, 44," *Hermes* 132 (2004): 292-308.

Conte, G.B. *Latin Literature: A History*. trans. Joseph B. Solodow. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Dalström, A. *Rhetorical Themes and Features in the Speeches of Julius Caesar's* De Bello Gallico *and* De Bello Civili. Unpublished MA thesis. Lund: Lund Univeristy, 2015. Accessed 8/31/2017 at http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=5257305&fileOId=5257306

Erickson, B. "Falling Masts, Rising Masters: The Ethnography of Virtue in Caesar's Account of the Veneti," *The American Journal of Philology* 123.4 (2002): 601-622.

Gardner, J.P. ed. *Conquest of Gaul*, rev. ed. Penguin Classics. London: Random House, 1983.

____________. "The 'Gallic Menace' in Caesar's Propaganda" *Greece & Rome* 30.2 (1983): 181-189.

Goldsworthy, A. *Caesar: Life of a Colossus*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Grant, M. *The Army of the Caesars*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974.

____________. *History of Rome*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Grillo, L. *The Art of Caesar's 'Bellum Civile': Literature, Ideology, and Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Holmes, T.R. *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*. Oxford: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1911.

Kelsey, F.W. "The Title of Caesar's Work on the Gallic and Civil Wars," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 36 (1905): 211-238.

Kenney, E.J. *The Cambridge History of Latin Literature*, v. 2 "The Late Republic." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Mommsen, T. *The History of Rome*. Collins, J.H. trans. New York: Meridian Books, 1958.

Murphy, P.R. "Themes of Caesar's 'Gallic War' " *The Classical Journal* 72.3 (1977): 234-243.

Nordling, J.G. *Indirect Discourse and Rhetorical Strategies in Caesar's* Bellum Gallicum *and* Bellum Civile. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 1991.

Rambaud, M. *L'Art de la Déformation Historique dans les Commentaires de César*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1966.

Rasmussen, D. *Caesars commentarii – Stil und Stilwandel am Beispiel der 140 direkten Rede*. Göttingen: Göttingen Universität, 1963.

Siedler, C.W. "Rhetorical Devices in Caesar's Commentaries," *The Classical Weekly* 50.2 (1956): 28-31.

Syme, R. "The Allegiance of Labienus," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 28.2 (1938): 113-125.

Tyrrell, W.B. "Labienus' Departure from Caesar in January 49 BC," *Historia*: *Zeitschrift fur Alte Geschichte* 21 (1972): 424440.

____________. *Biography of Titus Labienus, Caesar's Lieutenant in Gaul.* Unpublished PhD thesis. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, 1970. retrieved from: http://download.ebook6.com/BiographyofTitus-Labienusdownloadw70171.pdf. and https://msu.edu/~tyrrell/labienus.htm

Welch, K. "Caesar and his Officers in the Gallic War Commentaries," in Welch, K. and A. Powell, eds. *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments*. Cardiff: Duckworth, 1998: 85-110.

New England Classical Journal 44.4 (2017) 247-267

Sailing Through Greek with Hanno of Carthage

Michael L. Koneiczny
Harvard University

Instructors of ancient Greek will be all too familiar with the difficulty of identifying original texts suitable for use with students who have mastered the rudiments of the language but who are not yet fully prepared for the challenges posed by the more prominent authors of the Greek canon. In this article I shall discuss a short geographical text, the *Periplous of Hanno*,[1] and draw on my own experiences in the classroom to argue for its value as a pedagogical resource that can help facilitate the transition from sample sentences and "easy stories" to genuine, unadapted Greek.[2]

INTRODUCTION

Hanno of Carthage, sometimes called the "Navigator" to distinguish him from other individuals of the same name, is a figure seldom encountered outside discussions of

1 The standard edition of the *Periplous* is still that of Müller in the *Geographi Graeci minores* (1882). The text is available as part of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, and is printed in full in Appendix 2.

2 I am certainly not the first person to experiment with using the *Periplous* as an instructional text. Conference abstracts available online indicate that a paper on this topic, titled "Let's Go Periplousing! Reading Hanno in the Elementary Greek Classroom," was delivered by Georgia Irby at the 2014 meeting of CAMWS in Waco, Texas. I hope that my discussion here may encourage still more teachers to explore this exciting and very approachable work with their students.

early Classical geography and exploration. Sometime around 500 BCE, when Carthage controlled the Mediterranean, this Hanno led a naval expedition outside the Pillars of Heracles (the modern Straits of Gibraltar) and down the western coast of Africa, founding numerous cities and exploring the various islands, inlets, and rivers that he encountered along the way. An account of his exploits is contained in the document now known as the *Periplous of Hanno*, a Greek translation of a Punic original that was purportedly set up in the temple of Baal at Carthage; the text is preserved in a single manuscript dating to the 10th century, now at the University of Heidelberg.[3]

Although suspicion naturally attaches to the record, preserved only in translation, of an otherwise uncorroborated voyage, the *Periplous* contains enough plausible geographical references to suggest that Hanno's expedition actually took place, even if its details remain necessarily obscure. At the very least, his fleet seems to have attained the vicinity of the modern Senegal River, which Hanno refers to as the river Chretes.[4] Most commentators agree that he probably reached as far as Guinea or Sierra Leone; more adventurous (but generally discredited) interpretations have him sailing all the way across the Gulf of Guinea to Cameroon.[5] However far the expedition actually got before eventually returning to Carthage, it was undoubtedly among the milestones of early Atlantic exploration, and the *Periplous* is thus of particular interest as evidence for the expanding scope of pan-Mediterranean geographical awareness around the turn of the 6th and 5th centuries BCE.

In addition to its value as a historical document, the *Periplous* is also especially well-suited for use with students at a relatively early stage of their instruction in ancient Greek. Whoever produced the translation employed a clean, straightforward Attic idiom, eschewing rhetorical embellishment and presumably following the original Punic text in organizing the account as a chronological succession of facts tracking the various stages of the journey down the African coast. Although

---

3 Many detailed studies of the *Periplous* exist, offering various possible reconstructions of Hanno's route. For a representative sample in English, see Cary and Warmington (1929, pp. 47-52), Kaeppel (1936, pp. 26-61), and Carpenter (1966, pp. 81-100), the latter of which I have found to be the clearest and most persuasive. In general the literary features of the text remain understudied, although some interesting remarks can be found in chapter 1 of Romm (1992).

4 On the identification, cf. Carpenter (1966, p. 93). See Appendix 1 for a map of the locations referred to in this article.

5 Vicinity of Sierra Leone: Cary and Warmington (1929), Kaeppel (1936), Carpenter (1966); Cameroon: Burton (1883), Carcopino (1943), Ramin (1976, p. 72-74). Other scholars have argued that Hanno could only have sailed as far as the northern fringe of the Sahara desert, e.g. Mederos Martín (2015).

the account is generally rather sparse, there is sufficient detail and variety to hold the attention of the reader, and the text does have a certain narrative momentum, as the phenomena encountered by Hanno and his fleet grow increasingly uncanny in proportion to their distance from Carthage. At approximately 650 words, or the equivalent of about 3 pages of printed text, the *Periplous* is also short enough to be read in its entirety with novice students in one to two weeks, depending on the pace of a given course, the frequency of meetings, and the portion of each class set aside for working through the text. Even the shortest of the Platonic dialogues are generally still too long, as well as too difficult, to read from beginning to end with students in their first or second semester of Greek, so that the sense of closure and accomplishment derived from reading a text in its entirety must be ranked among the special advantages of the *Periplous* as a pedagogical resource.

In what follows, I shall discuss the text in more detail from the point of view of its content, vocabulary, and syntax, and conclude by offering a few suggestions for effectively incorporating the *Periplous* into the beginning Greek curriculum.

CONTENT AND VOCABULARY

As stated above, the *Periplous* is an account of a naval voyage "beyond the Pillars of Heracles" and down the western coast of Africa. The stated purpose of the voyage is colonization, and roughly the first quarter of the text takes the form of a fairly cut-and-dried summary of various cities founded along the Moroccan coastline. Things become more interesting once the expedition reaches the Lixus river (identified as the modern Draa, the largest river in Morocco),[6] where Hanno and his crew befriend the native tribe of the Lixites, and, after taking on board interpreters, continue south into uncharted territory. Most of the remainder of the text is devoted to a description of natural phenomena and human encounters, and the narrative concludes with an account of a violent confrontation with a people known as the "Gorillas."[7] The text ends abruptly at this point, when the expedition runs out of supplies and is forced to turn back to Carthage.

There are several advantages to employing this kind of document as an instructional text. First, the overall lack of political and cultural detail means that the narrative is readily comprehensible with a minimum of historical contextualization,

---

6 Carpenter (1966, p. 90).

7 On the problems posed by this detail, see n. 15 below.

which can hardly be said of most of the well-known authors of the Classical canon. In practical terms, this means that only a small amount of research and preparation is required of the instructor before presenting the *Periplous* in class, an especially useful feature if the text is being used concurrently with other instructional activities. Second, the step-by-step coasting narrative is divided naturally into a number of more or less self-contained vignettes clearly demarcated by references to direction and travel time. In addition to providing a sense of forward motion and satisfaction at completing each stage of the journey, the vignette structure is also useful for dividing the text into brief daily modules with natural stopping and starting points. Finally, the sorts of details selected for inclusion in the text, including fiery mountains, eerie nocturnal soundscapes, and a number of so-called "charismatic megafauna" (elephants, hippopotami, crocodiles), are perfectly suited to holding the attention of the modern student, just as they were likely intended to capture the imagination of the document's original readership.

