

ELAINE FANTHAM

ROMAN READINGS

ROMAN RESPONSE TO GREEK LITERATURE
FROM PLAUTUS TO STATIUS AND QUINTILIAN

DE GRUYTER

Elaine Fantham
Roman Readings

Beiträge zur Altertumskunde

Herausgegeben von
Michael Erler, Dorothee Gall,
Ludwig Koenen, Clemens Zintzen

Band 277

De Gruyter

Elaine Fantham

Roman Readings

Roman response to Greek literature
from Plautus to Statius and Quintilian

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-022933-2
e-ISBN 978-3-11-022934-9
ISSN 1616-0452

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Fantham, Elaine.

Roman readings : Roman response to Greek literature from Plautus to
Statius and Quintilian / by Elaine Fantham.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-3-11-022933-2 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Latin literature – History and criticism. 2. Rhetoric, Ancient.

I. Title.

PA6011.F36 2010

870.9–dc22

2010011248

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© 2011 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/New York

Druck: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
∞ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Content

Introduction	VII
--------------------	-----

I Comedy and Sexuality

1. Act 4 of the <i>Menaechmi</i> : Plautus and His Original	3
2. The Madman and the Doctor	15
3. Philemon's <i>Thesauros</i> as a Dramatization of Peripatetic Ethics	32
4. <i>Heautontimoroumenos</i> and <i>Adelphoe</i> : A Study of Fatherhood in Terence and Menander	51
5. Sex, Status and Survival in Hellenistic Athens: A Study of Women in New Comedy	79
6. <i>Stuprum</i> : Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offences in Republican Rome	115
7a. <i>Domina</i> -tricks, or How to Construct a Good Whore from a Bad One	144
7b. Women of the Demi-Monde and Sisterly Solidarity in the <i>Cistellaria</i>	157
7c. Maidens in Other-Land, or Broads Abroad: Plautus' <i>Poenulae</i>	176
8. Terence and the Familiarization of Comedy	195
9. Roman Experience of Menander in the Late Republic and Early Empire	215
10. Mime: The Missing Link in Roman Literary History	228

II Rhetoric and Literary culture

11. Imitation and Evolution: The Discussion of Rhetorical Imitation in Cicero <i>De oratore</i> 2.87–97 and Some Related Problems in Ciceronian Theory	243
12. Imitation and Decline: Rhetorical Theory and Practice in the First Century AD	265
13. Orator and/et Actor	285
14. Disowning and Dysfunction in the Declamatory Family	302
15. Quintilian on the Uses and Methods of Declamation	320

16. The Concept of Nature and Human Nature in Quintilian's Psychology and Theory of Instruction 331
17. The Synchronistic Chapter of Gellius (*N.A.* 17.21) and Some Aspects of Roman Chronology and Cultural History Between 60 and 50 BCE 343

III Ovid's Narrative Poem, the *Fasti*

18. Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation . . . 359
19. The role of Evander in Ovid's *Fasti* 393
20. Ceres, Liber and Flora: Georgic and Anti-Georgic Elements in Ovid's *Fasti* 409
21. The *Fasti* as a Source for Women's Participation in Roman Cult 430

IV Passion and Civil War in Roman Tragedy and Epic: Seneca, Lucan and Statius

22. Andromache's Child in Euripides and Seneca 457
23. Statius' Achilles, and His Trojan Model 475
24. Incest and Fratricide in Seneca's *Phoenissae* 482
25. Caesar and the Mutiny: Lucan's Reshaping of the Historical Tradition in *De Bello Civili* 5.237–373 502
26. *Religio* ... *dira loci*: Two Passages in Lucan *De Bello Civili* 3 and Their Relation to Virgil's Rome and Latium 519
27. The Angry Poet and the Angry Gods: Problems of Theodicy in Lucan's Epic of Defeat 535
28. *Discordia fratrum*: Aspects of Lucan's Conception of Civil War 559
29. Statius' *Thebaid* and the Genesis of Hatred 577
30. The Perils of Prophecy: Statius' Amphiaraus and His Literary Antecedents 607
31. *Chironis exemplum*: On Teachers and Surrogate Fathers in *Achilleid* and *Silvae* 624

Introduction

It is more than 40 years since my first publication, and I have come to realize that while some of my papers served only for a given occasion, others still have some merit of originality, or cover material that has not been developed since. Reviewing this body of work I thought it best to select approximately thirty papers with some internal coherence for reprinting, while providing basic references for readers interested in pursuing another 10–15 related studies. Some papers have already been reprinted in collections and these will simply be listed, starting with “The *Curculio* of Plautus: an Illustration of Plautine Methods in Adaptation,” *Classical Quarterly* 15 (1965) 84–100: this is available in both English and German, having been reprinted by Eckard Lefèvre in his collection *Wege der Forschung CCXXXVI, Plautus und Terenz* (1971). I would like to acknowledge here the pleasure and stimulus I have enjoyed from subsequent collaboration with Prof. Lefèvre and the generations of his pupils in successive conferences and collections on Roman comedy.

1. Comedy and Sexuality

If we want to follow the Roman experience of Greek comedy starting around 210 BCE, we must first face the sheer diversity of the Roman dramatic scripts that have come down to us. For Plautus it will be enough to contrast three plays on which I have written. While there seems no reason to include my 1965 paper on *Curculio* here, a summary will illustrate my approach in attempting a reconstruction of the Greek original that Plautus freely adapted: given the extent of his reworking, it would seem inappropriate to speak about his model. *Curculio* is only half the length of many Plautine comedies, but it contains the recognition of its heroine as a citizen available for marriage, a concealed identity of which the audience had the right to expect advance notice. Our Latin text lacks a prologue and offers no evidence that there ever was one; the whole play of under 750 lines bears obvious signs of compression. (The same is true of Plautus’ *Epidicus*, and I refer readers to my

parallel treatment, “Plautus in miniature; compression and distortion in the *Epidicus*,” *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar III* (1981) noting, however that my friend Sander Goldberg actually argued in *TAPA* 108 (1978) that Plautus dreamed up this complicated plot without reference to any Greek original!) *Curculio* starts as a typical love intrigue, in which the impecunious lover has sent his unscrupulous parasite from Epidaurus to raise money from a friend in Caria so that he can set his girl-friend free. This might be called a diaspora play, set not in democratic Athens, but in the Hellenistic age of mercenary warfare, full of soldier’s boasting of far away places. Far from being authentically Greek, the play’s most conspicuous scenes both depend on ethnic contrast. The bombastic parasite returns, ordering out of his way a whole array of unlikely *Greek* officials—commanders, tyrants, market magistrates, village and parish officers, and denouncing pretentious *Greek* intellectuals loaded with books and strolling in their foreign cloaks; later the Master of the wardrobe introduces himself and offers a survey of the *Roman* forum, itemizing the lowlifes that hang around each of its landmarks. By coincidence the parasite spent an evening in Caria drinking with a soldier (unmentioned to this point) and learning of the man’s interest in his master’s girlfriend, stole his signet ring. This soldier has actually agreed to buy the girl and needs to collect her. In a series of short (30 line) sketches with the drunken old custodian, with the sick Pimp supplicating Aesculapius for a cure, and with the banker, the parasite first gets the soldier’s deposit and then the girl as his property. But when the violent soldier arrives to claim his girl the whole intrigue is sent into reverse because the girl recognizes the ring on the parasite’s finger as her father’s signet ring. In a few quick-fire lines we discover that she is freeborn with an identifiable father (602), and what is more the soldier confirms that the ring belonged to his own father: the two are brother and sister. A play that began with a sentimental affair has turned into a situation ripe for, even requiring, marriage; yet the only hints of this happy-ever-after outcome were incidental comments naming the girl as a virgin (612–3) and her later claim that the pimp had preserved her chastity (698). There is an instant change of ethos, as a hedonistic love-affair has turned into a joining of two families in marriage, and a furious soldier-rival has been converted into a doting brother. A flippant comedy of intrigue and disguise has ended as a bourgeois drama, but it never rises to virtuous sentiment, remaining crudely mechanical in its jokes and contrivances.

Contrast *Menaechmi*, also a diaspora play set outside the old Athenian *politeia*: The scene is Epidamnus in Epirus and the chief personnel are Syracusan. The play is brilliantly organized with advance information that the Syracusan brother is searching the seas for his lost twin, and throughout the first four acts the two brothers enter and exit narrowly missing each other as the visiting twin is mis-identified by the local twin's wife, mistress, servants and in laws. The two papers on *Menaechmi* published here were written thirty years apart: in the study of Act III (*Classical Philology* 63 (1968) 175–83) my purpose was to detect Plautus' own humorous expansions in the Epidamnian Menaechmus' confrontation with his wife and parasite: in contrast "Madness and Medication," the original English text of my (Italian) lecture for the *Lectiones Plautinae Sarsinates*, focuses on the most truly Greek aspect of the episode; the paratragedy when the visiting Menaechmus pretends "madness" to escape from his brother's wife, and the parodic scene of his interview with the pretentious doctor. While the visiting bachelor Menaechmus is a free spirit, his local brother is henpecked and hagridden, and their humorous potential is as divergent as their personalities. It is the only comedy we have in which divorce is welcomed as a happy-ending.

In contrast again, Plautus adapted his *Trinummus* ("The Three-bit Trickster") from the *Thesauros* (Treasure) of Philemon, an altogether more leisured and sententious comedy which might well have disappointed audiences hoping for an intrigue of trickery and disguise. This comedy is called after a trickster, but is set in a sedate civic Athens and loaded with moralizing; to start with, it has four old men (and two would be enough) and opens with a long exchange of unwarranted reproaches from Senex A to Senex B who has bought his absent friend's house to save it from being sold by the man's spendthrift son Lesbonicus. This is followed by a prolonged scene of moral self-congratulation by the Good Young Man, and his request to Senex C, his father, for permission to marry Lesbonicus' unseen sister without a dowry, leading to a slow-moving encounter in which Senex C asks the spendthrift's permission and is almost refused. Apart from the rich metrical setting there is little so far to win over the Roman crowd. What compensates for this sedate action is the loyal and earthy slave Stasimus, working to save his master from himself, and a late-born plot to send a trickster with faked letters to give the young man access to money for the dowry. And this does indeed become funny when the returning absent father (Senex D) meets the trickster who claims that he sent him, and demands his money back.

The heavily moralizing emphasis of this play ties in with a genuine Aristotelian *aporia*. If two young gentlemen are friends how can one do the other a necessary kindness without damaging the other's honour? This play touches on two aspects of Hellenistic ethics; the conflict of competing moral ambitions, which I discussed in "Philemon's *Thesaurus* as a Dramatization of Peripatetic Ethics," *Hermes* 105 (1977) 406–201, and the wider issue of father-son relationships, which will become almost an obsession with Terence, as I illustrate from the contrasting pairs of fathers in two Terentian comedies, "*Hautontimoroumenos* and *Adelphoe*: a study in Fatherhood in Terence and Menander," *Latomus* 30 (1971) 970–98. It remains an issue among scholars whether we should read the denouement of *Adelphoe* with Demea's generosity at Micio's expense as Menandrian, or an adjustment by Terence in favour of the more severe approach to fatherhood.

What happened to Roman theatre between Plautus and Terence? There was another successful dramatist, Caecilius, whose plays were closer to Plautus, to judge from the excerpts from his version of Menander's *Plokion* preserved by Gellius (N.A. 2.23) than to either the Attic comedies which he adapted or to his successor Terence. I am convinced that the strange output of Terence is the product of his stranger circumstances. Suetonius tells us he was born at Carthage and grew up in the household of Terentius Lucanus, but the date of birth (185, altered by some editors to 195) would make this slave of Carthaginian origin (*Afer*) too young to have been a prisoner of war. A number of stories show Terence on intimate terms with young Roman nobles. How could this be? I think we need to imagine the Roman household as the context of education in this generation. Who would teach the sons of the house, and teach them Greek? Terence was no Greek, but once Lucanus hired a Greek schoolteacher to train his son(s) in both languages, it would be natural to enliven the schoolroom by providing other students—their cousins or young boys in the slave household needing to be trained as accountants and secretaries. Home-bred slaves were the safest employees, especially if, as must have often happened, the home-bred slave's mother was a concubine of the Master or his son. If Terence was so close to the master's family, he would share their education and probably apply it by working as an assistant teacher within a year of completing his training. The same young man would learn Greek, then teach it, then compose exercises for his pupils, then perhaps use the Greek he had learned to compose

speeches and scenes, like the young son in *Phormio* who goes off to practice a speech in defence of his brother's unauthorized marriage.

Thus comedy and education would be internally connected, as they continued to be in later centuries. And these sixteen-year-old classmates would be well placed to collaborate in Latin versions of Greek comedy. It would explain the correct family atmosphere of Terence's plays, and the dutiful respect of the young sons, respect shown even for father figures who are usually mistaken in their assessment of everyone around them, and especially of their women, whether wives or mothers in law (Sostrata in *Hecyra*) or mistresses. The enigma of Terence's origin and background, and the ultra-elitism of his values led to my presentation of this hypothesis in "Terence and the Familiarization (I should probably have said *domestication*) of Comedy," 21–32 in *Ramus* 33 (2004).

Working on Terence, with his often similar sentimental plots, convinced me that there was an inherent relationship between the legal status of these fictional young women (recognized as citizens, or struggling to obtain recognition) and the dramatic intrigues in which they were involved. Interest in the position of women was a recent and far from universal phenomenon in the 1970's but it led me to write "Sex, Status and Survival in Hellenistic Athens; a study of women in New Comedy," to provide a framework for students working on comedy, and show how a woman's lack of citizenship determined her options in life: only a known father could guarantee her the security of bourgeois marriage instead of struggling to live by her wits. I am happy that the intersection of comedy and private law has since been illuminated by Adele Scafuro's excellent study of family arbitration in comedy and the courts in *The Forensic Stage*.

There has always been a seepage of motifs and techniques between formal Palliata comedy and the popular stage of improvised mime and Atellane. Submerged threads connect comic situations in different generations and media, and two papers, "The Earliest Comic Theatre at Rome: Atellan farce, comedy and mime as antecedents of the *Commedia dell'Arte*," 23–32 in *The Science of Buffoonery*, ed. D. Pietropaolo, Toronto 1989 (not included in this collection) and "Mime; the Missing link in Roman Literary History," *Classical World* 82–83 (1989) 155–68, represent my attempt to provide background continuity. A similar interest in the continuity of Roman acquaintance with New Comedy led me to trace the role played by *Comoedi* in training young speakers in elocution, and their use of Menandrian speeches from otherwise lost

plays (attested by Quintilian), and again the performance of Menandrian scenes as after-dinner entertainment in elite homes like that of Atticus or Pliny the Younger: all of these aspects feed into the persistence of Menander's texts in upper-class Roman culture: hence "Roman Experience of Menander in the Late Republic and early Empire," *TAPA* 114 (1984) 299–309.

At the same time I had joined a collaborative enterprise to provide a combined source book and social history of women (*Women in the Classical world: Image and Text*, OUP New York 1994). Switching from literary interpretation to historical record, I assembled the somewhat scanty evidence for attitudes to sexual offences against citizens in the second century BCE, and the extent to which Romans differentiated between the heinousness of violating a protected female, and assaulting or seducing a well-born citizen male: I believe the attitudes of our Roman reporters confirm the verdicts of the admittedly limited case studies available for this early period: they are reviewed in the short paper "Stuprum: Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offences in Republican Rome," *Classical Views* 10 (1992) 267–91.

The only women who have any degree of autonomy in Classical comedy (or social life) are the outlaws, the non-citizen or fatherless girls who must make their way by their charms. They are also almost the only fully rounded and lively women on the comic stage after Aristophanes; hence three separate studies I have made on *Meretrices* / courtesans. Taking Plautus' black-comedy *Truculentus* (successful in his day but neglected in the nineteenth century syllabus) I examined the range of trickery applied by Phronesium to her assorted lovers—the ex-favourite Diniarchus who lends her his illegitimate child (but will have to end the play married to its offstage mother), the rich country lout who names the play, and her naïve soldier lover to whom she displays the virility of "his" newborn son. Then I compared her trickery with the accusations aimed at the honest Thais in Terence's version of Menander's *Eunuchus*, and Thais' reluctant manipulation of her peniless civilian lover to protect her "sister" from the crude soldier ("Domina-tricks, or how to construct a good whore out of a bad one").

"Maidens in Otherland or Broads abroad" examines the scenario in *Poenulus*, where the two freeborn sisters (captured and lost in Calydon) are on the brink of professional activity: while young *Hetaerae* speak freely in comedy, virgin daughters do not, but these young women exhibit both the vanity of their potential profession and the self-respect of their origin. The study of *Cistellaria* "Women of the demi-monde and

sisterly solidarity in the *Cistellaria*,” singles out two exceptional features; the sense of collective loyalty evinced by the old mother (“Lena”) in the face of proud matrons, and the anomaly that Selenium has been promised marriage by her lover before he or she can know that she is citizen-born and eligible. I wrote the three papers for collections published by Vogt Spira and other pupils of Lefèvre, and plan another related paper to come, on courtesans’ control of men and their finances.

2. Rhetoric and Literary culture

Comedy and Rhetoric are both performance arts, and we know from both Cicero and Quintilian that Roman orators obtained some of their training from *Comoedi*. My earliest work on rhetoric sprang from offering a graduate course on Cicero’s *De Oratore*. Although the book had to wait for my retirement there was time for articles (starting with “Ciceronian *conciliare* and Aristotelian *Ethos*,” *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 262–75, not reprinted here). I turned to Cicero’s representation of how natural talent was enhanced by training in performance and delivery—the indefinable essence of *decere*, itself the chief element of the eloquence, and to the issue of style. *Imitatio* had been a fourth ingredient, along with *natura* (*physis*), *exercitatio* (*melete*, also translated as *studium* or *diligentia*) and *doctrina* (*episteme*) in the system of Isocrates and the Roman rhetorician who composed *ad Herennium*. Moving from the actual imitation of Cicero’s teachers by their pupil Sulpicius Rufus, Cicero argued that Greek oratorical styles evolved from teacher to pupil, through a blending of their separate styles which Cicero believed his own generation also practiced. Thus Sulpicius’ shift of model from Antonius to Crassus is seen as parallel to the divergent evolution of Isocrates’ pupils Ephorus and Theopompus. Naturally in my two-phase study of Roman methods and principles of *Imitatio* Greek rhetorical theory is more prominent in the first study “Imitation and Evolution: the discussion of rhetorical imitation in Cicero *De Oratore* 2.87–97,” *Classical Philology* 73 (1978) 1–16, than in “Imitation and Decline: rhetorical theory and practice in the first century after Christ” whose starting point is a generation that already has Roman models to enhance or reject (*Classical Philology* 73 (1978) 102–116).

But the decade 60–50 BCE was also a time of broadening intellectual; curiosity and exploration of both Greek and Roman cultural history; this is the time when Varro and younger chronographers like

Nepos and Atticus were constructing a framework of time and place for the record of Greek poetry and prose—even as Cicero himself seems to have incorporated his historical account of Greek literature into a now damaged part of his *De Re Publica*. I have grouped in the papers on rhetoric “The synchronistic chapter of Gellius (NA 17.21)” from *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, an attempt to retrieve the chronological framework of Greek and Roman literature set up in Nepos’ lost *Chronica*, a no doubt less skilled forerunner of Atticus’ *Liber Annalis*.

Not reprinted here are “*Varietas and Satietas, De Oratore* 3.96–103 and the limits of *ornatus*,” *Rhetorica* 6 (1988) 275–290) “Occasions and Contexts of Roman Public oratory, from *Roman Eloquence*, ed. W. J. Dominik, London: Routledge 1997; “Meeting the People; the orator and the republican *contio* at Rome,” 95–112 in *Papers in Rhetoric III*, ed. L. Calboli Montefusco, and my exploration of Pliny’s double editorial procedure in revising his *Panegyricus* to make it simultaneously more literary and more ostensibly oral in parading the political formulae of Trajan’s glorious election to the consulate: “Two levels of orality in the genesis of Pliny’s *Panegyricus*,” 221–237, in *Signs of Orality*, ed. E. Anne Mackay, Leiden 1999.

During the nineties I was working on *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius*, Baltimore 1996, and preoccupied with the marginal forms of education and quasi-literary activities that fostered what we regard as more central texts. What was the social and socializing role of the declamatory school, and how did this strange new performance practice relate to the apparently lost art of domestic comedy? There seems to have been no continuity between earlier types of exercise (such as the accusations of Odysseus or Orestes as outlined in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*) and the dysfunctional family dramas of the elder Seneca’s youth. Rather we must look to overwhelming non-literary factors, to the outbreak of civil war, with young Quintus Cicero’s disloyal denunciation of his father and uncle, for a symptom of how families were turning sour under the pressure of debt and political blackmail. This was my thinking behind the specialized topic of the repudiated son: “Disowning and Dysfunction in the Declamatory Family,” *Materiali e Discussioni* 53 (2004), whereas the Quintilian paper “Quintilian on Declamation: themes and Problems,” 270–280 in *Hispania Terris omnibus felicior* (ed. P. Urso, Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider, 2002) aims to offset the point of view of the Elder Seneca in his generation with Quintilian’s more academic concern to treat the phenomenon of declamation, which he clearly thought a distraction from systematic training, with fairness

and independent judgement, and use it as a rigorous tool of legal and logical training.

In studying Quintilian's educational theory I was impressed by his scrupulous attempt to determine the elusive relationship between Nature (as a Stoic concept of providential control) and human nature as a psychological force applied in rhetorical training. How did Quintilian—an eminently sensible teacher who did not take things at face-value—relate his instruction to nature, human and universal? This led me to write "The concept of Nature and Human Nature in Quintilian's Psychology and theory of Instruction," *Rhetorica* 13 (1995) 125–136; once again we have to disentangle Roman attitudes to nature and art, and the role played by imitation.

3. Ovid's Narrative Poem, the *Fasti*

I came to Ovid's *Fasti* from comedy, and an interest in Roman recognition of women's (limited) sexual autonomy. Roman comedy depends on sexuality for its appeal, tempting a lusty audience with the prospect of vicarious gratification, and yet as I came to realize, it always exercised a code rather like the FBI's "crime does not pay," in denying sexual success to adulterers. Thus the married Menaechmus cannot even enjoy the rendezvous he has prearranged (with the gown stolen from his wife as payment) with the courtesan Erotium, but his bachelor brother wanders on stage and is invited for an intimate visit. This is not a taboo on what the Romans defined as adultery (limited to seducing a married woman), since infidelity by a wife does not even feature in comedy except in the false intrigue of *Miles Gloriosus*: nor is it because a comic Lothario is married that he is denied success; indeed in society he had a perfect right to sleep with any socially unregulated person. Often the reinforcing factor in comic and elegiac intrigue is the age or unattractiveness of the would-be lover. So too, although Ovid the lover of *Amores* chases other men's wives or women, Ovid, the poet of the *Fasti* delights in the frustration of certain over-sexed gods; not that they or their targets are married, but because they are old and/or lecherous. My first paper on *Fasti*, "Sexual comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: sources and motivation," *HSCP* 79 (1983) 185–216, sprang from this limited interest in the obvious similarities of several Ovidian narratives of sexual frustration: Faunus' assault upon Omphale (or rather Hercules cross-dressed), two variations of a tale in which Priapus tries to rape a sleeping nymph or the

goddess Vesta and is foiled by the untimely braying of Silenus' donkey, and finally Anna Perenna's frustration of Mars' attempt on the virgin Minerva by substituting her own aged body under the blanket—the same false-bride trick used to foil the lecherous Lysidamus of Plautus' *Casina*. There was also the undoubted attraction of the purely non-verbal mime settings, and the likelihood that Ovid was in fact taking over traditional Roman (panto-) mime.

Serious Roman poetry changed radically with Catullus, notably his translation of the vow of Berenice's lock from Callimachus' *Aitia*. From this time poets adapted the courtier language and values of Alexandria, and even Virgil's *Eclogues* allude freely to the astronomer Conon and invoke Apollo to justify their turning away from *reges et proelia* to a more fitting, lean and elegant poetry. There was already an abundance of contemporary studies of Augustan Callimacheanism from Wimmel's *Kallimachos in Rom* to the scholarship of Richard Thomas, and I was interested in the *Fasti* not for its powerful adaptation of Callimachean divine interlocutors (on which see John F. Miller, "Ovid's divine Interlocutors in the *Fasti*," *Studies Deroux III*, 1983, 156–192, also "The *Fasti* and Hellenistic Didactic," *Arethusa* 25, 1992, 11–31) but for its reaction against Hellenizing features of Virgil, Propertius and Horace (the cult of Olympic victors in e.g. Hor. *Odes* 1.1 (cf. e.g. 4.3 *illum non labor Isthmicus / clarabit pugilem, non equus impiger / curru ducet Achaico / victorem*), in the proem to *Georgics* III, and in the programmatic opening poems of Propertius' third book of elegies. By the time of the Secular Games in 17 BCE the *Aeneid* had transformed Rome's origins into the world of Aeneas, shaped by its destiny to be the empire of his descendant. Scholars had come to realize how much Ovid was "Virgil's Best Reader" (I quote J. J. O'Hara's powerful paper on Ovidian rewriting of Virgilian etymologies, from *Classical Journal* 91 (1996) 255–76) and wrote his work around but not against, Virgil's epic and religious poetry; Ovid embraced the imaginative power of *Aeneid* VIII, but he singled out and developed Virgil's hints of an earlier Italic world: *haec nemora indigenae fauni nymphaeque tenebant / gensque virum truncis et duro robore nata* (8.315–6) to build up in *Fasti* a site of Rome inhabited from its beginning by Janus (his most eloquent divine interlocutor) and Saturn, a world to which not Aeneas but Evander came in flight from primitive Arcadia. Ovid filled the shores of Latium with friendly rivers and families of prophetic and protective nymphs, and represented Rome's earliest history as a sequence of refugee colonizers from east to west; Hercules and his Argive followers (*Fasti* 1 and 5 (*the Argei*)) also Ino in *Fasti*

6, Diomedes, Odysseus, Halaesus, Antenor, even Solymus, companion of Aeneas and founder of Sulmona: they would be followed by gods, by Cybele (*Fasti* 4) and Aesculapius (*Met.* 15). The world of the *Fasti* was also home to a new calendar of Augustan ceremonial, and a vigorous religious life especially for women. Hence papers on Evander as a counterweight to Aeneas (*Arethusa* 25, 1992), in a joint panel on "Reconstituting Ovid's *Fasti*," and a discussion of "Women's cults in Ovid's *Fasti*," now printed here, as part of G. Herbert-Brown's Bimillennial collection *Essays on Ovid's Fasti* (Oxford 2002). The paper "Ceres, Liber and Flora; Georgic and anti-Georgic elements in Ovid's *Fasti*," *PCPS* 39 (1992), like Eleanor Leach's pioneering study of Ovid's (subversive) reworking of *Georgics* in *Ars Amatoria* ("Georgic Imagery in the *Ars Amatoria*," *TAPA* 95 (1964) 142–154) examines Ovid's combative reaction against Virgil's proper reverence for Ceres and Liber in his exaltation of the pollination goddess, associated with hedonism and the uninhibited sexuality of the mimes at the spring festival of the *Floralia*. It is, after all, Flora whom Ovid begs to grant her his grace, using language close to Callimachus' request to the muses to smear their perfume on his poems: *floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aevo / sparge precor donis pectora nostra tuis* (*Fasti* 5.277–8).

Because my focus on *Fasti* was divided between the Cambridge commentary on book 4 and reviews of innovative and controversial monographs by Barchiesi, Herbert-Brown and Newlands, I have no separate studies to include here, and have omitted even the contextualizing discussion of Ovid's rededication to Germanicus and abortive second edition ("Ovid, Germanicus and the *Fasti*," first published in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar V* (1985) 243–282, since republished in *Oxford Readings in Ovid*, ed. Peter Knox).

Papers on *Fasti* not reprinted here include a review article on Barchiesi's *Il Poeta e il Principe* and Geraldine Herbert-Brown's historically oriented study *Ovid and the Fasti* which appeared in *Classical Philology* 91 (1995) 367–378, and the M. N. Tod Memorial Lecture "Rewriting and rereading the *Fasti*," printed in *Antichthon* 29 (1995) and in a separate gathering of several Tod Lectures.¹

1 I have not reprinted here a number of papers that arose from my teaching of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, but mention them for the record. First "Ovid's Ceyx and Alcyone: the metamorphosis of a myth," *Phoenix* 33 (1979) 330–345, provoked by Ovid's mysterious invention of Morpheus' specialist team of dream imitators, and a complementary paper on other shape-shifters in *Metamorphoses*, "Sunt quibus in plures ius est transire figuras," *Classical World* 87 (1993) 23–36.

4. Passion and Civil War in Roman Tragedy and Epic: Seneca, Lucan and Statius

Seneca did not write epic, but he was influenced by it, especially by Ovid's Trojan narrative in *Metamorphoses* 13, and in turn exercised his own influence upon later epic. Two of my earlier publications are included here because they trace the influence of Greek tragedy from Euripides' *Andromache*, where the captive Andromache fights to save the child Molossus she has borne to Neoptolemus, just as she fought in vain to defend Astyanax. I tried to convey this overlap between the two episodes in "Andromache's Child in Euripides and Seneca," 267–80 in *Essays Presented to D. J. Conacher* (Calgary 1986). But work on Seneca's *Trojan Women* and its two Euripidean models (*Troades*, *Hecabe*) had also led me to examine the same type of scene in Statius' *Achilleid* ("Statius' Achilles and his Trojan model," *Classical Quarterly* 29 (1979) 457–620) where Thetis' protective action echoes Andromache's desperate attempt to save Astyanax in her highly developed confrontation with Ulysses that forms the central crisis of Seneca's *Troades*. We have here two Greek and two Roman versions of one highly pathetic situation.

Civil war began at Thebes, and the earliest full-scale Latin representation of Greek familial and civil conflict is Seneca's unfinished tragedy *Phoenissae*, almost certainly composed just before the enforced deaths of Seneca and Lucan, and after Lucan set out to write his (unfinished) epic of Roman civil war. This text ought to be a key to Roman understanding of the passions or anger and jealousy that lead to hatred between brothers in the family and rivals in a closed political society. Instead I found it profoundly disappointing. Examining this text, with no overlap of action or roles between its two groups of scenes, in "Incest and fratricide in Seneca's *Phoenissae*" (*'Seneca tragicus': Ramus Essays in Senecan drama*, Victoria, Australia 1983) I could see why Seneca had left his drama unfinished. The opening scenes of over three hundred lines show only the self-recrimination of the exiled Oedipus, and his inability

Keeping in mind the limited range of dramatic roles available to women, I examined women as mourners in two papers: "The Role of Lament in the growth and death of Roman Epic," 221–235 in *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World*, ed. M. H. Beissinger, Berkeley 1999, and "Mater Dolorosa," a study of Ovid's grieving mothers from Clymene to Hecuba and Aurora in *Hermathena* 77–78 (2003–2004).

to shape any constructive action out of his daughter Antigone's faithful support. Only when the focus changes to Jocasta with the second group of scenes is there scope for any kind of action. Miraculously transported onto the battlefield she vainly attempts to dissuade Polynices and his invading army from attacking his own city: echoing the famous parallel scene from Euripides' *Phoenissae*, she argues with him over the potential of exile for hope as well as despair, but leaves the issue unresolved for a far shorter and more futile attempt to win over Eteocles. It adds to the sense of futility that there is no direct contact between the brothers, although they appear to share the same scene with their mother. Opelt suggested that Seneca would have ended with a messenger narrative of the brothers' mutual murder and their mother's suicide. We can only say that Seneca did not see his way to drive the tragedy on to its end. The only new element comes in a series of hints that Seneca saw the precedent of incest as a threat as renewable like the reiteration of kin-murder, and my paper explored this and other related texts as evidence for fear of woman as an incitement to evil.

The fratricidal Theban war would provide Statius with a fertile source of dramatic narrative, as would the lesser Theban paradigm of the Spartoi sown by Cadmus. In Ovid's two versions of the Spartoi, the survivors of the Theban dragon's teeth resist Cadmus' attempt to restore peace, and themselves beget further murderous generations, whereas Medea's dragon men turn on each other and self-destruct. As I show in *Discordia Fratrum* forthcoming in a collection of *Civil War* papers (Oxford 2010) Lucan finds no room for this precedent in his *Civil War* except the paradoxical loving-fratricide of the desperate Caesarian Volteius and his men

Sic semine Cadmi
Emicuit Dircaea cohors ceciditque suorum
Volneribus, dirum Thebanis fratribus omen;
Phasidos et campus insomni dente create
Terrigenae missa magicis e cantibus ira
Cognato tantos inplerunt sanguine sulcos. (4.549–55)

If we look to Lucan's *Civil War* for a reflection of either Homeric epic or any other literary inheritance from Greek epic or tragedy this quickly proves misleading. When the known world is torn apart by matching forces, and combat is polarized as the hatred of rival commanders, or the massed and anonymous conflict of armies, there is little opportunity for grounding the narrative in myth or history, or for conscious opposition of Greek and Roman traditions. It is perhaps significant that two

Greek communities offer models of loyalty: the Massilians of book 3, who offer shelter and arbitration between the warring commanders, and the people of Mytilene on Lesbos who give shelter to Pompey's Cornelia (book 8) and are prepared to risk their community for him even after Pharsalus. Caesar himself will go (unhistorically) to Troy, and learn nothing from the ruins he tramples except the disappearance of the heroic past.

Yet Lucan's civil war has a greater dimension than the personal conflicts of the leaders and the Achillean anger of Caesar. From the beginning Lucan puts in parallel the shattering of Rome's empire and of the universe itself (1.79–80 *totaque discors/ machina divolsi turbabit foedera mundi*). He sees beyond the vicious selfishness of Roman leaders and Roman people (1.158–159 *hae ducibus causae: suberant sed publica belli / semina quae populos semper mersere potentes*.) This polarization persists as Romans fear and lament the outbreak of war, and is fully expressed in the only episode of total civil war in Lucan's poem; the horrified reminiscences of massacre and corpse violation by the old Survivor of Marius' assault and Sulla's tyranny. These hundred lines come as near to the Roman image of civil war as the dreadful carnage depicted by Tacitus in the "year of the Four Emperors" which Lucan would not live to see. Lucan creates his contrast of good and evil out of the quiet nocturnal consultation of Brutus and Cato. Both speakers use the Cosmos as their model for the wise man's soul, but where Brutus advocates disgusted abstention, Cato argues for an obligation to participate, but participate as a martyr, a model of *devotio* to draw away the missiles of both warring armies (2.306–319). This second book sees no actual confrontation (beyond the personal interview of Caesar and Domitius (2.528–595). Only with Pompey's flight from Brundisium as he sails on the open sea at the opening of book 3 is the war free to spread, as it will spread through Gaul (book 3) and Spain (book 4) and Illyria and Africa (book 4) to Epirus and Thessaly (books 5 and 6, book 7) and the Aegean, to Libya (book 9) and Egypt (9.1004–1108, until the text breaks off). Each of these changes of setting is associated with its own microclimate of storms and floods.

Through his unrelenting circumnavigation of the Mediterranean Caesar is accompanied by the disruption of earth and sea and sky: typical is the cloudburst that follows frozen winter in the Spanish campaign:

timbers from the untouched barbarian grove for his new fleet. It is also characteristic of Lucan to delight in Caesar's engineering: the harbour moles at Brundisium (2.660–679), the long rampart of investment at Massilia (3.381–387, 394–398) and his ambitious plans to expand his area of control in Epirus (6.32–43) hyperbolically compared with Babylon or the valley around Tigris and Orontes.

In any episode where Caesar speaks, he will dominate by sheer force of passion, but the power of his anger at e.g. 2.493 (*calida proclamat ab ira*) is matched by that of the undistinguished Domitius (2.521 *premit ille graves interritus iras*) and even the supposedly self-controlled Stoic Cato (9.509 *concitus ira*). Anger is characteristic of Caesar and part of his power, but anger is also fundamental to Lucan's own creativity. Romans were ambivalent about this manly passion, recognizing its contribution to authority, and Cicero and Seneca both, while denouncing anger as a destructive and distorting passion in *Tusculans* 4 and the three books of *De Ira*, clearly understand its role as a tool in the world of power. Lucan himself both acknowledges divine anger against Rome (2.86–88 and 4.805–9) and voices increasing anger with the gods (and their surrogate Fortune) over the death of the honourable Pompey. Lucan's stance allows for Rome's suffering in the civil war to be the consequences of an earlier sin (cf. the death of Remus, 1.82–97) but cannot forgive the gods for the outcome. It was in hope of defining Lucan's ideology and refuting the myth of Lucan's omission of the gods that I composed "The Angry Poet and the Angry Gods: Problems of Theodicy in Lucan's Epic of Defeat," reprinted here from *Ancient Anger*, Yale Classical Studies, Vol. 31, ed. S. M. Braund and G. R. Most, Cambridge 2003.

Lucan's ten books coincide in content with Caesar's own *Civil War*, and scholars such as Michel Rambaud and more recently Jamie Masters (*Lucan and the Poetry of Civil War*, Cambridge 1992) have argued that Lucan used Caesar as his model: The incentive to pay attention to the text which has survived is enormous, but the case for dependence on Livy's eight lost Civil War books (based only on the existing *Periochae*, remains strong. Moving from the two years covered by Lucan's empire-wide narrative to Statius' saga of the Theban expedition is almost like comparing apples and oranges: there is so vast a difference between Lucan's near-contemporary melodrama and Statius' essentially Homeric conflict articulated by its multiple leaders and multiple layers of supernatural causation, between Lucan's geographical and scientific curiosity and the dazzling local myths and sites of Statius *Thebaid* (es-

pecially in the Teichoskopia of 7.259 ff.). Yet I probably derived much of my enjoyment of Statius from his affinities with Lucan and the drastic scenes of evil triumphant relished by both authors. I have reprinted here a paper that aimed to disentangle the different levels of causality invoked by Statius, starting with the poet's own analysis of the brothers' emotions: "Envy and fear the begetter of hate': Statius' *Thebaid* and the genesis of hatred," 185–212 from *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, ed. S. M. Braund and C. J. Gill (Cambridge 1997). The poet has begun his action with the blind Oedipus' curse on his sons, in the savage daylight of his spirit with the Furies already in his heart: *saeva dies animi, scelerumque in pectore Dirae* (1.51).