As one might expect, this latter point has an especially strong bearing on the sort of vocabulary encountered in the *Periplous*. Before enlarging further on this issue, I shall cite a few statistics calculated with reference to the Dickinson Greek Core Vocabulary, a list of the roughly 500 most common words in the corpus of Classical Greek literature. According to the Dickinson College website,[8] the words on this list represent "the lemmas or dictionary headwords that generate approximately 65% of the word forms in a typical Greek text." A lexical survey of the *Periplous of Hanno* yields the following results:

- » Total number of word forms (excluding most proper nouns and adjectives): 618
- » Total words generated by lemmas in the Dickinson Core List: 425 (69%)
- » Total number of distinct lemmas: 252
- » Total number of distinct lemmas found in the Dickinson Core List: 119 (47%)

These statistics suggest the following conclusions. On the one hand, the *Periplous* may be considered just slightly more basic than the average Greek text from a lexical point of view, since nearly 70% of the text is derived from common words likely to have been mastered by students at an early level. This is an important consideration at this stage of instruction, where a relatively high proportion of familiar vocabulary is needed to promote fluency in reading and to help students gain confidence in

8 http://dcc.dickinson.edu/vocab/core-vocabulary.

the language. On the other hand, the lexical variety encountered in the remaining 30% of the text is quite high (133 distinct lemmas across just 193 total word forms), corresponding in part to the variety of phenomena encountered by Hanno over the course of his voyage. Consequently, while much of the *Periplous* should present little difficulty in terms of vocabulary, students are nonetheless likely to encounter a fair number of unfamiliar words as they work their way through the text.

Of the 133 lemmas not found in the Dickinson Core List,[9] the majority (about 80 by my count) refer to various items of geographical and anthropological interest, including animals (e.g., ἐλέφαντες, §4), "streams of fire" (πυρώδεις ῥύακες, §§15 and 17), and an orgiastic cacophony of noises that the crew hear at night while encamped on an island near the shoreline: "the sound of flutes and the din of cymbals and kettle-drums and a ceaseless shouting" (φωνὴν αὐλῶν ἠκούομεν κυμβάλων τε καὶ τυμπάνων πάταγον καὶ κραυγὴν μυρίαν, §14). In my experience, the dramatic and sensory appeal of such concrete details largely offsets the frustration students may otherwise feel at encountering unfamiliar vocabulary, especially when the semantic range of the words in question is comparatively narrow and thus easily comprehended. Moreover, many of the uncommon words encountered in the *Periplous* either have obvious English derivatives (e.g., ἐλέφας, κύμβαλος) or else are cognate with other Greek words that students are likely to be familiar with already (e.g., πυρώδης < πῦρ). Aside from words denoting natural phenomena, much of the remaining unfamiliar vocabulary can be classed under the heading of nautical terminology, including various compounds of "sailing" (ἀποπλέω, περιπλέω, etc.) and several recurring expressions of time and direction that can be supplied by the instructor (see more below).

In terms of vocabulary, then, the *Periplous* achieves a fine balance between familiarity and novelty, and the dramatic appeal of the narrative is likely to hold students' attention even while they reckon with words and expressions that they have not previously encountered.

SYNTAX

Even more so than its vocabulary, the syntax of the *Periplous* makes it a convenient text to use with students early in their transition to reading original Greek.[10] For the

---

9 See Appendix 3.

10 There are a total of 35 sentences, 73 clauses, and 652 words in the *Periplous*, yielding an average of

most part, the grammatical structures encountered in the text are relatively straightforward and repetitive, characteristics that can be attributed to the nature of the document as a traveler's log whose purpose is to relate a succession of facts and occurrences without generally commenting on the relationships between them or on their broader significance. The lack of syntactic variety and sophistication, while potentially tedious for more advanced students, is quite desirable at the earlier level, since it facilitates the application of previously learned material while minimizing the need for the instructor to gloss and explicate unfamiliar content. Similarly, the repetitiveness of certain linguistic features and narrative patterns is particularly useful in encouraging a predictive approach to reading and thus promoting the transition from mechanical translation to actual comprehension of the language.[11]

Especially noteworthy is the complete absence in the text of any verbs in the subjunctive or optative moods, a convenient feature given that many Classical Greek textbooks delay the presentation of these forms until relatively late in the curriculum. Again, this lack may be attributed to the nature of the text itself, which deals with concrete facts rather than with goals, potentialities, counterfactuals, or the like. This is not to say, however, that the *Periplous* is entirely trivial from a linguistic point of view: the syntactic expansion one finds is achieved mainly by means of participial phrases and relative clauses, so students must already be acquainted with these structures before embarking on the narrative. Students must likewise be familiar with infinitives, the aorist and imperfect tenses, the middle and passive voices, the comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives, and various uses of the accusative and oblique cases. Noteworthy linguistic features of the text include:

» The impersonal construction with ἔδοξε (§1)

18.9 words per sentence (range: 5 – 45), 8.9 words per clause (range: 2 – 24), and 2 clauses per sentence (range: 1 – 6). For sentences I rely on the punctuation in the edition of Müller; I generally treat as a clause any syntactic unit where a finite verb is either present or implied, except where the coordinating conjunction καί links two verbs that share the same subject. Although the adoption of other criteria may result in slightly different numbers, the statistics above give a good idea of the simplicity of the text, which in general does not require students to keep track of a great deal of syntactic information before the conclusion of a sentence or clause.

11 One additional feature to be mentioned here is the almost complete absence in the text of syntactic nesting, where one clause is contained entirely within another; the single exception is the simple parenthetical expression ὡς ἐδόκει in §16. The preponderance of cumulative rather than nested syntax further reduces the cognitive burden on students and promotes a far more fluent reading experience at this level than what is typically encountered in the more rhetorically elaborate texts of the Greek canon.

- Indirect discourse with the accusative and infinitive (§§7, 14)
- Adverbial τό (τὸ μὲν πλέον, τὸ δ' ἔλαττον, §13)
- Genitive of time within which (§14)
- Various uses of the dative (e.g., possessive, §2; instrumental, §9; respect, §18)
- Genitive absolute (§18)
- Crasis throughout (e.g., κἄπειτα, κἀκεῖθεν, etc.)

As can be seen, then, a fair amount of grammatical instruction must necessarily be completed before students are ready for even a comparatively straightforward text such as the *Periplous*, and certain features, such as the adverbial use of the definite article in §13, will probably still need to be glossed by the instructor. At the same time, once the rudiments of the language have been mastered and a basic range of syntactic structures have been learned, the *Periplous* can provide students with a convenient opportunity for putting their early linguistic knowledge into practice.

One recurring feature that may cause some difficulty and deserves further comment is the use of adverbial and internal accusatives to indicate the length of each leg of the journey. These range from the simple accusative of duration of time (ἐπλεύσαμεν δώδεκα ἡμέρας, "we sailed for twelve days," §11) to more complex expressions such as that found in §5: τήν τε λίμνην παραλλάξαντες ὅσον ἡμέρας πλοῦν, "sailing around the gulf by as much as a day's sail." To forestall any unnecessary confusion, these and similar expressions can be glossed by the instructor and perhaps addressed beforehand; students should also be apprised of the morphological ambiguity inherent in the form ἡμέρας, which can be either genitive singular or accusative plural, both of which occur in the text. Since this temporal phraseology recurs throughout the work, however, students will soon become accustomed to the various permutations of "sailing for x days," and by the time they reach the end of the text this particular feature of Greek idiom should present no further difficulty.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM USE

In the foregoing sections I have sought to demonstrate that both its lexical and syntactic characteristics make the *Periplous of Hanno* a convenient work to use with students in the early-intermediate stages of their instruction in ancient Greek. I shall conclude by offering a few suggestions for how to incorporate this text into the classroom.

In my opinion, the *Periplous* is best suited as a text for in-class sight-reading, rather than as a homework assignment, an exam passage, or a text for independent study. Beyond the obvious appeal of working through a Greek text first-hand rather than merely rehearsing the efforts of the night before, there is also a considerable advantage to addressing the linguistic difficulties of the text as they arise during reading. Because the language of the *Periplous* is generally quite straightforward, most of the difficulties that students encounter will concern issues of word order, idiom, and other natural patterns of language use that are typically avoided by authors of model sentences and textbook narratives. An example occurs early in the text, just as Hanno's fleet rounds the Pillars of Heracles (§2):

> Ὡς δ' ἀναχθέντες τὰς Στήλας παρημείψαμεν καὶ ἔξω πλοῦν δυοῖν ἡμερῶν ἐπλεύσαμεν, ἐκτίσαμεν πρώτην πόλιν, ἥντινα ὠνομάσαμεν Θυμιατήριον.
>
> When, after setting sail, we rounded the Pillars and sailed beyond them for two days, we founded our first city, which we called Thymiaterion.

Many students, reading the first few words of this sentence, will immediately confuse themselves by taking τὰς Στήλας as the direct object of ἀναχθέντες and then erroneously treating the participle as the main verb of the temporal ὡς clause, only eventually correcting the mistake upon realizing that there is no plausible function for the finite verb παρημείψαμεν after handling the beginning of the sentence in this way. If this passage were assigned for homework and reviewed the next day in class, a student would doubtless produce a correct translation and the difficulty posed by this sentence would in all likelihood be ignored and forgotten. On the other hand, by confronting the difficulty as it arises in the course of sight-reading, the instructor will be able to draw attention to the erroneous thought process, reason through the syntactic cues that produced the error, and thus train students in the process of active reading instead of merely checking the accuracy of a translation produced in advance.

No student commentary currently exists for the *Periplous*, either in print or online, so it will fall to the instructor to produce any supplementary materials desired for classroom use and enrichment. Since the text is short and generally quite straightforward, however, such materials can be prepared independently without an unreasonable expenditure of time on the part of the instructor. In order to promote fluent sight-reading in class, for example, it may be useful to distribute a glossary of

unfamiliar words and phrases to be learned beforehand, perhaps organized by general subject headings such as "Nautical terminology," "Geography and landscape," etc. Such a list, even if it were to include all 133 lemmas not found in the Dickinson Core vocabulary,[12] could still be made to fit on one double-sided sheet of paper, and would take perhaps two hours to compile.

As I suggested above, many issues of grammar and syntax are best addressed as they arise during the process of reading, and the problems encountered by students cannot necessarily be predicted. Other points of interest or difficulty, however, such as various case usages or constructions like the genitive absolute, should be anticipated by the instructor, and can be approached in a number of ways depending on individual preference or classroom temperament. With the *Periplous*, as with other texts, I have found Microsoft PowerPoint to be an especially useful resource, since it makes it possible to highlight and color-code individual words and phrases and produce what amounts to a slide-by-slide commentary on the text tailored to the needs of a particular class. The amount of detail included in such a slideshow can of course vary, but the presentation I have created for my own class consists of 80 slides containing the entire text with numerous glosses of varying degrees of complexity. Depending on one's previous experience with PowerPoint (or comparable software), such a presentation should take about 5-10 hours to put together.

Finally, we turn to the question of the historicity of the voyage, and in particular to the possibility of reconstructing the route of Hanno's fleet through the Pillars and down the African coast, a subject bound to excite the curiosity of students engaged in a reading of the text. Thanks to a number of meticulous studies of the *Periplous*, it is possible to identify with a high degree of confidence several of the landmarks mentioned in the document, such as the Draa and Senegal rivers, the Sahara desert, and even the island that Hanno refers to as "Cerne," convincingly identified by Rhys Carpenter as the modern port town of St. Louis at the mouth of the Senegal.[13] (In this latter instance, the satellite imagery available on Google Maps nicely illustrates the correspondence between the geography of the area and the character of "Cerne" as described in the text.) In addition, several initially puzzling details mentioned in the text, such as landscapes burning with fire (§§12 ff.) or references to "islands within islands" (§§14, 18), can plausibly be explained by reference to native agricultural practices and to peculiarities of some portions of the African coastline, respectively.[14]

---

12 Cf. Appendix 3.

13 Carpenter (1966, pp. 92-93).

14 Carpenter (1966, p. 98 (fiery landscapes), p. 99 (islands within islands)); in this latter instance, too,

On the other hand, the exact locations of the various settlements mentioned in the early chapters of the document are irrecoverable, and there seems to be no clear consensus on the farthermost point attained by Hanno's fleet, nor on the identity of the great volcano referred to in the text as the "Chariot of the Gods" (Θεῶν ὄχημα, §16). Certain other details, such as the "streams of fire" mentioned in §§15 and 17 or the identity of the "Gorillas" encountered by the crew at the end of the journey,[15] must also remain mysterious, and it is best not to devote too much effort to unpacking the spatial reasoning by which Hanno concludes, in §8, that Cerne lies "directly across from" Carthage. Thus, while occasional references to geographic locales and other *realia* can usefully supplement a reading of the text and pique student interest, it should be borne in mind that the *Periplous* is only a rough sketch of a long and complicated voyage, and that the exact details of Hanno's route down the coast are most likely irrecoverable.

CONCLUSION

I hope that in this article I have been able to lay out a persuasive case for the value of the *Periplous of Hanno* as a pedagogical resource for instructors of ancient Greek. Its clear Attic idiom, preponderance of core vocabulary, and generally straightforward syntax all combine to make it an ideal text for use at the late-beginning and early-intermediate levels, while its arresting content is guaranteed to motivate students as they begin to confront the challenges of unadapted Greek. With an adventurous teacher at the helm, students can follow Hanno outside the Pillars as they embark on their voyage beyond world of the textbook and into the wide and exciting realms of ancient Greek literature.[16]

---

it is possible to identify satellite views on Google Maps that would seem to corroborate the details found in the text.

15 The identity of Hanno's "gorillas" is, in the words of Carpenter, the "crowning uncertainty" of the whole text (1966, p. 99). Although Hanno apparently writes of them as human beings, most modern commentators seem to think they were a species of ape, though not gorillas proper; see Kaeppel (1936, p. 51-2 (chimpanzees)), Carpenter (1966, pp. 99-100 (baboons)), and Ramin (1976, p. 68 (orangutans)). The question will probably never be resolved, and students should feel free to draw their own conclusions.

16 Many thanks to Kathleen Coleman for encouraging me to write about my experiences with Hanno and for reading and responding to earlier versions of this article. Thanks also to Ivy Livingston and to the anonymous reviewer for the *NECJ* for their many helpful comments and suggestions.

Map of western Africa illustrating the extent of Hanno's voyage and some of the potential landmarks identifiable in the *Periplous*. Most scholars dispute the claim that Hanno's fleet made it as far down the coast as Cameroon.

ΑΝΝΩΝΟΣ ΚΑΡΧΗΔΟΝΙΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΕΡΙΠΛΟΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΥΠΕΡ ΤΑΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΣΤΗΛΑΣ ΛΙΒΥΚΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ ΜΕΡΩΝ, ὃν καὶ ἀνέθηκεν ἐν τῷ τοῦ Κρόνου τεμένει, δηλοῦντα τάδε.

1. Ἔδοξε Καρχηδονίοις Ἄννωνα πλεῖν ἔξω Στηλῶν Ἡρακλείων καὶ πόλεις κτίζειν Λιβυφοινίκων. Καὶ ἔπλευσε πεντηκοντόρους ἑξήκοντα ἄγων, καὶ πλῆθος ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν εἰς ἀριθμὸν μυριάδων τριῶν καὶ σῖτα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην παρασκευήν.

2. Ὡς δ' ἀναχθέντες τὰς Στήλας παρημείψαμεν καὶ ἔξω πλοῦν δυοῖν ἡμερῶν ἐπλεύσαμεν, ἐκτίσαμεν πρώτην πόλιν, ἥντινα ὠνομάσαμεν Θυμιατήριον· πεδίον δ' αὐτῇ μέγα ὑπῆν.

3. Κἄπειτα πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἀναχθέντες ἐπὶ Σολόεντα, Λιβυκὸν ἀκρωτήριον λάσιον δένδρεσι, συνήλθομεν.

4. Ἔνθα Ποσειδῶνος ἱερὸν ἱδρυσάμενοι πάλιν ἐπέβημεν πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα ἡμέρας ἥμισυ, ἄχρι ἐκομίσθημεν εἰς λίμνην οὐ πόρρω τῆς θαλάττης κειμένην, καλάμου μεστὴν πολλοῦ καὶ μεγάλου· ἐνῆσαν δὲ καὶ ἐλέφαντες καὶ τἆλλα θηρία νεμόμενα πάμπολλα.

5. Τήν τε λίμνην παραλλάξαντες ὅσον ἡμέρας πλοῦν, κατῳκίσαμεν πόλεις πρὸς τῇ θαλάττῃ καλουμένας Καρικόν τε τεῖχος καὶ Γύττην καὶ Ἄκραν καὶ Μέλιτταν καὶ Ἄραμβυν.

6. Κἀκεῖθεν δ' ἀναχθέντες ἤλθομεν ἐπὶ μέγαν ποταμὸν Λίξον, ἀπὸ τῆς Λιβύης ῥέοντα. Παρὰ δ' αὐτὸν νομάδες ἄνθρωποι Λιξῖται βοσκήματ' ἔνεμον, παρ' οἷς ἐμείναμεν ἄχρι τινός, φίλοι γενόμενοι.

7. Τούτων δὲ καθύπερθεν Αἰθίοπες ᾤκουν ἄξενοι, γῆν νεμόμενοι θηριώδη, διειλημμένην ὄρεσι μεγάλοις, ἐξ ὧν ῥεῖν φασι τὸν Λίξον, περὶ δὲ τὰ ὄρη κατοικεῖν ἀνθρώπους ἀλλοιομόρφους, Τρωγλοδύτας· οὓς ταχυτέρους ἵππων ἐν δρόμοις ἔφραζον οἱ Λιξῖται.

8. Λαβόντες δὲ παρ' αὐτῶν ἑρμηνέας, παρεπλέομεν τὴν ἐρήμην πρὸς

μεσημβρίαν δύο ἡμέρας· ἐκεῖθεν δὲ πάλιν πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα ἡμέρας δρόμον. Ἔνθα εὕρομεν ἐν μυχῷ τινος κόλπου νῆσον μικρὰν, κύκλον ἔχουσαν σταδίων πέντε· ἣν κατῳκίσαμεν, Κέρνην ὀνομάσαντες. Ἐτεκμαιρόμεθα δ' αὐτὴν ἐκ τοῦ περίπλου κατ' εὐθὺ κεῖσθαι Καρχηδόνος· ἐῴκει γὰρ ὁ πλοῦς ἔκ τε Καρχηδόνος ἐπὶ Στήλας κἀκεῖθεν ἐπὶ Κέρνην.

9. Τοὐντεῦθεν εἰς λίμνην ἀφικόμεθα, διά τινος ποταμοῦ μεγάλου διαπλεύσαντες, ᾧ ὄνομα Χρετης· εἶχε δὲ νήσους ἡ λίμνη τρεῖς μείζους τῆς Κέρνης. Ἀφ' ὧν ἡμερήσιον πλοῦν κατανύσαντες, εἰς τὸν μυχὸν τῆς λίμνης ἤλθομεν, ὑπὲρ ἣν ὄρη μέγιστα ὑπερέτεινε, μεστὰ ἀνθρώπων ἀγρίων, δέρματα θήρεια ἐνημμένων, οἳ πέτροις βάλλοντες ἀπήραξαν ἡμᾶς, κωλύοντες ἐκβῆναι.

10. Ἐκεῖθεν πλέοντες εἰς ἕτερον ἤλθομεν ποταμὸν μέγαν καὶ πλατὺν, γέμοντα κροκοδείλων καὶ ἵππων ποταμίων. Ὅθεν δὴ πάλιν ἀποστρέψαντες εἰς Κέρνην ἐπανήλθομεν.

11. Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἐπὶ μεσημβρίαν ἐπλεύσαμεν δώδεκα ἡμέρας, τὴν γῆν παραλεγόμενοι, ἣν πᾶσαν κατῴκουν Αἰθίοπες φεύγοντες ἡμᾶς καὶ οὐχ ὑπομένοντες· ἀσύνετα δ' ἐφθέγγοντο καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ἡμῶν Λιξίταις.

12. Τῇ δ' οὖν τελευταίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ προσωρμίσθημεν ὄρεσι μεγάλοις δασέσιν. Ἦν δὲ τὰ τῶν δένδρων ξύλα εὐώδη τε καὶ ποικίλα.

13. Περιπλεύσαντες δὲ ταῦτα ἡμέρας δύο ἐγινόμεθα ἐν θαλάττης χάσματι ἀμετρήτῳ, ἧς ἐπὶ θάτερα πρὸς τῇ γῇ πεδίον ἦν· ὅθεν νυκτὸς ἀφεωρῶμεν πῦρ ἀναφερόμενον πανταχόθεν κατ' ἀποστάσεις, τὸ μὲν πλέον, τὸ δ' ἔλαττον.