Tisiphone is the emotion in Oedipus' heart, but she is also the fiend outside him, addressed as if he were her votary, and a physical presence, stationed at Cocytus waiting to emerge in the upper world and give the signal that galvanizes the landscape from Sparta to Thessaly (like Allecto in *Aeneid* VII). It is her presence perched on Cadmus' citadel that infects the palace (there are echoes here of Seneca's *Thyestes*) and fills the brothers with emotions, madness and envy and fear leading to the love of domination and *sociisque comes Discordia regnis* (125–30); now Statius turns directly to the brothers and the price they have paid to occupy Oedipus' throne. From here the poet passes through the protests of a citizen chorus to the higher level of Jupiter, independently summoning his council of gods in anger at the sins of mankind; like the petulant autocrat of *Metamorphoses*, he is weary of his unruly subjects as he reports Oedipus' murder and incest which he has atoned for by his rejection of daylight (236–8). But now, as if Jupiter was unaware of Tisiphone's actions, he confirms that he will himself fulfil Oedipus' curse and destroy his race, using Adrastus' forthcoming marriage union to punish both Thebes and Argos; Adrastus (like Phaedra or Hippolytus) is an innocent tool of divine revenge but Jupiter's long memory can make a pretext of his ancestor Tantalus' offences. It has taken so much divine motivation to bring Polynices and the fugitive murderer Tydeus through the nocturnal storms to Adrastus' unoffending porch.

I have recapitulated here the many motivations of this civil war that will reach so far beyond the original tormented family. The epic defies the readers' control, and it seems right even in this introduction to attempt a mapping of its interwoven threads, as it is constantly drawn forward by different agents, and re-set in new directions by gods above and below, though the lesser Olympians (Mars, Venus, Bacchus) are more inhibited (and less convincing) than the Furies. Statius has calculated a

slow build-up for the Argive expedition through Tydeus' failed embassy and the deferral of the drought at Lerna and tragic death of the child Opheltes with its separate closure in the book-length ceremonial games of book 6. A morally important element in this narrative is provided by the seer Amphiaraus, whose victimization by fate prompted me to write "Amphiaraus or the perils of prophecy," in *Flavian Poetry*, ed. R. Nauta, H.-J. Van Dam and J. Smolenaars, (Leiden: Brill, 2005.) In Amphiaraus Statius has formed a fully Roman augur fully understanding the ominous message of the bird flights (3.546–551 and 566–572). In his resistance to the evil of warfare Amphiaraus plays the role of Latinus, until his refusal to admit the omens is denounced and overridden by a jeering Capaneus. It is Amphiaraus who will be first to die once Tisiphone has renewed battle frenzy in both camps and the battle is joined (7.690–823). It is his descent into Hades that provokes Dis himself to send out Tisiphone to produce a new level of abomination that will amaze her fellow Furies and start a program which readers can recognize as the cannibal death of Tydeus and Creon's refusal of burial to the dead, and of Capaneus as a vehicle of Dis' revenge on Jupiter as he tries to storm Olympus with thunderbolts (8.65–77). After books 8–10 have covered the deaths of Tydeus, Hippomedon, Parthenopaeus, and Capaneus, and Theban Menoeceus has sacrificed his life for Thebes in vain, comes the climactic book 11. Just as Jupiter in *Aeneid* XII had to summon up a new level of evil spirit, the Dirae attendant on his throne, to bring down Turnus, so now Tisiphone appeals for the help of Megæra to conduct her war and together they brood as outriders over the chariots of the brothers. But first the Furies must incite all the human agents, adding Creon bereaved by the sacrifice of his son, while on the side of mercy Jocasta and Antigone desperately intervene, resolved to deter the brothers from their duel, but find their human piety outweighed by the savage incitements of the Erinyes (11.382–402). When the Olympian wargods (Virtus, Bellona, Mars and Gorgon-bearing Athena) withdraw from the horror of this human hatred, the Stygian sisters dominate the field and the natural arena around the brothers, deserted by both gods and men, is filled with an audience of Theban ghosts. Adrastus too cannot endure and deserts his son-in-law, while the pale and pathetic spirit of Pietas makes the last attempt to resist the Furies. Scorned by Tisiphone she veils her eyes and flees to protest at the knees of Jupiter himself (11.496). The interweaving of world and underworld will end only with the mutual murder of the brothers whose dead souls will now pollute Hades itself. The poet makes a

vain appeal for this to be an end, and it seems a sign of an ending that Oedipus himself returns to the city. Led by Antigone to the corpses, he tries to touch their faces, and confesses to his first return of piety (605; Piety herself had fled at 496). After the ferocious clashing of hatred and repudiation of humanity the epic has returned to its point of departure.

Statius showed himself capable of more realistic, even humorous poetry, in his unfinished *Achilleid*, which has recently provoked a flowering of critical analysis, and in his personal *Silvae*. I hope to continue to interpret his poetry, but have brought this collection to a close with a simpler piece “*Chironis exemplum*: on teachers and surrogate fathers in *Achilleid* and *Silvae*,” 59–70 from *Hermathena* 1999. (I have omitted another short paper which takes into account the mature Achilles’ reminiscences of Chiron’s syllabus for heroes, “Chiron, the Best of Teachers,” 111–122 in *Literature, Art, History: Studies in Classical Antiquity in honour of W. J. Henderson*, ed. A. F. Basson and W. J. Dominik.) Chiron united the roles of parent and teacher, which Statius experienced as a devoted son (*Silvae* 5.3) and would-be adoptive father (5.5) and can serve as an archetype for both the values of poetry and of loving education for so many students of the Classics.

The author gratefully acknowledges the generous subsidy provided from the David Magie Fund by the Department of Classics, Princeton University. She would also like to thank most warmly Christine Ehle, her expert copy editor, and the students who came to her aid, Ana Troisi and Francesca Patterson of Kings College London, and Megan Campbell and Laura Mawhinnie of the University of Toronto.

Books Published

1. *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*: Phoenix, Suppl. 10, Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1972.
2. *Seneca's Troades: a Literary Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1982.
reviewed Griffin, *TLS* Nov 1983, Kennedy, *CW* Nov 1983, Calder III, *AJP* 1983, Douglas, *CR* 35.1 (1985), Billerbeck, *Phoenix* 38 (1984), review article: Fitch, *Classical Views* 29 (1985) 435–453.
3. *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays presented to D. J. Conacher*, Calgary: Calgary University Press 1986. Co-edited with M. Cropp, S. J. Scully.
4. *Erasmus: Literary and Educational Writings*. (Collected Works of Erasmus, Vol. 29). Co-edited with Erika Rummel, Toronto 1989; Essay “Erasmus and the Latin Classics,” annotated translation of *Lingua*.
5. *A Commentary on Lucan 'De Bello Civili Book 2'*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge 1992.
6. *Women in the Classical World: Image and Text*. Co-authored with Helena Foley, N. B. Kampen, S. J. Pomeroy, H. A. Shapiro, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 1994, Paperback 1995.
7. *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1996, Paperback 1998, in German translation, Stuttgart: Metzler 1998.
8. *A Commentary on Ovid 'Fasti book 4'*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998.
9. Editor and contributor: *Caesar Against Liberty? Perspectives on His Autocracy, Papers of Langford Latin Seminar 11*, FSU Tallahassee, Cambridge: Cairns 2003.
10. *An Introduction to Ovid's 'Metamorphoses'*, Oxford Approaches to Classical Literature, 2004.
11. *The Roman World of Cicero's 'De Oratore'*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004.
12. *Julia Augusti: the Emperor's Daughter*, Routledge 2006.
13. *Latin poets and Italian Gods* (The 2004 Robson Lectures.) Toronto: University of Toronto Press 2009.
14. *Seneca: Selected Letters*. (Oxford World Classics.) Oxford: Oxford University Press 2010.

I apologize to readers both for omitting papers they may have wanted to read, and for any perversities or weaknesses of argument in the papers that I have included.

I

Comedy and Sexuality

1. Act 4 of the *Menaechmi*: Plautus and His Original

The *Menaechmi* is perhaps the most satisfying among all the plays of Plautus in the balance and symmetry of its structure. There is not only the symmetry of alternation between the resident, Epidamnian Menaechmus, and his brother, the Stranger from Syracuse—that is, a balanced grouping of scenes for each hero in turn—but there is symmetry on a smaller scale; for example, the Sicilian Menaechmus in Act 2, scene 2, first accuses the cook Cylindrus of madness and offers to pay for an expiatory sacrifice, but soon it is Cylindrus' turn to suggest that Menaechmus must be mad and needs to make expiation. Later in the arbitration scene, Act 5, scene 2, where the old man is summoned by his daughter to rebuke her husband Menaechmus (it is in fact the other Menaechmus who is involved in this scene), he addresses himself in turn with equal sympathy and the same phraseology first to the wife (777) then to the supposed husband (810). The same symmetry is achieved in the final recognition scene by giving the slave Messenio the quite unnecessary function of negotiator and interpreter between his master and the other Menaechmus, dividing his attention more or less alternately between them.

Naturally the credit for this neat and well-balanced structure must go in the first place to the author of the Greek original, whether the Sicilian Posidippus or an unknown. The Greek play must have been mechanically superb. Yet some credit is also due to Plautus for respecting and preserving this symmetry. For all his vitality, and the exuberant verbal humour and ornament which he has undoubtedly added to the original, Plautus seems to have kept the structure and proportions of the play without distortion. No Plautine scholar has had reason to suggest that the *Menaechmi* contains any modifications of the Greek plot or any additional scenes, however short. Within the scenes, too, Plautus generally seems to have abstained from digressions or enlargements of favourite roles, such as that of parasite or slave, at the expense of a balanced structure.

There is however, one scene whose construction in our texts appears awkward and misshapen. In an article in *Rheinisches Museum* 37 (1882) 531–47, investigating textual problems arising in the *Menaechmi*, O. Ribbeck gave special attention to Act 4, scene 2—the confrontation of the Epidamnian Menaechmus by his treacherous parasite and vengeful wife. Ribbeck's treatment of this scene is based on Ritschl's text; it is in many respects too drastic, proposing wholesale transpositions of lines and reallocations of speeches, and rejecting (R) 617 to 624 (611 to 619 in our texts) as a post-Plautine interpolation. Indeed the text he proposes (*op. cit.*, 543) makes the scene barely recognizable as the one that Leo and Lindsay were able to accept without significant alteration of the traditional text. At the same time Ribbeck dealt only with the first part of the dialogue (604–35), but the later dialogue, while it is simpler to follow, seems to contain a great deal of Plautine innovation which Ribbeck was not concerned to identify. As far as I know there has been no separate discussion of the scene since Ribbeck's article, and I should like to make a fresh attempt to analyse it.

In order to distinguish the results of Plautus' treatment, it will not be sufficient to consider the negative question of lines which on grounds of content or technique could not have occurred in the original. Where a scene appears to have been as freely handled as this one, attempts to reach a reconstruction of the original by a process of purification and subtraction must be open to many doubts. I have preferred to adopt a more positive approach to Plautus' workmanship. A comparative study of features common to similar scenes of other plays suggests that Plautus contributes more than mere wisecracks and digressions to his originals; I hope to illustrate from this parallel material how the whole cast of the dialogue in large sections of this scene has been shaped independently by Plautus. Once such a picture of Plautine elements has been established, it will complement the general reconstruction of the scene in the Greek original which I shall try to deduce from the requirements of the action.

First, let us put the scene in its context. In the first act, the Epidamnian Menaechmus leaves his house after a quarrel with his wife; unknown to her he has taken one of her mantles to give to his mistress, Erotium. He promises the parasite Peniculus that they will share a feast at Erotium's house, and together they visit her and arrange a feast for later that day. Patron and parasite go off to the market place, leaving the mantle behind. Act 2 introduces the twin Menaechmus from Syracuse, who is mistaken by both Erotium and her cook for

his brother and welcomed in to enjoy the feast. But his behaviour in Act 3 brings retribution for his married brother; for as the Syracusan Menaechmus emerges triumphant from the party, the parasite, who has lost his patron in the crowd, takes him for his married brother and accuses him of enjoying the feast without him. When Menaechmus naturally does not recognize him and denies the charge, Peniculus in revenge goes to tell his patron's wife the whole story of the stolen mantle. The result is that in Act 4 the wife, infuriated, and backed by the parasite, comes into the street to tackle her errant husband at the very moment when he is at last returning from the market place after a frustrating delay.

Scene 2 brings the moment of confrontation, the climax when the reproachful wife, by openly accusing Menaechmus of the theft, forces him to make a confession and agree to restore the stolen goods; until they are returned, his own home is barred to him. In the short final scene (3) his attempt to recover the mantle from Erotium (who has already given it to his brother to have alterations made) makes his downfall complete. The anger of his wife and her barred doors are balanced by his mistress' fury: banned from both households through his brother's fault, Menaechmus is now *exclusissimus* (698).

There are several occasions in Plautus where an unfaithful husband is exposed and confronted by his angry wife: such scenes occur in the *Asinaria* (5.2), *Casina* (3.3), and *Mercator* (4.3 and 4), but the nearest to *Menaechmi*, Act 4, scene 2, in plot and in treatment is the finale of the *Asinaria* (5.2). Here too the parasite informs on a husband (not his own patron) and leads the wife to the scene of the crime. The beginning of this scene, although more detailed, is very close to *Menaechmi*, Act 4, scene 1. Both start in mid-dialogue, with the wife's indignation at what she has already been told. There are obvious verbal coincidences: *Men.* 562: "manufesto faxo iam opprimes: sequere hac modo" = *As.* 876: "sequere hac me modo, iam faxo ipsum hominem manufesto opprimas"; *Men.* 570: "ex insidiis aucupa" = *As.* 881: "aucupemus ex insidiis clanculum quam rem gerant" (in which *aucupari* is a purely Roman metaphor); there are also less obvious similarities. Compare *Men.* 568–69: "quid ego nunc cum illoc agam? / :: idem quod semper: male habeas ..." with *As.* 869–70: "ne <ego> illum ecastor miserum habebo. : : ego istuc scio, / ita fore illi dum quidem cum illo nupta eris."

Apart from the use of *aucupari*, and possibly *Men.* 568–69, there is nothing in *Menaechmi*, Act 4, scene 1, which need suggest any Plautine deviation from the original. On the other hand the theme of the stolen

palla, essential in the *Menaechmi*, occurs incidentally at *As.* 884–85, “egon ut non domo uxori meae / surrupiam in deliciis pallam quam habet, atque ad te deferam,” and forms a climax to the wife’s accusations at 929. This might suggest a Plautine reminiscence, imported from the *Menaechmi*, but is as likely to be a classic form of marital infidelity occurring independently in the Greek original of the *Asinaria*.

Scene 2 opens with Menaechmus’ song of frustration. He has been delayed by a client whom he had to defend in a lawsuit. The song falls into three parts: a general criticism of the folly of patrons and villainy of clients (571–87); a detailed account of his recent experiences with this particular client (588–95); and a short tailpiece summarising his misfortunes and hopes. The subject matter, depending on the patron–client relationship, and displaying many special features of Roman law, is as Plautine as the polymetry. Here the *Casina* (3.3) provides a simpler treatment of the same theme. E. Fraenkel, in *Elementi Plautini* (Florence 1960 152–53), has traced the theme of the lover delayed on the way to a vital rendezvous through *Casina*, Act 3, scene 3, and Terence’s *Eunuchus*, Act 2, scene 3, to Diphilus and Menander, and uses the much shorter *Casina* monologue to illustrate what is likely to have stood in the *Menaechmi* original.

Casina 563–73 gives only three lines to generalisation, four to the speaker’s own misfortune, and four to a proposed reform of the social system—a pattern which we meet elsewhere in Plautus, and (with a little modification) in an earlier scene of the *Menaechmi* itself, the monologue of Peniculus, frustrated of his appointment with dinner in Act 3, scene 3. These parallels led Fraenkel to suggest that the whole of Menaechmus’ monologue was developed from a few lines in the Greek play; he shows that whereas 570–95 represent a large free-ranging expansion, with new Roman material, the simplicity of 595a–601 and their affinity with *Casina* 566–69 suggest a direct paraphrase of the original.

Yet the large scale of this Plautine expansion causes no dramatic absurdity. The eavesdroppers must be silent for some thirty lines instead of at most a dozen in the original, but they can either be represented as unable to hear—since Menaechmus has a considerable length of stage to cross before reaching the nearer house—or allowed to hear the whole song: there is nothing in the first two sections to provoke them to interrupt or challenge him. It is sufficient for the action of the scene that

Menaechmus' wife should hear the incriminating admissions of 598–601.¹

At 602, wife and parasite exchange comment unheard by Menaechmus, who is making for the house of Erotium, beyond his own, and near the harbour end of the stage. Line 603, “hinc intro abeam, ubi mi bene sit,” makes it clear that he has reached her house: the eavesdroppers in the doorway of his own home (or possibly an *angiportum*²) must have to call him back. The first outcry of his wife (604), “ne illam ecastor faenerato apstulisti,” goes unanswered. Menaechmus has either not heard, or decided not to hear, the reference to the mantle (*illam* = *palla quam dedi*, 600). The threat itself is a type found in the *Asinaria* (5.2) at 896–97 “ne tu istuc cum malo magno tuo / dixisti in me,” 902, “ne illa escastor faenerato funditat,” and again at 909, or more briefly at *Cas.* 576, “audivi ecastor cum malo magno tuo,” and is clearly a cliché in such scenes. However the strong coincidence of the word *faenerato* (occurring only in these two related scenes) suggests that Plautus was inspired by his own work, as well as the text of the original. If anything, *As.* 902, *faenerato funditat*, with its alliteration and the appropriately spendthrift verb, is more successful than *Men.* 604 but it would be dangerous to use such a question of taste in support of any argument for the priority of either play.

When the wife renews her abuse (605) Menaechmus turns around to answer her, but without any formal greeting; like Demaenetus in *Asinaria*, Act 5, scene 2, he is too overwhelmed by shock. Her indignant *men rogas?* is answered by a more flippant *uin hunc rogem?*, a form of joke which recurs at 640: “me rogas? :: pol haud rogem te, si sciam.” The retort is hardly good enough to justify such repetition and is one of several motifs duplicated in this scene. If Menaechmus' flippancy is slightly surprising in itself, it is equally incongruous with the type of wheedling which would justify 607, *aufer hinc palpationes*; this comes unprepared and is itself unanswered—a difficulty which could easily be overcome in action but perhaps is a sign of careless writing. Line 607 is in fact an anticipation of 626–28, “ME. dic, mea uxor

1 Even the references to his mistress and the proposed party need not be regarded as incriminating, since Menaechmus had already threatened in Act 1, scene 1, 124 ff., to hold this party, and since it is clearly the theft of the mantle which obsesses his wife throughout Act 4 (cf. 560–61) and is the climax of her accusations in Act 5, scene 2 (803–4).

2 An *angiportum* seems to be implied by Messenio's comment in 1056–57.

quid tibi aegre est? PE. bellus blanditur tibi. / ME. potin ut mihi molestus ne sis? num te appello? MA. aufer manum. / PE. sic datur," where the feigned caress is properly introduced and meets with a proper rebuff, brought out by *sic datur*, "that's the way to treat him." This is a pattern we can illustrate from *Cas.* 228–30: "blande haec mihi mala res appellanda est. / uxor mea meaque amoenitas, quid tu agis? : : abi atque apstine manum. / : : heia, mea Iuno, non decet esse te tam tristem tuo Iovi." A further motivation for the Plautine anticipation at 607 may be the word *palpationes*, here only in Plautus, but suggested by the occurrence of the comic word *palpator* earlier in this same play (260; cf. *Rud.* 126).

Lines 609–10 present a more serious problem, the climax of the whole scene is the moment when the wife finally declares the theft of the mantle to Menaechmus' face. This moment of confrontation clearly comes at 642–45, marked by a speech of special dignity and rhetoric from the wife. Surely if the mantle is mentioned prematurely, the denunciation is an absurd anticlimax. There is no sign that Menaechmus hears his wife's outcry at 604, but in 609–10, "MA. pallam—ME. pallam? MA. quidam pallam—PE. quid paues? / ME. nil equidem pauco. PE. nisi unum: palla pallorem incutit," Menaechmus must not only hear but tremble. The clue to these lines lies in the wordplay of 610, *palla pallorem incutit*, a Latin pun not possible in the original. For the sake of this pun, Plautus anticipates the grand moment of denunciation and then has to drop the subject. He does this, as so often, by repeating an earlier phrase, *perge tu* (607), and resuming in 611, *perge in uirum*.³ But 611 does not only borrow an earlier phrase, "at tu ne clam me comesses prandium" is another anticipation. When this next appears, at 628, "properato absente me comesse prandium," it is very naturally answered by Menaechmus with indignant protest. It should have provoked the protest at 611, but it is ignored. Plautus has merely used the motif in advance as a means of leaving an awkward subject.

ME. non taces? PE. non hercle uero taceo. nutat, ne loquar.

ME. non hercle egoquidem usquam quicquam nuto neque nicto tibi.

MA. ne ego ecastor mulier misera. ME. qui tu misera es? Mi expedi.

PE. nihil hoc confidentius: quin quae uides ea pernegat.

ME. per Iouem deosque omnis adiuro, uxor, (satin hoc est tibi?) / me isti non nutasse.

PE. credit iam tibi de "isti": illuc redi.

3 Cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 105 ff., 137.

ME. quo ego redeam? PE. equidem ad phrygionem censeo; et pallam refer.
 ME. quae istaec palla est? PE. taceo iam, quando haec rem non meminit
 suam (612–19).

This is a closely connected section weaving together two themes: the grimaces of Menaechmus at the parasite and (again) the stolen mantle.

Line 614 has distressed many scholars because it seems unrelated to its context, and Kiessling's proposal to transpose 614 after 619 as an introduction to the new theme of 620, *num quis seruorum deliquit*, is very attractive. But 614 would be an interruption after 619, as it is now; it is an example of what can happen in Plautus when one party in a three-man scene has been driven out of the dialogue by the bickering of the other two. A similar interruption occurs in *Mercator*, Act 4, scene 4: the wife, neglected for seven lines in the altercation between husband and cook, has to recall her presence with the cry, *heu miserae mihi* (770), and is again ignored for fourteen lines. Nor is this confined to women. In *Curculio*, Act 5, scene 2, Phaedromus, distracted from the serious action by the bickering of the girl and the parasite and having been ignored for seven lines, bursts out in 608, *enim uero irascor!*, is answered, and again ousted from the dialogue by a new disturbance. So here Plautus restores the wife to the conversation with an exclamation of distress, but allows her to fade away as new jokes suggest themselves.

It is Menaechmus' oath in 616 which diverts the dialogue away from her. This is an oath of the greatest conceivable force, used in an incredibly trivial context and repeated verbatim in this same scene at 655. But in 655 Menaechmus has a serious offence to cover up, and his perjury (equal on both occasions) is justified by his extremity. There, such an oath is in place, as it is in *Merc.* 760: "CO. nemp̄e uxor rurist tua, quam dudum dixeras / te odisse aequē atque anguis ... :: ita me amabit Iuppiter, / uxor, ut ego illud numquam dixi" (760–63). At 616 it merely serves to introduce the wordplay which enables Peniculus to return to the question of the stolen mantle. This wordplay is on *isti* = *istic*, "over there,"⁴ and *illuc redi*, "get back there," used in two senses—physically of returning to the embroiderer's, and verbally of returning to the point, the previous point in the dialogue (610–11). Such a pun would not be possible in Greek, and interrupts the main conflict, leaving the wife speechless for three lines. Menaechmus' bold query, *quae istaec palla est* (619), does not square with his sup-

4 For *isti* = adverbial *istic* here; cf. *Ep.* 721, and e.g., *Cap.* 60 (with Lindsay's note), 94, 278, etc., where *illi* is used for *illic*.

posed terror in 610, and the whole passage fades into futility, leaving 620 to introduce a new theme. These features of 616–19 lend some plausibility to Kiessling's proposal, for the lines are most unlikely to have occurred in the original in any form, whereas our dialogue would pass neatly from 614 to 620 and would have been quite possible in the Greek play.

The new topic in 620, trouble with the servants, is one which features briefly in *Mercator*, Act 4, scene 3, 716, *num quid delinquent rustici?*, and 718, *quid autem urbani deliquerunt?*, a natural theme in either a Greek or Roman context. But the refrain with variations, *nugas agis ... nugas agis ... nugas agis ... nunc tu non nugas agis ... em rusum nunc nugas agis*, is a favourite device in Plautus. The refrain *surge amator, i domum* in the *Asinaria* finale (921–25) is without variations, but we may compare *Mo.* 975–79, *aiio ... aiio ... aiio ... non aiio ... neque istuc aiio*, or the supreme example in *Rud.* 1270–78, in which eleven replies of *censeo* (with comment) are followed by two frustrating negatives.

From 625 to 637 the dialogue runs easily. Menaechmus' attempts at blandishment are rejected; the parasite maliciously urges on the wife and taunts his former patron. His reference to the feast in 629–30 naturally drives Menaechmus into genuine denial. It is part of the comedy of the scene that he should be accused both of offences he has committed and those he has not. The false accusations give him confidence to deny those that are true and contribute to deny those that are true and contribute to the accumulation of bewilderment which he is to suffer from now on until the resolution of the plot in the finale. The pattern of his denials, “neque edepol ego prandi neque hodie huc intro tetuli pedem. / :: tun negas? :: nego hercle uero” (630–31) and “quin ut dudum diuorti aps te, redeo nunc demum domum” (635), recalls a passage in the central confrontation scene of the *Amphitruo*: “tun me heri aduenisse dicis? :: tun te abiisse hodie hinc negas? / nego enim vero, et me aduenire nunc primum aio ad te domum ... neque edepol dedi neque dixi” (758–62). Again, the similarity is natural in the context, and need not imply any Plautine reminiscence of his own earlier work.

With 637, *omnia hercle uxori dixi*, Peniculus has reached his trump card, but he has to play it twice; indeed the ensuing passage contains a much more serious repetition:

PE. omnia hercle uxori dixi. ME. quid dixisti? PE. nescio, eam ipsus roga. ME. quid hoc est, uxor? quidnam hic narravit tibi? quid id est? quid taces? quin dicis quid sit? MA. quasi tu nescias. palla mihi est domo surrupta. ME. palla surrupta est tibi? (639a) MA. me rogas? ME. pol haud rogem te, si

sciam. PE. o hominem malum, ut dissimulat! non potes celare: rem nouit probe. omnia hercle ego edictaui. ME. quid id est? MA. quando nil pudet neque uis tua voluntate ipse profiteri, audi atque ades. et quid tristis <sim> et quid hic mihi dixerit, faxo scias. palla mihi est domo surrupta. ME. palla surruptast mihi? [637–45]

Peniculus' remark in 637 and Menaechmus' feigned questions do bring on a crisis at 639a (the wife declares the theft of the mantle), but it collapses in the feeble witticisms of 640, "me rogas? : : pol haud rogem te si sciam," which are so reminiscent of 606, and Peniculus has to renew the attack (642). Again Menaechmus is blandly innocent, and his wife is goaded into her virtuoso speech—in a tragic tone marked by the doublets "*audi* atque *ades* (643) et *quid* tristis sim et *quid* hic mihi dixerit," and culminating in the identical phrase, "palla mi est domo surrupta."

What has happened? Lindsay's suggestion (639a in app. crit.) that 639a is a substitute verse designed to eliminate 640–45 must fail, since 639a could not conceivably be followed by 646. On the face of it 637–41 serve no purpose; the passage is mere patchwork. Not only in 637, *omnia hercle uxori dixi*, repeated in 642, but the parasite gets the same type of answer from Menaechmus, *quid dixisti* (637) = *quid id est* (642). Lines 638–40 recall 606, and 626, "dic mea uxor quid tibi aegre est"; (639) *quasi tu nescias* and (640–41) "o hominem malum, / ut dissimulate" repeat the themes of 608–9, "te scire oportet : : scit, sed dissimulat malus." But this patchwork can be parcelled, and *Mo.* 548–52 features the very same repetition as 637–42:

numquid dixisti de illo quod dixi tibi?
 : : dixi hercle uero omnia : : ei misero mihi metuo ne techinae meae perpetuo perierint.
 : : quid tute tecum? : : nihil enim, sed dic mihi dixtine quaeso? : : dixi inquam ordine omnia.

Here the motive for the repetition would seem to be line 550: the favourite idea of the slave's *techinae* (*doli*), a Greek word used as only Plautus would use it, in glorification of slave cunning. *Dixi omni* must be repeated to renew the dialogue, and it is a phrase which in most contexts could naturally be repeated for emphasis. On the other hand 639a, "*palla mihi est domo surrupta*," is unpardonable when it forestalls the proper climax of 645. Leo excises it as an interpolation, designed to fill a lacuna arising after 638.⁵ Whatever the cause, the line is surely not Plautine.

5 On the lacuna, cf. Ribbeck, *op. cit.*, 540. Without 639a *quasi tu nescias* and *me*

Plautus' love of the immediate joke often causes inconsequences of dialogue and repetitions at the expense of the action; but there is no humour at any level to be derived from 639a, and its effect on what follows is disastrous. Without 639a, our scene is repetitious, but reasonably effective until 645. But Menaechmus does not respond to the gravity of the situation, and the level returns to near farce. Echoing his wife's *mihi ... surrupta*, he provides Peniculus with the excuse for a witticism; "if it had been stolen from you it would not be safe (at the embroiderer's)".⁶ Menaechmus turns away from him, and with the resumptive *sed tu quid ais* returns to his wife, giving her a cue for her second denunciation (the third in the text of our MSS).

This phrase, *sed ... quid ais*, is frequently used by Plautus to return to the main course of a dialogue after one of his digressions. A typical instance is *Merc.* 487–92. Eutychus and Charinus want to buy a slave girl. The question is one of money. *Unde erit?* (487) is answered by a Plautine mythological extravagance, "Anchillem orabo aurum ut mihi det Hector qui expensus fuit," and further jokes; then Eutychus returns to the subject, "iam tace; / sed quid ais? unde erit argentum quod des?" Other, larger digressions are resumed with *sed quid ais* at *Am.* 620, *Cas.* 252, *Ep.* 29. Here then the dialogue has wandered; it is no further advanced at 648, and Menaechmus' reply *quis eam surrupuit?* would have been better following 645 immediately. Even now Menaechmus equivocates, and his feeble parryings from 648–53 are only designed to provoke the wordplay "tu tu istic inquam :: vin adferri noctuam / quae 'tu tu' usque dicat tibi? nam nos iam defessi sumus." This splendid pun can only have arisen in Latin—no owl ever cried *sou sou*—and points to the probability that at least from 651, *quis is Menaechmust?*, the material is Plautine innovation. Thus the lines between the wife's grand denunciation in 645 and Menaechmus' passionate oath are largely Plautine expansion. Where little more was required than the equivalent

rogas have to form one speech. But *me rogas?*, *rogasne?*, etc., are never preceded by any phrase in Plautus except an indirect question, and *quasi tu nescias* itself follows the phrase which it qualifies in the two similar instances at *Cas.* 333, *Cist.* 480. There is the further difficulty that "pol hau rogem te si sciam" does not answer *me rogas*, but is a fair retort to *quasi tu nescias*. This is a point in favour of assuming the unusual turn of phrase, and taking "quasi tu nescias me rogas!" as one speech without benefit of lacuna.

6 I take it that the point of Peniculus' jibe is that he saw Menaechmus (the Syracusan) take the mantle to the embroiderer's, and knows it is not yet in Erotium's hands, but can be safely recovered. See Leo, app. crit. on 646.

of “*palla surruptast tibi? quis eam surripuit :: tu :: quis arguit? :: ego-met :: et ego, atque huic amicae detulisti Erotio,*” Plautus has turned the confrontation into anticlimax by delaying Menaechmus’ surrender.

From 655, the scene runs a smooth and uninterrupted course. The solemn oath which Menaechmus has already used so trivially at 616 is appropriate and dramatic here,⁷ and made richer by the feeble pretext that he only lent the mantle. He suffers a curtain lecture (658–60) and is warned that he will not be received at home without the mantle. Peniculus also gets a fit return for his double dealing: when he asks the wife for his reward, she turns him away with an empty promise instead of a full meal; and he leaves the stage and the play, conscious that he has lost his position in that household forever. Menaechmus stays behind, still confident of better treatment from Erotium, but scene 3 rapidly destroys his hopes, and then end of the act is the nadir of his fortunes.

It may be advisable after this discursive analysis to recapitulate what seems to have been Plautus’ technique in creating this scene. Our story of the comparative material suggests that 601–26 form an independent, if undistinguished, Plautine creation, freely adapting ideas that occurred later during the action of the original and introducing humorous material of his own. Certain elements—the parasite’s support of the wife and contradiction of Menaechmus, Menaechmus’ falsely innocent questions, even his assumption (620 ff.) that it is the household which has offended his wife—are likely to have occurred in the Greek play. So also are Menaechmus’ attempts at blandishment and his rebuff (626–28). The parasite’s accusations over the feast consumed by the Syracusan Menaechmus and Menaechmus’ denials are essential, as is Peniculus’ declaration that he has told the wife all and that Menaechmus can gain nothing by concealment (640–42). This must have led to a grand denunciation (of 642–45), followed by a brief attempt at denial by Menaechmus and his final absurd perjury and capitulation (655 ff.) to the wife’s verdict dismissing the parasite and excluding her husband. It is not possible to estimate what embellishments the Greek play provided around this basic narrative, but we have seen some aspects of the Plautine treatment: anticipation of material at 607, 611, 616; intru-

7 Leo is surely assuming the ethos of Menander rather than of Plautus, in regarding 655–56 as interpolated because Menaechmus’ oath would be ungentlemanly and his wife’s retort would seem foolish. The humour of 657 depends on the solemnity of the preceding oath, and it could hardly follow *egon dedi* without some intervening qualification by Menaechmus.

sive wordplay at 609–10, 617–19, 645–47, 651–54; the refrain motif from 620–25.

Most of these identifiable Plautine features, while detracting from the main action with digressions and anticipations of the desirable climax, add considerably to the immediate comedy. Peniculus in particular, the least respectable of the characters, gains most from the Plautine innovations; the wife on the other hand is thrust into the background, except at the actual climax where she must be allowed to hold the stage (642–45 and 658–60) and in the two passages (620–25 and 649–54) where Plautus has provided her with humorous material. Thus the free and expanded treatment in the first part of the scene and in the interlude between the wife's challenge and Menaechmus' surrender, together with the greater prominence allowed to a subsidiary character, provides a natural explanation of the lack of continuity and balance for which this scene is conspicuous.⁸

8 I am greatly indebted for Professor G. W. Williams for his many valuable suggestions which helped me to set this narrow problem in a wider context.

2. The Madman and the Doctor

Part I Which is the mad man?

It is in the nature of identity comedies that much of their humour comes at the expense of straight characters when they suffer cognitive dissonance, that is, they are unable to decipher conflicting phenomena. Baffled by apparent contradictions or duplications they may be accused of being crazy by others who have not shared their experience. So in Plautus three comedies of switched identity, two of them relatively serious, use the motif of insanity to reconcile appearance with facts. It may be no coincidence that none of these plays, *Amphitryo*, *Captivi* and *Menaechmi*, is a standard family-based comedy set in bourgeois Athens, and none of them is motivated by a comic trickster in the usual sense.

In *Amphitryo*, certainly, Mercury has warned the audience that he and his father Jupiter are impersonating the humans Sosia and his master Amphitryo: only Sosia meets his double, leaving Amphitryo to be confused and finally panicked by discovering that a Doppelgänger has been enjoying his bed and board: his situation is very much that of the resident *Menaechmus* in our play, except for his indifference or hostility to his wife.

In *Captivi* the impersonation is more subtle. It is not a visible, physical, impersonation but a social identity which the two captives from Elis have exchanged so that the master Philocrates may escape home without paying a ransom, while his slave Tyndarus bravely stays captive in his place. The crisis comes when the new master Hegio finds another Elean gentleman, Aristophontes, who knows Philocrates, and brings him to meet his supposed friend: neither Tyndarus nor Aristophontes is deceived about identities, but Tyndarus' only hope is to maintain his false identity by alleging that Aristophontes is demented; initially he even succeeds in convincing Hegio, but as we shall see later, Aristophontes is too sincere and too thorough in unmasking the slave for Hegio to remain deceived: this "mad scene" is unlike like the mad-scene of *Menaechmi* because the schemer does not have to feign his own madness, but that of his adversary. Both plays contain elements

in common with *Menaechmi* and we shall return to them for comparative purposes.

Real madness has no place on the comic stage, and accusations of madness have only a limited potential for humour. With *Menaechmi*, however, the comedy derives not from impersonation, but from actual visual doubles; the prologue informs the audience that the well-informed bachelor twin has come to Epidamnus in search of his lost brother, when he inadvertently stumbles into his brother's double life. First the playwright sets up the world of the married Menaechmus, whose marital home occupies one side of the stage, while that of his mistress Erotium occupies the other. His double life involves him, and will involve his brother, with representatives of both his legitimate and his surreptitious life: the wife from whose home he exits as the action begins, and her aged father brought from offstage in Act 3, and his mistress's cook Cylindrus and maid. But the real trouble will only start for the brothers when a third element in the resident's life, his parasite, believes he has been cheated of a meal at Erotium's place, and informs on the resident to his wife. As for the bachelor Menaechmus, he has only one associate, his good slave Messenio, who will disappear early in the action without really meeting any of the local figures until the play is ready for its denouement.

The motif of madness, however, develops from the early scene when the bachelor is mistaken for his brother by the "other woman", Erotium's, cook and urged to go in to her. The scene is built around a symmetry between the first half when the bachelor Menaechmus thinks this stranger must be crazy to tell him he is expected, and talk about his parasite: yet he knows his name, Menaechmus, so he offers the fellow the price of a piglet to sacrifice for his sanity

responde mi,
adulescens, quibus hic pretiis porci veneunt
sacres sinceri :: nummis :: nummum a me accipe,
iube te piari de mea pecunia,
nam equidem insanum esse te certo scio
qui mihi molestus homini ignoto, quisquis es. (287–93)

But when Menaechmus claims he was never in Epidamnus before, affirms he does not live next door and curses whoever it is who does live there, the cook declares aside that he must be mad to curse himself:

Atque audin, Menaechme :: quid uis? :: si me consulas
nummum illum quem mihi dudum pollicitus dare –

nam tu quidem hercle certo non sanu's satis
 Menaechme, qui nunc ipse maledicas tibi –
 iubeas, si sapias porculum adferri tibi. (310–314)

The motif is more productive when Erotium herself accost the visiting Menaechmus and invites him in: his dinner is ready just as he ordered it, so he should come right in and recline with her. She does not stop when he asks her who on earth she is, and he again assumes she must be crazy; *certo haec mulier aut insana aut ebria est*, Messenio (373).

Messenio even tries to question her: where did she meet Menaechmus? But although he still thinks she must be crazy when she declares that he brought her his wife's gown as a gift, she is calling him by his correct name—the name he shares with his unknown brother—so he decides to humour her and enjoy what she has to offer. She in turn is confused by his talking about the ship he came in, but nothing is gained when she identifies him by his birthplace and patronymic: they are correct. Overriding Messenio's anxieties he dismisses him and goes in to enjoy his brother's paid up pleasures. As he emerges replete with food and sex from her house he is first greeted by his brother's parasite, who has arrived too late for the promised meal and is now determined to get his revenge (469–73): after repeating the dialogue pattern of the encounter with Cylindrus Menaechmus accuses him too of insanity:

tuum parasitum non nouisti? :: non tibi
 sanum est adulescens sinciput <ut> intellego ... (505–6)
 neque ego hercle uxorem habeo, neque ego Erotio
 dedi nec pallam surripui; satin sanus es? ... (509–10)
 tun me indutum fuisse pallam praedicas?
 :: ego hercle uero. :: non tu abis quo dignus es
 aut te piari iube homo insanissime. (515–17)

It looks as though the routine will be repeated when Erotium's maid appears to give him some jewelry to have remodelled. But this time he plays along and graciously accepts the bracelet. The bachelor Menaechmus deliberately discards his dinner wreath on the left and leaves (right) to look for Messenio, having turned three of these four encounters to a profit.