14. Ὑδρευσάμενοι δ' ἐκεῖθεν ἐπλέομεν εἰς τοὔμπροσθεν ἡμέρας πέντε παρὰ γῆν, ἄχρι ἤλθομεν εἰς μέγαν κόλπον, ὃν ἔφασαν οἱ ἑρμηνέες καλεῖσθαι Ἑσπέρου Κέρας. Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ νῆσος ἦν μεγάλη καὶ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ λίμνη θαλασσώδης, ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ νῆσος ἑτέρα, εἰς ἣν ἀποβάντες ἡμέρας μὲν οὐδὲν ἀφεωρῶμεν ὅτι μὴ ὕλην, νυκτὸς δὲ πυρά τε πολλὰ καιόμενα, καὶ φωνὴν αὐλῶν ἠκούομεν κυμβάλων τε καὶ τυμπάνων πάταγον καὶ κραυγὴν μυρίαν. Φόβος οὖν ἔλαβεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ οἱ μάντεις ἐκέλευον ἐκλείπειν τὴν νῆσον.

15. Ταχὺ δ' ἐκπλεύσαντες παρημειβόμεθα χώραν διάπυρον θυμιαμάτων

μεστήν· μέγιστοι δ’ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς πυρώδεις ῥύακες ἐνέβαλλον εἰς τὴν θάλατταν. Ἡ γῆ δ’ ὑπὸ θέρμης ἄβατος ἦν.

16. Ταχὺ οὖν κἀκεῖθεν φοβηθέντες ἀπεπλεύσαμεν, τέτταρας δ’ ἡμέρας φερόμενοι, νυκτὸς τὴν γῆν ἀφεωρῶμεν φλογὸς μεστήν· ἐν μέσῳ δ’ ἦν ἠλίβατόν τι πῦρ, τῶν ἄλλων μεῖζον, ἁπτόμενον, ὡς ἐδόκει, τῶν ἄστρων. Τοῦτο δ’ ἡμέρας ὄρος ἐφαίνετο μέγιστον, Θεῶν ὄχημα καλούμενον.

17. Τριταῖοι δ’ ἐκεῖθεν πυρώδεις ῥύακας παραπλεύσαντες ἀφικόμεθα εἰς κόλπον Νότου Κέρας λεγόμενον.

18. Ἐν δὲ τῷ μυχῷ νῆσος ἦν, ἐοικυῖα τῇ πρώτῃ, λίμνην ἔχουσα· καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ νῆσος ἦν ἑτέρα, μεστὴ ἀνθρώπων ἀγρίων. Πολὺ δὲ πλείους ἦσαν γυναῖκες, δασεῖαι τοῖς σώμασιν· ἃς οἱ ἑρμηνέες ἐκάλουν Γορίλλας. Διώκοντες δὲ ἄνδρας μὲν συλλαβεῖν οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν, ἀλλὰ πάντες μὲν ἐξέφυγον, κρημνοβάται ὄντες καὶ τοῖς πέτροις ἀμυνόμενοι, γυναῖκας δὲ τρεῖς, αἳ δάκνουσαί τε καὶ σπαράττουσαι τοὺς ἄγοντας οὐκ ἤθελον ἕπεσθαι. Ἀποκτείναντες μέντοι αὐτὰς ἐξεδείραμεν καὶ τὰς δορὰς ἐκομίσαμεν εἰς Καρχηδόνα. Οὐ γὰρ ἔτι ἐπλεύσαμεν προσωτέρω, τῶν σίτων ἡμᾶς ἐπιλιπόντων.

APPENDIX 3: SELECT VOCABULARY FOR THE PERIPLOUS OF HANNO

Words not included in the Dickinson Greek Core Vocabulary:

ἄβατος, -ον	unapproachable
ἄγριος, -α, -ον	wild, savage
ἀκρωτήριον, -ου, τό	promontory
ἀλλοιόμορφος, -η, -ον	strange-looking
ἀμέτρητος, -η, -ον	boundless
ἀμύνομαι	defend oneself (mid.)
ἀνάγομαι	put to sea (pass.)
ἀνατίθημι	set up
ἀναφέρω	cast up
ἀνίσχω	rise
ἄξενος, -ον	unfriendly
ἀπαράττω	repulse
ἀποβαίνω	disembark
ἀποπλέω	sail away
ἀπόστασις, ἀποστάσεως, ἡ	interval
ἀποστρέφω	turn around
ἅπτομαι	touch (mid.)
ἄστρον, -ου, τό	star
ἀσύνετος, -ον	unintelligible
αὐλός, -ου, ὁ	flute
ἀφοράω	see

ἄχρι (adv.)	until
βόσκημα, βοσκήματος, τό	flock
γέμω	brim with
δάκνω	bite
δασύς, δασεῖα, δασύ	thickly wooded
δένδρος, δένδρους, τό	tree
δέρμα, δέρματος, τό	skin
διαλαμβάνω	divide
διαπλέω	sail through
διάπυρος, -ον	fiery
δόρα, δόρας, ἡ	skin
δρόμος, -ου, ὁ	running
δώδεκα (num.)	twelve
ἐκβαίνω	disembark
ἐκδέρω	skin
ἐκεῖθεν (adv.)	thence
ἐκλείπω	leave behind
ἐκπλέω	sail out
ἐκφεύγω	escape
ἐλέφας, ἐλέφαντος, ὁ	elephant
ἐμβάλλω	flow into
ἔμπροσθεν (adv.)	ahead
ἐνάπτομαι	be clothed in (mid.)
ἔνειμι	be in

ἐντεῦθεν (adv.)	hence
ἑξήκοντα (num.)	six hundred
ἐπανέρχομαι	return (mid.)
ἐπιβαίνω	set out
ἐπιλείπω	run out
ἐρήμη, -ης, ἡ	desert
ἑρμηνεύς, ἑρμηνέως, ὁ	interpreter, translator
ἑσπέρα, -ας, ἡ	the west
εὐώδης, -ες	fragrant
ἠλίβατος, -ον	towering
ἡμερήσιος, -α, -ον	a day's
ἥμισυς, ἡμίσεια, ἥμισυ	half
θαλασσώδης, -ες	like the sea
θερμή, -ης, ἡ	heat
θήρειος, -α, -ον	of wild animals
θηρίον, -ου, τό	wild animal
θηριώδης, -ες	wild
θυμίαμα, θυμιάματος, τό	incense
ἱδρύομαι	establish (mid.)
ἱερόν, -ου, τό	shrine
ἵππος ποτάμιος, -ου, ὁ	hippopotamus
καθύπερθεν (adv.)	above
καίομαι	burn (pass.)
κάλαμος, -ου, ὁ	reed

κατανύω	complete
κατοικέω	inhabit
κατοικίζω	settle
κέρας, κέρατος, τό	horn
κόλπος, -ου, ὁ	gulf
κραυγή, -ης, ἡ	shouting
κρημνοβάτης, -ου, ὁ	climber of cliffs
κροκόδειλος, -ου, ὁ	crocodile
κτίζω	found
κύμβαλον, -ου, τό	cymbal
λάσιος, -α, -ον	thick, shaggy
λίμνη, -ης, ἡ	lake, gulf
μάντις, μάντεως, ὁ	soothsayer
μέγιστος, -η, -ον	greatest (supl. of μέγας)
μείζων, μεῖζον	greater (comp. of μέγας)
μεσημβρία, -ας, ἡ	south
μεστός, -η, -ον	full of
μυριάς, μυριάδων, ἡ	ten thousand
μυχός, -ου, ὁ	inner recess
νέμω	pasture (act.); graze (mid.)
νομάς, νομάδος, ὁ	nomad
νότος, -ου, ὁ	the south
ξύλον, -ου, τό	wood
ὄχημα, ὀχήματος, τό	chariot

πάμπολυς, -πόλλη, -πολυ	of all kinds
πανταχόθεν (adv.)	on all sides
παραλέγομαι	skirt, hug (mid.)
παραλλάττω	sail past
παραμείβω	go past
παραπλέω	sail past
παρασκευή, -ης, ἡ	preparation
πάταγος, -ου, ὁ	din
πεδίον, πεδίου, τό	plain
πεντηκόντορος, -ου, ὁ	penteconter
περιπλέω	sail around
περίπλους, -ου, ὁ	voyage
πέτρος, -ου, ὁ	rock
πλατύς, πλατεῖα, πλατύ	broad
πλοῦς, πλοῦ, ὁ	sailing
ποικίλος, -η, -ον	multi-colored
πόρρω (adv.)	far
προσορμίζομαι	make anchor (pass.)
προσωτέρω (adv.)	farther
πυρώδης, -ες	fiery
ῥέω	flow
ῥύαξ, ῥύακος, ὁ	stream
σῖτος, -ου, ὁ	food
σπαράττω	scratch

στήλη, -ης, ἡ	pillar
συλλαμβάνω	capture
συνέρχομαι	reach, arrive (mid.)
τεκμαίρομαι	deduce (mid.)
τελευταῖος, -α, -ον	last
τέμενος, τεμένους, τό	sacred precinct
τριταῖος, -α, -ον	three days'
τύμπανον, -ου, τό	drum
ὑδρεύομαι	take up water (mid.)
ὕλη, -ης, ἡ	forest
ὕπειμι	lie beneath
ὑπερτείνω	strech over
ὑπομένω	resist
φθέγγομαι	speak (mid.)
φλόξ, φλογός, ἡ	flame
χάσμα, χάσματος, τό	gulf

Works Cited

Burton, R.F. *To the Coast for Gold: A Personal Narrative.* London: Chatto and Windus, 1883.

Carcopino, J. *Le Maroc antique.* Paris: Gallimard, 1943.

Carpenter, R. *Beyond the Pillars of Heracles: The Classical World Seen through the Eyes of Its Discoverers.* New York: Delacorte Press, 1966.

Cary, M. and E.H. Warmington. *The Ancient Explorers.* London: Methuen & Co., 1929.

Kaeppel, C. *Off the Beaten Track in the Classics.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1936.

Mederos Martín, A. "La exploración del litoral atlántico norteafricano según el periplo de Hannón de Cartago" *Gerión* 33 (2015): 15-45.

Müller, K.O., ed. *Geographi Graeci minores.* 2 vols. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1882.

Ramin, J. *Le Périple d'Hannon = The Periplus of Hanno.* Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1976.

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

Lynn Kozak, *Experiencing Hektor: Character in the Iliad.*

London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. Pp. 328. Cloth (ISBN 978-1-4742-4544) $128.00.

Which Homeric character moves you? (I love Diomedes.) *How* does Homeric poetry make its oversized, foreign, and flawed figures appealing? Homeric characterization was a hot topic last century when scholars debated whether (and how much) Homer's heroes could be differentiated through speeches (e.g. Parry 1956 and 1972; Friedrich and Redfield 1978; Griffin 1986). Achilles received the most attention in this debate, but others were attended as well (especially in Martin 1989; Mackie 1996; Redfield 1975 for Hektor). Of late, there have been few studies in the characterization of individual heroes.

Lynn Kozak—who admits to an overwhelming emotional response to Hektor despite, initially, "little insight into his character" (21)—has written a stimulating book to fill this gap. As Kozak explains in her preface, her "primary goal" is to push the study of "Homeric poetics beyond oral poetry" by considering the aesthetics and methods of serial narrative (xv). Thus, in exploring Homeric characterization, Kozak also contemplates narrative, building upon the work of narratologists like Irene J. F. de Jong.

Kozak starts by introducing terminology from the criticism of serial television narrative. Her combination of a personal confessional tone with a brief survey of relevant scholarship makes for an easy and interesting read. Most important for Kozak's investigation are models of audience engagement that encourage "recognition, alignment, and allegiance with characters" (5) drawn from studies in film and television. Readers unfamiliar with this corner of academic theory are treated to a fast but clear presentation of a range of authors working from different points of view. A lasting lesson from this overview is that *time* is a necessary ingredient in developing audience attachment for a character.

In the rest of the introduction, Kozak outlines concepts that structure her investigation: "beats" (the "smallest structural unit of serial television," 6), "episodes" (which are made up of beats, "balancing closure and aperture" within the narrative structure, 11) and "arcs" (narrative patterns for individual characters which can

provide "an illusion of continuity between disjointed beats and episodes," 14). Such descriptive units are useful in a structural analysis of a work as complex as the *Iliad*. Kozak next argues that this structuration facilitates the presentation and understanding of character development. Especially enlightening is Kozak's assertion that our prior experience of a character can create tension as characters change. This is why, for example, our sympathy for *Breaking Bad*'s Walter White persists even as he commits terrible acts. Our attachments to characters help us justify their actions. As Kozak smartly puts it—drawing on studies in cognition and memory—our judgment of character privileges coherence over consistency.

On its own, the introduction is a satisfying *prolegomenon* to the study of Greek epic through the lens of contemporary serial narrative. The chapters follow every mention of Hektor, analyzed as the development of a character in a serial narrative. Such a structure is more conducive toward a 'reading with' as one returns to the *Iliad* or a sampling in the consideration of a single passage or a particular arc. Since Kozak's critical eye is trained on Hektor in particular, her comments are sharpest and most engaging when discussing him. Some of the analysis is enlightening; some of it reads like a live-blogged response to a television broadcast. Each chapter also offers comparisons to contemporary serial narratives (e.g. *X-Files, Alias, Lost, Game of Thrones, Dexter*). The combination of television references and deep affection for the epic may limit this book's appeal to varied audiences. (And the references will likely become dated quickly.) An ideal reader of this book is probably between 30 and 45, has watched a lot of serial television over the past 20 years, and has read the *Iliad* a half dozen times. So, I owe a special thanks to Kozak for writing a book for *me*.

Chapter 1 ("Enter Hektor") examines the *Iliad*'s first quarter as 'episodes' that help its audience anticipate and identify with Hektor. Most effective in this opening chapter is the point that even in his absence the narrative builds a sense of anxiety and doom surrounding Hektor. In short, we are primed for a strong emotional response based on what *others* say about him. Chapter 2 ("Killing Time") deals with the problem of narrative "middles"—how, once the boundary of a serial narrative is set, the tale must slow down and expand its narrative world. Thus, the epic's middle books (6–15) build upon Hektor's introduction "in building investment in him before unleashing him on the battlefield" (145). The emphasis on shifting "alignment" for audience interest is effective; to my taste Hektor's interaction with Polydamas is insufficiently examined (to contrast with fine comments on the conversations between Hektor and Paris).

Chapter 3 turns to the closing of narrative arcs beginning in book 16 with the deaths of Sarpedon and Patroclus—the last third of the epic both races toward and

forestalls Hektor's death. The short conclusion, returning to the author's own emotional involvement with Hektor, is, upon reaching it, less impactful. Kozak asserts that reading the *Iliad* in this way makes "it feel more and more like television" (231). She qualifies this somewhat circuitous comment by turning back to the Homeric tradition and considering how it may have developed "transmedially", that is, with audience members eventually becoming performers and contributing to the evolution or adaptation of its tales.

Kozak may have missed an opportunity to make a greater splash in Homeric studies and literary studies in general. Her analysis of characterization uses as its model modern binge-watching or the experience of a series in a discrete amount of time. Repetition and durative time, however, may have different effects (as she notes in her conclusion). In part, where Kozak wants to move a bit *away* from oral poetry, the insights of serial narrative might be even more beneficial in an oral performative context.

First, ancient audiences experienced 'Homeric characters' episodically, transgenerically, and throughout their lives. The durative exposure to multiple iterations of characters likely built deeper identifications that changed alongside life experiences. Ancient audiences heard about Homeric characters in symposia, in contest performances, in lyric, epinician, and tragic poetry. And they saw them in sculpture and painting. Such immanence has a better modern parallel with the Harry Potter phenomenon: someone engaged with that narrative world had books that took years to read, movie versions that reinterpreted the books and fleshed out their visual apparatus, fan fiction, new spinoffs in film, short story and stage, immersive entertainment spectacles (Universal Studios), and now (gulp), for more mature interests, Harry Potter-themed lingerie. Fans of Harry Potter have *grown up* with the books' characters and have a complex emotional and intellectual engagement with them that changes as their lives change. Ancient audiences would have started hearing about Homeric heroes at a young age—their prejudices and prior experiences of a character would become part of their response to each new telling just as their life stages would re-condition their responses to moments like book 6 when Hektor laughs at his doomed son.

Second, and perhaps no less important, *performance* shapes reception. Experiencing narrative *with others* amplifies the emotional response and sharpens opportunities for identification. When a television serial becomes "water-cooler" material, the way we view it, talk about it, and read about it adds intensity and duration to the narrative experience. Where and how the Homeric epics were performed, especially

when repeated over a lifetime, has a significant impact on the strength of their comparison to modern serial narratives.

If I have been critical of some of the details of this book, this is proof of how engaging I found it. In general, Kozak's approach is refreshing and exemplary. Although she does not specifically frame her work in this way, Kozak's investigation is a species of Homeric reception that helps us address the perennial question, "Why Homer?" By comparing Homeric techniques to those of modern narrative art forms, Kozak has provided us another way to think about artistic and cultural continuities (and discontinuities). The comparison, of course, works in both directions: "why Homer" can easily turn into "why *Breaking Bad*"? And questions about audience investment in Walter White or Hektor Priamidês yield answers that enrich our understanding of the importance of narrative in human life. This is the proof as much of good scholarship as a good story.

NECJ 44.4

Joel Christensen
Brandeis University

John Taylor,
Greek to GCSE: Part 1. Revised edition for OCR GCSE Classical Greek (9–1).

London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. Pp. xi +206. Paper
(ISBN 978-1-4742-5516-5) $27.95.

John Taylor,
Greek to GCSE: Part 2. Revised edition for OCR GCSE Classical Greek (9–1).

London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. Pp. xvi +351. Paper
(ISBN 978-1-4742-5520-2) $27.95.

Judith Affleck and Clive Letchford,
OCR Anthology for Classical Greek GCSE.

London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. Pp. 271. Paper
(ISBN 978-1-4742-6548-5) $29.95.

John Taylor's newly revised edition of his OCR-approved *Greek to GCSE* textbook is conveniently divided into two volumes of six chapters each and supplemented by a handsome companion anthology of readings selected and edited by Judith Affleck and Clive Letchford. The chapters are neatly and methodically organized, and increase in page length as extended texts and commentary are introduced into the chapers. Approximately three to five grammatical topics and paradigms of forms are treated in each chapter, while all finish with both a handy and full 'Summary' of the grammar and an alphabetical list of all the vocabulary words (*ca.* 40-50). Two noteworthy pedagogical aids are featured in the early chapters of volume 1 and then discarded (the first in chapter 3, the second after chapter 4): first, hyphenation (= stem-ending) of all nouns (ἀγγελ-ος/*aggel-os*), adjectives (σοφ-ος/*soph-os*), finite verbs (λεγ-ει/*leg-ei*), infinitives (μανθαν-ειν/*manthan-ein*) and derivative adverbs (καλ-ως/*kal-ōs*) serves the sound pedagogical aim of privileging the fundamental importance of inflection and function in Greek; secondly, accents are not written at

all until chapter 5, where they are formally introduced, treated in proper depth and used regularly thereafter. Sentences throughout are clearly presented in sharp text boxes and are brief enough (generally three to ten words) to provide solid practice and repetition of vocabulary with variation of sentence types and word order. The texts, which are slightly adapted in volume 1 and judiciously varied, begin in chapter 3 with a selection from Demosthenes' digression on the laws of the Locrians (from *Against Timocrates*), followed by fables of Aesop, a prose version of Homer's Cyclops episode and, finally, selections from the expedition of Alexander the Great. The choice of oratory—that rich storehouse of social and cultural history–is a good way to start off the readings, which maintain a welcome variety throughout all three volumes, a preferable alternative to the single continuous narrative spread over several chapters that shapes a number of Greek and Latin textbooks. Each text, moreover, is framed by a clear historical introduction and supported with line-by-line glosses of vocabulary words underlined in the text. On balance, volume 1 easily meets Taylor's stated aim of providing a 'user-friendly' introduction which trains its focus upon general principles rather than the 'minor irregularities' that can distract and dishearten the beginner (*Preface*, vol. 1).