While the visiting Menaechmus goes offstage to look for his slave Messenio, everything he has done comes back to haunt his married brother. The parasite has denounced him to his wife, and Erotium is disappointed of the gown, so the resident Menaechmus finds himself *exclusissimus* (698), kicked out of both his home and his mistress's place. Inevitably, when the visiting Menaechmus returns still clutching the stolen

gown, his brother's wife treats him as her offending husband, and answers his denials by summoning her father to ask for a divorce. Once again he protests that he knows neither of them: if he has ever set foot in her house where she lives, may he be the most wretched of all wretched men. Predictably again he is accused of insanity for denying that he ever lived in his own home

sanun es, qui istuc exoptes aut neges te unquam pedem
in eas aedes intulis<se> ubi habitas, insanissime?

Like the others the old man assumes Menaechmus is just joking, but this time the charge triggers a new dramatic twist. As the matron points to his discoloured and glittering eyes Menaechmus gets the idea of faking madness to drive them away—a ploy unique in Roman comedy.

Matrona: Uiden tu illic oculos uirere? ut uiridis exoritur colos
ex temporibus atque fronte, ut oculi scintillant, uide!

Menaechmus II:

quid mihi meliust quam, quando illi me insanire praedicant,
ego med adsimulem insanire, ut illos a me apsterream? (831–2)

Matrona: ut pandiculans oscitatur! quid nunc faciam, mi pater?
Senex: concede huc mea nata, ab istoc quam potest longissime.

Menaechmus: Euhoe atque euhoe Bromie, quo me in siluam uenatum
uocas? (835)

audio, sed non abire possum a his regionibus,
ita illa me ab laeua rabiosa femina adseruat canes.
poste autem ilinc hircus +alus+, qui saepe aetate in sua
perdidit civem innocentem falso testimonio.

... Ecce Apollo mihi ex oraclo imperat
ut ego illis oculos exuram lampadi[bu]s ardentibus ... (840–41)

..... Enim haereo
ni occupo aliquid mihi consilium, hi domum me ad se auferent.
pugnis me uotas in huius ore quicquam parcere,
nei a meis oculis apscedat in malam magnam crucem.
faciam quod iubes, Apollo ... (846–50)

hau male illanc amoui; <amoueam> nunc hunc impurissimum,
barbatum, tremulum Tithonum, qui cluet Cygno patre Titanum MSS,
Priscian

ita mihi imperas ut ego huius membra atque ossa atque artua
comminuam illo scipione quem ipse habet ... (853–6)

Faciam quod iubes; securim capiam ancipitem atque hunc senem
osse fini dedolabo assulatim uiscera ... (858–9)

old goat, he has spent his life ruining citizens with perjured evidence. In fact *Menaechmi* is a play with a high incidence of socio-political allusions: Peniculus was delayed by being caught up in an assembly; Menaechmus I was delayed by having to speak on behalf of a client (this could indeed be Roman). We might compare Lysidamus' grievance at the time wasted in serving as sponsor (*aduocatus*) for a friend in *Casina* 563–73. The slur of giving false witness recalls the citizen witnesses of *Poenulus* (Alexis' *Karchedonios*).

Now Menaechmus switches to Apolline possession: first he claims that Apollo's oracle is ordering him to burn out the woman's eyes with blazing torches; but when the father-in-law announces that he will leave to fetch strong slaves to carry Menaechmus off, it is not clear how Menaechmus hopes to avert the risk of seizure: he probably redirects his threatened assault against her father (taking *huius* in *huius ore* as masculine), perhaps cutting off the old fellow from his hoped for exit to his house. From describing Apollo's command in third person (840 *imperat*) Menaechmus now addresses himself (848) to the god. Both the old man and his daughter are equally frightened, and the ploy by which she hurries off-stage urging him to keep watch over Menaechmus (851 *adserua istunc mi pater*) will be repeated with variations at 954 *adserua tu istunc, medice*. Because she has fled, it seems the old man's opportunity to go and fetch slaves has evaporated, but Menaechmus continues to threaten him, and we should imagine the old man retreating as Menaechmus advances. It is unlikely that Menaechmus actually lays hands on him although he pretends the god is telling him not to spare his fists on the old man in case he get away—to damnation. Once the wife has fled (851–2), he concentrates on the old fellow in an absurd mix of epic and comic language: at 837 in keeping with Bacchic confusion of human and animal life, he had been a (stinking) he-goat; at 854 Menaechmus turns to epic diction and allusion. With Leo and Questa I would read this as an allusion to the helpless decrepitude of Tithonus: it is immaterial that Tithonus was a Trojan prince, not begotten of any of the known warriors called Cycnus; the name Cycnus simply evokes Tithonus' hoary gray hair at e.g. *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 228–30. The visiting Menaechmus' mythological lore is as random as were his earlier retorts to the wife that he knew her father as little as Calchas or Porthaon (745, 748)—it will be useful to compare the language of Tyndarus' mythological allusions when he repudiates Aristophontes in *Captiui* 562–3. Menaechmus' threats may be followed by gestures, but certainly not actual violence, as he pretends to listen to

Apollo ordering him to beat the old man to a pulp (notice the multiple elision of *membr(a) atqu(e) oss(a) atqu(e) artua/comminu(am) illo scipione*) with his own stick: he must seem to assault the old fellow, but make sure that the other performer can duck out of his reach.

I mentioned Tyndarus in *Captivi*: it is time to recall just how he tries to discredit the Elean Aristophontes when this old friend of Philocrates is brought to meet him: he claims Aristophontes was known to be crazy back home in Elis: he chased his father and mother with spears, and suffered fits (548–9). As Aristophontes is naturally indignant Tyndarus treats his anger as a sign of growing madness: see how he is glaring (*inimico uoltu*) and his frenzy is swelling up (*gliscit rabies*)! Still masquerading as Philocrates Tyndarus now declares in a climax of invention that this man is no more his old friend than the madmen Alcmaeon and Orestes and Lycurgus: *et quidem Alcmaeus et Orestes et Lycurgus postea / una opera mihi sunt sodales qua iste* (562–3): then returns to imagining the man's physical symptoms, his burning eyes, (just as the matron imagined them in *Menaechmi*) and the discoloured blotches that are appearing all over his body, proof that he is being upset by black bile (594–6). In a later reprise of tragic allusions he even compares Aristophontes to Ajax (615).

Although, like Tyndarus, Menaechmus is clearly running out of ideas, (*enim haereo*, 846) he keeps up the serial instructions from the god; now he will snatch up a two-headed axe (note the assonance of *securim capi(am) ancipitem*) and batter the old fellow's inwards down to the bone in smithereens: word accent and ictus coincide to mimic the blows falling in each foot, with hiatus at the diaeresis; *ósse fíni dédólábo ássulátim úiscera*. (Can this be an echo of Clytemnestra?) As a climax he pretends (862) that the god has told him to yoke horses and mount his chariot to trample down the decrepit, smelly, toothless old creature. The language and meter heightens with the anaphora and tricolon crescendo and multiple resolutions of 865, *iá(m) adstit(i) in cúrrum, iám lora téneo //*, *iám stimúlus in manust*, and in 866–7 the trochaic verse becomes increasingly infected with dactylic rhythms; *ágite e/quí faci/tóte /sónitus //* *úngul/ár(um) app/áreat: cúrsu /céleri / fáci(e) inf/léxa //* *sít pe/dúm pern/icitas*. Of course Menaechmus has no chariot, and if he is charging across the stage like a man on a hobbyhorse he must somehow stop himself, or be stopped, as Achilles is stopped by Athena in *Iliad* I and Herakles by a rock in Euripides' *Herakles Mainomenos*: when he imagines being jerked by his hair from the chariot (like Troilos, or just like a professional charioteer?) it would seem he pretends to be un-

seated from behind. No editor interprets this as an actual assault from the rear; either Menaechmus actually loses control and trips or he deliberately throws himself down, faking a fit (cf. *illi derepente tantus morbus incidit*) in order to bring the scene to an end. His last words as he falls maintain the fiction of acting under divine orders—the supposed attacker is “overthrowing or countermanding your command and decree, O Apollo.”

It is enough to convince the old man, who leaves the madman prone on the ground as he goes to fetch a doctor.

Where did this scene come from? As feigned madness it has no parallel; as madness it echoes a number of famous cases. To recognize and enjoy paratragedy Plautus’ audience must have been familiar with tragedy itself, so we turn to the tragic madmen listed by Tyndarus: Orestes and Lycurgus are classic examples of victims of Apollo and Bacchus, just as Orestes and Pentheus, with whom Virgil compares the demented Dido in *Aeneid* 4.468–73. Alcmaeon is a less obvious model, and may for that very reason be a pointer towards the Roman tragedy *Alcumeo* of Ennius. Obviously we do not know the date of *Menaechmi* and cannot even prove that Ennius put his drama on stage before Plautus’ death in 184; Ennius lived and wrote tragedies for another fifteen years. But the hallucination scene of Alcmaeon was famous, and is cited repeatedly by Cicero. Here as quoted in *De Oratore* 3.217, *aliud metus, demissum et haesitans et abiectum* is Alcmaeon’s voice of fear, low-pitched and tremulous with terror:

multis sum modis circumuentus, morbo exilio atque inopia,
tum pauor sapientiam omnem exanimato expectorat
alter (mater?) terribilem minatur uitae cruciatum et necem
quae nemo est tam firmo ingenio et tanta confidentia
quin refugiat timido sanguen atque exalbescat metu.

(16–20, fr. XIV Jocelyn)

I am encircled and trapped in many ways by sickness, exile, and poverty; then terror drives all wisdom from my panicked breast. The other one / my mother threatens a dreadful living torment and death: no man is so strong of spirit and firm of confidence that his blood does not drain from him in fright at these things, and he grows white with fear.

(This passage seems to be a favourite with Cicero who has already quoted it earlier in *De Oratore* 3.154 and will return to it in *Fin.* 4.62 and 5.31, also *Tusc.* 4.19.) In the *Academica*, when Cicero is discussing the role of the mind in distinguishing vision from delusion he returns to Alcmaeon, contrasting these words of the despairing but sane Alc-

maeon with his hallucinations, cast in monody. Cicero's interlocutor has claimed at *Acad.* 2.52 that when madmen begin to rave they say that something unreal seems to be happening, and when they are restored to normal they utter those words of Alcmaeon: "my heart in no way agrees with the sight of my eyes:"

sed mihi neuti quam cor consentit cum oculorum aspectu (*Joc.* 21)

Cicero himself corrects this claim at *Acad.* 2.88. 'You said that the things seen by men asleep or drunken or mad were weaker than things seen by men awake, sober and sane? How can this be so? When Ennius woke up he did not say he had seen Homer, but that it seemed as if he had. But Alcmeon declares "my heart in no way agrees," etc. (2.89) What about madmen? Doesn't your own example of Alcmeon once his madness has been roused, speak like this:'

unde haec flamma oritur? ("Where has this flame sprung from?") (*Joc.* 22), and later:

"+ incede incede + adsunt, me expetunt: ("come, come, they are at hand, they are attacking me") (*Joc.* 23)

What about when he begs the maiden's help? Do you doubt that he thinks he sees these things?

fer mi auxilium, pestem abige a me,
flammi feram hanc uim quae me excruciat,
caeruleae incinctae igni incedunt,
circumstant cum ardentibus taedis ... (*Joc.* 24–27)
intendit crinitus Apollo
arcum auratum luna innixus
Dianam facem iacit a laeua ... (*Joc.* 28–30 ; = fr XV)

Bring me aid, drive this plague from me, this firebearing force that torments me; they come blue-gray and girdled with fire, they stand around me with burning torches. Long-tressed Apollo stretches his gilded bow leaning on its crescent, while Diana hurls a torch from the left.

"How could Alcmaeon," says Cicero, "be any more convinced of these things if they were real than he was because they seemed to be. Clearly his heart and eyes are in agreement." Alcmaeon's hallucinations share with Menaechmus' opening lines the torches and the blocking of stage action, setting Diana, like the bitch-wife, on the left.

But Menaechmus' recurring visions are too varied to be traced to this single source.

If Plautus were simply adapting a feigned mad-scene from a Greek comic dramatist who relished spoofing Greek tragedy, such as the rather sensational Diphilus, it is difficult to imagine that the Greek scene would be so miscellaneous. As Ekkehard Stärk points out in his *Die Menaechmi des Plautus und kein griechisches Original*, such a potpourri of gods is alien to the Greek theatre; each madman should have only one divine persecutor (p.107). There is another problem. Menaechmus' fake hallucinations, like Alcmaeon's real hallucinations, are put before us on stage. If we review the mad scenes that have come down to us from Greek tragedy, leaving aside the *Bacchae*, since Pentheus' madness is prurient rather than violent in the way needed here, we note that Sophocles does not introduce Ajax until he has recovered from his mad violence: but Euripides does offer treatment of madness in two plays about Orestes and one about Heracles. In none of these plays does the hero's dementia set in on stage. When Orestes' intermittent madness sent by the Erinyes is described by the shepherd messenger in *Iphigenia in Tauris*, and by Electra in Euripides' *Orestes*, they quote excerpts from his deranged speech, but he is not shown maddened on stage. Nor is the maddened Heracles, whose actions come far nearer to the pretended violence of Menaechmus. It is a messenger who describes and quotes the hero's hallucinated offstage attacks on his wife and children, preceded by his delusion that he is mounting his chariot to travel to Argos for a victorious attack on Eurystheus and his family. Heracles himself does not return to the stage until he is brought in collapsed and exhausted. But exactly this "delusion," that he is mounting his chariot, is shared by Menaechmus, and takes the same form.

865 iam adstiti in curram, iam lora teneo, iam stimulus in manust (Leo's text)

Eur. *Her.* 947–49 ἐκ τοῦδε βαίνων ἄμαρτ' οὐκ ἔχω ἔχειν
ἔφασκε δίφρου τ' εἰσέβαινεν ἄντυγα
κᾶθεινε, κέντρον δῆθεν ὥς θείων χερσί

Next, mounting a chariot, which he did not have, he declared he had it and stepped to the rim of the plate and struck as if he had a goad in his hand

Where the details of Heracles' madness differ most from *Menaechmus'* counterfeit is in the constant changing of imagined setting, as he sets out for the Isthmus, wrestles and holds a victory feast, then goes onward to Mycenae to kill Eurystheus. And this is where we must draw on yet another Plautine comedy for parallel material. In *Mercator* Charinus, deprived, as he thinks, of his beloved who may have been shipped over-

seas, utters a ritual farewell to his family home, then puts on a performance before his friend Eutychus of his supposed departure into exile in quest of the beloved. Is he deluded? Or indulging in fantasy? Scholars differ, but his more or less instant recovery suggests it is mere controllable fantasy. Here then is the content of his fantasy: from 852–63 he is his own groom and attendant, resolved to search for her over river and mountain, winter and summer, night and day; rebuffing Eutychus' offer to accompany him he claims to be in haste to leave before sunset. Eutychus plays along (874–80) but as if Charinus were now on shipboard; "the wind is favourable from this direction, change your course, I see a great storm coming but there is sunshine on the left, the gods order you to turn this way!" After a lot of by-play, when Charinus hears that the girl-friend is safe in his friend's house, he is almost ready to give up his travels, but when denied instant access to the girl resumes his fantasy at 921, snatching up the (imaginary) travelling cloak and discarding his town cloak to the (imaginary) slave. Now he has his (imaginary) sword (*machaera*) in hand and his oil flask; he is ready to set off again and curses his own delay (929–30) sending the (imaginary) slave into the house,

iam in currum escendi, iam lora in manus cepi meas (931)

Now I have mounted the chariot, now I have taken the reins in my hands.

Charinus has not given up yet; instead he describes himself reaching Cyprus, then going on to Chalcis, where he sees a guest friend from Zacynthus who tells him that his girl-friend is right here in Athens, so he embarks on shipboard and sets out straight away; now he is home again, returned from exile. At this point finally the threads of fantasy are fused with fact as he greets Eutychus as if he had been long away. Eutychus can only comment *Hic homo insanust!* "The fellow is crazy."

And are we supposed to believe Charinus is actually crazy, deranged? What mattered was not the psychological state of the character, but the actor's opportunity for flamboyant theatrical mimicry. In this respect Stark is right, *not* in denying a Greek model from which Plautus deviated, but in stressing Plautus' own theatrical initiative, and his positive motivation for these often inconsistent stage extravaganzas.

But is it sufficient to assume only one step between Greek tragedy and Plautine paratragedy? Why have I given so much attention to a scene outside *Menaechmi*, in a play derived from the playwright Philemon? Because the convergence of the chariot motif in *Mercator* and

Menaechmi with the messenger narrative from *Herakles* suggests to me that two stages of adaptation underlie this scene of ours. First a Greek comic playwright—let us say Philemon—adapted the narrative of Heracles' madness to the feigned madness of comedy, then Plautus made his version of the scene in *Mercator* (this is generally believed to have been an early play given the lack of cantica and its apparent faithfulness to Greek structure). Later, composing *Menaechmi*, he incorporated the chariot motif into the composite mad-scene along with reminiscences of Ennius' *Alcmaeon* and other Latin plays which no longer survive, in a kind of extravagant *contaminatio* of divine dementias.

But couldn't Plautus have drawn his scene directly from the *Herakles*? I see two or three obstacles. Firstly, there is no evidence that any Roman adapted the play of Heracles' madness before Seneca, although we have the celebrated Assteas vase from Paestum as evidence that his madness was staged in south Italy. Indeed the myth of his madness seems not to occur in Latin literature before the first century of the common era. It would seem out of the question that Plautus should actually search out a Greek tragic script to inspire his para-tragedy. Secondly Greek tragedy does not seem to have staged scenes of mad violence, but kept them off-stage, mediating them through messenger narratives. The only staged mad-scene I know of before Seneca is precisely the *Alcumeo* of Ennius. Was Roman drama already accustomed to present delusion and violence on stage in its first generation? This is where the allusions of *Captivi* seem to offer strong proof that the Roman audience already knew Alcmaeon and Orestes and Lycurgus (just as Virgil could assume his readers knew *demens* ... *Pentheus*, ... *aut Agamemnonius scaenis agitatus Orestes*, *Aen.* 4.469, 471).

We know nothing of Greek tragedies about Alcmaeon, Aeschylus and Sophocles' *Epigonoï*, or Sophocles' *Alkmeon*, or Euripides' two plays based on Alcmeon's wanderings after his matricide. (Agathon too wrote an *Alkmeon*, and the comic Antiphanes quotes Alcmaeon as a familiar hero of tragedy.) So there is nothing to suggest that any Greek tragedy had a scene corresponding to Alcmaeon's on-stage attack of madness. Whatever stood at this point in the original Greek comedy, I think we must assume Plautus' audience had developed a taste for mad-scenes from their experience of the Roman tragic stage; if not from *Alcumeo*, then from other tragedies now lost.

Part II The Doctor Scenes 5.3 and 5.5,
882–898 and 909–956

It is regrettable that so much of the scholarship spent on the “Doctor scene(s)” of *Menaechmi* has concerned itself with arguing either that Plautus has contaminated this scene into the action of the play from another Greek source, or that Plautus has invented the scene whole cloth. I consider that E. Woytek (“Zur Herkunft der Arztszene in den *Menaechmi* des Plautus,” *W. St.* 16 (1982) 165–82) has done more than enough to prove the futility of Steidle’s analytical objections to the nexus of scenes (“Zur Komposition von Plautus’ *Menaechmi*,” *Rh. M.* 114 (1971) 247–61), but I would also like to use Woytek’s arguments against Stark, who argues from the other end of the spectrum, that not only the scene but the whole play is Plautus’ own independent creation. Steidle and before him Gaiser (*ANRW* 1.2.1061) approached this question in terms of dramaturgy, using both a prioristic principles of structural symmetry and specific issues of entrance and exit to argue that Plautus’ Greek model moved from the old man’s threat to abduct Menaechmus with his slaves at 846 to the actual abduction at 990 f. Stark’s approach is to point, as I shall myself, to the Roman ingredients in the dialogue of the doctor first with the old man then with Menaechmus (but now the local resident Menachmus) as evidence that Plautus invented the scene. Following Woytek I believe that the play from its first conception needed a climax that would take the local Menaechmus from his domestic and erotic crises into public danger and the risk of confinement beyond his home territory: the doctor, a stranger to Menaechmus, is needed to generate this climax from which his brother’s faithful Messenio will rescue him. As to Plautus’ invention, I have never doubted it, but I beg to differ from Stark in arguing that Plautus created not the actual encounter with the doctor, but its Latin humour, substituting jokes that his Roman audience would understand for what was probably a parade of technical medical jargon.

The issue of medical scenes in Greek comedy offers a more general problem. We now have the doctor scene in Menander’s *Aspis*, but despite the existence of four lost Middle and New Comedies entitled *Iatros*, ascribed to Antiphanes, Aristophon, Philemon and Theophilos, there are only one or at most two fragments suggesting doctor interviews: Arnott’s very full commentary on Alexis fr. 142 can cite only one other fragment which may be from Epicharmus, as Turner cau-

tiously allows. To find semi-parodic doctor-speak, I can suggest only that we resort to Plato's Eryximachus in *Symposium*. And his diction and level of argument is certainly not one that could keep a Roman audience amused. Doctors in some ways resemble cooks, in that they have a technical apparatus which could be used to entertain, and we know, thanks to Athenaeus' many quotations that many playwrights of middle comedy did parade boastful cooks and their gastronomic lore: so did Plautus in staging the boastful cook in *Pseudolus*. But our lack of evidence for doctors in comedy may not simply be the result of Athenaeus' indifference to doctors. They differ from cooks, I would suggest, on the basis of *Aspis* and the Plautine title *Parasitus Medicus*, in that while Greek comedy featured real cooks, it may not have made fun of real doctors: instead many, if not most, "doctors" in comedy will have been impostors contributing to an intrigue.

It is also relevant that doctors were a recent innovation at Rome and foreigners an object of mistrust. Cassius Hemina (ap. Pliny *N. H.* 29.12–13) reports that the first physician to come to Rome was the Peloponnesian Archagathus, in 219 BCE who was given citizenship and a surgery at public expense; he seems to have been a surgeon, and a drastic one. Cato, who composed his own notebook (*commentarii*, 29.15) of household remedies warned his son against Greeks, against their writings but even more against their doctors. *Iurarunt inter se barbaros necare omnes medicina, et hoc ipsum mercede faciunt ut fides is sit et facile disperdant.* ("They have sworn a common oath to kill all barbarians with their medicine, and even this they do for a fee, to win credit and ruin men more easily.") Things had not changed much since Cato; two-hundred years later Pliny sees medicine as a sinister art which no Roman is willing to practice, with a mystique that gives prestige only to treatises written in Greek (29.17). Doctors are supremely suspect.

So let us pick up Plautus' comedy with the return of the old man at 881, complaining in noticeably heavy iambic senarii at the time he has to waste, first seated (in the doctor's clinic?) waiting for his return from a call, then in escorting back this fellow who walks like an ant (*formicinarum gradum*) and boasts of setting the broken limbs of Aesculapius (who is at least mortal) and Apollo himself. When the doctor speaks he starts by asking a most unmedical question: *num larvatus aut cerritus?* "Is the patient possessed by Ghouls or by Ceres?" (this was Sosia's suggestion – when Alcumena contradicted Amphitryo's expectations at *Amph.* 775–7 *quaeso etiam quin tu istanc iubes / pro cerritam circumferri ... nam haec quidem certe larvarum plenast!*) But then the doctor passes

from mental to physical illness, suggesting that the patient is suffering from lethargy or dropsy.

Now it will be part of my procedure to show that most of the material in this scene stems from popular Italian folk-medicine; thus both lethargy and dropsy occur in Catullus, (17.24 and 99.14) and Cicero's intimate letters: lethargy is an issue in Horace's *Sermones*: *fidis offendar medicis, irascar amicis / cur me funesto properent arcere ueterno* (*Epist.* 1.8.9–10), just as the choice of wine and medication by hellebore occur at *Sat.* 2.3.82 *danda est ellebori multo pars maxima auaris*, and 2.4.26–9 *leni praecordia mulso prolueris melius. si dura morabitur aluus, / mitulus et uiles pellent obstantia conchae / et lapathi brevis herba, sed alba non sine Coo*.

I have no suggestion for amending the doctor's next statement, apparently that he will take such great care that he utter sighs (*suspirabo*) more than six hundred times a day; it seems obvious that the verb needs replacing by a physical form of cure, like drawing blood. (Possibly *suscitabo*?) At least the old man recommends observation, the medical practice of *parateresis*.

From the local Menaechmus' soliloquy they learn only that he is most unhappy: but the doctor's first question *quor apertas brachium?* points to a gesture—perhaps he has raised his arm to heaven in despair?—and somewhat surprisingly claims that this gesture is very harmful to his sickness—a sickness which he had not yet diagnosed, but again with *quidni sentiam?* he seems to affirm expertise; this will take a whole field of hellebore. Why does Menaechmus challenge his first diagnostic question whether he drinks white wine or black? It is clear from Pliny's *Natural History* that investigation of drinking habits was expected as a preliminary to prescribing a cure for many illnesses (cf. 14.58, for medical advice on wine; 14.73, the recommendations of Erasistratus, 14.76 for a whole pamphlet on the choice of wines addressed to Ptolemy by Apollodorus, and Pliny's own recipe for invalids at 14.100). We learn from Pliny (14.80) that wine had four colours *albus*, *fuluus*, *sanguineus* and *niger*: but if it was normal to call wine *albus*, as Catius does in Horace (cited above), what we call red wine was always called *niger*, not *ater*; hence Menaechmus' jest about eating crimson, scarlet, or golden bread (luxury colours, incidentally the colours of Virgil's golden age rams). Scaly birds and winged fish are on an altogether different level of fantasy (916–18). *Deliramenta loquitur*, says the old man, as Amphitryon does in an early phase of the “Mad” scene with Alcumena (*Amph.* 696).

Like most ignorant people even now, the old man wants a “quick fix”, with something for the patient to drink (*aliquid potionis*) but the doctor is determined to go through his routine interrogation, and puts simple questions: Do his eyes turn hard on him? Do his innards growl? Does he get a good night’s sleep? These questions may have stood in Plautus’ model play, but they allow rude commonsense answers—“Do you think I am a lobster?” “Well, they don’t growl when I’m full but they growl when I’m hungry, and yes, I sleep right through the night if I’ve paid my creditors.” It is certainly possible that this exchange replaces something more technical and fanciful in the Greek play.

Now Menaechmus is provoked to anger, and as in the false mad-scene of *Captivi*, (592 *enimvero nequeo contineri*) the sane man’s rising anger is treated as a sign of madness setting in (916 *nunc homo insanire occipit*). When the old man accuses him of the words and behaviour of his twin brother, of calling his wife a mad bitch and threatening to ride him down with yoked chariot horses, this reinforces Menaechmus’ fury and he replies with a heap of absurd charges: “I know that you stole the sacred crown/garland from Jupiter and were imprisoned for it; that when you were released you were beaten on the *furca*, and I know you thrashed your father and sold your mother—*satin haec pro sano maledicta maledictis respondeo?*” (“Are these retorts to your insults good enough for a sane man?”) Here too we are dealing with Plautine commonplaces; for stealing Jupiter’s crown, compare the more explicit accusation of *Trin.* 85 *nam nunc si ego te surripuisse suspicer / Iovis coronam de capite ex Capitolio / qui in columine astat summo*. If it were not for *Trinummus* we might not understand that the suggestion is not just sacrilegious: it is all but impossible as a physical feat. This passage seems to build on the *Trinummus*: but the imprisonment and slave punishment are a new enhancement of the fantasy. And beating his father and selling his mother? This too is Plautine, part of the exchange of *maledicta* between young Calidorus and Ballio which begins at *Pseudolus* 355; *adsiste altrinsecus atque onera hunc maledictis*: after Calidorus has used up the social insults—*uerbero*, *bustirape*, *furcifer*, *sociofraude*, *parricida*, *sacrilege*, *periure* and *legirupa*, and several more ordinary accusations, we come to *uerberauisti patrem atque matrem*, answered cheerfully and in the same spirit as Menaechmus by “yes, and what’s more, I killed them, to save having to feed them!” *atque occidi quoque, potius quam cibum praehiberem* (367–8). In his lectures on *Pseudolus* Eduard Fraenkel used to remind us that Old Comedy at least delighted in such accumulated accusations;

both the slanging match between the Just and Unjust Arguments in *Clouds* 908 f., and Pheidippides' later abuse of his father at 1327 f., rise to the equivalent insult: *patraloias kai metraloias*. This at least, could as well be Greek as Italian. The old man is panicking, and it only remains for the doctor to wind up the interview; "have him brought to me," he says, repeating the hellebore motif, "I'll take care of him with a twenty day diet of hellebore." Ignoring Menaechmus' threats at 951, which are mere variations of 943 (*pendentem* recalls the *furca*, *fodiam stimulis* the notion of *caesum uirgis*) the doctor tells the old man to fetch attendants to drag him to the clinic, while the father-in-law in turn tells the doctor to keep an eye on him, but neither man wants to be left with the lunatic, and both leave at 956. Certainly the action has advanced no further than we expected when the father-in-law first volunteered to fetch attendants to carry Menaechmus home at 845, 847, but we have gained two things: whereas at 845 f. the visiting twin would have been dragged into his brother's home, the doctor has brought the situation out of the family and household into the public domain, making sure that either of the twins will have a chance to be rescued.

The last repercussions of the confusion come when the local Menaechmus, still lurking in the porch in hope of admission to his home at nightfall, apparently does not hear Messenio's soliloquy (966–989), nor is Messenio noticed by the old man, who does, however, spot his prey Menaechmus (990–996) and orders his attendants to seize his son-in-law. It remains for Messenio to rescue the man he believes is his master, and ask for his freedom as reward. Equally baffled by the unknown slave's behaviour and his family's accusations, the local Menaechmus makes one last attempt (1039–47) to reconcile the latest behaviour of a total stranger with the equally strange behaviour of his father-in-law and the doctor: *socer et medicus me insanum esse aiebant; quid sit mira sunt. / haec nihilo esse mihi uidentur setius quam somnia* (1046–7). He leaves the stage only once more, attempting this time to be admitted to Erotium's house, and is again thrown out; but this time his rescuer and his twin are both at hand and the action is finally resolved.

3. Philemon's *Thesaurus* as a Dramatization of Peripatetic Ethics

There is much to suggest that Menander's contemporary and rival Philemon was a dramatist of ideas, who won his many victories less because of his undeniable stage-craftsmanship than for the ethical appeal of his plays. The heavy moralising of the fragments need not be representative; we can blame this on Stobaeus' predilections:¹ more significant is the evidence of "Demetrius" *On Style* and Apuleius² that Philemon's plays were favourite reading; Demetrius tells us that because of their continuous, even, style they were read rather than performed in his time; Apuleius depicts Philemon himself reading a new play to a public gathering on the eve of his death. Apuleius praises Philemon for his *ioca non infra soccum, seria non usque ad cothurnum*; it may well have been the *seria* of his plays which won him the vote of respectable bourgeois judges over the more elusive psychology and subtler portrayal of human relations by his great rival.³

-
- 1 This point is answered by Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Attisches*, Berlin 1931, in the excellent appraisal of Philemon which opens his chapter on the *Trinummus* (225–228). Jachmann draws attention to fr. 94 and 213, for affinities with thought in the *Trinummus*. We might add 140–141, 164, 168, and 176 as evidence for Philemon's concern with benefactions; besides 94, 23 illustrates his rather inartistic explorations of moral paradoxes.
 - 2 Demetrius, *Περὶ ἑρμηνείας* 193, γραφικὴ δὲ λέξις ἢ εὐανάγνωστος. αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἡ συνηρτημένη καὶ οἷον ἡσφαλισμένη τοῖς συνδέσμοις. διὰ τοῦτο ... Φιλήμονα δὲ ἀναγινώσκουσιν. Apuleius *Florida* 16.63–64 credits Philemon with wit, well-turned intrigues, lucid recognition scenes, characters appropriate to the action, and, on the level of thought, *sententias uitae congruentes, ioca non infra soccum, seria non usque ad cothurnum*. Among the character types attributed to him the *patruus obiurgator*, the scolding uncle, confirms his taste for moralising in drama.
 - 3 The best discussion of Philemon in English is Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, Manchester 1970, 125–151. Although his criticisms in the main echo Jachmann's assessment, he points some useful contrasts with Menander, drawing attention to the flatness of form in Philemon, his near repetition of words, his moralising (141), his elaboration of characters' sentiments beyond the requirements of the occasion, and failure to create dramatic situations which justify such self-analysis. His moralising "may be said to proclaim one

Of the three Plautine adaptations⁴ of Philemon, *Trinummus*, adapted from the *Thesauros*, stands apart. It is a peculiar play; the love affairs of the prodigal Lesbonicus, alleged cause of the dramatic crisis, are never specified, and instantly forgotten when his marriage is imposed in the resolution of the finale; the cast consists of four old men, all virtuous, two young men, (one “born middle-aged”) and one loyal slave; even their names, to suggest the Tropos of their owners.⁵ There is a dearth of comic roles, and the longest scenes of the play are all discussions of morality on a scale unparalleled in comedy except for Plautus' *Captivi*.⁶

real value, the value of friendship, but otherwise ... does not go beyond the polite commonplaces of Athenian society ... the speeches probably have more *êthos* and more *dianoia* than Middle Comedy” (150–151). In *Trinummus* while dialogue continues to represent these commonplace values, I believe Philemon reveals their inadequacy through the action; the situation, not the sentiments is the medium of his critical judgement. Webster's claim that Philemon's work is essentially comedy of caricature and extemporisation (151) seems to me false both to *Trinummus/Thesauros* and, if we follow his attribution, *Captivi/Aitolos*.

- 4 *Mercator* and *Trinummus* identify their originals in the prologues (*Merc.* 9, *Trin.* 18–19). The identification of *Mostellaria* with Philemon's *Phasma* was originally made by Leo in *Hermes* 18 (1883) 559, on the basis of *Mo.* 1149 and affinities with the two certainly attributed plays. See most recently Fuchs, *Mus. Helv.* 6, 106, n. 5.
- 5 Callicles means “of fair fame”, Lysiteles, “the profitable one”, Megaronides, “high in virtue”, and Stasimus, “Standfast”. K. Schmidt, “Griechische Eigennamen bei Plautus,” *Hermes* 37 (1902) 173–211, 353–390, shows that Callicles and Charmides are attested both in other comedies and in inscriptions; Stasimus, here only in comedy, occurs in several inscriptions; there is epigraphic evidence for Philto, not found elsewhere in comedy, and apparently without significance. Lysiteles, also attested epigraphically, is obviously significant; Schmidt quotes the epithet λυσιτελής applied to the good friend in e.g. Xen. *Mem.* 2.6.5. On Megaronides and Lesbonicus, named, not attested elsewhere, Schmidt argues for significant naming, associating Lesbonicus with the comic tradition of Lesbian profligacy (cf. λεσβίζειν, λεσβιάζειν) p. 372; Megaronides he sees as related to names like Meg-Aristos, and comments “der Name paßt vorzüglich auf unsern Alten” (374).
- 6 Compare Wilamowitz' trenchant criticism in: Menander, *Das Schiedsgericht*, Berlin 1925, p. 165, “Im Trinummus hat Philemon den Versuch gemacht, ernster, tiefer, Menandrischer zu werden, was unbefriedigend ausgefallen ist. Denn in ihm langweilt man sich selbst bei Plautus”, with his accompanying footnote comparing the *Captivi*.

With notable exception of Leo,⁷ scholars of this century have been substantially in agreement that Plautus, though he changed the title of the *Thesauros* to advertise the scene of the imposter, and slightly expanded the role of the slave, has retained the plot structure and articulation of scenes unchanged.⁸ Suspicion cast on the prologue by Wilamowitz, repeated by Jachmann, Körte⁹ and many others, was reaffirmed by Abel in his careful study of the Plautine prologues: yet I am still persuaded, with Leo and Webster,¹⁰ that the allegory of *Luxuria* as mother

7 *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, 1.116–117, Berlin 1913; compare Körte, *RE* XIX.2142, Jachmann *op. cit.* (n. 1), 244.

8 Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*, Firenze 1960, notes the transformation of a brief monologue into Lysiteles' great canticum at 223 f. (53, 133), the expansion of Stasimus' comment at 538–555 (111) and the interpolation of a slave-monologue at 1008 f. (146–149).

9 Wilamowitz *op. cit.* (n. 6), 148; Jachmann, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 229–243, Körte, *RE* XIX.2143, K.-H. Abel, *Die Plautus-Prologe*, Diss. Frankfurt 1955, 19–25. Körte summarises the arguments against the Greek origin of the prologue; there are two main counts; the play has no anagnorisis or other problem requiring a prologue to inform the audience; the prologue we have does not even report the dramatic situation, but refers the audience to the opening dialogue of Megaronides and Callicles for the exposition.

10 Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, Berlin 1912, 202; Webster, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 140. Leo argued that *Trin.* 8–9 (*Plautus nomen Luxuriae indidit / tum hanc mihi gnatam esse voluit Inopiam*) merely reported the Latin names given to the Greek abstractions *Trouphê* and *Aporia*. His arguments and those of Webster, based on the appearance of Hera and Lyssa in Euripides' *Heracles* and of *Penia* in Aristophanes' *Plutos*, are reiterated by G. Hertel, *Die Allegorie von Reichtum und Armut*, Nürnberg 1969, 45–48. While it is likely, as Stoessl suggested (*RE* XXIII.2 s. v. Prologos 2401) that Philemon gave a more positive role to *Trouphê* and *Aporia* than survives in the Plautine prologue, he may have been content with a mere tableau; it is more likely that Philemon devised the personification than that Plautus should either have borrowed or invented the conception. I would add to the usual arguments four points: the increasing proportion of New Comedies now known to have had prologues; the use of such personifications in popular moral theory from Prodicus' *Heracles* at the cross-roads, as reported by Xenophon, to Cleanthes, who used a scenario of Pleasure, attended by the Virtues to show the folly of Epicureanism (Cicero, *De fin.* 2.21.69); the appearance of *Tryphe* personified, usually as a courtesan, in later Hellenistic art (vide G. Downey, *TAPA* 69 (1938) 260, 262) and the possible source of Philemon's scenario in an image of Menander, *Dysk.* 208–211 ὦ κάκιστ' ἀπολουμένη / Πενία, τί σ' ἡμεῖς τηλικούτ' ἐφεύρομεν; / τί τοσοῦτον ἡμῖν ἐνδελεχῶς οὕτω χρόνον / ἔνδον κάθησαι καὶ συνοικεῖς; Wilamowitz has suggested that Philemon was imitating Menander in this play; could he not have converted the verbal image of poverty as a concubine, into a stage-tableau?

of *Inopia*, is Philemon's conception, perhaps truncated, but not introduced by Plautus. The issue is indirectly important for the consideration of the ethical theme or themes of the play, because the prologue as we have it commits the playwright to a Lesbonicus ruined by *Luxuria*; if we acknowledge the prologue as essentially Philemon's, we must accept the profligacy of Lesbonicus as part of his original Greek *persona*.

As it is, the contradictions of his personality remain the most disputed aspect of the play. Thus while allusions in the body of the play led Leo to believe that Lesbonicus had in the *Thesauros* a love affair like that of Philolaches in *Mostellaria/Phasma*, and that Plautus—contrary to his usual practice—had suppressed this feature, Jachmann¹¹ saw the love-affairs as a general characteristic given to Lesbonicus by Philemon for the purpose of plot and character-contrast, but which Philemon failed to integrate into a credible personality. Wehrli,¹² writing in terms of tradition and innovation in plot-motifs, traced the contrasted pair Lysiteles/Lesbonicus back to the σῶφρων and καταπύγων of Aristophanes, but gave no further scrutiny to Lesbonicus' role. Most recently Lehmann¹³ has taken the opposite approach, seeing the young man, not as a diluted version of the Aristophanic lecher, but as the pure ἄσωτος, in the sense defined by Aristotle at *E.N.* 1121 a 13 “der edle Verschwender im Sinne des Aristoteles, der immer gibt und nicht nehmen will”. He stresses the evidence in the play that Lesbonicus' impoverishment is due to misplaced generosity; for Lehmann the interest of the play lies in the Aristotelian meaning of ἐλευθεριότης, and he interprets the central acts as reflecting in successive dialogues the behaviour of the ἐλευθέριος contrasted with the two extreme types of ἀνελεύθερος and ἄσωτος. This thesis leads him to see the allusions to Lysiteles' love-affairs in the body of the play as Plautine distortion, beyond the intent of Philemon's characterization.¹⁴ It need hardly be said that such as inter-

11 *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur* 1.117 n. 2, criticized by Jachmann *op. cit.*, 242–243. Jachmann adds “Wirklich seiend ist diese Figur nicht, zu voller und runder Gestaltung, zu wahrhaftem Leben ist sie nicht geschaffen. So bleibt denn in dieser Hinsicht auch die Gestalt des Lesbonicus unanschaulich.”

12 F. Wehrli, *Motivstudien zur Griechischen Komödie*, Leipzig/Zürich 1936, 49, 99.

13 E. R. Lehmann, “Der Verschwender und der Geizige: Zur Typologie der Griechisch-Römischen Komödie,” *Gymnasium* 67 (1960) 73–90.

14 Lehmann argues from an aprioristic assumption that the Romans, thinking in terms of *frugalitas* and *parsimonia* rather than the subtler ideal of ἐλευθεριότης (*liberalitas*) could not understand the conception of ἄσωτία as excessive generosity; the dramatist therefore in adapting the play for the Roman audience had

pretation is not compatible with acceptance of the Greek origin of the prologue.

At first sight this problem of character interpretation might seem to have no bearing on the main theme of the *Thesauros*, the requirements and testing of friendship. Ribbeck¹⁵ recognized friendship as the theme of the play, and attributed New Comedy not only to its dramatic antecedents in Euripides' Orestes plays, but also to the influence of Aristotle and Peripatetic philosophy. Writing of Middle Comedy he says "in ihrer letzten Zeit entwickelte Aristoteles die Theorie der *philia* (Eth. Nicom. VIII, IX), und Menander und Philemon lasen Theophrasts Schrift wie sie erschien".¹⁶ The opening of *Trinummus* is one of his illustrations of such dramatised ethics.

Leo's hint at the philosophical stimulus to such dramatic themes was taken up by Zucker, "Die Freundschaftsbewährung in der Neuen Komödie,"¹⁷ who devoted half of his extensive discussion to the treatment of friendship in *Trinummus/Thesauros*, and its relationship to Aristotelian theory represented by books 8 and 9 of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. It is his valuable contribution to have pointed out the recurrence in New Comedy of what he calls "Die Kasuistik der Freundschaftsbetätigung in konkreten Situationen dramatisiert,"¹⁸ and examined this play as a representation of friendship put-to-the-test. But Zucker's aim of covering all varieties of *philia* took his focus away from *Thesauros* before he had fully explored the problems of the play, or its close affinity with Aristotelian precepts and aporetic.

In returning to his theme I would like to extend his discussion in four ways:

I. By a closer scrutiny of Act I in relation both to Aristotle and to the major crisis of Act 3. This will make clearer the conscious parallelism of

to import *luxuria*, substituting a vice which his audience could recognize (pp. 80–81). But if the emphasis on *frugalitas* in Lysiteles' canticum or his father's speeches, is Roman, it does not follow that the opposite vice, *luxuria* played no part in the characterization of the original. (See below, for a wider interpretation of the ἄσωτος, recognized by Aristotle and perfectly appropriate to the figure of Lesbonicus as we have it in Plautus.)

15 *Geschichte der Römischen Dichtung* 1.103 f.

16 *Plautinische Forschungen* 128.

17 *Berichte der Phil.-Hist. Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 98/1, Leipzig 1950, 3–38.

18 p. 7.

the two dramatic confrontations, Megaronides/Callicles and Lysiteles/Lesbonicus.

II. By a re-examination of Act 3 scene 2, illustrating the popular attitudes which underly the morality practiced by Lysiteles and respected by Lesbonicus, and relating them to Aristotle's discussion of friendship, generosity, and the pursuit of honour. I will argue that the conflict in this scene between material generosity and the demands of honour upon the recipient is clearly foreshadowed, and only partly resolved in Aristotle's discussion of *eouergesia* in *E.N.* book 9.

III. By re-considering Lesbonicus' role. Is this a credible character? Why does Philemon give him the attributes of both a wastrel and a man of honour? Is his *persona* intelligible in terms of Aristotelian psychology? To what extent is this, as Zucker has suggested, the reason for the breakdown of the action in Act 3 scene 2, rather than a fundamental inadequacy in popular morality, based as it is on the pursuit of honour in various forms?

IV. By demonstrating the symmetry with which the play is constructed around affirmations of friendship and moral obligations. It will be argued that the architecture of the play is related to its moral issues rather than the modest and ineffectual intrigue of the old men.

It is tempting to raise a final question: is the ethical theme borrowed from philosophy to make interesting drama, or as an end in itself? If there is social criticism in Act 3, was the plot designed to produce it, or is it a by-product of the dramatic action?

The play presents different aspects of three friendships, all between honourable men; that of Callicles and the absent Charmides is, as it were, offstage—a matter of the pre-dramatic situation—but itself a provocation for the issue of friendship between Callicles and Megaronides. The other friendship central to the play is that of the young men Lysiteles and Lesbonicus.¹⁹

In Act 1 Megaronides' friendship for Callicles obliges him to reproach Callicles with his apparent betrayal of his absent friend. Megaronides opens the dialogue on his own terms of friendship: he is

19 Aristotle divides friendship according to several classifications: into the three categories of friendship for advantage, pleasure, or for the sake of virtue itself, the only true kind of friendship (1156 a 10 f.): into friendship as between equals, or between superior and inferior (1158 b 10) and into the social categories of friendships between young men (1156 a 31) and between old men (1156 a 24–26, cf. 1158 a 1–6), the friendships of good men or gentlemen (*ἀγαθοί, ἐπιεικεῖς*) and vulgarians (*φραῦλοι*, 1157 b 2, *ἀγοραῖοι*, 1158 a 21).

Callicles' friend and wellwisher, if Callicles is the kind of man he wants him to be, if not, his indignant enemy.²⁰ Callicles' moral fault (*culpa* 78, 81) has forced him to speak his reproaches. "Rightly" says Callicles, "you are my truest friend. If you know I have committed a blunder or wrong,²¹ and fail to accuse me, you yourself should be reproached" (94–96). Zucker²² recognized in this an acting out of the Aristotelian precepts concerning moral failings in friends, but oddly failed to pinpoint the situation here enacted; the equivalent in Aristotle is *E.N.* 1165 a 36 ἔχει δ' ἀπορίαν καὶ περὶ τοῦ διαλύεσθαι τὰς φιλίας and specifically the formula of solution at b 19–20 ἐπανόρθωσιν δ' ἔχουσι μᾶλλον βοηθητέον εἰς τὸ ἥθος ἢ τὴν οὐσίαν, ὅσω βέλτιον καὶ τῆς φιλίας οἰκείότερον ... ἀλλοιωθέντα οὖν ἀδυνατῶν ἀνασῶσαι ἀφίσταται. If our friends are capable of reform or recovery,²³ we must help them towards moral even more than towards financial recovery. Only if the friend is changed for the worse and cannot be saved does one stand aloof, since if one's friend's is πονηρός one should not love him and must not grow to resemble him (15–18). The other keynote of the scene, Latin *fides*, comes with Callicles' self-defence; welcoming the well-intentioned criticism, as is recommended in the peripatetic tradition²⁴ he vindicates himself: he is

20 *Trin.* 46–47 *tui benevolentis, si ita es ut ego te uolo / sin aliter es, inimici atque irati tibi.*

21 *si quid scis me fecissi inscite aut improbe.* The Latin combines a pragmatic word with a moral one; the assimilation of morality with commonsense is characteristic of Aristotelian thought. Probably the original employed a combination of ἀμαρτάνειν and ἀδικεῖν (they are interchangeable in e.g. *Men. Pap. Didot.* cf. 6 ἐκεῖνος εἰ μὲν μείζον ἡδίκηκέ τι, 8, *ei d'eis em' hēmartēken*, and 13, τοῦτο τί μ' ἀδικεῖ, λέγε (Körte's punctuation). Or again *me fecisse inscite*, suggest an adjectival form like *Epitr.* 1099: ποῶν / μηδὲν ἄτοπον μηδ' ἀμαθές, 1100: νῦν τρόπος ποεῖ / ἀμαθές τι;

22 *op. cit.* (n. 17) 11–13.

23 The word ἐπανόρθωσις "the act of correcting" is Aristotelian. In Plato the verb ἐπανορθοῦν is common of practical, intellectual or moral adjustments or corrections to arguments (*Prot.* 340 a and d, *Gorg.* 461 d, *Symp.* 180 d) calculations (*Theaet.* 143 a; 167 e, cf. ἐπανόρθωμα 183 a) life-styles (*Rep.* 425 e) and laws or social structure (regularly in *Laws*). Aristotle introduces it in the mathematical account of justice as τὸ ἐπανορθωτικόν *E.N.* 1132 a 13, and equates ἐπανόρθωμα with δικαίωμα 1153 a 13, and τὸ κατὰ νόμον 1137 b 17. But as the reference to property in 1165 b 19 suggests, the concept is intrinsically practical, and only moral by the analogy of virtue with pragmatism which is used persuasively in this and other passages.

24 For the need to terminate a friendship on moral grounds compare Cicero *Laelius* 76–77; the need for moral correction, 88–90; f. 88 *nam et monendi amici*

bound by a promise, has kept it with honour, and is free of blame (117, 124, 142; cf. 192). As Epitropos he has acted with what in Greek tradition would surely be δικαιοσύνη;²⁵ but this needs no philosophical pedigree. If in telling Megaronides the secret of the treasure, he breaks his promise to save his reputation, we should I think see it not as a significant violation of *fides*²⁶ but as a perquisite for dramatic action. No revelation: no play!

Megaronides undertook the necessary correction of his friend and had to threaten termination of the friendship, because of a misunderstanding; the crisis was a false problem, though dramatically fruitful. In contrast when Philemon moves from the friendship of the old in Act 1 to that of the young men in Acts 2 and 3 there is real need for moral correction, or rather aid to recovery, both moral and economic. The dramatic context of Lysiteles' proposal returns us to the Act 1 crisis and risk of termination, but this time complicated with the further problems arising from εὐεργεσία; the equilibrium of kindness and honour between friends.

Something should be said first about the popular tradition behind such acts of generosity; at issue in Acts 2 and 3 is the traditional obligation of the Greek gentleman to give money to friends in need. The technical term is ἐπαρκεῖν "to help out". Aristotle's recognition in *E.N.* 1163 a 33 that it is the role of the good friend to help out his

saepe sunt et obiurgandi, et haec accipienda amice cum benevole fiunt. Although the basis of the *Laelius* is Stoic, much Peripatetic theory seems to have been transmitted; Gellius 1.3.10 f recognized in *Lael.* 36 and 61 the argument of Theophrastus' first book *On Friendship*; it is likely that 76–77 and 88–90 also go back through Panaetius to Theophrastus, although it should be noted that Theophrastus seems to have differed from Aristotle *E.N.* 1165 b 15–16 on the obligation to terminate a friendship with a bad man. See F.-A. Steinmetz, *Die Freundschaftslehre des Panaetius*, Wiesbaden 1967, 66, 106, 134 (differentiating between Aristotle and Theophrastus) and 149. Zucker (p. 13) quotes *Laelius* 88 without reservations as Theophrastean.

25 Δικαιοσύνη is conventionally defined as keeping trusts and returning what is not ours by Cephalus, in *Rep.* 331; Socrates' reply quotes the case of returning a sword to a friend who has lost his wits, as a restitution which his not just—the paradeigma reflected in *Trin.* 129: *dedistin hoc facto ei gladium qui se occideret.* See now K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality*, Oxford 1974, 170–171.

26 This criticism is made by Stein, "Morality in Plautus' *Trinummus*," *CB* 47, (1970) 7, 8.

friends in need²⁷ is no innovation, since the idea recurs in various forms in Aristophanes, especially in *Ploutos*, where the good man has been impoverished by such generosity; in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, where Socrates can depend on the support of his friends because he is poor, but Ischomachus as a rich gentleman has the burden of satisfying the demands of his friends. It is found in Demosthenes, and Menander's *Samia*; the young man of the prologue explains that he can afford to live like a gentleman, with public benefaction, keeping dogs and horses, serving as an officer in the cavalry, and helping out his friends in need. This custom, somewhat embarrassing to us, was required because classical Athenian and Hellenistic society held it a dishonour to be a paid employee, and gentlemen lived either by property or investment; to realize any of one's inherited capital was a step towards ruin. Sostratos in Menander's *Dyskolos* tells his father that their money should be used to help all men (ἐπικουρεῖν πᾶσιν, εὐπόρους ποιεῖν 801) and does so as an argument for marrying a poor girl without taking a dowry (and indeed giving his own well-dowered sister in marriage to the poor girl's brother). Similarly in our play *Lysiteles*, having declared to the audience his own intention to live without wastefulness on love and luxury, demands his father's permission to marry the otherwise anonymous sister of the spendthrift *Lesbonicus*, in order to help out his friend. Webster suggests adoption of the father-son argument from *Dyskolos*,²⁸ but if so, Phile-

27 E.N. 1163 a 33, φίλου γὰρ ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι τὸ ἐπαρκεῖν τοῖς ἐνδεέσι. Compare Ar. *Eq.* 94, and *Pl.* 829–831, 834–836.

ἐγὼ γὰρ ἱκανὴν οὐσίαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς
λαβὼν ἐπήγκουν τοῖς δεομένοις τῶν φίλων
εἶναι νομίζων χρήσιμον πρὸς τὸν βίον.
... κἀγὼ μὲν ὥμην οὕς τέως
εὐεργέτησα δεομένους ἔξιν φίλους
ὄντως βεβαίους, εἰ δεηθεῖν ποτέ·

Xen. *Cyr.* 5.11 and *Oec.* 2.8 καὶ ἐμοὶ μὲν, εἴ τι καὶ προσδεηθεῖν, οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ σὺ γινώσκεις ὥς εἰσιν οἱ καὶ ἐπαρκέσειαν ἂν ... οἱ δὲ σοὶ φίλοι πολὺ ἀρκοῦντα σοῦ μάλλον ἔχοντες τῇ ἑαυτῶν κατασκευῇ ἢ σοῦ ὁμῶς ὡς παρὰ σοῦ ὠφελησόμενοι ἀποβλέπουσι. Dem. 16.268 ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις εἰ μὴ πάτες ἴσθ' ὅτι κοινὸς καὶ φιλόανθρωπος καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις ἐπαρκῶν, σιωπῶ. Men. *Sam.* 13–16. τῷ ὀπηγεῖν διέφερον / [καὶ τῇ] φιλοτιμίαι· κύνας παρέτρεφέ μοι / [ἵππο]ς ἐφυλάρχησα λαμπρῶς· τῶν φίλων / τοῖς δεομένοις τὰ μέτρη ἐπαρκεῖν ἐδυνάμην. Philemon, fr. 213, while not using the verb ἐπαρκεῖν treats this idea of helping out friends.

ἀλλ' ἑταῖροι καὶ φίλοι σοὶ καὶ συνήθεις, νῆ Δία, ἔρανον εἰσίσουσιν. Εὐχου μὴ λαβεῖν πείραν φίλων.

The best account of this obligation is Dover, *op. cit.* (n. 25), 177 f.

28 *op. cit.*, 137.

mon develops the issue beyond Menander's interest. Lysiteles wins his argument with his father;²⁹ so the father is sent off to see Lesbonicus and ask for his sister's hand, without a dowry.

Lesbonicus is first seen free of social pressure, totting up accounts with his faithful slave; the money from the house-sale has gone; some 6 minae on luxury and girls; a great deal more on bailing out a young friend in debt (403–431). He is then partly a victim of the very custom of generosity which is now to be extended to him. The sale of the house incidentally finds a neat parallel outside Philemon's fiction in the alleged career of Timarchos,³⁰ who on his father's death sold off his city house, his suburban estate, and finally his last, remote plot of land. Like Timarchos, Lesbonicus has sold the town house and has now only a plot of land; in the scene with Philto he insists on giving this last piece of land as dowry for his sister; they complete the betrothal formulae, leaving only the question of the dowry for referral to Lysiteles. It is the need for a dowry which motivates the play's only intrigue, when Callicles is driven to the honourable deceit of the fake messenger (585 f.), and the play's moral climax, when Lysiteles confronts Lesbonicus, in what Lehmann has rightly seen as the Agon of the play.

Although dramatic convention begins the dispute of the young men offstage, the audience in fact hears the entire sequence: Lesbonicus has refused the favour from Lysiteles despite his obvious good-will. Lysiteles first reproaches him with his past behaviour, then argues that he is refusing the offered dowry, so that Lesbonicus may have a chance to set himself right, and seek the honours in public life which his ancestors expected of him (642–656, 687). By his moral exhortations he is attempting the major Aristotelian obligation of helping the fallen friend recover

29 He argues that they can afford to fulfil both family obligations and the noblesse oblige of charity; 355–356 *deum uirtute habemus et qui nosmet utamur, pater, / et qui comitati simus beneuolentibus*—but the charity is limited apparently to known friends—*beneuolentes*. This double obligation is quoted by Cicero in a Theophrastean context (probably from the *Peri Ploutou*) at *De officiis* 2.64; *habenda autem est ratio est rei familiaris ... posse autem liberalitate uti non spoliante se patrimonio, nimirum est pecuniae fructus maximus. recte autem a Theophrasto est laudata hospitalitas ...*

30 Aeschines *Tim.* 97–98. the city house was sold and later resold for 20 minae, the suburban estate was bought next, and finally the remote plot (ὥριον) at Alopeke, probably the family farmstead, since his mother begged to have a burial plot kept there; it was his last property and fetched 2000 dr., as much as the town-house. The whole episode in Aeschines' speech is treated with a pathos that may derive from (Middle) Comedy.

his character (βοηθητέον εἰς τὸ ἥθος) in his renunciation of the dowry he is offering the second form of aid ([εἰς] τὴν οὐσίαν). Lesbonicus' reply acknowledges this, but argues that it would be a greater dishonour to himself as a decent man (*homini pudico* 698) to give away his sister without a dowry, leaving her almost in the position of a concubine. Athenian society at this level did look askance at an undowered wife,³¹ and the sister's honour could have been made the focus of the scene; instead Lesbonicus represents the problem as one of his honour: "I shall be disgraced by gossip that I gave her to you as a concubine". The issue of the play, and concern of the audience, lay in male honour and the conflict of masculine obligations: the sister then is forgotten. Bluntly Lesbonicus tells Lysiteles that this material benefit would bring Lysiteles a profile in honour, but he, Lesbonicus, would suffer public reproach. *Tibi sit emolumentum honoris, mihi quod obiecent siet* (694).

It seems that one man's honour must be bought as the expense of the other's. Lysiteles leaves with an ultimatum; he will continue the friendship only on his terms. "If your sister is offered me in marriage without a dowry as I think right and proper, and you don't emigrate, all my property is yours; but if you disagree—then good luck to you. I'll not be your friend on any other terms. I've made up my mind."³² The friendship stands or falls by this decision. The breakdown in the action seems to reflect a more serious breakdown in this level of morality.

The gentlemen of Aristotle's world sought virtue, and besides virtue only honour, as he indicates in defining the μεγαλόψυχος, the high-minded man. This man is, and knows himself to be, worthy of great things "... of such the most important is honour, greatest of external goods. The high-minded man has the right attitude to issues of honour

31 On the social need for a dowry expressed at *Trin.* 612; *flagitium quidem hercle fiet, nisi dos dabitur uirgini*, see Harrison, *The Law of Athens, the Family and Property*, Oxford 1968, 45–48. See also Fantham, *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 54 and n. 28 for dowry-problems in other comedies.

32 si mihi tua soror, ut ego aequom censeo, ita nuptum datur,
sine dote, neque tu hunc abituru's, quod meum erit, id erit tuom;
sin aliter animatus es—bene quod agas eueniat tibi,
ego amicus numquam tibi ero alio pacto. sic sententia est.

Quod meum erit id erit tuom represents the traditional saying *koina ta philôn* quoted along with other expressions of unanimity at *E.N.* 1168 b 8–10. It seems to have been of Pythagorean origin; see A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter der Römer*, Leipzig 1890, 20.

and dishonour: in short high-minded men seem to make honour their object, for they claim honour most of all, but in proportion to their deserts.”³³ Aristotle recalls the desire for honour in his discussion of friendship at 1159 a 12, seeing love of honour as motive for the desire to be loved, but explaining men's love of being honoured as itself derivative either from the love of influence which honour confers, or the desire to have one's self-respect confirmed. But the desire for honour clashes with Aristotle's account of friendship between good men,³⁴ as his own argument reveals.

Starting from the idea that the friend, for whom you will do and wish good things for his own sake, is a second self (1168 b 1–4) Aristotle argues that one's own self, is one's closest friend, for whom one seeks all the best things. This attitude is not vulgar selfishness, φιλαυτία in the popular sense, but the higher self-interest of the man who always wishes to have the greatest share of just acts and virtuous behaviour (1168 b 25). So the reasonable man, the ἐπιεικής, will choose the best, virtuous actions for himself (1169 a 16) “he will undertake any task, even risk his life for his friends and country ... and will sacrifice money on condition that his friends may receive more, since his friend will get the money, but he will get the noble act, the greater good. Likewise honours and offices ... he may even sacrifice the opportunity of gallant deeds to his friend, because it is nobler for him to have been the cause of his friend's achievement, than to have performed the deed himself; in all praiseworthy respects, the good man (σπουδαῖος) is seen to take the greater share of what is noble. This is the way in

33 E.N. 1107 b 22 περί δὲ τιμὴν καὶ ἀτιμίαν μεσότης μὲν μεγαλοψυχία and 1123 b 19–23 ... τὸ ἐπὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις ἄθλον· τοιοῦτον δ' ἡ τιμή· μέγιστον γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀγαθῶν· περί τιμᾶς δὴ καὶ ἀτιμίας ὁ μεγαλόψυχος ἔστιν ὡς δεῖ. See Joachim, *Aristotle, the Nicomachean Ethics*, Oxford 1951, 125 on the relation of the μεγαλόψυχος to external goods, and cf. n. 37 below.

34 On Aristotle's discussion of φιλία, Robin, *Aristote*, Paris 1944, has a good brief account (241–247) with the interesting suggestion that the nearest equivalent for φιλία may be Altruism; in the sense, there is an obvious paradox in the problem of φιλαυτία raised in Book 9 ch. 8. Hofmann's 1933 paper: “Aristoteles' Philosophie der Freundschaft”, reprinted in *Ethik und Politik des Aristoteles*, Darmstadt 1972, 149–182, excludes the question of φιλαυτία from discussion for lack of space. By far the most helpful comments on the ἀπορίαι of book 9 occur in Hardie's paper: “The Final Good in Aristotle's Ethics”, reprinted in *Aristotle*, ed. Moravcsik, New York 1967, 297–322.

which one should be selfish.”³⁵ Earlier in the same general sequence of argument, Aristotle had spoken of the competition between good men who were friends, competition to do good to each other: this can cause no conflict, for the conferrer of good succeeds in his aim of benefaction, while the other cannot be angry with his friend, who does him a kindness out of affection, but will retaliate with kindness (1162 b 6–12).³⁶

How does this work, in the bourgeois world? For instance how will Aristotle’s good man win what is noble for himself by sacrifice for others? By generosity to his friends and the community—what the Greeks came to call *φιλοτιμία*, naming the act of charity its original motivating ambition for honour.³⁷ So Lysiteles, to return to our play, will renounce money for Lesbonicus and gain a profit in honour; Aristotle used precisely this idea at the end of book 8. Since it is the role of

35 *E.N.* 1169 a 26 f. καὶ χρήματα προοῖντ’ ἂν ἐφ’ ᾧ πλείονα λήψονται οἱ φίλοι· γίνεται γὰρ τῷ μὲν φίλῳ χρήματα, αὐτῷ δὲ τὸ καλόν· τὸ δὲ μείζον ἀγαθὸν ἑαυτῷ ἀπονέμει. Καὶ περὶ τιμᾶς δὲ καὶ ἀρχᾶς ὁ αὐτὸς τρόπος· πάντα γὰρ τῷ φίλῳ ταῦτα προήσεται· καλὸν γὰρ αὐτῷ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπαινετόν. ... ἐνδέχεται δὲ καὶ πράξεις τῷ φίλῳ προῖσθαι, καὶ εἶναι κάλλιον τοῦ αὐτὸν πράξει τὸ αἴτιον τῷ φίλῳ γενέσθαι. ἐν πάσῃ δὲ τοῖς ἐπαινετοῖς ὁ σπουδαῖος φαίνεται ἑαυτῷ τοῦ καλοῦ πλεον νέμων. Οὕτω μὲν οὖν φίλαυτον εἶναι δεῖ, καθάπερ εἴρηται See Joachim 256, and Hardie 315–316. Hardie alone of commentators known to me has questioned the suggestion of sacrificing the opportunity of virtuous action to a friend; he asks “Or is it a joke?” I see it as a sign that Aristotle has recognized the problem of satisfying the other party’s need for honour or even nobility.

36 *E.N.* 1162 b 6–12. οἱ μὲν γὰρ δι’ ἀρετὴν φίλοι ὄντες εὖ δρᾶν ἀλλήλους προθυμοῦνται (τοῦτο γὰρ ἀρετῆς καὶ φιλίας), πρὸς τοῦτο δ’ ἀμιλλωμένων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐγκλήματα οὐδὲ μάχαι· τὸν γὰρ φιλοῦντα καὶ εὖ ποιοῦντα οὐδεὶς δυσχεραίνει, ἀλλ’ ἂν ἡ χαρίεις, ἀμύνεται εὖ δρῶν.

37 On this social sense of *φιλοτιμία* cf. Sam. *Prol.* 13 τῷ χορηγεῖν διέφερον [καὶ τῇ] *φιλοτιμία*. See also A. R. Hands, *Charities and social Aid in Greece and Rome*, London 1968, 43, 77. Aristotle’s two discussions of *φιλοτιμία* in the *E.N.* are problematic. At 1107 b 22 he identifies the right attitude towards honour, desire in proportion to one’s merits, with *μεγαλοψυχία* (see n. 33 above), while an excess of desire for honour is called *χαννότης*. But 1107 b 29, and its near repetition at 1129 b 19 f., quote *φιλοτιμία* as the excess of desire for honour, claiming that the right degree of desire is nameless. At the same time Aristotle admits in 1107 b 32 that usage sometimes calls the man of the right attitude *philotimos* sometimes *aphilotimos*; that is, this passage recognises the popular application of *philotimia* because of the contradiction between 1107 b 22, and 29 f. Joachim follows Monro in treating the second passage as a later, or even post-Aristotelian addition. The situation is similar to the conflict between Aristotle’s new, prescriptive definition of *ἄσσωτος*, and the popular application, which he recognizes and uses.

the good friend to help out those in need, when such a benefaction occurs, “each party should gain an increase from the friendship, but not the same thing; the superior gains in honour, the inferior, or man-in-need, gains materially, in profit” (1163 b 1–1165).³⁸ The difference is that Aristotle is here describing a friendship of unequals, in which the inferior is only seeking material gain, and is thus a means of the superior gaining honour. But in our situation, both men have the same values, with honour, not material gain as their goal, and we are now made by Philemon to see that such ideas are incompatible with Lesbonicus' impoverishment; he *cannot retaliate* in generosity, and sees his honour as impaired by his friend's benefaction, and despite Aristotle's argument in 1162 b 6–12, he rejects it angrily.

Aristotle seemed to have a solution for this conflict of higher self-interest at 1169a; the good man, he suggested would give his friend the chance to do gallant deeds instead of himself, as an act of nobility. It is difficult to see how this would restore the balance of honour required. In battle, A might stand back and let B save C's life, in the ἀγορά he could deliberately let B bail out C, but you will note that such a situation is usually at the expense of C—acceptable perhaps so long as C is materialist, an ἀγοραῖος not competing for higher timings.

It was, I think, a severe handicap for Aristotle to take over the honour-culture of this society, and try to rationalise it and incorporate it into his moral system. Τιμή, τιμᾶσθαι, external honour, is essentially a selfish value. Thus in our play each young man is motivated chiefly by the desire to be thought good and noble;³⁹ hence the impasse, for which Philemon provides a dramatic, not a philosophical solution, with the Return of the Father.

38 E.N. 1163 b 1–3 δεῖν ἑκατέρῳ πλεον νέμειν ἐκ τῆς φιλίας, οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δέ, ἀλλὰ τῷ μὲν ὑπερέχοντι τιμῆς τῷ δ' ἐνδεεῖ κέρδους.

39 Hence the obsession with *fama* (Greek δόξα) in this scene (642; 689–690; 692) and the concern with public criticism (653; 689; 694; 703). We might note that in the similar rudimentary Agon between Orestes and Pylades, in Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 674–699, as each competes to die instead of the other, each offers as a major argument the desire to avoid public criticism and ill-fame. The Euripidean scene is used as an illustration of self-sacrifice for friendship by Cicero, *Lael.* 24: although on nationalist principles he quotes from the Latin version of Pacuvius both the argument and the illustration are likely to have occurred in his Greek source, and may have been inherited by Panaetius from the Peripatetic tradition.

This account of the Agon has suggested a problem inherent in popular morality; that the pursuit of honour through generosity seems to entail damage to the honour of the recipient. In society as a whole this can be avoided by displaying generosity towards those too humble or too crude to be conquered with honour. Between friends however, this type of generosity requires the possibility of reciprocal favours, if the friendship is not to break down in the reproaches of the giver, or embarrassment of the receiver. Should we blame impasse instead on a failure in the individual, Lesbonicus?

Lysiteles' argument to persuade him to retain his property are such as the Athenian public would endorse, and are confirmed by Stasimus' joking award of the prize⁴⁰ to Lysiteles for his "performance"; *uicit tua comoedia* (706). The audience has already heard from Philto in Act 2 sc. 2 that a man has a primary obligation to maintain his income so as to fulfil his commitments to the family and the community:⁴¹ in this Lesbonicus has failed and his projected emigration will equally rob society at home of his services. Yet while both young men talk of honour-as-reputation, Philemon gives Lesbonicus a claim at a higher level, which Lysiteles does not answer:

is est honos homini pudico, meminisse officium suum (697).

Real honour lies in the fulfilment of one's duty. As Zucker admits "er hat Ehrgefühl". He explains the conflict between the young men as arising from divergence of Ethos; they are not *ὁμοῖθεις*, and he accordingly labels the dramatic issue here as that of true friendship between men who are not *ὁμοῖθεις*, a deviation from ethical theory.⁴²

This is, I think, a false trail; for all his past weaknesses, attested in almost every scene,⁴³ Lesbonicus has the same values as Lysiteles, and

40 703–706: Lehmann 78–79 calls him "Kampfrichter", umpire.

41 *Tri.* 350–354 *sed ciui innuni scin quid cantari solet?*

"quod habes ne habeas, et illuc quod non habes habeas, malum, quandoquidem nec tibi bene esse pote pati neque alteri"

:: scio ego istuc ita solere fieri: uerum gnate me,

is est innunis quoi nil est qui munus fungatur suum.

Cf. *Tri.* 687 *eum agrum me habere quam te, tua qui tolere moenia*, and *Ar. E.N.* 1163 b 5–8 οὐ γὰρ τιμᾶται ὁ μηδὲν ἀγαθὸν τῷ κοινῷ πορίζων τὸ κοινὸν γὰρ δίδεται τῷ τὸ κοινὸν εὐεργετοῦντι, ἡ τιμὴ δὲ κοινόν. See also Dover, *op. cit.* (n. 25), 173.

42 Zucker, 18–19.

43 References to Lesbonicus' wasteful extravagance occur at *Prol.* 13; 108; 114; 116; 360, etc.; specific reference to his love-affairs occur at 131–132 *amanti*

ends the play as his friend and brother-in-law, with every hope of a steady future. To see him only as a wastrel would overlook the dramatic data of his positive generosity acknowledged in 333 and in more detail at 425–431; thus we are brought back to the uncomfortable contradiction between Lesbonicus' honourable attitude and behaviour on stage, and the extravagant folly of his love-affairs according to his own admission (657–659) and the reports of others.

Lehmann directed our attention to the type of ἄσωτος carefully distinguished by Aristotle in 1121 a 13; but if we look at Aristotle's discussion in its wider context, we come to a type far closer to the role we have been considering. His words in 657: *scibam ut esse me deceret, facere non quibam miser*, recall the condition of the ἀκρατής⁴⁴ and in particular *E.N.* 1119b31 τοὺς γὰρ ἀκρατεῖς καὶ εἰς ἀκολασίαν δαπανηροὺς ἄσώτους καλοῦμεν “we call those who cannot control themselves and squander money on profligacy spendthrifts”. This kind of ἄσωτία is fully described in 1121 b 8 f. εὐχερῶς γὰρ ἀναλίσκοντες καὶ εἰς τὰς ἀκολασίας δαπανηροὶ εἰσι, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ζῆν πρὸς τὰς ἡδονὰς ἀποκλίνουσιν. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἄσωτος ἀπαιδαγωγήτος γενόμενος εἰς ταῦτα μεταβαίνει, τυχὼν δ' ἐπιμελείας εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ εἰς τὸ δέον ἀφίκοιτ' ἄν, and more significantly for our play, 1121 a 20 εὐιάτος τε γὰρ ἔστι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἡλικίας καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀπορίας, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον δύναται ἐλθεῖν. Such profligates can be cured by age or by lack of means, ἀπορία. Surely this is what we are witnessing in Lesbonicus; a young man who has just begun his own moral recovery under pressure of poverty, and will complete his recovery with timely rebukes of Lysiteles. *Aporia* daughter of *Trouphê* has cured her house-mate of his folly.

Without Lesbonicus' sense of honour there would be no grounds for continued friendship, and no dramatic crisis; but Philemon could have retained his sense of honour and let Lesbonicus incur his debts only out of generosity—Lehmann's pure ἄσωτος free of other failings. Why did Philemon create this hybrid figure?

Several motives suggest themselves:

homini adolescenti, animi impoti / qui exaedificaret suam inchoatam ignauiam, at 334; 406–412; 648; 651; 657–658; 667–673; 751–752 *adulescenti ... / indomito, pleno amoris ac lasciuiae?*

44 For Lesbonicus as ἀκρατής cf. *animi impoti*, 131, and *indomito*, 751 above. *Facere non quibam miser*, corresponds to Aristotle's definition at 1145 b 13 καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀκρατής εἰδὼς ὅτι φαῦλα πράττει διὰ πάθος ... ἀκολουθεῖ. 1119 b 31 simply anticipates the full discussion, in order to specify the particular kind of ἀκρατεῖς whom Greeks call ἄσωτοι.

I. The audience needs a man of human frailty with whom to sympathise or even identify; comedy habitually embodies this in the young lover.

II. Just as tragic justice is offended by the suffering of a good man without fault (Ar. *Poetics* 1452 b 34–35) so in ethical comedy it is more acceptable to the audience's moral sense that the man who experiences misfortune should have some appropriate fault of character.

III. The dramatic potential of the Agon in Act 3 scene 2 depends on such a differential between the two young men. Lysiteles could not effectively reproach his friend for *generosity*. If there is to be a confrontation Lesbonicus must have deserved rebuke, and his dissipation provides additional subject-matter for moralising.

The Agon needs motivation, contrast, and content; but however great Philemon's interest in exploiting the added scope for moral discussion offered by Lesbonicus' unspecified sexual escapades, or in creating a satisfactory contrast between two roles, we must see his chief motive in the deliberate repetition and variation of the theme of crisis and moral correction in friendship which has already been dramatised in Act I. The formal parallelism of the two episodes guarantees the purpose and emphasis of the second, centrally placed, dispute. The conflict over the dowry, and Lesbonicus' honourable insistence on providing one, is in no way dramatically necessary to stimulate the old men's intrigue; far from it. They do not know of Lesbonicus' resolve, and judging him by his past lapses, continue to believe, in 729–735 as in 605–613, that he will hand over his sister undowered. But the conflict is thematically important for the ethical issue, for the interest of the arguments generated, and, I would suggest, for the ἀπορία in which it is suspended. When Philemon provided a dramatic solution with the return of the father in Act 4 he did not resolve the moral contradiction of the *beneficium* proposed by Lysiteles to Lesbonicus.

Further evidence of the careful composition of this play as a study in friendship is the symmetry of motif and action between the first section, from Act 1 to Act 4 scene 4, and the denouement, Act 4 scene 5 to the end. In the first act Callicles' behaviour towards Charmides was challenged by Megaronides out of a sense of obligation, and acting in the name of friendship. He saw himself compelled to rebuke and correct Callicles, believing him guilty of a breach of faith (*culpa* and *fides* are the key words in the Latin text). In the last scene of Act 4 Charmides returns to challenge Callicles, as a result of a second misunderstanding: he opens with the question *qualine amico mea commendavi bona?* and Cal-

lices rapidly vindicates his *fides* as in act I; it is formally confirmed by the slave Stasimus' direct monologue *ad spectatores*, 1110–1115; then the pattern is enlarged and completed in Act 5 scene 2, when Callicles declares his good deeds are “no cause for praise: I have merely avoided reproach: unlike a kindness, given for keeps, a deposit is entrusted to be reclaimed at will”.⁴⁵ This at first sight otiose expansion resumes the themes of *culpa* and *beneficium* which dominated the opening and central acts of the play, and indicates the superiority of Lysiteles' *beneficium* to his own mere good faith in returning the treasure unharmed.