Volume 2 adheres to the patterns established in the first six chapters, though texts become more frequent, longer and less adapted, while the more complex grammatical topics are introduced. Plato's lively dialogues and creative myths provide most of the texts in chapters 7 and 8, while chapter 9 treats standard heroic myth cycles (Theseus, Meleager, and Perseus). A number of the most interesting episodes and tales from Herodotus (Rhampsinitus, Arion and the Dolphin, Gyges and Candaules, Marathon, etc.) enliven the final three chapters (10-12), though the Ionic dialect has been prudently adapted into Attic. Herodotus' appeal, stronger than ever in our contemporary multicultural and globalized world, easily justifies the numer and range of texts and actors (ancient sages, great warriors, clever women, etc.) that dominate the last quarter of the textbook and nudge the learner to further Greek explorations. Volume 2 concludes with a number of particularly helpful items: 300 Revision Sentences that cover all of the major grammatical concepts (10 sentences devoted to each concept) of the two volumes of the textbook; 60 English-Greek sentences; 4 GSCE Practice Papers; and an extensive Reference Grammar tailored to volume 2.

The companion *OCR Anthology for Classical Greek*, like volumes 1 and 2 of the textbook, provides a wide selection of mostly unadapted readings from Homer,

Herodotus (in Attic dialect), Euripides, Plato, Plutarch, and Lucian, enhanced by thorough introductions and fairly heavy glossing of the vocabulary. The overall production of the volume is marked by a similar clarity of presentation (blue and black font, illustrations, notes, etc.) and overall high quality, starting from a generous Introduction and featuring, among other useful items, a 'How to use this book' orientation, some Tips for Translation, a Timeline of events and classical authors, as well as a full 2-page map of the Eastern Mediterranean world, indicating the most important city-states and including Greece, Asia Minor, and North Africa. Technical Terms and Literary Style terms form the last two portions of the Introduction. The *Anthology* employs a crisp two-tone 'blue-figure' color scheme in the reading texts, wherein the darker blue marks finite verbs, the lighter blue all nominative words and phrases—helpful aids to moving the learner forward. When one combines all of the aforementioned assets with the running vocabulary on the facing page throughout, this reader easily stands alone as an intermediate Greek text.

Though one should never judge books by their covers, aesthetics really do matter in our competitive textbook marketplace and the judicious use of color in this instance does create a persuasive impression! On the outside all three covers cannot help but attract an audience with their graphic black-figure action scenes drawn from epic and myth (reminiscent of the dancing lyre-player and pair of warriors on the covers of Hansen-Quinn's *Greek* and Nagy's *Best of the Achaeans*!), while inside all three volumes color is used in a restrained manner to the good ends of enhanced pedagogy and student interests. On balance, all three volumes represent a lean, pellucid, and expeditious path to a solid mastery and thorough enjoyment of Greek. Volumes 1 and 2 together will provide a fresh year-long introduction for both college and high school levels and expand the menu of choices available on the market such as *Athenaze*, *Alpha to Omega* and Hansen-Quinn's *Greek: an Intensive Course*. Similarly, Affleck and Letchford's *OCR Anthology* of appealing and generously-framed readings, which span some 1,000 years of Greek culture, will prove a rich and stimulating complement for the third semester (college) or spring of the second-year (high school), culminating in selected original texts of Euripides (*Alcestis, Electra, Bacchae*), Plato (*Phaedo*), Plutarch (*Life of Lycurgus*) and Lucian.

NECJ 44.4

Brian T. Walsh
The University of Vermont

Victoria Moul, ed., *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature.*

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. xxviii + 488. Cloth (ISBN 978-1-107-02929-3) $140.00.

Joel Relihan observes that "the only two Latin humanist texts that have passed into the Western canon are Erasmus' *Praise of Folly* (1509) and More's *Utopia* (1516)" (340). Yet there are many more neo-Latin texts than just these—epic poems, lyric poems, letters, fiction, history, drama, and indeed every genre classical or modern literature has invented. How can a would-be reader get started in this great treasure house of Latinity? The present volume offers some ways in. It will be useful not only to neo-Latin specialists, but to Latinists in general, and to scholars of Renaissance vernacular literatures or history.

As Moul notes at the start of her introduction (1), this book is one of three recently published handbooks of neo-Latin, with different emphases. The *Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin* (Oxford 2015) and *Brill's Encyclopedia of the Neo-Latin World* (Leiden 2014) are broader in scope, covering not only the Renaissance but later Latin, and ranging beyond literature to "cultural contexts," the title of part 2 of the Oxford volume. The Cambridge *Guide* confines itself to neo-Latin literature of the Renaissance and early modern period, roughly 1350–1700. Its 23 chapters are divided into four parts: "Ideas and Assumptions," "Poetry and Drama," "Prose," and "Working with Neo-Latin Literature." The contributors are leading neo-Latinists; not surprisingly, many of them also contributed chapters to one of the other new handbooks.

Two chapters from part 1 give a particularly good sense of what neo-Latin is all about and why one might want to read it. Sarah Knight's chapter, "How the Young Man Should Study Latin Poetry: Neo-Latin Literature and Early Modern Education," explains the place of Latin in education in the early modern period, then works through a handful of poems about education. Schoolboys were taught to write Latin verse, and what they wrote about was often their own experience as students. Knight makes the point that, as *imitatio* was held up as "one of a poet's necessary skills" (65), many of these poems quote and allude to classical models; creativity for a neo-Latin poet does not always mean the sort of originality valued by the Romantics.

Françoise Waquet's chapter, "The Republic of Letters," gives us a view into the intellectual world of the 17th and 18th centuries, as well as the humanist period just before; the term "res publica litteraria" was apparently coined by Francesco Barbaro in 1417 (66) and came to refer to the international community of well-educated

writers, communicating with each other in Latin. As Waquet explains, erudition was not just an intellectual virtue but a moral one as well, at times even a religious ideal (71). Members of the republic of letters came from various social classes but were bound by their common knowledge and zeal for learning. Of course, "the Republic of Letters is a masculine realm" (72), as universities were not yet admitting women and thus relatively few women knew Latin; eventually, particularly as Latin becomes less prominent, learned and intellectual women certainly emerge.

Part 2 covers the major verse genres of neo-Latin literature: epigram, elegy, lyric, verse letters, verse satire, pastoral, didactic poetry, epic, and drama. Sara Kivistö's chapter on verse satire is particularly fun, especially the sub-genre of medical poems. Some of these poke fun at bad doctors, others are mock-encomia on diseases. Paul Gwinne's treatment of epic is one of the strongest in the whole collection, vividly written, and introducing a whole host of epic poems, whose subjects include both mythology and recent history.

Part 3 treats prose genres: letters, oratory, dialogue, prose fiction (divided into two chapters, for shorter and longer works), prose satire, and history. An introductory chapter by Terence Tunberg talks about style and rhetoric in neo-Latin. Marc Van der Poel, on oratory and declamation, emphasizes that "the humanists stood in a living tradition of using Latin for scholarly and literary purposes" (287), drawing on all extant Latin literature, not just the major authors of the golden age. Joel Relihan's chapter on prose satire introduces a variety of less familiar texts, and talks about how 17th-century anthologies helped form the canon.

Finally, the two chapters of part 4 help the reader work with neo-Latin texts. Craig Kallendorf talks about how to find texts, which can be surprisingly difficult. Texts that have been printed can often be found through library catalogs, and may even be on line, but not necessarily; texts that only exist in manuscript are more difficult to locate. Keith Sidwell talks about how to edit a neo-Latin text. A critical edition of a classical text is meant to be a reconstruction of what the author wrote, or at least of the archetype of all the extant manuscripts. This is not as straightforward as it sounds, since the author may have revised the text—think, for example, of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In general, though, it makes sense to talk about *the* text of a classical work, as if it were a fixed object. For modern texts, whether Latin or vernacular, the fluidity of the text is more obvious. Authors' revisions may survive, sometimes even in autograph manuscripts; subsequent printed editions may include new material; we may have notes or correspondence from the author talking about the text. As Sidwell puts it, "the classicist's mantra is an oversimplification" (400). Thus an edition of a neo-Latin text may need to include a large *apparatus criticus* or even more

than one distinct version of the text. Sidwell also argues for an apparatus of sources, indicating where an author is quoting or alluding to other texts, and says further that "it is crucial to provide a full translation of the text" (405), for the convenience of readers not deeply trained in Latin, such as some historians or specialists in vernacular literatures. Naturally, it makes more sense to publish neo-Latin editions on line nowadays, given that "in the future fewer and fewer conventional publishers will risk their capital in such a restricted market" (396).

One of the most striking features of the *Guide* is the number of suggestions for future work: translations from the vernaculars into Latin (49), alliances among scholarly families (72), detailed studies of Latin style (243), longer prose fiction (322), canon formation through anthologies (7, 342), and so on. Neo-Latin is still a fairly young field and there is much scope for scholarly work. There is also great pleasure to be had in reading Latin from the (early) modern world, and the essays in this volume provide excerpts to suit any reader's taste; all the Latin in the book is also translated into English. My copy is now studded with marginal notes about Latin works I want to read, perhaps to teach. Classicists curious about neo-Latin will find this an excellent starting point.

NECJ 44.4

Anne Mahoney
Tufts University

Richard Hodges,
The Archaeology of Mediterranean Placemaking: Butrint and the Global Heritage Industry.

London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. Pp. xvi +161, 47 b & w photos, illustrations and maps. Cloth (ISBN-13 978-1-3500-0662-1) $114.00.

Butrint, ancient Buthrotum, is one the most important archaeological sites in Albania and is fast becoming a popular stop for tourists and scholars alike. With the earliest remains dating back to the Bronze Age, the site was subsequently occupied by Greeks, Romans, Slavs, and Venetians before being abandoned in the 16th century. Butrint was first scientifically explored in 1928 by the Missione Archeologica Italiana under the direction of Luigi Maria Ugolini.These excavations set the tenor for contextualizing Butrint, not only in the setting of the ancient world but shaped by contemporary narratives that define an identity for the "place". The Second World War intervened to close the Italian excavations and, after the creation of a communist state under Enver Hoxha, all foreign archaeological efforts were banned. Excavations continued under the directions of the Albanians until the collapse of the communist state in 1992. The subsequent democratic government solicited external support for the excavations of Butrint, and they found willing patrons in the Lords Rothschild and Sainsbury of Preston Candover who established the Butrint Foundation in 1993 to coordinate the study and preservation of the ancient town.