In the second phase of denouement, Lysiteles, who left Lesbonicus with a threat of breaking off the friendship, comparable to Megaronides' first entry in Act 1, returns to the stage to obtain confirmation of his betrothal. When Charmides reproaches him with the corruption of Lesbonicus, it is Lysiteles who wins a pardon for his friend, and calls the shamefaced Lesbonicus out for the good news, identifying himself as *beneuolens tuus atque amicus*, “your friend who loves you well.”⁴⁶ In this way Act 5 scene 2 restores the friendship that was at risk in Act 3 scene 2 with almost the same words that opened the action in Act 1 scene 2.

It would be dangerous to suggest that this, or any other play of New Comedy was written as social criticism, or even as a *pièce à thèse* to support a moral argument. Philemon, like Antiphanes⁴⁷ the writer of

45 We might express this schematically.

Act 4 sc. 5	Act 1 sc. 2
1095 <i>qualine amico?</i>	→ 46 <i>tui beneuolentis</i>
1096 <i>fidelis, fidus, cum magna fide</i>	→ 117 <i>qui tuae mandatus est fidei</i>
1110 f. <i>firmus, firma fide</i>	<i>et fiduciae.</i>
Act 5 sc. 2	cf. 128, 142, 192
1125, 1128 <i>fides, fidelitas</i>	
1129 <i>culpa caruisse</i>	→ 79, 81 <i>culpam admittere</i>
	Act 2 sc. 3
1130 <i>beneficium</i>	→ 323 <i>benefacta</i> , 328 <i>bene ... facere</i>
	347 etc.

46 The alternatives offered by Megaronides of friendship (46) or enmity (47) are taken up by Lysiteles' declaration at his exit in Act 3 sc. 2, of friendship (713–714) or estrangement (715–716), both conditional on the friend's behaviour. This is resolved by the form of Lysiteles' re-entry, using the same self-identification as a friend at 1177 which opened Megaronides' scene with Callicles.

47 Cf. fr. 191 K. on the difficulty of the comic poets' craft; while tragic playwrights have their plots ready made and known to the audience, ἤμῖν δὲ

middle Comedy, had to create his own plots, and in a long tradition of plots around the theme of young gentlemen in love and debt, would be glad to get ideas for situations from outside the dramatic tradition. The ἀπορίαι of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, or his Θέσεις φιλικαί, and their development by Theophrastus in his three books Περὶ φιλίας, were discussed and read in Philemon's generation, and available to him when he came to Athens if not before.⁴⁸ If the development of later Peripatetic thought into a casuistic based on ἀπορία suggests that a post-Aristotelian source would offer more ready-made dramatic situations, we must acknowledge that the embryos of the problems hatched in Philemon's *Thesaurus* are all well formed in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. An ideal friendship of thoroughly good men is not a subject for comedy: in realistic drama characters must dilute perfection with recognizable human failings. Aristotle too was a realist; if his pragmatic approach and his attempts to retain a core of popular moral belief are imperfectly reconciled with the idealistic structure of theory he inherited from Plato, they have the advantage of making him a fertile source for the dramatist. Philemon in turn need not have been a moralist: the pursuit of good material was sufficient cause to lead him to Aristotle. When the requirements of his dramaturgy and his moral themes clashed, they produced the conflict which is embodied in the role of Lesbonicus. It is not the action of the *Thesaurus*, but the characterization, which has fallen victim to his appropriation of a philosophical framework.

ταῦτ' οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ πάντα δεῖ / εὐρεῖν, ὀνόματα καινά, τὰ διωκημένα / πρότερον, τὰ νῦν παρόντα, τὴν καταστροφὴν / τὴν εἰσβολήν. ἂν ἔν τι τούτων παραλίπη / Χρέμης τις ἢ Φεῖδων τις, ἐκσυρίττεται. / Πηλεῖ δὲ ταῦτ' ἔξεστι καὶ Τεύκρω ποιεῖν. (K. II, p.90)

- 48 Diogenes Laertius 5.22 attributes to Aristotle a Περὶ φιλίας in one book; 5.23 adds two books of Θέσεις φιλικαί. Diogenes also attests Theophrastus' three books Περὶ φιλίας, and a Περὶ φιλοτιμίας (5.46. See Regenbogen, *RE*, Supplbd. VII.1485 [12] and 1486 [14]). Since Theophrastus wrote on both topics, it is not unlikely that he discussed the conflict between friendship and the pursuit of honour in one or both works.

Philemon won his first victory at the Dionysia in 327/326, and he acquired Athenian citizenship by 307/306; Theophrastus was teaching in Athens from 335 to 307/306 so that Philemon could even have attended his lectures. But since Philemon lived on after Menander to the age of 99, probably in 264/263, he will have been writing even after the virtual fall of the Peripatetic school. See Körte, *RE* XIX.2.1357 for Philemon's birthdate and career, and F. Grayeff, *Aristotle and the Peripatetic School*, London 1974, for Theophrastus' teaching career and the fate of the school and library after his death.

4. *Heautontimoroumenos* and *Adelphoe* : A Study of Fatherhood in Terence and Menander

The relationship between father and son is, of all common human bonds, the one treated most frequently and with the greatest sympathy by Terence. In five of his six plays (*Eunuchus* is the exception) the attitudes and obligations of fathers and sons to each other are discussed and illustrated by scenes which are designed to express aspects of this relationship. In the *Hecyra* and *Phormio* (Ἐπιδικαζόμενος) of Apollodorus, this is subordinated to other issues, but in three of the Menander-based plays, *Andria*, *Heautontimoroumenos* and *Adelphoe*, it is given more serious and prominent treatment. Clearly this relationship was also of importance to Menander; it is featured in *Dyskolos* (Callipides/Sostratos) and *Samia* (Demea : Moschion) and almost certainly in *Hypobolimaios*¹ as well as in the originals of Terence's plays; again all the plays of Philemon known to us through Plautus feature father-son pairs: but concern for the art of fatherhood, and its direct effect on the son is nowhere so prominent as in Terence's more limited output. It would be fascinating, but futile, to speculate on the cause of this preoccupation in Terence's own life. Instead I would like to consider the treatment of fathers and sons in the *Heautontimoroumenos* and *Adelphoe*, to see what judgement is expressed in these plays on how a man should act as father of a growing son. The great similarity of plot structure between the plays makes such a comparison particularly relevant. In *Heautontimoroumenos*, it will be found that the characterization and verdicts are relatively unambiguous. Because of this, and because *Heautontimoroumenos* has traditionally been accepted as an accurate representation of Menander's play, a study of *Heautontimoroumenos* should prove helpful in approaching the major problem of the *Adelphoe*: this problem, of the conflict in characterization and evaluation of each of

1 See A. Körte, *Menander* 2. 146–52 for surviving fragments and *Testimonia*. But of these only 430a *senex qui reposcenti filium patri* etc. suggests that the play is concerned with more than one *pater* (if indeed adoption is involved here). See also my more recent article *Terence and the Familiarisation of Comedy* (8 below).

the two fathers, has been intensely studied in recent years² and has raised a further issue for those who believe that the conflict is serious: are the final judgements on the fathers of the *Adelphoe* Menandrian, or due to modification by Terence of the crucial last act of Menander's play? I believe that interpretation of the *Heautontimoroumenos* will show affinities of structure and characterization with the *Adelphoe* which both explain the development of its final act, and support the claim of this act to be regarded as a fair representation of Menander.

A secondary problem is that of priority and development. Since the Terentian *Heautontimoroumenos* precedes the *Adelphoe* by three years,³ any discrepancy in the values expressed in the two plays might be attributed to a development in Terence's own outlook. But inasmuch as the plots and characterization of both plays derive from Menander, such development in Terence can only be assumed if he can be shown to have modified the conclusions of either play, or on the hypothesis that in each case Terence chose to translate the plays because he believed in their moral judgements, and not merely because they were good comedies in their own right. There is no factual evidence, internal or external, for the relative chronology of Menander's Ἑαυτὸν τιμωρούμενος and Ἀδελφοί β.⁴ At best the study of technique and ethos in the two

2 See (on the *Adelphoe* alone) O. Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders in den Adelphen des Terenz*. Mit einem Vorwort von K. Gaiser, Hildesheim 1964, 106 ff.; M. Neumann, *Die Poetische Gerechtigkeit in der Neuen Komödie*, Speyer 1958, 172–3 simply accepts that Menander himself has ruined the last act in his own portrait of Micio. He calls *Adelphoe* (p. 182) “das einzige Stück der neuen Komödie, das hinsichtlich der poetischen Gerechtigkeit unlösbare Probleme bietet”. A larger selection of articles on this topic is given in n. 17 below.

3 I adhere to the chronology of the *Didasalia*, which place *Adelphoe* in 160 as Terence's last composition. The validity of the *Didasalia* is confirmed by the nature of the plays themselves. *Andria*, *Hecyra*, *Heautontimoroumenos*, in which the element of Plautine comedy and intrigue is small, represent Terence's early output. After the failure of *Hecyra* and possible unpopularity of *Heautontimoroumenos* (suggested by the lapse of two years between *Heautontimoroumenos* and *Eunuchus*) the three later plays show a conscious striving for popularity in his choice of plays which offer a greater prominence for the comic slave (and parasite), and a more lively action such as would appeal to the supporters of Plautine comedies of intrigue.

4 Körte, *RE* XV. 710–11 on Menander disposes of earlier arguments (see Bethe, *Hermes* 37 (1935) 280–3) based on the interpretation of *Heautontimoroumenos* 117 (*Ad regem militatum abiit*) and 194 (*patriam incolumem*) that the *Heautontimoroumenos* must have been written before the death of Alexander and was thus one of Menander's very first productions.

plays may perhaps reveal greater maturity in the handling of the theme for one or the other, and so suggest a possible relative dating. These questions are however so complex and interrelated, that any hypothesis about the relationship of the two Greek plays can represent only one of many possible and unverifiable interpretations.

Heautontimoroumenos and *Adelphoe* are similar in plot and structure, even in individual dramatic motifs. Both focus on the relationship of contrasted pairs of fathers and sons; these relationships are brought to a crisis by the son's love affairs. In both plays the stronger, more generous and high-principled boy (Clinia : Aeschinus) loves an honest girl whose citizen birth enables their romance to end in marriage: the weaker boy is in love with a vicious or insignificant girl (Bacchis in *Heautontimoroumenos* is vicious; the *psaltria* of *Adelphoe* merely insignificant) to whom marriage is impossible. This has been concealed from the father, and the second intrigue is concerned with this weaker boy's attempts, aided by his stronger friend and a clever slave, to keep the affair concealed, and the consequences of his failure.

In structure the plays follow a similar pattern. Each opens with the fathers, and the most important scene of each first act shows through dialogue between the fathers what their attitudes are towards fatherhood, and their feelings towards their sons. In both plays the second act⁵ is predominantly concerned with the sons, who make their first appearance, and the details of their love affairs which are unknown to the fathers. The weaker sons (Clitipho : Ctesipho) are allowed to reveal their attitudes in monologue (*Heautontimoroumenos* 213 ff., *Adelphoe* 254 ff.) before they encounter their more honourable comrade (*Heautontimoroumenos* 230 ff., *Adelphoe* 265 ff.) and discuss their situation in dialogue. The act is developed by their encounter with the helpful slave (Syrus in both plays) who sets the intrigue underway with the women (*Heautontimoroumenos*) or the pimp who controls one of them (*Adelphoe*). In *Adelphoe* however the revelation of Aeschinus' respectable love is delayed until the next phase of the drama in Act 3.

5 In *Heautontimoroumenos* this should begin at 171, where Chremes returns after an empty stage (see Skutsch, *Hermes* 67, 141): there is no empty stage at 213, where the manuscripts indicate the beginning of Act 2.

This description of Act 2 of the *Adelphoe* is not affected by Terence's introduction (as Act 2 sc. 1) of a scene from Diphilus' *Synapothneskontes*. On Terence's modifications of Menander in Act II of the *Adelphoe*, see my article in *Philologus* 112 (1968) 196–215.

In both plays Act 3 begins to involve the fathers in these love affairs and the separate generation elements of Acts 1 and 2 are drawn together. The respectable affair of the stronger boy is the first to be resolved: Clinia's by the recognition of Antiphila following *Heautontimoroumenos*, Act 4 sc.1, Aeschinus' by his father's discovery of the seduction and approval of the marriage (Act 4 sc. 3 and sc. 5). This leaves Act 5 to provide the more difficult solution for the unsatisfactory affairs of the weaker boys, Clitipho and Ctesipho, and returns the focus of attention to the fathers and their different principles of upbringing. A further common feature is the disappearance of one of the young men in Act 4 (the decent Clinia after *Heautontimoroumenos* Act 4 sc. 4, Ctesipho after *Adelphoe* Act 4 sc. 2), but it should be noticed that whereas Clinia naturally disappears after the solution of his love affair, it is not the corresponding figure Aeschinus but the colourless Ctesipho who disappears from the *Adelphoe*.

The confrontations between the fathers provide crucial scenes which frame the plots of both plays. Menedemus and Chremes of the *Heautontimoroumenos* meet in Act 1 sc. 1 (this encounter forms the whole of Act 1); Act 3 sc. 1; Act 4 sc. 8; and Act 5 scs. 1 and 5: Micio and Demea meet in the main scene of *Adelphoe*'s first act: Act 1 sc. 2, in Act 4 sc. 7 and Act 5 scs. 3 and 8–9. The early relationships of Act 1, in which Chremes and Demea each criticize their rival's behaviour as a father, are developed to the point where Chremes and Demea reach their extreme of confidence (*Heautontimoroumenos* Act 4 sc. 8; *Adelphoe* Act 4 sc. 7) followed by their downfall with the revelations at the opening of Act 5 (*Heautontimoroumenos* Act 5 sc. 1; *Adelphoe*, Act 5 sc. 3). In each play their downfall is followed by a renewal of authority (Chremes Act 5 sc. 2, sc. 4 : Demea Act 5 scs. 5–8) and a re-establishment of balance when both fathers together contribute to the final situation (*Heautontimoroumenos* Act 5 sc. 5; *Adelphoe* Act 5 sc. 9).

But *Adelphoe* offers a more complicated pattern, in that Micio too suffers a reverse of authority: it is Micio's reversal which offers parallels to a striking motif in *Heautontimoroumenos*. In this play Chremes' lofty advice to Menedemus (153–6):

uerum nec tu illum sati' noueras
 nec te ille; hoc qui fit? ubi non uere uiuitur.
 tu illum numquam ostendisti quanti penderes
 nec tibi illest credere ausu' quae est aequom patri

is returned to him by Menedemus (924–6):

quid faciam? : : id quod me fecisse aiebas parum
fac te patrem esse sentiat; fac ut audeat
tibi credere omnia ...

This is underlined by Menedemus' own comment in soliloquy (503–7):

Ita comparatam esse hominum naturam omnium
aliena ut melius uideant ac diiudicent
quam sua! an eo fit quia in re nostra aut gaudio
sumus praepediti nimio aut aegritudine?
hic mihi nunc quanto plus sapit quam egomet mihi!

and its reversal in 922–3:

nonne id flagitiumst te aliis consilium dare,
foris sapere, tibi non posse te auxiliarier?

In *Adelphoe* the proposal of Micio from a superior position in Act 1 sc. 2, 129–32:

uerum Demea
curemus aequam uterque partem: tu alterum,
ego item alterum; nam ambos curare propemodum
repscere illumst quem dedisti

is cast in his teeth, when he has failed to adhere to it, by Demea: Act 5 sc. 3, 796–8 and 802:

dictum hoc inter nos fuit
(ex te adeo ortumst) ne tu curares meum
Neue ego tuom? responde : : factumst, non nego
... quando ego tuom non curo, ne cura meum.

This device is repeated when Micio's argument against Demea later in the same scene (833–4):

solum unum hoc uitium adfert senectus hominibus
adtentiores sumus ad rem omnes quam sat est

is returned by Demea in 953–4:

bene et sapienter dixi dudum: uitium commune omniumst
quod nimium ad rem in senecta adtenti sumus

This motif of verbal reminiscence in *Heautontimoroumenos* forms the main Peripeteia of Chremes' downfall. In *Adelphoe* the same device foreshadows and ornaments the secondary Peripeteia, the "fall" of

Micio; yet neither in Act 5 sc. 3 nor Act 5 sc. 8 does it point to Demea's real criticism of Micio's method.

There is another coincidence of verbal motif in these plays; one without moral significance, but revealing the work of the same playwright in both passages: Chremes expressed his pleasure with the deceitful slave Syrus in *Heautontimoroumenos* 761–3:

non possum pati
quin tibi caput demulceam; accede huc, Syre:
faciam boni tibi aliquid pro ista re ac lubens

Compare Demea's assumed goodwill towards his enemy Syrus: *Adelphoe*, 886–7:

seruom haud inliberalem praebes te, et tibi
lubens bene faxim

In characterization the sons are evenly matched in the two plays. Clinia and Aeschinus are alike honourable in intention, and aside from their human⁶ offence of falling in love without their fathers' approval, decent and admirable,⁷ torn between loyalty to their future wives and to their fathers. For Clinia this is well brought out by Menedemus' opening narrative (114–117), in Act 2 sc. 4, 397–409, and in Act 4 sc. 3, 700–705, where Clinia is unwilling to approach his father with a lie.

In the *Adelphoe*, the illustration of Aeschinus' decency and loyalty is concentrated in Act 4—his great monologue *discrucior animi* (sc. 4) and the dialogue with his father (sc. 5), culminating in his expression of filial love when left alone:

hic non amandus, hicine non gestandus in sinust? Hem
itaque adeo magnam mi iniicit sua commoditate curam
ne imprudens forte faciam quod nolit: sciens cauebo.

For both boys the conflict of loyalty is made more difficult by a further loyalty—to their comrade. Clinia must wait for the solution to his love

6 Compare the comment of Hegio—representing the playwright's judgement—on Aeschinus' seduction of Pamphila: *persuasit nox amor uinum adulescentia / humanumst. Ad.* 470–1.

7 However, Aeschinus' behaviour in Act 2 sc. 1, the scene borrowed from Diphilus' *Synapothneskontes*, has been fairly criticized as out of key with his delineation in the rest of the play. With the action of Diphilus' play, Terence has also taken over its Ethos, and the standards by which his "Aeschinus" acts—violence and arrogance to the low-born pimp—are manifestly different from those of Menander.

until Clitipho's deception is completed (*Heautontimoroumenos* Act 4 sc. 3, 695 ff.). Aeschinus, who has incurred scandal and reproach by the abduction committed to save his brother from a desperate act, cannot clear himself of suspicion even to his own beloved, without risking the betrayal of Ctesipho (*Adelphoe* Act 4 sc. 4, 626 ff.). There is perhaps more difference between the weaker boys, Clitipho and Ctesipho. Both depend upon others to achieve what they desire, but in Ctesipho's case this is depicted as due to youthful ignorance of the world; his chief characteristic is fear, especially of his father (cf. *Adelphoe* 283 and Act 4 scs. 1 and 2), but he is without ill nature or vice: his gratitude to Aeschinus and embarrassment before him (*Adelphoe* 254–59, 268–70) do him credit, and even towards his father, he wishes only a modified illness that would handicap him for a couple of days *quod cum salute eius fiat* (*Adelphoe* 519). He is neither good nor bad enough to be interesting, and the dramatist keeps his appearances to the minimum (Act 2 scs. 3 and 4; Act 4 scs. 1 and 2); thus although the crisis of Act 5 derives from his deception of his father, he is not brought back to the stage. The balance of interest is reversed in the *Heautontimoroumenos*; there, the weak Clitipho makes a more interesting character study than Clinia; while Clinia leaves the stage in Act 4 sc. 4, Clitipho's reaction to his crisis is shown fully in Act 5 scs. 2, 4 and 5. He is a spoiled boy: indifferent to his father (Act 2 sc. 1), infatuated with a woman he knows to be vicious, and fears (Act 2 sc. 1, 223–228; Act 2 sc. 3, 311 ff.). Syrus accuses him of seeking pleasure without the courage to take risks (322–5). His own indiscretions nearly ruin the intrigue (Act 3 sc. 3) and it is only by keeping Clitipho away that Syrus can continue his plot on the boys' behalf. In the last act, his reaction to his father's anger is self pity (Act 5 sc. 2, esp. 955–7, 971, 980) and absurd melodrama (Act 5 sc. 4, 1024–1027). However he is not beyond redemption, and shame (Act 5 sc. 4, 1043–4) is finally followed by obedience (Act 5 sc. 5, 1059) and the prospect of reformation.

There is one interesting difference in the relationship between the pairs of boys as it is found in these plays. Whereas Clinia and Clitipho are presumed to be *aequales* (implied by 183–4 *mihi cum eo iam inde usque a pueritia / fuit semper familiaritas*), Aeschinus and Ctesipho are actual brothers and Aeschinus is the elder (cf. *Adelphoe* 47): this is reflected in their behaviour together in Act 2 scs. 3 and 4: Ctesipho's attitude is that of a schoolboy towards an undergraduate. The fact that these two are brothers gives added emphasis to the difference in their characters but it must be noted that Terence (or Menander) does not use this to

raise the issue of environment versus heredity: in both plays the boys are treated as the products of their *upbringing*. The only exceptions in *Heautontimoroumenos* are the flippant comments of Chremes to Sostrata his wife (1020–22):

Conuincas facile ex te natum; nam tui similest probe;
nam illi nil uitist relictum quin siet itidem tibi;
tum praeterea talem nisi tu nulla pareret filium

and his ambiguous reproach to Clinia (1033–4):

gerro iners fraus helluo
ganeo's damnosu'; crede, et nostrum te esse credito.

It is never suggested in *Adelphoe* that Aeschinus and Ctesipho, sharing a common father, Demea, by nature, should have been similar in character. The function of Aeschinus' adoption by Micio in the dramatist's⁸ plot is merely to justify Demea's concern for Aeschinus and Micio's intervention in Ctesipho's affairs. At the same time the brotherhood of Micio and Demea explains their intimacy and gives a subtle ambiguity to the title (which pair of brothers is meant by *Adelphoe*?). In turn their own different circumstances—easy bachelor life in the city opposed to the relative hardship of married life in the country—are used as explanation of their different characters (by Micio: *Adelphoe* 40–46; by Demea: *Adelphoe* 862–868), without comment on the similarities which a belief in heredity might lead one to expect.

The characters of the fathers, and the values to be set upon their behaviour, are far more complex and clearly the real *focus* of interest for playwright and audience. So many problems are raised, especially in the *Adelphoe*, that it is essential to consider the plays separately, beginning with the *Heautontimoroumenos*, as Terence's first handling of the theme.

Students approaching this play for the first time tend to describe the fathers naïvely as lenient (Menedemus) and severe (Chremes). The play itself shows this to be a misrepresentation and the emphasis on leniency versus severity, although suggested by the dramatist himself in 151–157, distracts the interpreter from other aspects of these father-figures, which are more significant.

8 I use the general term 'dramatist' in this section in order to avoid attributing details of plot or dialogue specifically to Terence, as if they were innovations absent from Menander. The question of Terence's deviation from Menander will be discussed in the next section.

Menedemus has been severe in the past, threatening to disinherit his son for acting in a way he believes unworthy of himself (106–8):

ego te meum esse dici tantisper uolo
dum quod te dignumst facies, sed si id non facis
ego quod me in te sit facere dignum inuenero

By his reproaches he has driven Clinia into service in Asia, but from love of his son and conviction of his own selfishness (128–150) he has resolved to suffer until his son ceases to suffer. When he returns to the stage in Act 3 sc. 1 he is willing to do anything to have his son restored, and his first desire is to see him (432). Certainly he is now *lenis* (Chremes' verdict, 151 and again 438). Chremes' other reproach (153–6) that Menedemus has never really revealed his love to Clinia and encouraged his trust, may have been true formerly. What is certain from Menedemus' behaviour in the rest of the play is that he does love and trust his son. It is Chremes, not Menedemus, who constantly suspects dishonest trickery and interprets Clinia's past and future behaviour in that light. See especially Act 3 sc. 1, 478–89, and Act 4 sc. 8, 848–857. Another, related, characteristic of Menedemus is his *humility*. He has humbled himself after Clinia's departure: similarly he answers Chremes' rebuke with humility: 158 *ita res est, fateor: peccatum a me maxumest*; and acknowledges his own ignorance of how to treat his son (503–7, quoted above: at the same time by making Menedemus comment in general terms on man's wisdom in handling everyone's affairs but his own, the dramatist is preparing the audience for Chremes' failure). Even late in the development of the intrigue (Act 4 sc. 8, 850 ff.) he is easily convinced of Chremes' greater wisdom.

Menedemus is gentle even towards the errant Clitipho (Act 5 sc. 2, 957–9, Act 5 sc. 5, 1045–7, 1049–50). He has learnt from experience, and the humility which has followed his own failure gives him the wisdom to try to save Chremes, when the situation is reversed (919–20: *non tu te cohibes? non te respicis? non tibi ego exempli sati'sum?*). It is not Menedemus' former severity nor present leniency which is most conspicuous during the play (nor is Clinia's good behaviour towards his father described as being caused by either); rather Menedemus is not deceived or betrayed, because he has been honest and humble, and his reward is a personal happy ending.

Is Chremes, then, a severe or an indulgent father? In theory he is tolerant, in practice severe. This conflict of theory and practice, this

lack of honesty with others and himself, is his ruling fault.⁹ The advice he gives to Menedemus looks wise: your error, he declares in 153–7, is due to lack of trust and understanding. His advice to his own son in the following scene seems equally high-principled:

Uerum ubi animus semel se cupiditate deuinxit mala,
necessest, Clitipho, consilia consequi consimilia. hoc
scitumst, periculum ex aliis face[re] tibi quod ex usu siet.

But *scitumst* casts a false note: this is not morality, but *savoir vivre*; Chremes' pose as a man of the world here, and in conversation with Syrus (Act 3 sc. 2) and Clitipho (Act 3 sc. 3, especially 570–578), is incompatible with the moral severity he affects elsewhere. Thus his wordy tolerance for Clinia's affair in Act 3 sc. 3 suffers an instant change when the affair is seen to concern his own son (and money).

As soon as Clitipho is left alone (Act 2 sc. 1), we can measure Chremes' lack of success. Clitipho criticizes his father for lack of trust: If I have a son ... (218–9); *et cognoscendi*¹⁰ *et ignoscendi dabitur peccati locus / non ut meus (sc. pater) qui mihi per alium ostendit suam sententiam*. He has not talked straight with Clitipho, but obliquely; he has failed in the very way for which he reproached Menedemus. Moreover, 220, *is mi ubi adbibit plus paullo, sua quae narrat facinora* shows that Chremes' morals are all a pretence; he preaches virtue to his son because this is advantageous to himself, while showing that he does not respect virtue in boasting of his own youthful wild oats. The revelation in this same monologue of Clitipho's affair with Bacchis is conclusive proof of Chremes' failure either to convince or to understand his son.

However the extreme instance of Chremes' insincerity and dishonesty arises in Act 4. His lack of principle has involved him in an absurd situation whereby he encourages Syrus to deceive Menedemus, for Menedemus' own good. He urges Syrus in Act 4 sc. 5 to practice deception, but refuses to support him by pretending to betroth his new-found daughter to Clinia 782, *non meast simulatio*. Yet when he returns to the stage in Act 4 sc. 8, in dialogue with Menedemus, he advises the

9 Cf. T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander*, 65: "a more serious defect is insincerity ... later Chremes himself preaches insincerity both to Menedemus and to Clitipho" (478, 575).

10 Perhaps the force of *cognoscendi* has not been recognized here. It has more function than mere word-play. Chremes' habit of play-acting and devious approach to his son have destroyed any possibility of confiding or confession on Clitipho's part.

same piece of pretence (863–6); Menedemus is to declare to Clinia that Chremes has agreed to the betrothal. Here is insincerity triumphant. He is unwilling to let a mere slave believe that he will lie, but the same lie becomes legitimate, employed by a fellow citizen and gentleman, against the younger generation. Small wonder that Chremes' son does not trust him! 782 itself is a masterpiece of dramatic irony and psychology: all Chremes' advice, all his behaviour, is *simulatio*: perhaps at no single moment does he know what he really believes, or care what is morally right. Indeed, Act 4 sc. 5 imposes exquisite poetic justice on Chremes: it is in stooping to conspire with a slave to deceive his own friend that he puts himself in the slave's power, and begets his own deception.

This is brought upon Chremes by his lack of principle but even more by his absurd arrogance; his conviction that he can control other men's affairs and minds. This confidence in his own worldly wisdom leads him to manipulate others' lives and fail to run his own successfully; it makes him into a self-important busybody.¹¹ His πολυπραγμοσύνη appears not only in his interference with Menedemus' affairs but even in trivialities: Phania, asked to dinner before the play begins, has to be reminded to come on time (169–170).¹² His devoted services to Menedemus have to be interrupted while he postpones a service which he was performing for neighbours, acting as arbiter in a boundary-dispute (498–502). He sees himself as a busy man, whose wisdom is superior to and needed by others.

He is patronising to Menedemus, but openly rude and contemptuous towards his wife. Now, while abuse of the wife is a common feature in Greek comedy, even by characters not depicted as arrogant (Laches in *Hecyra*, Daemones in *Rudens*, Simo in *Mostellaria*) Chremes goes beyond these examples in abuse of Sostrata (633 *te inscientem atque imprudentem dicere ac facere omnia*, 1020–22 above) and in self-importance (634–6, *iam primum si meum imperium exsequi uoluisses, interemptam oportuit*).

When it comes to the crisis of Act 5 sc. 1, and Chremes is made to realize his son's deception (195 ff.), this artificiality is deflated, and a

11 Cf. Duckworth, *Nature of Roman Comedy*, 244: Chremes is “meddlesome, deceitful and miserly”; Webster, *op. cit.*, 65, “officious”.

12 The main motivation for this device is one of Greek stagecraft. The stage had to be emptied for the chorus of Dionysiac revellers to pass across. The dinner both justifies their appearance and gives Chremes a reason for departure which fits his character.

more human figure emerges: he admits his own stupidity and reproaches himself (915–6): he loses his temper, and now it is Chremes who seeks Menedemus' aid: 920–21 *prae iracundia, / Menedeme, non sum apud me ...* 924 *quid faciam?* and is rightly reproached for preaching to others what he fails to achieve himself. The motive for his violent severity in planning to disinherit Clitipho is a common fault in the fathers of Comedy—money: 928 *immo abeat multo malo quouis gentium, quam hic per flagitium ad inopiam redigat patrem nam si illi pergo suppeditare sumptibus / Menedeme, mihi illaec uere ad rastros res redit*. Concern for his money is stronger than love of his daughter (835–841) or son: but this fault, being a convention of the comic father, is given less prominence by the dramatist than the more serious psychological failings which are peculiar to Chremes.

However, the dramatist allows Chremes a certain success in his handling of the crisis, and his speeches of Act 5 sc. 2, 906–971, and Act 5 sc. 4, 1032–1042 are powerful and impressive. Indeed although Chremes' threats may be extreme, although perhaps *nimis grauius cruciat adulescentulum / nimisque inhumane* (1045–6), he acquires and retains a calm control of the situation, and it is only his severity which brings the young offender sufficiently to his senses to make him feel a gentlemanly shame and ensures that he will accept the respectable last resort of marriage that will put an end to his offences.

Thus if the initial condescension and authority of Chremes towards Menedemus is completely reversed in the Peripateia of Act 5 sc. 1, the balance is largely restored in what follows by Chremes' effectiveness in dealing with Clitipho, and the happy solution for Clitipho is achieved in the finale by a combination of Chremes' severity and Menedemus' gentle plea for forgiveness.

Can we then deduce what are presented as the essentials of fatherhood in *Heautontimoroumenos*? There is no one character who can be said to be the dramatist's mouthpiece, no *Raisonneur*; even Menedemus in his reaction to Chremes during the crisis of Act 5 sc. 1, confines his comments to the immediate situation without generalising or attempting to prescribe a pattern of fatherhood. Rather the proof of the father lies in the son's behaviour: we see Menedemus as a good father because his son is honest, affectionate, respectful; even before the play, when Menedemus was harsh, he lost Clinia physically by his absence, but not mentally by his distrust; rather the young man was convinced, and obeyed him. During the play Clinia's merits as a man and as a son are set alongside Menedemus' appearances—his honesty and humil-

ity—and without any direct encounter between them, it is clear that the father's virtues produced those of the son. In *Chremes* on the other hand we see dishonesty and conceit, we are shown (Act 2 sc. 1) how he has forfeited *Clitipho's* respect, and simultaneously the dramatist presents the spoiled young man himself; we not only can make our own judgement of *Chremes* by what he has produced, but we are given a clear picture of the father as seen by his son. Here is a man who has failed as a father because he has never questioned his motives, his methods or his values, nor doubted his own success. If the last act modifies the original impression of *Chremes' failure*, this is partly because *Chremes' character* itself has been modified, partly a concession to the atmosphere of the comic finale: overall the impression of failure remains. His faults are the negatives of *Menedemus' virtues*,¹³ and it is these, honesty, humility and love—a question of attitude, not method, which are set forth as the qualities of a good father.

The fathers of the *Adelphoe* present a more obvious antithesis, although this can be expressed in different ways: indulgences opposed to severity, urban to rustic values, *liberalitas* and its antithesis.¹⁴ But the apparent simplicity of the contrast disappears during the development of the play, and both *Micio* and *Demea* seem finally to combine incompatible qualities.

Micio appears first: his love for *Aeschinus* is stressed almost immediately (38–39):

13 In this interpretation I am at variance with Walzer, *Hermes* 70 (1935) 197–202. He sees both *Chremes* and *Menedemus* as exemplifying extremes, ὑπερβολαί where virtue is represented by the μέσον (thus linking the characters with Peripatetic theory). *Menedemus* represents first ἀκρασία, when in anger he drives out his own son, then excessive μεταμέλεια, then equally excessive ἡδονή (compare *Menedemus' own* allusion in 505–6 to *gaudio* / ... *nimio aut aegritudine*). *Chremes* exemplifies φιλανθρωπία without φρόνησις, which is thus mere πολυπραγμοσύνη. While these aspects are certainly present in the two fathers, Walzer's interpretation does less than justice to *Menedemus*, and destroys the genuine antithesis of the two men which is clear from their characterization when we take account of the qualities which I have illustrated above. Menander's and Terence's characters are fully developed men, not Theophrastian types illustrating a paragraph in a textbook of Ethics.

14 In this section I wish to present the characterization of the fathers only as it appears from Terence's play, without reference to the Greek ideals and judgements which may have been embodied in Menander's *Adelphoe*, or to any modifications which may have been introduced by Terence. As a result the outline which follows is deliberately naive, in so far as it is confined to the immediate effect of the play itself.

uah, quemquamne hominem in animo instituere aut
parare quod sit carius quam ipse est sibi.

From this he proceeds to a description of Demea, Aeschinus' natural father, and of their contrasted attitudes to fatherhood. Micio presents his own creed (72):

ill' quem beneficio adiungas ex animo facit,
studet par referre, praesens absensque idem erit.
hoc patriumst, potiu' consuefacere filium
sua sponte recte facere quam alieno metu:
hoc pater ac dominus interest.

He has also sought to win his son's love and trust (*ea ne me celet consuefecit filium* 54), by generosity and tolerance: yet he feels a moral concern for Aeschinus, although he is not willing to reveal it to his brother (141–3, 147–53), and in his encounter with Aeschinus in Act 4 sc. 5 he combines love and forgiveness with real severity: cf. 670–2, 680, *nam te amo, quo mage quae agi' curae sunt mihi*, and the main speech of this scene: 683–96. Before his father Aeschinus feels a proper shame (643 *erubuit*, and 680–683) and an answering love, revealed by his monologue (707–712). Towards Aeschinus' mistress and her family Micio behaves himself with a sense of duty and of their dignity: cf. Act 4 sc. 3, 593–4:

ego in hac re nil reperio quam ob rem lauder tantopere Hegio,
meum officium facio, quod peccatum a nobis ortumst corrigo.

Nothing that is said or done by Micio or his son in the first four acts of *Adelphoe* suggests that his concept of fatherhood is anything but successful. But the fifth act shows him in a different light: Demea's criticism in Act 5 sc. 3, 796 ff.,

dictum hoc inter nos fuit
(ex te adeo ortumst) ne tu curares meum
neue ego tuom? ...
quando tuom non curo, ne cura meum

is justified, and must have been felt by the audience as unanswerable. Micio is not deterred, and his moral arguments from 821–830 are impressive, but he has not answered the charge, and Demea's fears (835–7),

ne nimium modo
bonae tuae istae nos rationes, Micio
et tuos iste animus aequo' subuortat,

smack of sense and inspire doubts: are Micio's *rationes nimium bonae*? Is he merely sophistic and plausible?

When Demea's change of policy in the next scene leads into a series of benefactions at Micio's expense, Micio agrees to them all, even the marriage which he describes as *prauom ineptum absurdum atque alienum a uita mea* (944) urged on by Aeschinus, apparently in order to please his son. Finally, having made all these concessions, he is condemned out of Demea's mouth, and by the agreement of the very son he has set out to please (986–8):

ut id ostenderem, quod te isti facilem et festiuom putant,
id non fieri ex uera uita neque adeo ex aequo et bono
sed ex adsentando indulgendo et largiendo, Micio.

and 995:

tibi pater permittimus,
plus scis quid opu' factost.

Thus whereas the first four acts seem to show Micio as a good and successful father, mixing a right measure of indulgence and authority, this estimate is reversed and rejected by the development and conclusion of the last act.

The beginning of this re-estimate is the crucial reproach by Demea quoted above (796 up to 802). In Act 1 sc. 2 Micio proposed a limitation of spheres of interest to Demea; let each concern himself for his own child: *tu alterum / ego item alterum*. In Act 5 sc. 3 Demea can fairly accuse Micio of breaking faith, and Micio has no valid defence. To the legally-minded Roman audience there is only one interpretation, that Micio *has* broken faith, is guilty of *inconstantia*; he has failed, like Chremes, to adhere to the principle he proposed for other men's use. But the moral reverse is not exploited and Micio emerges from Act 5 sc. 3 apparently triumphant, while Demea's conviction of defeat is shown by the ensuing monologue.

Only after Demea's *reductio ad absurdum* of Micio's indulgence to Aeschinus (underlined by the second instance of reproach with Micio's earlier principles 833–4 = 953–4) and his final revelation of his motives and criticism, does Micio really suffer a moral reverse. The reader begins to re-examine Micio's speeches and behaviour in previous scenes: with Demea in Act 1 sc. 2, Act 4 sc. 7, with Aeschinus in Act 4 sc. 6, to discover any previous sign that Micio's principles were false, or his affirmations shallow platitudes without sincerity like those

of Chremes to Menedemus. But in the live performance the audience could not reinterpret earlier scenes retrospectively in the light of the final verdict. On the other hand, caught up in a fast-moving denouement, they would not have time to recall previous scenes which seemed to be contradicted by the outcome of the play. It cannot be denied that there is an irreconcilable clash between the apparent success of Micio as a father in Acts 1–4 and his weakness, acknowledged as such by his own son, in the last scene of the play; it is this which prevents us attributing to Terence an unambiguous judgement of Micio as a father.

Is there the same contradiction in Terence's presentation of Demea? Demea is above all the severe father, severe even with himself (45 *semper parce ac duriter se habere*, 869 *contriui in quaerundo uitam atque aetatem meam*). His first entry is angry and contentious, as Micio has already foretold (cf. 60–67, 78–90). He sees his son Aeschinus as corrupted by Micio's indulgence and contrasts him unfavourably with Ctesipho whom he himself has disciplined and reared as a sober young farmer. He too believes that he understands fatherhood (125):

pater esse discere ab aliis qui uere sciunt.

It is perhaps these words, reminiscent of *Heautontimoroumenos*, 153–8, which prepare the audience to discover that Demea is deceiving himself. Like Chremes he knows how to be a father—but his son knows better how to deceive him. By the time of his next appearance in Act 3 sc. 3, the audience knows of the deception and the whole scene emphasizes his folly in believing that he understands his son. Like Chremes, again, he is most effectively fooled by the clever slave who knows his weakness, 394–7:

tu, quantu' quantu's, nil nisi sapientia es
ill' somnium: sineres uero illum tu tuom
facere haec? :: sinerem illum? aut non sex totis mensibus
prius olfecissem quam ille quicquam coeperat?

He is shown more favourably in his touching comment on Hegio whose old-style virtue gives him some comfort in a corrupt modern world, and in his shame at Hegio's bad news (485) and desire to do right (499–9a, 505 *fient quae fieri aequomst*). But in the hands of Syrus (Act 4 sc. 2) he is again fooled through his own belief in Ctesipho's virtue (564 *laudo, Ctesipho, patrissas! abi, uirum te iudico*) which springs from his conviction of right method in bringing up his child. Act 4 sc. 7 is more complex, and his reactions reveal a more sordid side of his char-

acter. The climax of his reproach against Aeschinus is 728–9 *uirgo nil habet ... et ducenda indotata*: he is most concerned, then, at the financial implications of the marriage. Demea's view of immorality as extravagance has already been suggested in Act 1 sc. 2 both by Micio's form of reply in 116 ff., and by his own impatience in 134: *profundat, perdat, pereat*, and in Act 3 sc. 3 (384). Later it will be made apparent by the first section of Micio's defence in Act 5 sc. 3 (806–817) and by Demea's own monologue (Act 5 sc. 4): his opening metaphor is one of accounting (855) and his theme one of contrasted expense and returns (870). It is not impossible that, as has been suggested by Rieth (*op. cit.*, n 2 above), he wished Micio to repudiate Aeschinus' future bride; yet his repeated questions: 727 *non clamas? non insanis?* 730 *quidnunc futurumst?* 733 *istocine pacto oportet?* 732 *quid facias?* etc. seem rather concerned with Micio's lack of indignation against Aeschinus, than with the actual marriage decision.

With 733:

si non ipsa re tibi istuc dolet
simulare certe est hominis,

a more serious doubt is thrown of Demea's standards. Here momentarily is revealed an insincerity similar to that of Chremes—a man ought to pretend distress at such wicked behaviour, if he doesn't feel it. A similar preoccupation with appearances is suggested by Demea's outcry against Aeschinus at his first entry, 91 ff.,

clamant omnes indignissime
factum esse. hoc aduenienti quot mihi, Micio,
dixere. In orest omni populo,

and perhaps by his choice of *flagitia* ('public scandals') to describe Aeschinus' offences in 721 (cf. Chremes, *Heautontimoroumenos*, 1035–7 *non ... patiar, Clitipho / flagitiis tuis me infamem fieri*). Like many of the figures in Comedy Demea is concerned with *res* and *fama*,¹⁵ the superficial criteria of men whose morality is purely external.

Of these faults, for which Demea can be compared with Chremes, Terence has clearly brought out the illiberal preoccupation with money; the concern for public opinion is less apparent, and perhaps only at 732–3 is this unambiguous.

15 However, this concern is often expressed by characters represented as honourable; Philolaches, Plautus, *Most.* 144: Lysiteles *Trin.*, 256–275.

So far then Demea is a fool for believing that he understands and can control his son; his values are shown to be shallow in that he judges immorality primarily in terms of money and public opinion. Act 5 sc. 3 confronts him with the real moral crisis—the discovery of his son’s corruption: if his initial reaction, like that of Chremes in *Heautontimoroumenos*, Act 5 sc. 1, 920–1 (*prae iracundia / Menedeme non sum apud me*) is uncontrollable anger and despair, cf. 789 *ei mihi quid faciam? quid agam? quid clamen aut querar!* 794 *tandem reprime iracundiam atque ad te redi*. His recovery is considerable and, as I have shown above, his criticism of Micio’s intervention is answerable. Nor are his protests confined to financial hazards; 820 *mitto rem ... consuetudinem amborum ...* shows genuine moral concern. 835 *ne nimium modo / bonae tuae istae nos rationes Micio / et tuos iste animus aequo’ subuortat*, not only expresses a legitimate warning but foreshadows the new developments which follow when Demea assumes the same *bonae rationes* and *animus aequos*; and in so doing overthrows (*subuortere*) Micio’s position of superiority in the final scene.

The most important scene for an understanding of Demea is the monologue which follows, and it has been rightly interpreted, in detail, by Rieth (*op. cit.* (n 2), 106–110). Demea rejects his previous way of life not on moral grounds, because he has found it wrong, but on grounds of policy: 860–7 *re ipsa repperi / facilitate nil esse homini melius neque clementia*: he sees Micio’s success as earned not by love and understanding but *paullo sumptu* (876). Now he will try what he sees as Micio’s methods.

experiamur contra ecquid ego possiem
blande dicere aut benigne facere, quando hoc prouocat

(*Hoc prouocat* itself is ambiguous: does he refer to Micio’s immediately preceding request, 842 *hodie modo hilarum te face*, or does he see Micio’s previous life as a general challenge which he must answer? This is supported by his final thoughts:

ego quoque a meis me amari et magni pendi postulo
si id fit dando atque obsequendo, non posteriores feram.

His motive is to win back his children’s love; for this he will play a role, and will not content himself with a subsidiary role, at that.

Throughout the following crescendo of assumed generosity Demea leaves no doubt that he is play-acting, and doing so out of spite against his brother. Consider the sequence of asides and comments: 884–5 *iam nunc haec tria primum addidi / praeter naturam* (the Syrus scene, Act 5 sc. 5)

896–7 *meditor esse adfabilis / et bene procedit ... paullatum plebem primulum facio meam* (with Geta: Act 5 sc. 6) 911 ff. *euge! iam lepidus uocor. / fratri aedes fient peruiiae, turbam domum / adducet, [et] sumptu amittet multa, quid mea? / ego lepidus in eo gratiam. iube nunciam / dinumeret illi Babylo uiginti minas* (Act 5 sc. 7) 946 *quid ego dicam, hoc quom confit quod uolo*, and 958 *suo sibi gladio hunc iugulo* (Act 5 sc. 8 with Aeschinus as his ally in overwhelming Micio). So far perhaps only comic malice is evident, but in Act 5 sc. 9, the final scene, Demea adopts irony with a clear moral content (cf. 964–9) and his final argument is Aeschinus' whim *denique hic uolt fieri*. The malice begins to assume a moral justification which is finally confirmed by Demea's last speech. Micio has accused him (985) of *largitas* (not the admirable *liberalitas* which Micio himself preaches). Demea now reveals a motive which was absent from his apparently self-revelatory monologue, and the ensuing scenes—to prove the falsity of Micio's success. Yet if his description—*adsentando, indulgendo et largiendo*—does not represent the Micio of Acts 1–4, but only of the last two scenes, Demea's positive proposals:

quae uos propter adulescentiam
minu'uidetis, magis impense cupiti', consuliti' parum
haec reprehendere me et corrigere et [ob] secundare in loco

do not represent his own former attitude and behaviour; the old universal severity *has* been modified, and Terence presents us in this scene not only with a new picture of Micio, but also with a new Demea. It is not only because of Micio's collapse of authority, but even more because of Demea's new moderation that Aeschinus pronounces what is apparently the final verdict: *plus scis quid opu' factost*, in its comparative form.

If this analysis is correct, there is indeed a conflict in the characterization of Demea, as in that of Micio; for just as in Micio's case, the Demea of Acts 1–4 has given no hint of the wisdom which emerges from the last encounter. In fact this conflict is more serious, since at least in the monologue (Act 5 sc. 4) which depicts Demea's change of policy, the audience has a right to know the whole truth about Demea's intentions. Instead, he presents only an inadequate interpretation of Micio's success and his own failure, and only the superficial, spiteful motive for the behaviour which he adopts.

Why has the dramatist chosen this form of finale to the play, which involves such serious contradictions of characterization? Once again I postpone the question of Terentian originality: whether this was the ending of Menander's *Adelphoe*, or instead a new form of ending was

imposed upon Menander's play by Terence, it is still legitimate to ask why Terence's play ends this way. If the answer is to be in terms of a social or moral philosophy it becomes essential to distinguish between Menandrian and Terentian elements in the play; but there may be a different kind of answer; an answer related to the playwright as a craftsman concerned with dramatic structure and a successful comic effect.

I have illustrated throughout this analysis similarities between the structure and characterization of Terence's *Heautontimoroumenos* and *Adelphoe*. Perhaps this comparison will also help to throw light on the finale of *Adelphoe*. In *Heautontimoroumenos* Chremes' terrible crisis when his failure as a father is revealed at the beginning of Act 5 is followed by a renewal of confidence and ultimate success in winning the shame and respect of his own son. In scenes 2 and 4–5 of the last act Chremes shows a new moderation (exemplified by his exoneration of Syrus; 975–6) and self-control, even a certain sense of irony (cf. 1033–4 above); hence his recovery of parental authority. This represents a development of the character depicted in Acts 1–4, which is perhaps inadequately motivated in the dialogue; at the same time because of this development, he is able to restore the balance, which at the beginning of the act was completely against him, in his own favour. Thus the submission of Clitipho, necessary for a conventional comic ending, is combined with a partial re-evaluation of Chremes, who has his share in the final honours.

It is perhaps with the same motive that in *Adelphoe* the dramatist follows Demea's humiliation with a new phase in the plot of the final act. Demea regains the initiative and begins for the first time in the play to control events; from the depths of failure and absurdity which he has reached at the beginning of Act 5 sc. 3, he gradually takes on a new wisdom. If, even more than Chremes' development of character, this is inadequately motivated, Demea achieves, even more than Chremes, a re-estimate of his value as a father, and the balance of praise and blame swings back from the extreme of Demea's catastrophe to provide a comically satisfactory ending, in which he too has learnt from disaster, and earns his share of the general success. What makes the *Adelphoe* more disquieting than *Heautontimoroumenos*, though it employs the same structural pattern, is that this is achieved at Micio's expense. Fundamentally it is the devaluation of Micio, not the re-estimate of Demea, which has caused the concern of scholars shocked by the contradiction in the finale of the Greek values embodied by Micio, and forces them to

consider the Terentian *Adelphoe* as a deviation from, and falsification of, Menander's principles.

The *Heautontimoroumenos* and *Adelphoe* of Menander

Following Terence's own assessment of *Heautontimoroumenos*, as *ex integra Graeca integra(m) comoedia(m)* (Prol. 5) it has generally been assumed that the plot and characterization of the play are those of Menander's original;¹⁶ although Terence may have made minor modifications at the end of Act 1 (170) and in the timing of the celebratory meal (see A. Körte, *Menander* 2.38, fr. 133), his representation of fathers and sons and his final solution to the drama are accepted as representing those of Menander.

In the case of the *Adelphoe* the outcome of the last act has provoked many discussions.¹⁷ Of these the most recently published and the most serious is that of Rieth/Gaiser: this is written from an intensive understanding of the philosophical background to Menander's plays, and is more concerned with moral philosophy than stagecraft. Rieth's argument is that Terence has made modifications both in the exposition¹⁸ of the play and in the last act, prejudicial to Micio and in favour of Demea, because, while he himself endorsed the Greek values and the concept of ἐλευθεριότης represented by Micio, he was aware of the Roman suspicion of these values, and sympathy with the inflexible rustic morality of Demea, because, in short, he believed the triumph of Micio's principles would be unacceptable to the Roman audience. In a detailed analysis of the last act Rieth reveals the conflict between Demea's final display of wisdom and his superficial conclusions and change of policy expressed in the monologue of Act 5 sc. 4. His main points are:

16 See e.g. Walzer, *Hermes* 70 (1935) 197.

17 I have consulted: M. Delcourt, *Phoibos* 5 (1950) 29–34 (not concerned with Menander); Mackendrick, *R.F.I.C.* 82 (1954) 18–35; W. G. Arnott, *Greece and Rome*, N.S. 10 (1963) 140–144, answering Dorey, *Greece and Rome*, N.S. 9, 37–39; and Rieth, *op. cit.*, 101 ff., with Gaiser's editorial postscript, 145–51. For more superficial estimates, cf. Webster, *op. cit.*, 65–7; Duckworth, *op. cit.*, 245; Norwood, *The Art of Terence*, 117–120.

18 I find their criticisms of the exposition and reconstruction of the opening of Menander's *Adelphoe* unacceptable. See my article in *Philologus* 112 (1968) 212–215.

1. According to Menander's usual dramatic technique, as in e.g. *Samia* 271 ff., a character would reveal his whole intention in monologue. If Demea's actions in Act 5 scs. 5–9 are intended to reveal the inadequacy of Micio's concept of fatherhood he should, like Moschion in the *Samia*, reveal this in the monologue, rather than mislead the audience by expressing only trivial and selfish motives.
2. As Donatus on 938 remarks: *apud Menandrum senex de nuptiis non grauatur: ergo Terentius εὑρετικῶς*, Micio's protestations against the marriage with Sostrata (934–946) and the pressure put upon him by Aeschinus, are created by Terence; without them the marriage with Sostrata, paralleled by the behaviour of Callipides in *Dyskolos* (794–818) would have been a reasonable and liberal action, accepted by Micio because it was worthy of a man of gentlemanly principles. Particularly significant is Aeschinus' declaration in 940 *promisi ego illis*, which is impossible in the dramatic context (Aeschinus has not seen Sostrata or her family since his own marriage was agreed) and an irresponsible action unworthy of Aeschinus' character, especially of his affirmation in 710–11 that he will do nothing against his father's will.
3. Rieth believes that Terence has modified the role of Aeschinus; that Syrus' and Aeschinus' thanks to Demea were in Menander ironical and without conviction; further (119) that Micio's requests at 956 and 969 for Aeschinus' approval of the gift to Hegio and liberation of Syrus may have been a Terentian addition to exaggerate Micio's dependence on Aeschinus.
4. On the vital question of Demea's final speech Rieth is more ambiguous. He declares (113) that only the final speech and presumably Aeschinus' reply) are incompatible with the implications of the monologue (Act 5 sc. 4) which is itself Menandrian. But (114) he acknowledges that Menander also made use of Demea's transformed character to attach some festive and comic scenes to his comedy, and that at least from 947 to 979 Terence is following Menander. His discussion on 115–120 throws no further light on the ending, and his final verdict (p.120) on the form of the last act leaves completely open the question of how Menander brought his play to a close.

Thus, according to Rieth, while Demea acted pettily and maliciously, believing himself to be imposing a defeat on his brother, Menander's Micio, acting out of ἐλευθεριότης, would have granted both the mar-

riage and the other requests of his own free will, not to please Aeschinus, but because he believed these actions to be right and desirable.

These are impressive arguments, but there are legitimate objections:

1. The conflict between Demea's final speech and his monologue may well spring from a modification by Terence; but it may be the monologue, not the final speech, which has been transformed: Terence may have found in the Menander play a declaration by Demea that he will prove Micio's folly, and omitted it to achieve a final effect of surprise.
2. Rieth is surely right that Terence has exaggerated Micio's repugnance to the marriage in 934–46 and invented Aeschinus' promise; in doing so Terence has created an imbalance and anticlimax, imposing the most severe demand on Micio's tolerance before the less distressing financial claims. Again Terence's motive may not have been that of making Micio seem weaker, but a purely comic indulgence in the traditional theme of a bachelor's hostility to marriage. Clearly in Menander also Micio agreed to the marriage,¹⁹ but as the first of many demands made upon him it probably was treated more briefly, so as not to delay the sequence of favours distributed.
3. The points in Rieth's argument are clearly dependent on his hypothesis, and cannot be independently verified.
4. If Rieth's reconstruction is accepted, how did Menander bring the play to a close? Surely there is a great risk of anticlimax if Micio agrees generously and without sacrifice of principle to all the demands presented by Demea. Are we to suppose that Micio called Demea's bluff: "you are wrong if you think that you are harming me, Demea? There is nothing I will not give gladly in a good cause. You also must be generous, and let Ctesipho enjoy his lyre player. Now come join with me and let us all go inside to celebrate the wedding."? And did Aeschinus remain silent after his last, "ironical," thanks to Demea (at 972, according to Rieth)? If so, how dreadfully predictable, how lacking in surprise. Surely this is vastly inferior as a finale to what survives in Terence's play?

There are other arguments from within the play to support the view that Terence's finale was that of Menander. Rieth/Gaiser virtually disregard

19 For other casually arranged marriages in the finales of Menander plays see W. G. Arnott, *op. cit.*, 143–4 (Gorgias and Sostratos' sister in *Dyskolos*; Clitipho's marriage in *Heautontimoroumenos* is not a valid parallel). Arnott also sees in the partial conversion of Knemon a parallel to Demea's change of attitude.

the implications of Act 5 sc. 3: yet it shows clearly that Micio has contravened his own proposal (796–802); his own arguments against pre-occupation with money (833–4) are similarly turned against him by Demea in 953–4 (a passage accepted by Rieth as Menandrian). The one instance of this petard-like device guarantees the other; and both point to a turning of the scales against Micio. Again 835–7 *ne nimium modo / bonae tuae istae nos rationes, Micio / et tuos iste animus aequo' sub-uortat*, depicts exactly the course of the finale. Demea uses Micio's *bonae rationes* to undermine Micio himself. Without the Terentian finale, 835–7 would be empty foreboding, irrelevant and misleading as to the outcome of the play. If, as no one has questioned, Act 5 sc. 3 represents Menander's scene, it provides a strong case for accepting the Terentian finale as that of the original.

I return to the comparison with *Heautontimoroumenos*. Whereas Terence could indeed have been influenced by the finale of this play to impose a similar, but more extreme, change of fortune in the *Adelphoe*, once we accept that the *Heautontimoroumenos* finale is unchanged from that of Menander, it becomes much easier to believe that the Greek dramatist is responsible for the finale of *Adelphoe*. Whether the restoration of Chremes and Demea is seen as a device of dramatic structure to revive flagging interest by a new surprise element in the last phase of the play, or as a moral comment, that men only learn by misfortune (a moral already made clear by the earlier behaviour of Menedemus in *Heautontimoroumenos*) and true wisdom springs from previous failure²⁰—or merely as a pleasant concession to the traditional comic finale,²¹—the two plays illustrate the same pattern, and the treatment of Chremes is a convincing argument for the Menandrian authenticity of Demea's final triumph.²¹

There remains the question of priority. Terence's *Adelphoe* has traditionally been considered his last work, and I accept this tradition. It is customary to consider it being not only his last but also his most successful play. Yet the qualities for which it is esteemed are not primarily Terence's own contribution (language and dialogue), but plot, structure

20 Cf. Arnott, *op. cit.*, 144. He suggests as Menander's motive for the finale of *Adelphoe* "the desire to surprise the audience with a final ironic twist": he adds two other factors which may explain this ending of the play: the tradition of the κῶμος finale of old Attic Comedy, and the practice of tragedy that consistency of characterization was sacrificed where necessary to the requirements of the plot.

21 See Appendix.

and characterization, which must derive at least in part from Menander and, I have argued probably represent Menander throughout the play, except in the scene acknowledged by Terence to be taken from Diphilus and some related adaptation in Act 2. It would seem logical then to assume that if Terence's *Adelphoe* is more successful than his *Heautontimoroumenos*, this is because the Menandrian Ἀδελφοί β was a later and more mature work than the other play.

But here I think we come upon a paradox. The *Adelphoe* is undoubtedly a more lively comedy than *Heautontimoroumenos*, and the moral values represented by Micio are more sophisticated than those expressed in *Heautontimoroumenos*. But the very liveliness of action in the *Adelphoe* and the comic elements absent from the other play, seem to argue that Menander's *Adelphoe* belongs with *Samia* and *Dyskolos* as one of his earlier works. I will illustrate what I mean by comic elements: it is these that make *Adelphoe* "maiore ex parte motoria" (*Donatus*, Praef. 2). Act 3 sc. 2 depicting the indignant slave Geta, is the best developed example of the *seruus currens* in Terence; the scene has an impetus and exuberance which would be out of place in *Heautontimoroumenos*. Act 3 sc. 3 contains a genuine piece of comic parody—where Syrus mimics the form of Demea's moral precepts in his own down-to-earth cooking instructions. In Act 4 sc. 2, Ctesipho has to be concealed from his father but twice he emerges from the house at the moment of danger (543–4, 549–52); there is room for considerable comedy of action. Later in the same scene Syrus sends Demea on a false errand (with a pleasantly fantastic description) and when Demea returns in Act 4 sc. 6, comedy is derived from his exhaustion and irritation. Syrus is the vehicle for similar comedy at the beginning of Act 5 (scenes 1 and 2). In all, Syrus, while contributing little to the plot, is responsible for the high proportion of laughter in the play, and his power of invention produces wit, parody and fantasy. Either we must see in all these scenes real creative writing by Terence, as extensive as any undertaken by Plautus, or this comic element was present in Menander; if so, it is surely Menander's early manner, and not the greater seriousness of the *Epi-trepontes*. If the Ἀδελφοί β was indeed an earlier play, this may also explain the moral anomalies of the finale; Comedy has triumphed over Ethos, and the high-moral philosophical level found in Acts 1–4 is not sustained, because Menander has not yet reached the level of skill whereby he can satisfy the demands of stagecraft and of his own moral theories. In the *Heautontimoroumenos* there is throughout less exuberance of dialogue, a greater concern with sober psychology and a re-

jection of conventional comic motifs. The finale itself, exemplifying the same pattern as that of the *Adelphoe*, is achieved with greater consistency of characterization and moral judgement. *Heautontimoroumenos* has more of the features of the late Menandrian style, and Körte is surely right to prefer Köhler's arguments on the basis of its sophisticated structure to Bethe's claims for an early dating.

If I am right in suggesting that Ἀδελφοί β was an earlier play than Ἐαυτὸν τιμωρούμενος, how is it that Terence's *Adelphoe* has been judged to be a better play than its predecessor? It is I think after all because of Terence's own talents. He had added to the excellent Menandrian psychology of at least the first four acts, his own skill, developing during and since the adaptation of *Eunuchus*, in presenting pure amoral comedy. This element of comedy must have been present in Menander, but it has gained from Terence's immense control of language derived from both the Greek and Roman traditions. The fact is that scholars apply different criteria in appraising Greek New Comedy and Roman Comedy, but the *Adelphoe* is unusually well qualified to satisfy both sets of criteria. Both the psychological and the purely comic scenes are superbly presented, and the Roman play achieves its greatness because Terence knew and appreciated the art of both Plautus and Menander.

Appendix

Bacchides and *Dis Exapaton*

There is one other adaptation preserved of a Menander play featuring a double pair of fathers and sons—the *Bacchides* of Plautus. Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (Florence 1960) noticed the affinity between the moral collapse of the fathers in *Bacchides* and that (of Micio in particular) in *Adelphoe*, and this has been brought out in more detail by T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Menander*, p. 131, who points to a further coincidence, this time with *Heautontimoroumenos*: Philoxenus, the ἀστειός of *Bacchides*, listens to the self reproaches of the harsh father Nicoboulus in the opening scene of Act 5 (v.1076 ff.) as Menedemus in *Heautontimoroumenos* 915 is the audience for Chremes' self-reproach. But Philoxenus is not a fully developed, sensitive, father like the reformed Menedemus, or Micio. There is some correspondence: he is, like them, the father of the more scrupulous and responsible boy (compare Pistoclerus' opposition to the *meretrices* in the first scene preserved: like Clinia and Aeschinus, he becomes involved for the sake of his friend); in Act 3 sc. 3 (408–410, 416–418) and in his monologue Act 4 sc. 10.

neque placitant mores quibu' uideo uolgo (in) gnatos esse parentes:
ego dare me meo gnato institui ut animo obsequium sumere possit;
aequom esse puto, sed nimi' nolo desidiaei dare ludum (1081–3)

Philoxenus is depicted as indulgent but concerned, and Neumann (*op. cit.*, p. 77) does him less than justice in accusing him of “moral feebleness”—when we consider his appearances in Acts 1 to 4. Nevertheless the contrast between Philoxenus and Nicoboulus fails to reveal any moral principles or concern for his son, Mnesilochus, in his scenes (Act 2 sc. 3; Act 4 scs. 6–8) because his function is merely to be pitted against Chrysalus as the repeated dupe of his intrigues. Instead the role of moral critic belongs to the Paedagogus Lydus (who must have held this function in Menander also); Lydus, like Chremes, succeeds in misinterpreting the moral situation of the two young men (coincidence of motif: *Bacchides* 477–488 = *Heautontimoroumenos* 565 ff.).

The finale is based on reversal: the fathers who have set out to save their sons, undergo a total collapse of morality, in which first Philoxenus (1155 ff. leading to 1162 *ego amo* and 1164–5 *meo filio non sum iratus / neque te tuost aequom esse iratum: si amant sapienter faciunt*) and later Nicoboulus (1193 ff.) surrender to the *meretrices* in return for future fa-

vours. This sacrifice of paternal dignity creates no serious conflict: for the dupe Nicoboulus there were apparently no real values—except cash—to lose; and Philoxenus, although a more subtle character, can be expected to yield in old age as he did *saepe in adolescentia* (410). Not just the finale, but the general Ethos of the play, has been amoral—one of intrigue in which the audience must desire the victimisation of the fathers, and one like *Truculentus*, largely devoted to glorifying the power of love (or lust).²² The finale is farcical in Plautus and must have been so in Menander (an adequate parallel is provided by the moral tone of the *Dyskolos* finale), since the play is frivolous throughout, not just in a few scenes which could be regarded as Plautine distortion of Menander. The element of general forgiveness proper to a finale is satisfied by the return of half his money to Nicoboulus and the guarantee that the *senes* will enjoy the feast and its aftermath. This is not a play which invites us to judge the fathers, nor the sons; for this reason the “ignoble” capitulation of the fathers for the sake of the happy denouement should create no conflict; at the same time, *Bacchides* (and, I believe, *Dis Exapaton*) provides another Menandrian parallel for the capitulation and loss of moral standing by Micio in the *Adelphoe*.

Postscript – this article was submitted before the publication of E. W. Handley’s discussion of the new *Dis Exapaton* fragments (*Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison*, London 1968). Professor Handley’s fine analysis and conclusions in matters of detailed stagecraft do not affect the arguments I have advanced in this appendix about the Ethos of the Menandrian play, or the nature of its denouement.

22 Cf. Neumann, *op. cit.*, 78 and 181 “in Bacchides soll die Allmacht der Liebe und die Bestrafung all derer, die sich ihr widersetzen, gezeigt werden.” With Neumann I do not believe that Δις Ἐξαπατῶν can have been seriously concerned with an “Erziehungsproblem”—such a moral level is incompatible with the nature of the intrigue.

5. Sex, Status and Survival in Hellenistic Athens: A Study of Women in New Comedy

Gomme's essay on the position of women in Athens,¹ written in 1925, has remained a classic source for students of this topic, and its humanity and breadth of scope still has much to teach us after fifty years. Yet by the very fact of quoting the greatest thinkers, by his use of the royal women of Greek tragedy, and by his interest in the no less aristocratic values of a Pericles, he provides a picture unrepresentative of the great bulk of bourgeois Athenians (gentlemen and would-be gentlemen), whose less enlightened standards affected a far greater number of women. My purpose in writing this essay is more limited, but perhaps more attainable; to test and use the evidence of Menandrian² comedy in order to present an account of the social roles available to different categories of women in the everyday world of around 300 BCE: this will require a brief introduction, distinguishing the legal and economic factors which affected their choice of life, considering their social mobility and the degree to which they were protected or exposed by the laws and conventions of their world.

How valid is Greek New Comedy, or any other variety of the genre, as evidence for life? It was once mandatory to begin any discussion of Menander with the praises of Aristophanes of Byzantium, "O Menander, O life, which of you imitated the other?", or the Ciceronian description of New Comedy as a "mirror-image of society".³ But be-

1 "The Position of Women in Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.," in A. W. Gomme, *Essays in Greek History and Literature*, Oxford 1973, 28–35.

2 In this category I include with the surviving plays of Menander the adaptations of Menander and his pupil Apollodorus by Terence, and the Plautine *Aulularia*, *Bacchides*, *Cistellaria*, and *Stichus*. This evidence is supplemented with parallel material from other plays of Plautus, where there is no reason to doubt that Plautus is representing accurately the social or legal situation of his original source.

3 Quoted as Testimonia 32 and 36 in Körte, *Menander, Reliquiae* 2.7. Cicero's phrase *speculum consuetudinis* comes closest to the approach of this paper, since *consuetudo* includes both the legal basis of society and the superstructure of custom and social prejudice.

fore we dare treat comedy as a true image of social prejudice or practice, we need to recognize the hazards and take security measures. First, comedy as a source for contemporary law: surviving Attic oratory provides enough samples of family litigation to confirm that New Comedy is faithful to Attic law; details of such family-law often provide the motive-power that turns the plot-mechanism, as in the heiress-themes of Apollodorus' *Phormio* and the original of Turpilius' *Epikleros*. Studies of law in Plautus and Terence⁴ confirm that Roman adaptations retained as much of the Greek legal basis for the play as was necessary for the understanding of the plot; they are even helpful to us in explaining for their Roman audiences aspects of Attic law that we might not otherwise have realized. Hence the plot-situations of Greek comedy can be assumed to represent society in their treatment of the civil status, eligibility for marriage, liability to divorce, etc., of the female roles; almost all points of detail can be confirmed from a supposedly factual source such as the Pseudo-Demosthenic speech against Neaera,⁵ a mine of information on the legal handicaps of non-citizen women and their consequences. In contrast, it is obvious that the high frequency in comedy of family structures disrupted by seductions, exposure of children, mistaken identities, kidnappings, and remarriages offers a statistically false picture of Greek society even in the years of war and occupation after the death of Alexander in 323. Comedy, to be exciting, must deal with the exceptional, with initial situations that threaten family stability or social harmony, and complications that prolong the tension of such threats. Finally, comedy is impossible if all the participants in the action are rational and free of prejudice. Farce requires exagger-

4 See U. E. Paoli, *Comici Latini e Diritto Attico*, Milan 1962 (hereafter Paoli); his conclusions (3) and (4) argue that whatever refers to a legal situation essential to the intrigue of a comedy, such as the *epikleros*-law cited in Terence's *Phormio*, cannot be Roman in origin. (This does not exclude coincidence of Attic and Roman law in many situations.) Plautus in particular may superimpose vocabulary of Roman law, and even additional features, upon the Greek plot; for an example, cf. G. Williams, "Some Problems in the Construction of Plautus' *Pseudolus*," *Hermes* 84 (1957) 425-427.

5 Paoli, *op. cit.*, 22-31, derives from this speech most of his corroborative evidence for the legal position of *hetaerae*. The speech (59 in the Demosthenic corpus) contests the citizenship of Neaera's children and her married status, on two grounds: her non-citizen birth, and her long and varied career as a *hetaera*. Like most prosecuting speeches it is more plausible than scrupulous in representing the facts of her life, but the texts of laws quoted incidentally cover most of the recognized offences connected with a woman's civil and sexual status.

ation, and comic irony requires misjudgements; it would be intensely misleading to take the misogynistic statements of comic fathers or slaves as a reflection of public opinion, or the dramatist's own values, unless they were confirmed by the action behaviour of the female characters in the plays. Some female roles conform to popular stereotypes, and illustrate prejudices, others clearly do not. Sometimes a dramatist is content to operate with the stereotype; sometimes he deliberately moves beyond it. To renew one of Gomme's most telling points, a fragmentary source is a most dangerous tool for evaluating real public opinion. I offer an illustration, Men. fr. 276: "an extravagant wife is a nuisance, and doesn't let the man who married her live as he wants. But there's one good thing she produces: children." This genuinely reflects a priority of the contemporary world, in which the purpose of marriage was specified as "for the begetting of legitimate children;"⁶ but as I have quoted it, it is three times false to Menander. I have omitted the opening lines, which advise the interlocutor that all good things have inherent disadvantages, including wives. I have cut off the continuation, which adds praise of wives for tending their husbands when sick, for faithfulness to them in misfortunes, and for the last services offered to them in burial, and I have concealed the title of the play from which this derives—"The Misogynist," which suggest strongly that our speech is merely quoting the criticism of wives uttered by the title-character, in order to rebut it. One might add that such a title, like "The Mistrustful Man," "The Bad-tempered Man," "The Superstitious Man," is derived from the particular folly of the leading figure, and positive proof of a measure of sympathy for women! The question of prejudice against women is both elusive and tendentious, and my intention is to subordinate such questions as much as possible to a factual account of the position occupied by women in comedy, and their circumstances as reflected in the different types of comic intrigue.

One further caution seems necessary: most of the plays of Menander which have survived are in the naturalistic tradition, ethical comedies which try to be realistic and to apply everyday moral rules; their problem is to reconcile romance with morality. This is true of the Terentian

6 The formula of betrothal varies slightly in the dramatic quotations, but always includes the words *gnêsiôn* / *paidôn ep' arotô*, Men. *Perik.* 1013–1014, *Sam.* 727; cf. *Dysk.* 842–843, and fr. 682 K. (References to Menander will give the verse-numbering of Sandbach's Oxford Classical Text (1972) and/or Körte 2 (1953).)

adaptations also, except for elements in the *Eunuchus*. Such plays are fair quarries for illustrations of social behaviour; but there is in Plautus' adaptations a different type of comedy—the amoral escapist intrigue—whose world of perpetual holiday is brought out by Segal's study,⁷ and which imposes its own morality based on the desires of the youthful or slave protagonists. A play such as *Mercator*, with its melodramatic parody of a young lover and decrepit old father competing for the same girl, so that the young man finally gains control over his father through the old man's folly and terror of his wife, clearly gets its fun from overturning the normal family structure and thumbing its nose at society; plays such as *Asinaria*, *Mercator*, and *Menaechmi* cannot be used as evidence for the social roles of male or female.

Harrison's recent analysis of family law, and Lacey's book on the Greek family⁸ bring out clearly the absolute dichotomy between the rights and liabilities of those women who were part of a citizen *oikos* in their *polis*, and those who were not. Within the citizen family the need to perpetuate succession to the *oikos* and the hereditary *kleros* of landed property dictated the marriage patterns of sons and daughters. The son's woman, or wife (Greek has only one word for both concepts) must be a citizen (*aste*) in order for him to beget citizen sons, for since the Periclean law of 451 only children of citizens on both sides were entitled to be registered as citizens with the *deme*, and as lawful members of the religious phratry of their Athenian father.⁹ Only a citizen woman

7 Erich Segal, *Roman Laughter*, Cambridge, Mass. 1968. The different tone of these comedies reflects Plautus' own method of adaptation, but derives also from his choice of plays. Thus *Mercator* is based on a play by Menander's closest rival and contemporary Philemon, and has been praised by such philhellene critics as Gilbert Norwood for its fidelity to the (lost) Greek original. To judge from fragments of the *Dis Exapaton*, original of Plautus' *Bacchides*, Menander's comedy was as amoral as the Roman version. These plays defy convention, but respect actual law; they would be fair evidence for legal practice, but as it happens they are not much concerned with situations relevant to the status of women.

8 A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens: the Family and Property*, Oxford 1968; W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece*, London 1968. These works will hereafter be quoted by the author's name alone.

9 On the Periclean citizenship law see Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 26.4, Harrison 25, Lacey 104 and n. 14; on *deme*-membership and registration of citizens, Lacey 94; phratries, Lacey 92. Neaera's son-in-law Phrastor, a citizen tricked into marrying her daughter, a non-citizen, was persuaded by her to present their son to his phratry and *genetai* of his clan for enrolment. When they refused,

was *enguite*, subject to a betrothal contract, and could be treated as *gamete*, a legal wife. Her fidelity was not just a matter of sexual pride to her husband, for both the family property and its cult would be violated by the participation of a concealed bastard, and any act of infidelity by a wife cast suspicion on all her children past and future. Hence a law of adultery which permitted murder of an adulterer caught in the act, and enjoined repudiation of the adulterous wife, on penalty of *atimia* (disfranchisement) to the husband who publicly condoned her behaviour by keeping her in his home: her fate was repudiation, return to her kin, and exclusion from all public religious life, on penalty of any physical brutality short of death.¹⁰ If there were no sons to take up the family property, or they predeceased their sister, dying without heirs, the daughter was put in a special category, as *epikleros*, “heiress-in-trust.” If she married outside the *genos* the family cult could not be maintained by her line, and the property of her father’s *oikos* would pass to her son(s), bearing the descent of another family; for this reason such an “heiress” was subject to *epidikasia*, a legal procedure securing her marriage to the male next-of-kin within her father’s *genos*, or to a man of his choosing.¹¹ At the other end of the economic scale, a brotherless and fatherless girl, if she inherited no property, could be protected from poverty or dishonour by the corollary of this practice, which compelled

and he threatened to sue them, they demanded that he should swear “that he believed this was his own son by a citizen woman betrothed to him in marriage according to the law” (Dem. 59.50–61). H. J. Wolff, “Marriage Law in Ancient Athens,” *Traditio* 2 (1944) 43–95 (hereafter Wolff) argues that the legitimacy law was the basis of the whole Attic marriage system, and I have followed him in deducing the woman’s role from that of the sons she was expected to conceive.