No one is better positioned to recount the archaeological history of Butrint than Richard Hodges. As scientific director of the excavations from 1993 until 2012, Hodges oversaw the study and preservation of the site on behalf of the Butrint Foundation. The author does not set out to introduce us to Butrint guided by monuments or chronological timeline but presents the site within its development as an archaeological "place", or destination, to use the touristic parlance. His discussion of Butrint poses important questions and challenges for archaeologists: What heritage or history is served by archaeology? How do archaeologists contribute to the branding of a place? Who are the important stakeholders needed to sustain the effort to protect ancient sites?

Hodges is a clear and engaging writer whose personalized account make this book hard to put down. Divided into five chapters, *The Archaeology of Mediterranean Placemaking* begins in chapter 1 by defining a "place" in an archaeological setting and how "placemakers", nation states, academics, and intuitions such as UN-

ESCO, provide a kind of authenticity to a site. For Butrint, having gained World Heritage status in 1992, the designation provided a globally recognized label that has encouraged increased support for the antiquities while putting pressure on local infrastructure to maintain the site.

In his second chapter, *In Virgil's Long Shadow*, Hodges explores the celebration of Butrint in Virgil's *Aeneid* (III 291-355) as "a little Troy" and how this association was manipulated by the Romans and, much later, by the Italian excavators who sought to "artfully shape Butrint as Virgil's Troy". Under communism, Albania's archaeologists and historians avoided the connections to Virgil as they were tied to fascist and western narrative. Not surprising, the inscription conferring World Heritage status on Butrint makes no mention of Virgil.

Chapter three, *New Identity? An Excavated Narrative*, reviews the history of excavation at Butrint and outlines the strategies being employed by the Butrint Foundation as they develop a new master narrative for the site. The description in this chapter comes close to serving as a guide to the site in general. An important addition to the new narrative for Butrint is the inclusion of the sites located in the surrounding territories now protected by the Butrint National Park.

The history of Butrint Foundation is the focus of the fourth chapter. The efforts and goals of the foundation are presented in four phases: 1) establishing working relationships between the various parties working at the site; 2) creation of the Butrint National Park; 3) developing the park's infrastructure; and 4) planning for a sustainable future. The last of these is a work in progress. Hodges is honest in his assessment of the challenges ahead as local communities wrestle with the park in their midst and wonder how they might benefit or profit from the resulting tourism. Preserving the ancient town in its natural setting presents an ongoing struggle as the coast of Albania is developed to meet the growing demands of residents and tourists.

This discussion segues smoothly into the last chapter, *Eternal Butrint? Reflections on Its Future Sustainability*. Here, Hodges conveys his concern about long-term preservation of Butrint in the face of mass tourism and its economic allure. The Butrint Foundation, together with Albanian authorities, have worked dilligently to keep pace with growing demand for access to the archaeological site. Between this reviewer's first visit to Butrint in 2004 and his last in 2013, the rapid development of the site has been stark. Signage around the site had been installed, the Museum was renovated, and amenities for visitors had been added including a hotel near the site and public toilets. All of this to accommodate nearly 150,000 visitors annually.

Though not strictly writing a guidebook, Hodges has produced an important and, at times, controversial introduction to the site of Butrint that grapples with

many of the critical issues that are faced by archaeologists today as they navigate the way archaeology helps to make a place.

NECJ 44.4

James Higginbotham
Bowdoin College

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

Dear Members of CANE:

Well, the year is certainly moving along quickly, with Thanksgiving just around the corner. When I think about those things for which I am thankful, one would surely be my half century of positive learning, friendship and renewal derived from membership in the Classical Association of New England. The other day a visitor to my school in her capacity as a professional reviewer was taken quite by surprise when I could rattle off names of several teachers in her area of eastern Massachusetts, some one hundred fifty miles away from the Berkshires. I explained that is a distinct benefit of being a CANE member all these years, and the wonderful networking it provides classicists from throughout the six-state region. I have, and will continue to keep my membership as a top priority when giving thanks this month.

The CANE Executive Board convened its first meeting of the year on 14 October at Amherst College, a day that still had the look and feel of late summer. The full agenda covered some new initiatives, an overview of Annual Meeting plans, and an ever-important lengthy vetting of the CANE budget. I wish to mention some takeaways from that meeting which have immediate importance for all members. First, please consider presenting a paper or workshop at the annual meeting on 16-17 March 2018 at the University of Rhode Island. You may make your proposal at caneweb.org hopefully by early December at the latest. Just click the "Annual Events" tab. I will notify you as promptly as possible about the status of your offering. Remember that papers MUST NOT exceed a 15-minute delivery time, with just a couple of additional minutes for any questions. Workshops do not exceed a one-hour window. Another very important item for your attention is a survey on caneweb.org from Scott Smith at

the University of New Hampshire. You will find it by clicking the "News" tab. We really need your individual and collective help to glean a health report for classical studies programs throughout the six-state region. This survey is an attempt to be one way that we can give our profession a greater public presence. Soon on the CANE website you will be able to express your thoughts about what provides you with the greatest satisfaction and joy as a teacher or devotee of classical studies. We hope to garner enough comments from throughout CANE Country that we can post in appropriate locations and media sources. Also, do encourage your students to write about Lucretius's assertion that life must exist elsewhere in the cosmos. You will find rules and regulations under the "Annual Events" tab. (N.B. One of the best-selling books for the past couple of months, and still, as of this writing, #5 in the Boston Globe, is "Astrophysics for People in a Hurry" by Neil DeGrasse Tyson. I was just elated upon opening to Chapter One to find that this distinguished scientist, as a heading for Chapter 1, gives the reader this quote from Lucretius. "The world has persisted many a long year, having once been set going in the appropriate motions. From these everything else follows." This just proves that everything ancient is suitably modern!) Finally, remember, too, that caneweb.org is a delightfully rich source of ideas and information about all things classical. On the home page you will find great articles from teachers who continue to find innovative ways to get their students excited about Latin and other classical subjects. And you should also peruse the possibilities for scholarships and funding located under the "resources" tab. Ben Revkin has given us a web site of which every CANE member can be duly proud!

It's difficult to believe that for many of us in the region's schools, the first quarter of teaching and learning has come to an end. Education continues to evolve, and some of us sometimes reel under the pressures coming from initiatives for classroom pedagogy and management with acronyms too numerous to mention, let alone remember. But on this I think we can all agree. When you get the chance to close that classroom door, and it's just you and the kids together with Caesar or Vergil, Catullus

or Lucretius, Daedalus or the Fates, does it get any better? Some fifty-five years ago as a senior at Haverhill (MA) High School studying Vergil under the tutelage of the late Margaret McCormick, I decided then and there that my life would be a full one if I could ever match her zeal and creativity as a classical studies teacher. It has certainly been a life "less travelled by", but via Frost, "that has made all the difference."

Please accept, on behalf of the CANE Executive Board, my best wishes to you for the holiday season. And both March and URI await us all!

Ex corde,

Charlie Bradshaw, CANE President
Wahconah Regional High School
Dalton, MA
cbradshaw@cbrsd.org or cbradshaw372@gmail.com
413-253-2055

CANE survey of classics and latin programs in New England

The Classics-in-Curriculum Committee of CANE is conducting a survey of the health of classics and Latin programs in New England. We are asking that all programs, both at the pre-collegiate and collegiate levels, fill out our survey, which can be found on the links provided on the CANE webpage (under "News"). It is extremely important that we have as many programs report as possible. There is a separate button for college level and precollege level.

You may also have been contacted by your state representative with a paper survey (sent electronically); it is not necessary to respond both to the online form and the paper form.

We encourage response by December 10, 2017, but we will continue to receive responses until March 2018.

We greatly appreciate your attention to this matter, and we ask you to do your part to spread the word about this survey!

Call for Papers

The 111th Annual Meeting of Classical Association of New England will be held at the University of Rhode Island, 16 and 17 March 2018. All interested scholars are invited to submit abstracts (300 word maximum) no later than 1 December 2017 for papers to:

CANE President,
Charles Bradshaw,
54 Potwine Ln., Amherst, MA 01002;
413-253-2055;
cbradshaw372@gmail.com

Barlow-Beach Distinguished Service Award

The Barlow-Beach Distinguished Service Award recognizes a member of CANE whose service to the organization and to Classics in New England has marked the recipient's career. Annually, the President serves as Chair of the Barlow-Beach Award Committee, and invites the CANE members to submit nominees to:

Charles Bradshaw,
54 Potwine Ln., Amherst, MA 01002;
413-253-2055;
cbradshaw372@gmail.com

Matthew Wiencke Teaching Prize

The Matthew I. Wiencke award recognizes excellence in teaching at the primary, middle and secondary school levels. Nominations are invited for this year's award. A nominee must be:

1. a member of CANE,
2. currently teaching Classics in a New England primary, middle, or secondary school, and
3. nominated by a professional colleague (fellow teacher or administrator at the nominee's school, or a classicist from another school who knows the nominee well in a professional capacity).

Letters of nomination should contain evidence of the nominee's qualifications, particularly those qualities exemplified by Matthew Wiencke in his personal life and professional career, among them "his infectious wit, his boundless enthusiasm, his optimism, and his loyalty," as expressed by Norman Doenges in his memorial published in the November 1996 issue of the *New England Classical Journal*.

Letters of nomination should be sent to the senior At-Large Member of the Executive Committee:

Kevin Ballestrini,
21 Oakwood Dr., Storrs, CT 06268,
kevin.ballestrini@gmail.com.

Only those nominations postmarked by December 31, 2016 will be considered for this year's award, which will be presented at the CANE Annual Meeting in March, 2017. Current members of the CANE Executive Committee are not eligible for nomination.

Phyllis B. Katz Prize for Excellence in Undergraduate Research

This Prize was established in honor of Dartmouth College teacher and CANE member, Phyllis B. Katz. College professors are invited to submit exemplary undergraduate papers for consideration to:

Anne Mahoney,
Department of Classics, Eaton 331, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155
anne.mahoney@tufts.edu.

The winner of the prize will read his/her paper at the 111th Annual Meeting, and will receive a small monetary award in recognition of excellence.