- 10 See Harrison 32–36: the Draconian law, 33; repudiation, 35–36. The law is quoted in the Neaera speech (Dem. 59.87): “If he apprehend the seducer, let it not be lawful for the husband having apprehended him, to cohabit with his wife; if he cohabit, let him be disfranchised. And let it not be lawful for the wife to attend public sacrifices, if a seducer has been apprehended with her. If she attend, let her suffer whatever is inflicted on her save death itself, without penalty to the agent.” (I have used “disfranchised” to represent *atimos*, “deprived of civic rights”).
- 11 On *epikleroi* and *epidikasia* see Harrison 9 f., 134–136. Kinsmen claiming the hand of an “heiress” registered their claims with the *archon eponymos*. All such claims were published at the next assembly. If a claim was uncontested the Archon adjudged the girl in marriage to the claimant; if there were rival claimants, the Archon presiding over a jury-panel decided between them.

the next-of-kin either to marry her or provide the dowry with which she could find a husband.¹²

The citizen girl normally anticipated only one pattern of life: marriage to a fellow citizen chosen for her by her father or the kinsman legally responsible for her, the *kyrios*. The prerequisites were her chastity and a dowry, which would attract a husband from the same financial class, and decide the degree of prestige she herself enjoyed in her marriage, for the dowry was capital kept in trust for her, the equivalent of her maintenance, and should she or her husband decide on divorce, for any reason other than her adultery, it returned with her to her family home. Although the husband, as her *kyrios* while she lived with him, had the free use of her dowry, he must be able to repay it, since legally she could withdraw herself and reclaim it at any time.¹³

From the point of view of the eligible bachelor, two considerations would dictate the wife his father selected for him. The first, not peculiar to Athens, or Hellenistic Greece, concerned social advantage: the girl should be the right man's daughter, and carry a profitable dowry. The second consideration was absolute: the law forbade him to treat as a wife a non-citizen (*xene*), no matter how wealthy her parents, or how important in their own community. The Athenian youth could neither marry such a girl, nor claim his children by her as citizens and legitimate heirs, and the penalties for false representation of her status or that of their children were prohibitive.¹⁴ Even the possibility of legitimising

12 This is the situation in Terence's *Phormio*. Harrison, 135–136, quotes Dem. 43.54 for the law which bound the nearest male kinsman of a girl without means either to marry her himself, or to dower her; the amount of the dowry was related to the kinsman's own financial class. In this situation the law was only involved if the kinsman defected and an outsider was found to bring proceedings against him.

13 See Wolff, 62–63, on the purpose of the dowry as a social institution. The security afforded by the dowry to the wife was limited; Harrison, 52, points out that it was not technically the wife's property during marriage, and the husband could alienate any real-estate that was part of the dowry. Again, she almost certainly needed the support of her own family to initiate divorce proceedings, since she had to be represented before the Archon (Harrison 42–43); her representative would normally be the male relative into whose *kyrieia* she would pass (and with whom she would live) after the divorce. Consequently the most common form of divorce was *aphaeresis* by the woman's father; in comedy this is illustrated by *Euprepontes* and Plautus' *Stichus*, based on Menander's *Adelphoe A*.

14 See Harrison 24–28. The laws are quoted in the Neaira speech (Dem. 59.16): "if an alien man live in marriage with a female citizen by any guile or deceit, let

their children by adoption (in order to create an heir) was excluded, since only citizens born of a legal marriage were eligible for adoption.¹⁵

Obviously this greatly limited the prospects of non-citizen women; if they were daughters of rich residents, the official metic class, they could be married by lawful contract, and with formal dowry,¹⁶ to sons of equally respectable metic households. If they were daughters of prosperous families, they were also free to return with their family to their own community, and obtain a legal marriage in their own state. More often, however, such girls were from humble backgrounds, living with mothers either widowed or unmarried, some respectable but poor, others belonging to the half-world which the citizenship laws created.

The *xene* from this social level most often depended for her living on a sexual relationship with one or more citizen men, which might take any of several forms. The most stable and binding was formal concubinage. This could be entered into by contract and even financed with a sort of dowry.¹⁷ The concubine was legally protected in certain ways: Solonian law recognized the right of a man to keep a concubine for the procreation of free children,¹⁸ but after 451, at least, such chil-

any Athenian for whom it is lawful start proceedings before the *thesmothetae*; if he be found guilty let him and his property be sold and a third part be given to him who secured conviction. And if an alien woman live in marriage with a male citizen, let it be in the same way, and let him who cohabits with the alien woman be liable for 1000 drachmae." Wolff, 67, deduces from the different formulation and penalty of the second clause that was aimed at citizens cohabiting with *hetaerae*, who together conspired to pass off their liaison as a citizen marriage. False representation of the children of such a union is covered by the law quoted in Dem. 59.52: "if any man give in marriage an alien woman to a citizen as if she were his kinswoman (*prosekousa*), let him be disfranchised and his property confiscated by the state, and a third part be given to him who secured the conviction." This was probably intended to penalize a citizen attempting to give in marriage his own illegitimate daughter, but would cover the less common case of his misrepresenting any foreign or slave-born child. The law is badly drafted, and the penalty on the false kinswoman not stated; would she too have been liable to be sold, or would the offence be attributed only to the citizen who used her?

15 Lacey 146 and n. 80; more detailed evidence in Wolff 79 f.

16 Lacey 112, 116 and n. 108, for the right of intermarriage among metics.

17 Harrison 46 n. 3; Lacey 116 and n. 107; see also Wolff 70–75.

18 Harrison 36, 164 n. 2. The evidence for this category comes from Draco's homicide law as quoted at Dem. 23.53. It is not clear whether even before 451 Attic law would give full citizenship to the children of such a union.

dren would not qualify for citizenship, and most concubines were taken in by men who already had legal heirs. As widowers or divorcés they would not want to prejudice the inheritance of their existing heirs by taking a second wife, and risking more children; the concubine offered the option of housekeeping and sex without this complication, and so was not encouraged to reproduce. While Draco's homicide law put the recognized concubine on a footing with the wife, mother, and daughter of an Athenian citizen, so that it was justifiable homicide for her protector to kill her seducer, it is clear that concubinage was often more temporary and casual. The man fulfilled normal expectations if he provided her with her wardrobe, jewellery, and maids; he was free to discard her at any time in favour of a new or younger woman. She, on the other hand, was legally her own mistress and owner of her personal property, which she could take with her if either partner chose to separate.

Young and accomplished women often supported themselves by the gifts they elicited from one or more lovers. The self-employed *hetaera* with her own household and slaves was not restricted from cultivating as many lovers as she could juggle without incurring their protests. It would seem that these were often men too young for marriage, and the *hetaera* was useful to them as a source of sexual satisfaction during the years before marriage, a means of acquiring experience, and a social centre, where friends who shared her favours might meet and be entertained. Another category of client was the transient merchant or mercenary soldier—foreigners visiting the city for a short period. These women had to extort enough money from their lovers while young to support themselves in later years, perhaps by purchasing and training attractive young slave-girls and running their own "House"¹⁹—although no such establishments feature in comedy, where the *pornoboskos* is usually a male pimp.²⁰ Most often the *hetaera* would cut her losses and

This category will have been rare in comparison with the slave—or *hetaera*—concubines, who enjoyed no protected status.

- 19 Compare Neaera's childhood (Dem. 59.18–19). She was one of seven little girls acquired by Nicarete, the freedwoman of an Elean citizen and "wife" of his cook. Nicarete trained them as courtesan-entertainers, and made her living from their hire, calling them her daughters so as to get a higher fee from lovers on the grounds that they were free. These girls were, even if she had not purchased them, in the position of her slaves, and sold by her as such.
- 20 There is one reference to a *pornoboskos* in Menander: in *Epir.* 136 Charisios is said to give the pimp 12 drachmas a day for the hire of Habrotonon, which, as

enter into concubinage before she grew too old to please. The frequenting of *hetaerae* by young married men was frowned on by society as expensive and detracting from their obligation to beget heirs at home; it was normal in older married men,²¹ and such affairs were no doubt as common then as their modern equivalent.

In one sense the *hetaera* was the only woman in Greek society who enjoyed a freedom comparable to that of men, running her own household and finances, with the right to choose the company she admitted to her home, and to attend the *symposia* and dinner parties of the men-folk. At the same time she had little or no protection against unwelcome advances, and her status would limit the fairness of her treatment in a court of law.

Most free *hetaerae* had begun as slave-entertainers. Children sold or kidnapped were trained by the slave owners as music-girls, taught to play the flute or lyre at *symposia* at their master's expense. These were hired out for parties, or to individuals by the month or year as temporary concubines. In comedy these girls are often described as virgins at the moment when they were put up for sale, but it is unlikely that a pimp would lose money by preserving the virginity of his slave-girls, and this practice should be seen in the contexts of plot-requirements, which we will discuss presently. It is clear that lovers did, single or collectively, buy these girls from their masters,²² and, under the influence

the speaker comments, is 36 days maintenance for a man at the level of the 2 obols a day state maintenance pay (the *diobelia*: see Gomme/Sandbach 298 on *Epir.* 14). There are male slave-owners dealing in *hetaerae* in Terence's *Phormio* and *Adelphoe* (though Sannio's stage-appearance derives most probably from the second original used for the *Adelphoe*, Diphilus' *Synapothneskontes*), and in Plautus' *Curculio*, *Persa*, *Poenulus*, *Pseudolus*, and *Rudens*. These should however be distinguished from brothel-keepers; see below, n. 23.

21 An impossible statement to verify, but economically *hetaerae* could only survive if there was a sizable clientele of financially independent mature men. The trade could not have flourished on young men's pocket-money.

22 For the joint purchase and sharing of a *hetaera*, compare the early history of Neaera: two lovers "gave Nicarete 30 minae for Neaera's person, because she was expensive to hire, demanding the upkeep of the entire household from them, and they bought her as their slave according to Corinthian law." When they wanted to marry, they told her they did not want to see their *hetaera* on the streets, or exploited by a pimp, and so they would willingly accept from her a smaller sum than they had paid for her, and settle for 20 minae. She raised a subscription from her former lovers, and handed it over, with some of her own savings, to Phrynion, who agreed to supplement the fund up to the 20 minae, and purchase her freedom (29–32). Later she deserted Phrynion, taking

of infatuation, might set them free. As freedwomen the girls could then return to the career of an entertainer, set up as *hetaerae* with their own household, or live as freedwomen concubines, with the first or subsequent lovers.

One last category, the slave-prostitute, resident in a brothel and compelled to transient sexual activity, must have existed in life, and is attested for the Roman bourgeois world at least by episodes in Plautus' *Pseudolus* and *Poenulus*,²³ but their encounters with men, by nature casual and anonymous, were unsuited to form the basis of a continued relationship in life or literature.

The plots of Greek New Comedy and its Roman adaptations, almost invariably based on a sexual relationship frustrated by social obstacles, misunderstandings, or mistaken identities, depend on the two separate patterns of behaviour for the categories of women which I have outlined above. The plots assume the existence of love or infatuation between the male protagonist and a girl, and set out to reconcile its demands with those of respectable society.

We might start with the comedy of citizen love and marriage, as the most orthodox form of romance. In the normal circumstances of bridal selection by the young man's father, the motive is often a desire to seal a friendship between the two families by the marriage alliance (compare the linking of *amicitia* and *adfinitas* in Terence's *Andria* 538–543, and *Hecyra* 252, 533). The young man is told that he is to marry X's daughter, whom he has never or barely seen.²⁴ In such circumstances love

some of his property, and a new lover, Stephanos, tried to establish her free status as a *xene* before the Polemarch. Private arbitrators between the claims of Stephanos and Phrynion made a settlement that the men should share her, each having her with him for an equal number of days in the month (47); there were witnesses to testify that this arrangement lasted for some time.

- 23 *Poen.* 3.3: Collybiscus goes to the pimp for entertainment, including a girl, in his house; *Pseud.* 1.: the famous display scene in which Ballio parades, instructs, and threatens to beat all his girls. But in these as other plays, the specific girls seem to be virgins; both girls in *Poenulus* are destined for sale, and attested as untouched. If we define a brothel as a house employing a number of girls for short-term hire on the premises, *Poenulus* seems to offer the only clear example in comedy. See Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*, Florence 1960, 140 f., who argues that Plautus has converted the Greek situation of *Pseudolus* into the brothel (*lupanar*) more familiar to his Roman audience.
- 24 In *Andria*, Pamphilus believes Chremes' daughter must be deformed (*aliquid monstri alunt*, 250), since they are so eager for him to marry her. At the end of *Heautonimoroumenos*, Chremes offers his errant son a friend's daughter, but

might indeed grow out of marriage but could hardly precede it; it was virtually impossible to generate a plot based on romance from such material. The one counter-example in comedy is the love of Charinus in Terence's *Andria* for old Chremes' daughter (a respectable girl never seen on stage), but this may itself prove the rule in that Charinus was added by Terence to the plot of *Andria*, either from Menander's *Perinthia*, or of his own invention.²⁵ His love for Chremes' daughter is accordingly Terence's invention, in order to provide her with a husband at the end of the play; there is no need to attribute the young man's love for the girl to Menander's Greek world. For a young man to fall in love with a decent citizen girl, more unusual circumstances were required. In the *Dyskolos* of Menander the divine intervention of Pan (Prol. 34–44) combines with the misanthropy and economy of Knemon to leave his daughter unattended on their rural farm where a rich young man, Sostratos, may see and love her. Early in the play, returning to the scene to speak to her father, Sostratos actually meets the girl when in an emergency she has to go to the shrine of the Nymphs for water. She blushes to leave the house in case she should meet anyone at the shrine (198 f.), accepts modestly when Sostratos steps forward and offers to fetch the water, and rushes back into the house for fear of a beating if her father returns. Even so, her step-brother's slave, watching the episode, blames her father for leaving her un-

he has seen her and refuses ("What, that red-headed spinster with green eyes, freckles, and a hooked nose—I can't do it, father" (1061–1062)), and proposes the daughter of another friend whom he must also have seen (1065). The fathers of Antipho in *Phormio* and Alcesimarchus in *Cistellaria* wanted to marry their sons to girls they themselves had not seen; in each case by dramatic coincidence the girls are already living with the young men, and the marriage is no hardship. The only marriage in the text of Menander which is not the result of existing love is that offered to Gorgias in the *Dyskolos*; here he may already have seen the girl at the sacrifice. In any case the decision is his own, since his father is dead.

- 25 The evidence for Terence's introduction of Charinus comes from Donatus' comment on *And.* 301: *has personas Terentius addidit fabulae; nam non sunt apud Menandrum*. Ludwig, "The Originality of Terence," *GRBS* 9 (1968) 173 and n. 8, believes they are derived from Menander's *Perinthia*, but all the minor awkwardnesses of their scenes (e.g., Byrrhia's unseen entry, eavesdropping, and exit in 2.5) suggest the *ad hoc*-invention of characters, rather than borrowing of fully-rounded roles from the second Menander play. If so, I would suggest that the marriages of both Charinus and the boy Clitipho in *Heautonimoroumenos* are Roman additions, and their knowledge of the girls reflects Roman society.

guarded (223) and reports it to his master Gorgias, who in turn accosts young Sostratos and accuses him of dishonourable intentions: “trying to corrupt a *free-born* girl.”²⁶ Only the honesty of both young men, and further divine intervention, carries this theme of love at first sight through to marriage. A further exceptional feature of this play is the generosity of Sostratos’ father Kallipides, who not only agrees to the unprofitable marriage, but, after some sophistic persuasion by his son, reinforces the alliance with the marriage of Gorgias to Sostratos’ sister. *Dyskolos* stands alone in the simplicity of its romance, and makes fewer demands on the modern concept of love than the bulk of New Comedy.

In other plays love has to be compounded with rape and pregnancy for the young man’s choice of a girl not known to his family to become acceptable. This “rape” motif is essential to provoke the marriages of *Aulularia* and *Adelphoe*, adapted from Menander, and Plautus’ *Truculentus*. A variation is employed in *Epitrepontes* and *Hecyra* discussed below, and in both plays the violence of the young man (described in terms of the girl’s torn clothes, dishevelled hair, and weeping at *Epitr.* 487 f.) is attested. We may recoil at this feature of rape, rather than seduction, but the latter would probably have prejudiced the audience irremediably against the girl, while they seem to have found rape a human error, when mitigated by darkness, drink, and youthful desire. The *Samia*, in which the young lover himself reports his affair to the audience in the prologue,²⁷ is more ambiguous. The neighbour’s wife and daughter are friends of his father’s mistress and visited his home, so he clearly knew the girl and probably claimed to love her (a lacuna prevents us from knowing) before the crucial incident, the roof-top feast of Adonis at which he makes her pregnant: “I don’t like to say what followed—perhaps—I’m ashamed, but it’s no use; all the same, I’m

26 *peisein nomizôn examartein parthenon / eleoutheran*. Gorgias even accuses Sostratos of intending outright rape, *pragma thanatôn axion / pollôn* (290–293). The alternatives would imply the long-term planning of a seduction, with gifts, secret meetings, and perhaps an abduction, or the immediate brutality of rape, as in Chaerea’s behaviour in *Eunuchus*. It is interesting that the girl’s free birth receives the same emphasis in the words with which Terence’s Thais reproaches Chaerea: *an paulum hoc esse tibi videtur virginem/vitiare civem?* (*Eun.* 858–859).

27 On the *Samia* Prologue, compare H. Lloyd-Jones, “Menander’s *Samia* in the light of new evidence,” *YCS* 22 (1972) 125–127 (a translation with commentary), and Christina Dedoussi in *Menandre. Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* 16 (Geneva 1970) 159 f. Theme, characterization, and dramatic techniques are discussed in J. M. Jacques, *La Samienne*, Paris 1971, xxviii–xxxvi and Eva Keuls, “The *Samia* of Menander,” *ZPE* 10 (1973) 1–20.

ashamed. The girl got pregnant" (*Sam.* 47–49). He conscientiously approaches the girl's mother and admits responsibility, asking her hand in marriage, but the ceremony has to await confirmation by his father and hers when they return from a long voyage to the Black Sea—so long that the girl gives birth before the play has begun. In this case there is no obstacle from the fathers, who had separately agreed upon the marriage (113), and the plot-complications depend on a further series of misunderstandings based on the concealed parentage of the baby. *Aulularia* illustrates a blend of the themes of *Dyskolos* and *Samia*; the respectable girl whose piety wins the support of the prologue deity (*Lar Familiaris* in Plautus' version) is motherless and neglected by a mean father. She has been raped by a rich young man who knows her identity, while she is ignorant of his, and her father is ignorant of her pregnancy. The background to the conception is not given by the prologue but emerges in later dialogue (689, and 745, "I did it overcome by wine and love"). Nine months have elapsed, and by a recognized stage convention the girl gives birth with an offstage scream of pain during the play, before the young man has had the courage to tell her father or his guardian, and formally ask for marriage—a piece of timing reflecting conventions of continuous action and a small time-scale in comedy, rather than a pattern from life. By a further twist the prologue god has impelled the young man's rich uncle to ask for the girl's hand in marriage, so that the young man will be driven to telling his family; in due course his intervention enables the young man to rescue the stolen treasure of the girl's father so that he will belie his nature and give her the treasure as dowry.²⁸ We note in passing that there were motives to prompt men, if not necessarily young ones, to choose a wife without a dowry, and that the uncle sees in a poor and dowerless girl a more submissive and therefore desirable wife.

28 W. Ludwig, "Aulularia-Probleme," *Philologus* 105 (1961) 48, argues that the girl's dowry was essential to her prestige as a wife. Certainly, even though Harrison (45–48) believes that a bride had no legal claim to a dowry, and that it "was not an essential ingredient of marriage," he shows that the convention was so strong in the fourth century that a dowry was socially obligatory. However, the exception would surely arise precisely in a context such as that of *Aulularia*, where the seducer had forfeited the right to expect a settlement on his wife. While it was open to the bride's father to give a dowry in her interest, the seducer may have come to accept loss of dowry as a penalty; see specifically *Truc.* 845, where Callicles deducts six talents from his daughter's dowry *pro ista inscitia*.

Legally most interesting is the seduction-plot of the *Adelphoe*. The rich young man Aeschinus violated the girl next-door, daughter of a poor but respectable widow, under the influence of love, drink, and probably festival circumstances, but he identified the girl and went straight to her mother promising to marry her (333–334, 471–472) and rear the child as his own son. When he appears to have taken up a music-girl, and deserted the pregnant citizen, her mother thinks of legal redress and plans to consult a male kinsman, despite the risk of disrepute if Aeschinus denies responsibility for her condition. This scene (Act III sc. 2) is revealing of the social and legal situation. The mother points to their poverty. The girl has no dowry; now she has lost her chastity, her second dowry, and has been made ineligible for marriage to any other (345–346; the Greek word for such a girl is *anekdotos*). If they wish to sue Aeschinus they have on their side his ring,²⁹ and the fact that they have accepted no money or maintenance from him. By acknowledging his act he has made himself liable to a *graphe hubreos* (prosecution for criminal assault) or a *biaion dike* (a civil suit for violence)³⁰ entailing at least a severe financial penalty; he could counter by denial of the act (but the ring is evidence), or by discrediting the relationship as mercenary, which would release him from the obligation of

29 Reading *miserat* in 347, the ring is a gift sent by Aeschinus as a token of his engagement to the girl. O. Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders in den Adelphen des Terenz*, Hildesheim 1964, 64 f. and 75, shows that the custom of giving a betrothal ring was Roman, and has been added by Terence to supplement the Greek oath of betrothal with the ring required by Roman practice. (The alternative reading *amiserat* would imply a ring lost during the rape it would then have been retained by the girl and used to identify her assailant, as in *Epitrepontes* (387 f., 499 f.) and Terence's *Hecyra* (820 f.). But in those plays the ring is needed for the recognition of an unidentified ravisher; in *Adelphoe* no recognition is necessary, since Aeschinus voluntarily admitted his responsibility (cf. 334 f.).)

30 See Rieth (*op. cit.*, n. 29), 63. So long as the citizen girl had received no money she was entitled to the protection of the law, and her seducer could be prosecuted for sexual assault, within a thirty day period after the act. Aeschinus' early promise of marriage had forestalled such a lawsuit so now the girl's patron would have the further problem of establishing the offer of marriage, in order to explain why the suit had not been filed earlier. There is the further difficulty in defining the status of Hegio, acting for the girl. In Menander this character was the girl's maternal uncle (Donatus on *Ad.* 351): Terence converted him into her dead father's friend and unspecified *cognatus* of the family. Thus in the Greek play he was himself eligible to marry the girl (Harrison 23), perhaps even committed to do so if he could not find her a husband: he would have been her *kyrios*, not merely a *patronus* as in Ter. *Ad.* 456.

marriage, and dishonour the girl's family. Since no money has passed, he can only avoid the penalty by offering marriage to avert legal action. This is the simplest explanation of the words used by the mother's advocate, Hegio, at 490, when he tells Aeschinus' natural father, Demea, that he hopes the girl will obtain voluntarily from Aeschinus' family "what the law compels".³¹ In fact, in this play, as in *Samia* and *Aulularia*, the only obstacle to the marriage has been the cowardice of the young man, and the union is sealed by marriage as soon as the facts are known. How society actually viewed such shot-gun marriages to poor girls is perhaps better represented by the comments of Demea than by the magnanimity of his adoptive father Micio. Demea's first reaction is fury that the boy has assaulted a virgin, and a citizen (725); when the marriage is confirmed he complains that the girl is penniless (728) and will have to be taken without a dowry (729). I would argue that the last comment is not an automatic inference from her poverty, but an additional liability incurred by Aeschinus' admission of rape (see n. 28 above). Strange intrigues, these, for a comedy, but such tortuous, and in some ways shocking, plots were necessitated by the romantic ideal of a love sealed by marriage, in a society which all but excluded the combination of the two elements in everyday circumstances.

There was a way out of the dramatist's dilemma: love between a youth and girl was easier to contrive if the girl, though born a citizen and eligible for marriage, had lost her identity through kidnapping or been rescued as a foundling, and was already living as a non-citizen. Plots involving what we might call a concealed citizen are far more

31 In what sense did the law compel him to marry her? Did the magistrate express the obligation of marriage as a legal decision, or merely punish dereliction by a severe sanction? Harrison, 19, adds to the recognized option of the *dike biaion* or *graphe hubreos* a less well-attested procedure, for which the only clear evidence derives from Roman declamations. According to Seneca Rhetor (*Contr.* 2.3) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 9.2.90) the unmarried seducer could be compelled to choose between marriage, if it were accepted by the girl and both her and his fathers, and death! The evidence of comedy only speaks generally of compulsion: *Aul.* 793, *eamque uxorem mihi des*, ut leges iubent; *Andr.* 780, *coactus legibus eam uxorem ducet*. In *Epir.* 568–571, Onesimus assumes that if his master is found to have produced a child by the unmarried daughter of a free-born father (*patros korê / eleoutheron*) he will marry her and divorce his present wife, but since he has already deserted the first wife, the mere statement that he *will* marry need not entail compulsion to divorce. No doubt in bourgeois society, where a young man was ruled and kept by his father, the combination of public disapproval and a threatened fine was sufficient to compel a marriage.

common in surviving plays than the first type, whereas the reality, even in the troubled times of the Diadochi, was probably less frequent than rape; loss of status might frequently result from evacuation in wartime or the occupation of a city and enslavement of its people, but the happy reunion which resolves so many comedies was bitterly unlikely in the real Hellenistic world. The recognition of the foundling is a theme of most mythologies, and it was the divinely fathered heroes, and exposed royal princes of tragedy, not bourgeois life, which inspired the recognition of long-lost children in comedy. The audience of a Greek tragedy based on a myth had the advantage of knowing the secret identity of its hero; and what they (or some of them) might not know was told to them, especially in the recognition-plays of Euripides, by a prologue figure, often a god concerned with the outcome of the myth. So comedy too, when plays were based on recognition, regularly explained the parentage of the concealed citizen to the audience, in a divine prologue³² before the action unfolded: the last act—or even earlier—brought the identification of the girl as of citizen birth, and respectable, even desirable, parents; quite often the very family with which the young lover's father was seeking the marriage alliance. But for the girl to achieve security and happiness in marriage it was legally essential that she should have been kept chaste, and comedy invariably emphasizes her decency of character and sexual innocence.³³ In Terence's versions of Menander which suppress the expository prologue and do not formally tell the audience about the girl's birth, allusions to her modesty and breeding are one of the main clues to the happy ending.

32 See Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, Berlin ²1912, ch. 4; Wilamowitz, *Das Schiedsgericht*, 50, Schadewaldt, "Bemerkungen zur Hecyra des Terenz," *Hermes* 66 (1931) 20 ff. Examples of recognitions foreshadowed in the prologue are Menander, *Perikeiromene* and *Sikyonios*, Plautus, *Casina*, *Cistellaria*, *Poenulus* and *Rudens*. The opening of *Epitrepontes* is lost; Plautus' two short recognition comedies, *Curculio* and *Epidicus*, have no prologues, perhaps as a result of deliberate abridgement. Terence never used expository prologues.

33 A significant word in this context is *eleutherios*, Latin *liberalis*, the adjective associating breeding with citizen status. Compare Men. *Heros* 39, *eleutherios kai kosmia*; Ter. *Andr.* 122–123, *forma praeter ceteras / honesta ac liberali*; *Pho.* 815, *perliberalis mihi uisa est*. More general statements of virtue and chastity: Ter. *Ht.* 226, *bene et pudice educta*, cf. 265–295; *Eun.* 116, 748; *Pho.* 104–108, 113–116. Plautus' versions place more stress on the girl's actual virginity than her ladylike demeanour; besides the excerpts from *Curculio* quoted below, cf. *Cas. Prol.* 83 f., *Cist.* 96–87, *Poen.* 98–101, 1185–1186.

At the worst the girls might be kidnapped and bought by a pimp (Plautus' *Curculio*, *Poenulus*, *Rudens*), in which case they had to be recognized and saved before they were sold into concubinage; it is this requirement which explains the literary phenomenon of the girl-slave kept chaste by her master. Thus in *Curculio* the lover answers his slave's inquiry (50–51) "she's as chaste on my account as if she were my sister, except that she's a little bit debauched by kissing," and the pimp rather implausibly tells her purchaser "I brought her up decently and chastely at my place" (518). After this it is no surprise, despite the lack of a surviving prologue, that she turns out to be a citizen and sister of the army captain who wanted to buy her, who promptly betrothes her for lawful marriage to her admirer.

If the girl was adopted by a poor woman she would perhaps be prepared for the life of a concubine; in Menander's *Perikeiromene* ("she who gets shorn") and *Synaristosae* adapted as Plautus' *Cistellaria*, and in the Terentian adaptation of Menander's *Andria*, girls actually living as concubines when the play opens are enabled by the discovery of their citizen birth to marry their present lovers, who have, the dramatists assure us, treated them with the love due to a wife.³⁴ *Cistellaria*, a play set in Sicyon, is particularly interesting legally; Selenium believes herself to be the daughter of a *meretrix*, conceived in a casual encounter,³⁵ whereas we are told by the delayed prologue that she was the exposed child of a citizen girl raped at the Dionysia-festival by a visiting Lemnian merchant—"by force, drunk as he was, late at night and in the open street" (159). Rescued from exposure she was brought up "decently and chastely" by the *meretrix* as if she was her own daughter, while the original parents, now reunited and married, have begun to look for their lost baby. Selenium has been established as a concubine in her own house by her rich young lover Alcesimarchus, who, since his father is alive, is subject to his father's authority and has now been ordered to marry a rich heiress. The young man is explicit that he promised to marry Selenium, and his language about her resembles the professions of the young lover in *Andria*. She was intended to live out her life in marriage with him (243); she had been commended to him, and entrusted to his honour-

34 *Perik.* 488 *egô gametên nenomika tautên* = *Andr.* 273 *quam ego animo egregie caram pro uxore habuerim*. The references to *fides* in *Cist.* 245 and *Andr.* 296, below, add the concept most highly valued by a Roman to convey the same sense of honourable devotion.

35 *Cist.* 39–40: *illa te, ego hanc mihi educaui / ex patribus conuenticiis*.

able protection (245). So Pamphilus in *Andria* speaks of the scene in which the dying 'sister' of his beloved entrusted her and all her property to his honourable protection (295–6). What is surprising is that Selenium's lover, believing her to be the illegitimate daughter of a woman of low status, offered her actual marriage;³⁶ such a promise could not have been kept at Athens unless her citizen birth were established, whereas in *Cistellaria* the promise is first made before she is acknowledged a daughter of a Sicyonian citizen girl and the merchant from Lemnos, and is ratified in the last act. Both her actual and her assumed status seem to assume a more generous citizenship law in Sicyon: since she finally holds citizenship by virtue of her mother alone, it is reasonable to argue that she and Alcesimarchus believed, when the play began, that her assumed mother also entitled her to citizenship. Alternatively, if she was eligible for legal marriage in Sicyon, and the procreation of citizens, *without* formal citizenship, her real origin affects only her social acceptability to the boy's father and not her legal standing. But though the law of Sicyon may have been indulgent in permitting mixed marriage or parentage to citizens, and this was probably the reason for Sicyon as the scene of the play, we cannot infer from the play whether it only accepted children of citizen fathers into its citizen body³⁷ or included children of citizen mothers by foreign fathers.

36 See Fredershausen, "Weitere Studien über das Recht bei Plautus und Terenz," *Hermes* 47 (1912) 207 (the setting in Sicyon means that such a marriage may be legal). Ludwig, "Die Plautinische *Cistellaria*," *Entretiens Hardt* 16, 45–71, accepts the oath of marriage (48) without comment on the legal question, noting, however (52), that the relationship between the young gentleman and the girl from a *hetaera*'s household is closer and more binding here than in any other New Comedy. Paeoli, 67, fails to notice that the play involves Sicyonian, not Athenian, law.

37 By Athenian standards the child of a citizen mother was more foreign than that of a male citizen, since until 451 sons of citizen fathers had been full citizens, even when born to foreign mothers. Hence Aristotle *Pol.* 1278 a 12–34 argues as follows: "even foreigners are absorbed into the citizen body of some states; the child of a female citizen has citizenship in some democracies, and such is the law about bastards in many societies; of course they make such people citizens from a shortage of legitimate children (employing these laws because of a decline in manpower), but when they are well-populated, they gradually disqualify first the children by a male or female slave, then those (who are of native descent) in the female line, and finally they make citizens only those whose parents are both citizens." This implies four degrees of severity in giving citizen status: the most severe confines it, as in Athens after 451, to children of two citizens; more generously it will include those born to citizen fathers, but *not*

The girl in *Andria* knows of her citizen birth and can hope that proof of it will bring ratification of her union, as it does with the arrival of the Andrian witness Crito. As a dramatic convenience she is found to be not just a respectable citizen, but daughter of the man whose friendship Pamphilus' father was hoping to cement by the enforced marriage which precipitates the intrigue of the play; hence her marriage to Pamphilus satisfies the original intentions of both fathers and presents them with an instant grandson (the babies are always gratifyingly male, and heirs to the family).

But a citizen girl left in poor circumstances had little to distinguish her from a non-citizen. In the complex situation of *Phormio* (based on Apollodorus' *Epidikazomenos*) young Antipho sees a lovely girl at her mother's funeral, attended only by an old woman. His assumption is that she is a potential mistress, and he approaches the old woman with a proposition (113). Her reply first affirms the girl's status—a citizen, a respectable girl of respectable parents—and argues from it that she is legally entitled to marriage but not available on other terms. To help Antipho, Phormio the parasite exploits the principle of *epidikasia* applicable to a penniless girl without father or brothers, and prosecutes him as next of kin,³⁸ so that he will be legally compelled to do what he desires, and marry her; as a result, he actually marries without his father Demipho's consent, and without confirmation of her parentage (136). It is treated as obvious that his father would never have let him marry a girl without dowry and of humble origin, and in fact Demipho on

those deriving their claim from their mothers, who are admitted at a third degree of tolerance; the most permissive will accept children of citizens by not only a foreign but even a slave consort. There is ambiguity in the phrase *apogounaikôn* which I have rendered by "who are of native descent in the female line," but Aristotle clearly intends to distinguish this relationship from simple parenthood denoted by *ek* in the adjacent phrases. (I am indebted to Prof. Douglas MacDowell for elucidation of this point, and others in n. 38 and 40.)

- 38 The title of Apollodorus' play is given by Terence *Pho.* 25 as *Epidikazomenos*, leading readers to assume that Phormio himself was conducting an *epidikasia*, but, as Donatus shows in his comment on *Pho.* 25 (Wessner 2.355), the Greek play was in fact called *Epidikazomene* (passive principle) "she who gets adjudged in marriage," after the girl. As daughter of a father of unknown or minimum census, she should have been claimed in *epidikasia* by one of her kinsmen to ensure her support. In default it was open to Phormio, or any volunteer, to lay a charge (*graphe*, see Harrison 136) against an identified kinsman. The legal decision would entail the adjudging of the girl to the defeated kinsman, while leaving him the option of finding her a dowry and a husband.

his return instantly sets about repudiating her, without attempting to deny her citizenship; the girl is to be rejected on social grounds, and not in terms of her status. Since the marriage is legally valid without his consent, he will hope to achieve a repudiation by moral and economic pressure, probably the threat of disowning his son.^{38a} Only later in Terence's play (567 f.) does the audience discover the positive reason for Demipho's resolve to end the marriage—the plan of the two old men to marry Antipho to the bigamously³⁹ conceived daughter of Uncle Chremes. But very quickly, by the sort of coincidence in which comedy improves on life, Antipho's girl is revealed to be the long-sought daughter, unaware of her relationship because the philanthropic Chremes was known to her mother under an assumed name. Phormio's prosecution was not so far from the mark; apart from her half-brother Phaedria,⁴⁰ who would have been favoured in Athenian

38a On the validity of such marriages see Harrison 18 n. 5; other scholars are more inclined to believe that the father's consent was legally necessary. Gomme/Sandbach, 32, do not exclude this, but emphasize that "it was in practice required." *Apokenuxis*, the father's ultimate sanction, entailed eviction from the family home, so that Antipho would have no roof or support for his bride; in addition the disowned son was debarred from participating in the family rites, and excluded from the paternal estate on his father's death (Harrison 75 and n. 3).

39 Harrison, 16, argues that Athens had no legislation positively enforcing monogamy. Since the girl was a citizen, her mother must have held *epigamia*—Athenian marriage rights (cf. Paoli 67 n. 1), and her Lemnian marriage with Chremes will have been recognized in Attic law. So she had entered into two marriages; but the second, under an assumed name, is clearly no evidence for legalized bigamy. Once registered as a citizen, the daughter presumably retained her status.

40 See Harrison 22: "Marriage between brothers and sisters by the same father, but a different mother was allowed," and 23 n. 1: "the Athenian made provision for an undowered girl by allowing a brother by the same father to marry her." In *Phormio* the fact of Antipho's cohabitation precludes any serious thought of marrying the girl to Phaedria when her parentage is discovered. But the legitimacy of marriage between non-uterine siblings, if it was recognized outside Athens, raises an interesting problem in *Epidicus*, set in Thebes, where Stratipocles loves Telestis, but has to renounce her (cf. 651) when he discovers that she is his father's daughter by the girl Philippa, "born in Thebes but begotten in Epidamnus" (*Epid.* 636). The renunciation is an anticlimax, which may have been imposed on Plautus by the Roman prohibition of such a marriage. The analogy of *Phormio*, and the weak ending, strongly suggest that in the Greek play adapted as *Epidicus* the young man married Telestis, to the satisfaction of everyone.

law if it had not been inconvenient for the denouement, and Demipho, who was too old (cf. 422 “for your age has already passed the time for marriage”), Antipho was indeed her most eligible kinsman. The same principle invoked by Phormio in his legal action “so that no citizen girl should commit any impropriety out of poverty” (415–416) was the cause of Chremes’ voyage, sending him back to Lemnos to find his daughter. She is no *epikleros*, since he is living, and could not become one, since she has a healthy half-brother, but the need for her respectable maintenance—the reverse side of the *epikleros*-principle—set the old fathers to planning this intrafamilial marriage.

Comedy reflects fairly the economic situation of a household consisting of women alone. In *Adelphoe*, Aeschinus’ beloved, her mother, and her old nurse were all able to survive in unprofitable domesticity because they owned the working slave Geta: “he keeps them; single-handed, he supports the whole household” (481–482). Without such a possession, a woman was faced with the choice of chaste penury from wool-working, or the greater rewards of a *hetaera*’s life. The Andrian Chrysis after attempting the former (75–78) changed to the profits of *quaestus*⁴¹ (“the Profession”), no doubt because she was also supporting a young “sister,” and hoped by sacrificing her own honour to preserve that of the younger girl, a motif brought out in the playwright’s treatment of the courtesan Thais in *Eunuchus* (145 f., 748, 869–870). One might add that, without citizenship or dowry, no other hope of companionship extended itself to these girls.