Certification Scholarship

CANE will provide up to $1500 to an outstanding junior or senior undergraduate in New England who is preparing for secondary-school certification as a teacher of Latin or Greek or both in one or more of the New England states, or to the holder of a Master's degree to cover the cost of tuition and other fees required to obtain such certification. Full-time, part-time, and summer programs will qualify.

Deadline for application is 1 January 2018. Please, send the following to:
Amy White,
8 Green Hill St., Manchester, CT 06040;
860-647-0559;
argentum@cox.net.

1. Two letters of recommendation from college classicists who know your proficiency in Latin and/or Greek.
2. A letter from someone (e.g., former or current teacher, supervisor, counselor, clergyman) who can speak to your ability to communicate and work with young people and inspire them to high levels of achievement.
3. A personal statement of NO MORE than 1000 words in which you explain why you want to pursue a career as a secondary-school classicist.
4. High School and College transcripts.
5. A description of your program and the expenses involved.

Other Scholarship opportunities and application details are described on the CANE website. Please visit: www.caneweb.org

Funding Opportunities

Two sources of funding are open to CANE members.

Educational Programs funding is awarded to any group or sub-group of the membership to promote a program of interest designed to promote understanding of the Classics, pedagogy, or topics within ancient history. To apply for funds, a letter outlining the program and its goals, including the intended audience may be submitted to:

Dr. Edward Zarrow, World Languages Department,
Westwood High School, Westwood, MA 02090;
781-326-7500 x3372;
tzarrow@westwood.k12.ma.us.

Discretionary Funds are awarded four times each year for supplies, ancillary materials, or enrichment materials that will enhance a particular project or curriculum, and for which other funding is unavailable. The deadlines are: 1 October 2017; 1 January 2018; 1 April 2018; and 1 July 2018. Applications may be submitted to:

Susan Curry,
319 Murkland Hall, 15 Library Way,
University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824;
(603) 862- 3589;
susan.curry@unh.edu

CANE Annual Writing Contest 2017

This year's topic:

"Necesse est confiteare esse alios aliis terrarum in partibus orbis et varias hominum gentis et saecla ferarum."

— De Rerum Natura, Lucretius, II, 1074-107

"We must admit that there are various kinds of beings and wild creatures in other parts of the universe."

Due Date: 15 December 2017

Guidelines:

» The project may be a short story, poem, drama, or essay.
» The project should be typed or word-processed.
» Maximum length: 700 words
» If you use any source materials for this project, you must provide specific references and a bibliography.

Your project will be judged holistically, based on how successfully you address the given topic, how imaginative and creative your idea is, and how well you use language to engage your reader.

Your name should not appear on the project itself. Please include a cover page in the following format, including this signed statement. Only projects with this signed statement will be considered for judging.

» Name of Student
» Grade of Student
» Name of School
» Name of Teacher
» Email Address of Teacher

This project represents my own original work. No outside help has been provided for this project. If selected as a winner, your entry and name will be published on caneweb.org.

Signed____________________________________Date________________________

GUIDELINES FOR TEACHERS

The CANE Writing Contest is a regional competition open to students of Latin, Greek, or Classics in New England middle and secondary schools. We believe that the goals of the contest can best be served by requesting that the written project be the student's own work. Hence, the student should not ask for any help in writing or correcting the project before submitting the final copy. To ensure that all entrants have an equal chance to win this contest, we urge all teachers to follow these guidelines:

1. Present the topic to your students and answer any questions they may have about it.
2. **Give your students a copy of the document "CANE Annual Writing Contest 2017,"** including a due date and supplementing it with any additional suggestions you may have about revising the rough draft and proofreading the final copy.
3. Give your students a deadline early enough to allow you to judge your students' projects and submit the three best projects to your State Representative by **December 15, 2017.**
4. **You may discuss the general topic with your students to be sure they understand it,** but explain that the projects must be original works on the given topic and that students may not seek help from others, whether students, teachers, or parent, although they may arrange to have the final draft typed or word-processed by someone else.
5. **For the three winning entries you submit to your state representative, make sure your students have included the required cover page and statement that the work is their own.**
    - Name of Student
    - Grade of Student
    - Name of School
    - Name of Teacher
    - Email Address of Teacher

We will use teacher e-mail to communicate with the top three winners in each state at the middle school and high school level. If one of your students' projects is among the winning entries, you can expect to hear from your State Representative by January 15.

6. Remind your students that this is a contest, with certificates and prizes given to the three finalists in each of the New England states at both the high school and middle school level, and that the New England-wide high school winner will receive a certificate and a gift card, to be presented at the 111th Annual Meeting of CANE, 16 and 17 March 2018 at the University of Rhode Island. **The high school winner will have the opportunity to be our guest for dinner and to read the winning entry at this event. The winning entry will be published in CANE's Annual Bulletin and on its website with the student's name.**
7. You may find it helpful to provide your students with copies of past winning projects, published in the Annual Bulletin. Please visit www.caneweb.org for recent high school winning entries.
8. Submit the best three projects from your school to your CANE State Representative by December 15, 2017, making sure that you enclose each student's signed statement that the project is his or her own work. For names and addresses of the State Representatives see the listing under the CANE Executive Committee on the CANE website, www.caneweb.org. Students may not submit their projects directly to the Chair of the Writing Contest. To do so will invalidate the project.
9. Please do not rank the three projects that you submit from your school to your state representative. If you wish, you may recognize the authors of all three projects in some appropriate way, but at this preliminary level students' projects are not to be ranked first, second, or third place. The State Representatives will submit the entries to the president-elect.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals has placed the CANE Writing Contest on the 2017-2018 NASSP National Advisory List of Contests and Activities as a regional program for participation by students in middle and secondary schools in Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Students from other states who are enrolled in independent or parochial schools in New England are eligible to enter the CANE Writing Contest. We have had many inquiries about the CANE Writing Contest from students in schools outside the area served by the Classical Association of New England. We are happy to answer these inquiries with information about the contest, but we regret that students enrolled in schools located outside New England are not eligible to participate.

Attention State Representatives: After you have read your assigned entries, please advise Susan Curry, President-Elect, of your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place choices by **January 15, 2018**. Please also include a ranked list of the three top winners in the state, including the students' teachers and the name of their school.

LIST OF BOOKS RECEIVED, NOVEMBER 2017

Publishers are invited to send new books for this list to
Prof. Jennifer Clarke Kosak,
NECJ Book Review Editor, Department of Classics, Bowdoin College,
7600 College Station, Brunswick, ME 04011;
jkosak@bowdoin.edu

Emily Katz Anhalt, *Enraged: Why Violent Times Need Ancient Greek Myths*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017. Pp. 280. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-300-21737-7) $30.00.

Kathleen Coleman, ed., *Albert's Anthology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017. Pp. 250. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-674-98054-9) $20.00.

Samuel D. Gartland, ed., *Boiotia in the Fourth Century B.C.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016. Pp. 248. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-8122-4880-7) $65.00.

Stephen Harrison, *Victorian Horace: Classics and Class*. New York and London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. Pp. 217. Cloth (ISBN 978-1-4725-8391-8) $114.00.

Sarah Hitch and Ian Rutherford, eds., *Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient Greek World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. 348. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-521-19103-6) $99.99.

Robert Knapp, *The Dawn of Christianity: People and Gods in a Time of Magic and Miracles*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017. Pp. 320. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-674-97646-7) $29.95.

Ioanna Kralli, *The Hellenistic Peloponnese: Interstate Relations. A Narrative and Analytic History from the Fourth Century to 146 BC*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2017. Pp. xxxiv + 556. Cloth (ISBN 978-1-910589-60-1) $95.00.

Lucy Pollard, *The Quest for Classical Greece: Early Modern Travel to the Greek World*. London: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 2015. Pp. xiv + 281. Cloth (ISBN 978-1-78076-961-5) $110.00.

Frederic Raphael, *Antiquity Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017. Pp. 376. Cloth (ISBN 978-0-300-21537-3) $26.00.

Stephen Ridd, *Communication, Love, and Death in Homer and Vergil: An Introduction*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2017. Pp. 272. Paper (ISBN 978-8061-5729-0) $29.95.

NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS

1. *New England Classical Journal* publishes articles, notes and reviews on all aspects of classical antiquity of interest to its readership of secondary and college teachers of the Classics, and of other students of the ancient world.

2. Contributions to the "Articles & Notes" section of *NECJ* are evaluated by blind refereeing and should therefore contain no indication of who their authors are.

3. Manuscripts should be submitted in the first instance as an attachment to email. Paper submissions are also accepted, but authors must be prepared to supply a word-processed document. The preferred word-processing program is MS Word. All Greek must be typed using APA Greekkeys. The editors may request a paper copy of the submission before final printing.

4. Submissions should be doubled-spaced throughout, including between paragraphs, and typed in single font size throughout (thus e.g. no large capitals or small print). Italics should be used instead of underlining. Boldface type should be avoided in favor of italics.

5. All text should be left-justified (ragged-right). Hard returns should be used only at the ends of verses and paragraphs, and not at the ends of continuous prose lines. Similarly, tabs and/or indents should be used instead of resetting margins in the course of the manuscript. For difficult matters of citation, contributors should consult *The Chicago Manual of Style*. A specific *NECJ* style sheet is also available upon request from the Editor-in-Chief.

6. Materials for the various sections of *NECJ* should be sent directly to the appropriate section editors. (See inside front cover as well as at the head of each section.)

7. Manuscripts and other materials will normally be returned only if a stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed with the submission.

2018 NATIONAL LATIN EXAM

- More than 149,000 registered students in 2017
- 40 question multiple choice exam
- Seven levels; Introduction to Latin through Latin VI
- Grammar, reading comprehension, mythology, derivatives, literature, Roman life, history and oral Latin
- Gold and silver medals
- Opportunities for Scholarships
- $5 per US student, $7 per foreign student, $10 minimum order, to be sent with the application
- N.B. $10 shipping and handling fee per school
- Postmark Deadline for application and payment: January 20, 2018

For Application and Information:

National Latin Exam
University of Mary Washington,1301 College Avenue
Fredericksburg,VA 22401
website: www.nle.org ▪ email: nle@umw.edu

NATIONAL LATIN EXAM ▪ SINCE 1977

Sponsored by The American Classical League/National Junior Classical League