Clinia’s beloved, Antiphila, since she was in fact a citizen, and would be restored to her respectable parents and betrothed to him during the play, conformed to the comic pattern and maintained herself in chaste poverty during his absence, as his slave reports, to Clinia’s relief, *Ht.* 285–291. (It should be noted parenthetically that no individual in comedy was ever too poor to employ one slave, and that the mark of utter penury was a single old woman attendant.) But while Chrysis was free to make her own choice, Antiphila at least was at risk as long as she lived with her “mother” the old Corinthian woman, “her nasty mother, under whose rule she lives, and who cares for nothing ex-

41 *Quaestum facere*, “to earn a living,” applied to a woman, always denotes the life of a *hetaera* or prostitute. In the same way *meretrix*, “she who earns,” refers to the most likely way for a woman to support herself; in Greek similar words, appropriate for male artisans, *ergasia*, *ergazomai*, *ergastêrion*, were used for prostitution (e.g., Dem. 59.23, 31, 67) but are not found in this sense in Menander.

cept profit" (233–234). Indeed her actual father Chremes, who originally ordered his wife to expose the new-born girl, reproaches her with handing the baby to the Corinthian, because she had saved the child's life, but committed her to a future of dishonour, "either taking up the Profession or being sold into slavery" (640). Sale into slavery was a risk for any minor or young girl separated from her kinsmen, and provides the background in *Eunuchus* of Thais' "sister", whom she is hoping to recover from the boorish Thraso. The girl, originally a citizen, had already been sold once when Thais' mother adopted her; in Thais' absence, her uncle had sold her again, rather than maintain her and dower her, and only coincidence had prevented her being sold to a stranger and lost forever.⁴²

The discovery of a girl's citizenship could affect radically not only her future, but the position in law of any man who like young Chaerea presumed on her alien status, and assaulted her sexually; in *Eunuchus*, when the girl's birth is established, Chaerea's accomplice Parmeno is convinced that he will be seized as a *moechus* and made to suffer awful physical indignities, even mutilation (992; cf. 951–957).⁴³ Luckily Chaerea no sooner hears of her citizen birth than he begs Thais to help him marry the girl and extends hope that his father will agree to

42 According to Thais (*Eun.* 107–138) the girl was an Athenian citizen, stolen by pirates from the coastal *deme* of Sunium when she was too young to know anything but her parents' names. The pirates sold her to a merchant, repeating the information (unlikely in life, but a prerequisite for Thais' tale); he in turn, when he came to Rhodes gave her as a gift to the Samian (surely a courtesan?) who was Thais' mother. She respected the girl's citizen birth and brought her up chastely. Thais meanwhile left for Athens with her soldier-lover Thraso, and when her mother died, the wicked uncle sold the girl; Thraso, on his way back from campaigning in Caria, was present at the sale and bought the girl as a gift for Thais (not knowing she had another lover, Phaedria). At the beginning of the play this girl of fifteen has been kidnapped, sold, given to a *hetaera*, resold, and his about to be given to another *hetaera*, who is exceptional in her desire to protect the girl's honour.

43 The adultery law presupposed here conforms to Attic law in detail. Paoli, 58, lists as elements of Attic law (1) the extension of *moicheia* to cover unmarried girls; (2) the right of her brother to kill or physically punish the offender caught in the act (*Eun.* 953); (3) his right to bind the offender (954); (4) the application to a sexual offence committed within the home (943–4). Parmeno's disbelief, because *moicheia* does not apply in the house of a *meretrix*, also conforms to Attic law, cf. Dem. 59.67. For the instant vengeance, binding and threatened mutilation, compare the faked adultery of Pl. *Mil.* 1400 ff.; for trespass as an ingredient in the offence cf. *Mil.* 1166–1168.

the marriage “so long as she is a citizen” (890). His father is so terrified by Parmeno’s tale of the rape and supposed summary justice that he readily agrees to Chaerea’s marriage, and affords his patronage to Thais in her liaison with his older son Phaedria.

In general the concealed citizen offered comedy a great range of plot-types, by virtue of the different degrees of knowledge the girl or others might have of her status and parenthood, and the variety of situations in which she could be placed by her loss of identity.

There was little scope for a romantic plot in comedy based on the free *hetaera* and her lovers. Besides *Eunuchus* two Plautine versions involve a courtesan as leading lady: *Menaechmi*, in which the *hetaera* Erotium is more important as a source of incident than as a character, and *Truculentus*, which is closer to *Eunuchus* in theme. We have seen that Thais earned recognized concubinage with Phaedria and his father’s protection because of her generosity to young Chaerea; in Terence this is combined with the retention of Thraso as a subsidiary lover.⁴⁴ Since Thraso is derived from Terence’s secondary source, the *Kolax* of Menander, it is possible that the relationship with him confined to the finale is merely Terentian modification, in the attempt to marry his two plots; but Phronesium, the dubious heroine of *Truculentus*, retains two of her three lovers, contriving to keep the soldier Stratophanes alongside the new favourite Strabax.⁴⁵ (The third, Diniarchus, has fathered a son by the respectable daughter of Callicles, and so ends the play

44 On the recognized sharing of a *hetaera* between *synerastae*, see above, n. 22. Paoli 22 n. 2, argues that *rivalis* in *Eun.* 1072 translates *synerastes* and argues against Pasquali (*StItal* 13 (1936) 117 f.) that the compromise which ends the plays is normal Greek practice, and so should be assumed for Menander’s Thais, despite our modern feeling that she has shown herself too fastidious for such a bargain.

45 What is the chronology of Phronesium’s lovers? Diniarchus’ dismissal as fiancé of Callicles’ daughter was probably caused by the beginning or discovery of his affair with Phronesium. During his absence in Lemnos (Prol. 91 f.) his fiancée had his baby, which was smuggled away by a maid and given to Phronesium as hers. The Babylonian soldier, her lover a year earlier, before Diniarchus (390), has been on campaign and newly returned; hence Diniarchus, like Phaedria in *Eunuchus*, is asked to recede for the length of time needed by Phronesium to get money from the soldier. Once she receives it at the end of the play, although Stratophanes clearly thinks she is rearing his son, and sees her as his formal concubine, he is forced to accept her proposal—*utriusque mos geratur amborum ex sententia*—of shared favours, and the tougher attitude of the rival makes it clear that Stratophanes, like Thraso, will get rather less than equal terms for his money.

as her future husband; see n. 28 above.) The analogy of *Truculentus* suggests that despite the difference in Ethos between the two women (and the two plays), we should not exclude a double ménage for Thais as the conclusion of the Menandrian *Eunuchus*.

Plays centred round a slave-*hetaera*, loved, purchased, and freed by young men, offer little of legal interest except as evidence for the law of sale. The plots almost always (cf. *Asinaria*, *Epidicus*, *Mostellaria*, *Pseudolus*, and the subplots of *Phormio* and *Adelphoe*) hinge on financial trickery at the expense of the youth's father, or the girl's owner. The convention of freeing the girl on purchase attested at *Epid.* 47–52, 508–509, *Mo.* 297–302 (cf. 244, 1139), *Ps.* 1311, and promised at *Cu.* 209, is probably unrealistic; at an average of 30 minae (9000 times the two obols per day of state pay for a poor man's maintenance) they were too expensive for most young men to buy, and it was sheer absurdity for them to give away their investment by instant manumission; this is both a symbol of their infatuated folly, and a mark of the escapism and pie-in-the-sky of this type of comedy. Terence allows his boys to keep but not liberate their slave-mistresses (*Pho.* 1040 ff., *Ad.* 845–849). Although Onesimus in *Epitrepontes* is convinced that Habrotonon would be bought and freed by Charisios if he believed she was mother of his child (*Epitr.* 539), she does not seem to have been freed as a reward for her help in the reconciliation. The story of Neaera, from life, should be proof that the generosity of comic lovers was unrepresentative; although girls might be given their freedom, they had to earn it over a period of time, or buy it at a reduced price, like Neaera or Bacchis in the Plautine adaptation of *Dis Exaponton*.⁴⁶

The last category of sexual relationship to provide a dramatic intrigue returns to the more settled world of marriage, and its shadow, monogamous concubinage. This type of plot did not appeal to the Roman audience: Plautus offers no example; and Terence's only comedy within marriage was his greatest public failure; as a result the examples of this type of play come from Menander himself, and there is no risk that elements of law or custom in the action are not Athenian. This group of plays take takes an established relationship, presupposing real love between man and woman, and sets up a source of misunderstanding in the suspected infidelity of the woman. She has to be innocent, to

46 *Ba.* 1184. Nicoboulos settles for half the money of which Chrysalus cheated him, to buy her freedom (see Paoli 27–28).

retain the sympathy of the audience, and there must at the same time be strong cause for the man's suspicions, to make them acceptable; thus in *Perikeiromene* Polemon saw his concubine Glycera accept the kiss of a young man, whom she knows to be her unacknowledged brother: in fury he publicly shamed her by shaving her head, and when the play begins she has fled to the house of her brother and his "mother." He believes she has left him for the "seducer" and wants to take her back by force. In an important passage (496–503) the neighbour Pataecus explains the legal position to Polemon; she was not his wife, and so is now legally independent. If Moschion has seduced her, Polemon has grounds for an *enklema* (lawsuit), if he wishes to go to arbitration; but if he uses violence, he will himself be liable to prosecution (*dike*). Vengeance is the privilege of the husbands, or at most the patrons of the special class of concubines listed in the Draconian homicide law. The plot is resolved by Polemon's remorse and the discovery that Glycera (and Moschion) is a citizen, child of Pataecus; she is then free to marry Polemon, and formally betrothed by her new-found father.

The role of the concubine in the *Samia* is more complex; Chrysis, Demea's Samian concubine, has been carrying his child during his long absence; before he returns, Moschion, Demea's adopted son, has fathered a baby by the neighbour's citizen daughter. Chrysis, her own child apparently still-born, takes in the illegitimate baby out of pity and to conceal it from the girl's father; she agrees to tell Demea it is her child by him. When he hears this he is angry for rearing the baby without his leave, and in an ironic scene complains of her to Moschion: "Apparently I didn't know I had taken this *hetaera* as a wife ... it seems I have a secret son; let her get out of the house and go to blazing taking it with her."⁴⁷ Both on account of the baby and the woman, this shocks a

47 *Sam.* 130, 132 *gametên hetairan, hōs eiok', elanthanon / echōn . . . lath[ri]o[s] ti[s] houos*, *hōs eiokē, gegone moi*; cf. 354–355, where the rearing of the baby is his pretext for expelling Chrysis. On the irony of *gamete* here, compare the famous distinction made in *Dem.* 59.122: "for we have *hetaerae* for pleasure, concubines for the sake of daily care of our persons, and wives in order to beget legitimate children, and have a trustworthy guardian of our home." Demea speaks of Chrysis as a *hetaera*, not a *pallake*; is he denying her even the status of concubine? The word *pallake* seems to be archaic and technical. Nicaretus applies it in the artificial language of 508, where the tone is contemptuous; it also occurs in a narrative fragment (453 K), but like our "common-law

modern reader, but in Demea's eyes the child merely threatens Moschion's economic prospects by imposing expense on him, although it cannot in any way affect his rights as heir. Worse still, Demea discovers Moschion is the child's father, and seeing Chrysis suckle the baby, naturally is confirmed in his belief that she is the mother; inevitably he assumes that she has betrayed him with Moschion in his absence. In two long monologues he tries to judge the responsibility for the offence and asks the audience (most of them experienced jurors) to join him; instinct and prejudice drive him to exonerate the son he has brought up himself and blame the concubine: after all she is a *hetaera*. In fury he drives Chrysis from the house; she believes her fault is having reared the child without permission (374); he does not explain, but dismisses her with the child, its old nanny (373), and all her possessions, adding two maids.⁴⁸ His forecast of her future life evokes the social desperation of the *hetaera* who does not find an escape in concubinage: "out in the city, you'll see clearly what you're worth; other women who don't have your luck, Chrysis, run to and fro to dinner-parties earning ten drachmae, and drink strong liquor until they die, or starve unless they take the trade up quick. You'll find this out better than any-

wife" it was probably not used in conversation. On the legal equivalence of *hetaera* and *pallake* in this context see Wolff 73–74.

- 48 *Hetaerae* were often given a pair of maids by their lovers (cf. *Eun.* 506, *Tru.* 530–531). Paoli, 26–27, sees them as a mark of the lover's generosity, but since independent *hetaerae* are depicted with a pair of maids at, e.g., *Poen.* 221–222, *Hec.* 793 (*sequimini vos ambae*), and even the exploitative Phrynion provided them for Neaera, it is likely that the two maids were regarded as a routine prerequisite, on a pair with a woman's wardrobe and jewellery. For the latter compare *Cist.* 487, *Mil.* 1127 (Pyrgopolynices voluntarily dismisses Plane-sium with *aurum ornamenta / quae illi instruxisti*). Both clothes and jewels are implied in the *kosmos* which Polemon gave to Glycera (*Perik.* 516). Neaera, leaving Phrynion took *hosa ên autê houp' ekeinou peri to sôma kateskeouasmena himatia kai chrousia kai therapainas douo* (Dem. 59.35), "the personal possessions with which he had equipped her, clothes, jewellery and two maids," and when Phrynion sued for restitution of his property, the arbitrators adjudged that Neaera was free and legally independent (*autên hautês kourian*) but should return what she had taken *except* the clothes and jewellery and maids which had been bought for her by him (46). (Does Demea give Chrysis her jewellery in 382? While one papyrus reads *chrousi* (*chrysia*, "jewellery"), editors rightly prefer to read the vocative *Chrousi*, as in 378 in the same metrical position. It would be contrary to practice if he specified the jewellery but not the clothes: *ta sautês panta*, "all your possessions" (381), represents the impatient roughness of his anger, and desire to end the painful scene.)

one, and realize what you were to go wrong like that." Demea's reaction to her infidelity is intensified by the apparent involvement of his beloved son; both Moschion and Chrysis clearly owe their material comfort to Demea's generosity, and he feels a double betrayal. But when the confusions and errors are resolved, he makes full amends to Moschion in a human and moving speech of apology (695 f.); Chrysis gets nothing more than a gruff "Come over here, Chrysis, ... run on in then!" when he lets her into the house to escape the frantic Niceratus. For the dramatist it would seem her problems and her honour were of no more concern; his real interest is the man-to-man relationship of Demea and his adopted⁴⁹ son, and Chrysis once back in the household is forgotten.

The most extreme cases are the situations which provoke the near-tragedies of *Epitrepontes* and *Hecyra*. In both plays the very artificial circumstances of the plot should serve as a warning against taking such episodes as representative of even exceptional marital problems in bourgeois Athens; what matters are the reactions of the participants, and the moral judgements implied.

In *Epitrepontes* young Charisios, drunken from feasting at the Tauropolia, raped an unknown girl and lost his ring in the struggle; later by dramatic coincidence he and this girl Pamphile are married without recognizing each other. He leaves on a business voyage without consummating the marriage, and unaware of her condition. As a result, when the child of the rape is born in his absence, she knows it cannot come from her marriage, and arranges for it to be exposed to die in the

49 Cf. Jacques (above, n. 27) lxvi, Keuls (above, n. 27) 6. Jacques questions Chrysis' status (xlili-xliv) after discussing the theory of Mette (xxxxxiii n. 2) that Moschion physically kidnapped her for his father; perhaps these questions are better considered in reverse order. Demea calls her a free woman in 577; the way in which he dismissed her with her possessions (like Glycera or Neaera), and her social equality with the citizen mother and daughter next door, confirm her free status in Demea's home. Should we assume that she was a slave until he fell in love with her and freed her? If so, he would have reproached her with it in 377 when he recalls her poor clothing at the time he took her in. If she had been a slave-*hetaera* the rich Demea need not have feared the competition of the young men mentioned in 25-26; he could have bought her from her owner. Nor need, or would, he have condoned a kidnapping by his son. Whatever the meaning of *egkratês* in 25, it is more reconcilable with obtaining the monopoly of a free *hetaera*, than seizing a slave-girl. Moschion's service to his father lay probably in negotiation or persuasion of Chrysis to leave her own accommodation for Demea's household.

hill-country. Before the play begins, he has returned, heard the story of her unknown assailant and the child's birth from his slave, and sadly left the marital home, abandoning her in horror; but love for her is too strong, and although he hires a music-girl Habrotonon as a companion, he leaves her untouched (440). His behaviour is reported to us by the indignant father-in-law Smikrines (133–136) and the slave Onesimos (419 f.), after the exposed baby has been rescued and brought to his notice with his master's ring. In terms of marital offence, the situation is complicated because Pamphile's father clearly knows nothing of his daughter's pregnancy, and sees only that Charisios after a generous dowry of four talents (134) has not seen fit to stay home, but sleeps apart and has paid a pimp twelve drachmas a day for Habrotonon. By 645 f. (Sandbach) he has also credited the false story that Charisios has had a child by Habrotonon: "your fine friend felt no shame to beget a child by a trollop."⁵⁰ He goes to take his daughter home and reclaim the dowry. The damaged text permits us to see that his assessment of the marriage is largely financial, and Charisios' extravagances taken more seriously than his infidelity—a feature paralleled in the comments of many fathers of comedy. The audience does not meet Charisios himself until the wife has both defended him to her father, and learnt from Habrotonon that her baby is safe, and Charisios is its father. Indeed the "deceived" husband appears only in this sequence of the play, when, still believing he has fathered a child by Habrotonon, he overhears Pamphile's declaration of loyalty to him and refusal to leave his home. The sequence builds up to a fine climax, leading from the uncomprehending report by Onesimos of his master's gestures of emotion and outcry of remorse to Charisios' stage entry. His attitude towards his wife is one that surpasses the routine morality of his world. Finding his wife pregnant by an unknown, he could even before the play opened have repudiated her and sent her back to her father; even then he chose to keep silence, and if he left home, it was in instinctive shock—a shock conditioned by the obsession of his society with chastity in the family. Now he sees himself and his act of rape as responsible for the marital breakdown ("I am the fatal offender"⁵¹) and barbaric in his failure to for-

50 *paidarion ek pornês* [—]. The text is damaged, but the missing words probably include *poiein*, recalling the technical verb *paidopoieisthai*, associated with procreating lawful heirs in marriage.

51 *egô . . . halitêrios* (894). In using the word *aliterios*, Charisios is comparing himself with the evil spirit (in Greek tragedy) which destroys an *oikos* through the

give her involuntary fall, because he was obsessed with public opinion and his good name. His position as father of a harlot's child, separated from the wife he loved, appears to him as divine retribution for his own offence (911–912) and cruelty in dishonouring her misfortune; his resolve to brave her father and assert his desire to keep her as his wife comes before he finds out from Habrotonon that he is the father of his wife's child, and no other (953). The facts release him from any legal pressure to leave his wife; his decision to reclaim her, made before the facts are known, confirms his new understanding of life, his love for her, and their prospects of a united and happy marriage.

Few scholars now question that Apollodorus was influenced by admiration of this play to compose his *Hecyra*, preserved to us only in Terence's Latin adaptation. Again a premarital rape, committed without recognition by husband or wife, again delayed consummation and an enforced voyage are part of the basic situation; again there is a baby apparently fathered by another, and the play focuses on the young husband's reaction, and decision about the future of his marriage. But there are major differences; Pamphilus, the husband was formerly in love with a *hetaera*, Bacchis; he loved her at the time of the rape, which he confessed to her in his immediate shock after the event. (*Hec.* 820–829). Compelled to marry, he continued from love of Bacchis to ignore his wife, until her gentle ways won him over; as a result only the girl, her mother, and his personal slave, Parmeno,⁵² know that

wickedness of its members. Polemon, in calling himself an *alastor*, for his drunken abuse of Glycera (*Perik.* 986), takes on the same guilt. Compare for this use of *aliterios* the gossip about Callias son of Hipponikos in Andoc. *Myst.* 130–131: "Hipponikos is bringing up an *aliterios* which is overthrowing him bed and board ... when he thought he was bringing up a son, it was an *aliterios* that overthrew his wealth, his honour, and his whole life."

Charisios' use of *atuchousa* (898), and *akousion* . . . *atouchema* in 914, also has the moral force of acknowledging that she is not responsible for her condition; an *atychema*, misfortune, was distinct from both *hamartema*, a culpable error, for which one was legally responsible, and *adikema*, an actual offence at law. Webster, *Studies in Menander*, Manchester 1950, 18, believes that the distinctions between *atuchein*, *atuchema*, *hamartia* (fr. 358 K.), and *adikēma* (fr. 359 K.) made in Menander's *Rapizomene* reflect a similar plot to *Perikeiromene*, involving a girl accused of unchastity, and absolve her as a victim of rape. By their judgement, Charisios and Polemon are more enlightened than the law, which seems to have imposed the same penalties on married victims of rape as on seduced wives (Harrison 26).

52 The report of Parmeno in 143–150 specifies that Pamphilus left her a virgin "because it would be dishonourable for him and harmful to the girl if he did

the child which she gives birth to on his return home after the enforced voyage cannot be the product of their marriage. In order to leave his home she has had to simulate an illness; others assume a quarrel with his mother, and the play opens with the speculations of various persons about the wife's sudden departure. As a result, when Pamphilus returns home at the very moment of her delivery, and stumbles on her confinement, his natural revulsion at the thought of a bastard is compounded by embarrassment as the parent generation crowd around him; first her mother explains the rape and begs his secrecy, promising that the child will be exposed, if he will only conceal his knowledge; then he meets his own mother, genuinely solicitous about his wife's "illness". When the news that a boy is born (it is a boy as usual) leaks to the fathers, they seize on the birth of an heir as the best conceivable cause of reunion of husband and wife. The child which is such a joy to them is the worst of griefs to Pamphilus, who sees it as the intruder. The question of his wife's restoration, which he had reluctantly rejected in the first instance (403–406) when it was detached from the issue of the child, is now irretrievably linked with the acceptance of a bastard,⁵³ whom his pledge of secrecy would drive him to rear as heir to his own family. In terms of the *oikos*, to represent such a child as his own at the *Apatouria*, enrol it in his phratry, and let it participate in the family cult demanded not merely a life of hypocrisy, but actual sacrilege. In this intolerable situation the drama would have reached impasse, if the suspicion of the fathers had not fallen on Bacchis and brought her into the action, to resolve the crisis when the girl's mother sees her daughter's ring on Bacchis' hand. When the separate knowledge of the two women is combined, the baby is seen to be the true child of legal husband and wife. Again, the morality of the play shocks a modern audience; that a young man in love with a mistress (who presumably satisfies

not restore her intact as he had received her." Is there a legal point here? As far as her marriageability was concerned, mere divorce would not make her *anekdotos*, but if she were returned as a virgin, she would not be suspected—as might be the case if he had slept with her—of being repudiated for unchastity. It is almost certain the audience of Apollodorus' play already knew of Pamphilus' rape of the girl from a divine prologue (Schadewaldt (above, n. 32), 20 f., confirmed most recently by Lefèvre, *Die Expositionstechnik in den Komödien des Terenz*, Darmstadt 1969, 60 and n. 80); the reported motives of Pamphilus would be rich in irony for the Greek audience.

53 *Etiam si dudum fuerat ambiguom hoc mihi / nunc non est quam eam sequitur alienus puer* (648–649).

his needs) should rape a total stranger, and then present her ring to the mistress, makes it difficult to accept his sincerity as a lover; it might seem that he has little right to feel disgust at his wife's condition, and less intelligence, when he fails to connect it with his own past behaviour: perhaps he commits rape so often that he has forgotten the affair as insignificant? In fact Terence's audience could raise none of these points, since it learns of Pamphilus' own sexual history at the climax of the play, when the resolution is at hand (822 f.). If the facts of Philoumena's pregnancy were given the audience in an expository prologue to Apollodorus' Greek play, they would have to accept Pamphilus' behaviour before they met him. Both Menander in *Epitrepontes* and Apollodorus needed delicacy to preserve audience sympathy for their young husbands, but Apollodorus' more difficult task would be lightened if he kept in the foreground the two issues of Pamphilus' obligation to his mother,⁵⁴ with whom he thought Philoumena had quarrelled, and the intruding baby. Where we are shocked that a rapist should reject a wife otherwise virtuous, but victim of physical assault, the contemporary audience would be primarily concerned with the baby; knowing it to be a lawful heir to the family, they would be in suspense until its status was vindicated and survival guaranteed. In neither play is the woman's sexual behaviour a moral issue; both husbands acknowledge the wife's defencelessness and lack of responsibility for the situation; rather it is her condition, polluted and so unusable as a transmitter of the *genos*.

Since Charisios believed the baby had been exposed, his decision to return to his wife might otherwise have seemed easy, but in both plays the fact of the child's premarital conception is at the mercy of a slave; Onesimos who reported the birth and exposure to Charisios (*Epitr.* 422–427; the text is too damaged to give precise information) and Parmeno, who knew that Pamphilus had delayed consummation of the marriage (*Hec.* 145, 409–411), and so must on no account get wind of the baby. The husbands were at the mercy of *doxa* (*Epitr.* 908) or *fama*⁵⁵ which could utterly dishonour them if they

54 He is genuinely concerned for his mother in 447–449, but uses her in 476–478 as an excuse to fend off the fathers; when his mother offers to withdraw to the country, his aside (601–602) again reflects love for both wife and mother, but as soon as his mother is relegated by Laches (610) the new problem of the baby claims his (and the audience's) attention (38 f.).

55 Compare the obsession of Demea with public opinion and scandal in *Ad.* 91–93, 112, 721, and the silly boasts of Niceratus, *Sam.* 508–513, that all the gos-

were known to have condoned an unchaste wife. Such plots do not seem the stuff of popular entertainment: even if the suffering of the raped girl is kept off-stage, the distress caused to the husband, particularly in the nightmarish *Hecyra*, is so great that a last-minute denouement is hardly sufficient to dispel audience tension and distress. But real tragedy was dead, and Menander's generation with their intense interest in everyday human behaviour might well feel that domestic crisis merited serious treatment, and enabled them to achieve something approaching tragic *pathos*. The greater variety and vigour of *Epitrepontes* might suggest that the intensity of the *Hecyra* was a product of the Roman temperament (or the fault of Apollodorus); but both Apollodorus and Terence could produce a happier treatment of similar romantic themes in the *Epidikazomenos-Phormio* play.

The documentary value of these plays, it seems to me, lies in two features; the illustration of external pressure on marital partners, and the implication that thinking men now looked beyond sexual fact to sexual responsibility.

Finally we might note that adultery finds little place in comedy. Adultery by a wife was unpardonable;⁵⁶ extra-marital affairs of the husband with *hetaerae* were not regarded as *moicheia*, since they were no offence against either woman. Nevertheless philandering husbands come off badly in New Comedy, and in all the plays known to me are both frustrated and humiliated. The adulterously inclined Demaenetus and Lysidamus of *Asinaria* and *Casina* are mocked and sent home; Lysimachus in *Mercator* is foiled, and the two fathers in *Bacchides* who end the play being entertained by *hetaerae* may be widowers. In Terence the only adulterer, Chremes in *Phormio*, is soundly scolded for an offence now fifteen years old. To some extent what we have here is disapproval of the Dirty Old Man, and this is made explicit in *Mercator*, 1015 f.: "I think we should lay down the law for old men before we leave, for them to observe and adhere to. Whosoever shall have reached

sips of the barbers' shops would know he was a man by his punishment of his concubine.

56 The two episodes resembling adultery with a married woman in comedy, *Mil.* 1400 f. and *Ba.* 851 f., are confidence tricks, employing a *hetaera* to intimidate an enemy, or extract money by blackmail—a device used by Neaera and Stephanos (*Dem.* 59.54); he would apprehend any rich innocent foreigner acting as her lover and lock him up as a *moichos* with her, and make a great deal of money. They repeated the trick with their "citizen" daughter and Epaenetus in 84 f.

sixty, if we know of any man, be he married or single, who goes in for wenching, we shall proceed against him at law, and hold him—a blithering idiot.” Menaechmus, the only young adulterer, fares no better; he never succeeds in his rendezvous with Erotium, who is taken instead by his bachelor brother. In extant Graeco-Roman comedy only Jupiter is permitted his fling, on special terms which concede both infidelity and *moicheia* to his divine right.

How are our separate categories—for the respectable citizen, maiden, wife, and widow; for the non-citizen, music-girl, courtesan, concubine, or procuress—reflected in the characterization of comedy? The diversity of masks listed by Pollux—fourteen types for young women, including 2–3 in each category of little slave-girl, maiden, wronged maiden (our concealed citizen), *hetaerae*, and concubines, with others again for old women whether honest nannies or grasping procuresses⁵⁷, might suggest immense variety of characterization. But subtleties apart, what emerges from the plays are two fully-characterized types—the *hetaera* and the established wife—with stereotyped personalities which the dramatist may use literally or may exploit in order to reveal the contrast between the popular image and the more subtle and decent reality; thus characters talk in terms of prejudices which act as a foil to the unselfishness of Thais, or Bacchis in the *Hecyra*;⁵⁸ Habrotonon is not yet a *hetaera*, but there is a similar contrast between her behaviour and what is expected of her. Since the stereotypes as described by prejudiced speakers, or portrayed on stage, are more revealing of the attitudes of middle-class society than the dramatists’ superior conceptions, I will round off my account by illustrating the antithetical figures of prejudice mostly from the less subtle adaptations of Menander in Roman Comedy. For the grasping *hetaera* no more lurid example can be quoted than Bacchis of *Heautontimoroumenos*, introduced by her lover as “foul-tempered, petulant, flamboyant, extravagant, and notorious” (229). We can add Chremes’ pen portrait of her behaviour at dinner; “she’s really designed to bring a man to ruin; first she brought with

57 Pollux 4.143–154, summarized in Pickard/Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, Oxford ²1968, 227–230; compare Webster, *Greek Theatre Production*, London 1956, 62 f., and *Monuments Illustrating New Comedy*, BICS Suppl. 11 (1961).

58 Such prejudices are voiced most fully by slaves; compare Parmeno, *Eun.* 50–80, 931–940 (where the audience already knows how wrong he is), and the strictures of Lydus (*Ba.* 1.2), Parmeno (*Cur.* 1.1 and 3), and Messenio (*Men.* 2.3).

her more than ten maids loaded with her wardrobe and jewellery; if her lover was a Persian Satrap he'd never be able to supply her expenses ... I only served up one dinner to her and her retinue; if I have to do it again, I'm done for. Not to mention the rest, the sheer volume of wine she wasted with her sippings; 'just so-so'—'this is too rough, old man; pray fetch me a smoother vintage'—I unsealed all the flagons and casks; she had the whole household frantic—and that was just one night." As often, it was the expense that penetrated to the bourgeois heart. Bacchis herself in dialogue with the young citizen Antiphila offers a social analysis of the dichotomy that makes her what she is (381–395):

Upon my word, Antiphila, I admire you and think you're blessed by fortune that you've set yourself to match your good looks with good behaviour. So help me, I'm not surprised if all the men desire you. Your words have shown the sort of person you are; in fact, when I think over your life-style and that of all you girls who keep the crowd at a distance, it's no wonder you're like you are; and we are not: it's worth your while to be good girls, while our business clients won't let us try it; it's our looks that drive the fellows to devote themselves to us; when once they fade, men take their hankerings off elsewhere. But if any man's close to you in character, they attach themselves to you, and both sexes are really bound to each other by mutual kindness, so that no disaster can ever overtake your love.

But let us move to the *matronae*; the *dotatae uxores* who may once have been sweet young things like Antiphila; is the comic stereotype all that different from the blousy Bacchis? Plautus in his *Aulularia* and *Miles Gloriosus* provides two general attacks on the rich wife; the brief lines at *Aul.* 166–169 may be a close adaptation of Menander:

I thank the gods I'm rich enough on my own account—I can't stand those mighty social sets, the airs and graces, those dowries spent on luxury, the harangues, the bossing about, the ivory-inlaid carriages, evening gowns and imported cloth, that drive poor husbands into slavery by their extravagance.

In 489–521 Plautus indulges himself in a longer, almost Catonian denunciation of expenditure on luxury goods and services which is probably a considerable expansion of his original. There is a similar picture of the rich wife in *Mil.* 690 f.:

Am I to bring home a bride who wakes me up before cock-crow with "Please, dear husband, give something to make a present to mother on the first of the month, give me some cash for spices, more to pay the medium, the dream-monger, the fortune-teller and the lady diviner: it would be a scandal to send nothing to the palm-reader; then I can't in all decency leave our a present for the wardrobe woman; the candle-seller's been cross

for months because she's had no tip; then the midwife complained that she hadn't received a big enough fee; aren't you going to send a little something to the wet-nurse that feeds the servant-brats?" It's expenses like these and lots of others brought on by women that keep me from getting a wife.

The rest of the bachelor's narrative in praise of his club-man's life is indisputably Greek in tone, and there is no reason to deny these lines to the Greek play. Many of the Menander fragments show that for the male audience of comedy the worst aspects of women, respectable or otherwise, were their demands for money, reinforced in the behaviour of the *dotata* by a sense of her own status and financial grievances that were often genuine.⁵⁹

While no example of the tyrannical wife survives in a complete play of Menander, the fragments of his *Plokion* preserved by Aulus Gellius (NA 2.23) are sufficient to form a portrait of the dominating Crobule, an *epikleros* and not merely a *dotata*.⁶⁰ none of the fragments are spoken by her, and we cannot be sure that she even appeared on stage, but like Cleostrata (*Casina*) and Nausistrata (*Phormio*) she probably had an active role. What is significant is the description provided by her old and impecunious husband: she is ugly, pretentious, and arrogant, bad-tempered to her children as well as her husband; she has sent away a pretty and hard-working maid, to show everyone that she is the mistress (*despoina*, fr. 333); we hear from another that she has decided on her son's marriage to a kinswoman; in fact her sins are all summed up in the complaint (fr. 334, 2–4) that she is the *kyria* of the household, estate, and everything else. This is not of course her legal position; we have seen that no woman could ever be *kyria* of anything but herself,

59 Nausistrata, for instance, has lost two talents from her father's Lemnian property in the maintenance of the bigamous wife (789–901, cf. 1013).

60 Here and elsewhere in Roman comedy *dotata* offers a substitute for the Greek term *epikleros*, which would not be understood by a Roman audience without explanation. An *epikleros* succeeded to the entire inherited estate and was not technically dowered at all, so that Caecilius' version is legally inaccurate in crediting Crobule with a dowry of ten talents (see Paoli 63). With Crobule's wealth of ten talents (Men. fr. 333.111, cf. Caecilius) compare the dowry of the wife in *Mercator* 701–702: *em quoi te et tua quae tu habeas, commendes uiro / em quoi decem talenta dotis detuli, haec ut uiderem*. It is difficult to gauge the size of this fortune; since the mean Chremes of *Heautontimoroumenos* endows his foundling daughter with two talents (*Ht.* 940), and the generous Chremes of *Andria* bestows ten talents on his foundling (and second) daughter (*Andr.* 950–951), it may not have been a very great fortune in Menander's time.

and marriage automatically transferred *kyrieia* from father or male-kinsman to the husband. No—Crobule's offence is that her money has given her the power to behave as head of the household and take on the privileges of a man. Then as now, money could override in practice the rules of law and convention.

Comic convention usually denied to female roles a chance to speak their defence or make counter-charges, and it would no doubt betray a lack of humour on my part if I were to protest on their behalf. Instead I might perhaps recall the words of Nausistrata in Terence's *Phormio* (792–793):

uirum me natam uellem:

ego ostenderem ...

I would to God I'd been born a man; I'd show them!

6. *Stuprum*: Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offences in Republican Rome

In 38 BCE C. Julius Caesar Octavianus divorced his second wife Scribonia immediately after she had borne him a daughter, Julia, to marry Livia, wife of Ti. Claudius Nero, at that time six months pregnant with Nero's second son, Drusus.¹ Twenty years later, as Augustus Caesar, he enacted what is known as the *Lex Iulia de adulteriis*, the first law to make adultery a criminal offence and to subject to public prosecution what had previously been a family issue, the sexual activity of women outside marriage.² Under this law the husband confronted with his wife's infidelity was not left the option of forgiving or ignoring her offence, but was open to prosecution for pandering if he did not begin divorce proceedings: either he or the woman's father was then given sixty days in which to launch prosecution for adultery against first the lover, then, on obtaining his conviction, the ex-wife: in default of the husband or father, once these sixty days had elapsed, outsiders were encouraged to lay charges against the lover, the wife, and the husband himself, for his complicity. The woman's father was authorized to kill the lover caught in the act in the paternal or marital home, provided that he also killed his daughter at the same time. The husband's rights

I would like to acknowledge the generous advice of Susan Treggiari, who allowed me to consult her own continuing research into Roman marriage, and saved me from some errors of law in this presentation. I would also like to thank Amy Richlin and the late Jack Winkler for their kind comments on an earlier draft, and the improvements which I owe to their recommendations. Any remaining inaccuracies are my own.

- 1 On Octavian's divorce of Scribonia and marriage to Livia, see Suet. *Aug.* 62–63, Cass. Dio 48.34.3, with discussion by Carcopino 1958, 65–82.
- 2 On the Augustan marriage laws in general, see Csillag 1976. On the *Lex Iulia de adulteriis* in particular, see Csillag 1976, 175–99. The details of the adultery law are derived from the citations of later jurists in *Digests* 48.5. Galinsky 1981 argues that moral reconstruction, rather than demographic concerns, motivated these laws: “the main target ... was the pleasure orientated way of life especially of the Roman nobility, and the main goal was the restoration of a sound family life” (128).

were much more limited: he had no right to kill the wife, and could kill the lover only if he surprised him in the marital home and the man was of a disreputable social class. Adulterers found guilty were condemned to confiscation of a substantial part of their estate and relegation to an offshore island. The same law applied to the much smaller number of women not yet, or no longer, married, whose sexual activity was designated as *stuprum*: the basic prohibition was

ne quis posthac stuprum adulteriumue facito sciens dolo malo

Let no one henceforth commit fornication or adultery wittingly or with malice aforethought (*Digest* 48.5.13).

Its most famous victim, sixteen years later, was Augustus' daughter Julia, condemned by the emperor as judge in a private hearing, but denounced publicly to an embarrassed senate, disinherited and sent to the barren island of Pandateria. She was never allowed to return to Rome or re-enter normal civilian life.³

It is not surprising to find the adultery of wives severely punished and their killing at their father's hand approved. But the law provokes two types of question. First, why was the sexual activity of unmarried women assimilated to adultery and treated with equal severity? And second, since Rome had flourished for many centuries without this legislation, why had it become necessary at this juncture?⁴ Since Roman wives had not waited until this generation to practice extramarital sex, we must ask whether attitudes had suddenly changed, or previously efficient sanctions ceased to work. In short, what were the attitudes and sanctions affecting sexual activity outside marriage during the middle and late Republican period?

Fruitful comparisons may be drawn between Rome and the politically and economically similar society of Renaissance Venice, which has recently been the subject of Guido Ruggiero's impressive study *The Boundaries of Eros: Sex Crime and Sexuality in Renaissance Venice* (New York 1985). Republican Rome shared with Renaissance Venice its status-oriented social system in which marriage was "at the upper level an

3 On Julia's disgrace and exile, see Suet. *Aug.* 65; Tac. *Ann.* 1.53 and Carcopino 1958, 124–42. Both Julia's adultery and her punishment were almost certainly politically motivated: see Levick 1972, 779 f.

4 Unrecorded legislation from the Republican period may have sanctioned private criminal prosecution of adultery, thus Kunkel 1962, 121–24, who notes that *Digest* 4.2.2. refers to earlier laws repealed by the Julian adultery law. I will argue for a different interpretation below.

instrument of social placement”, placing the woman in virtually the only acceptable position that society allowed her, and involving important transfers of property through the law of dowry. It also shared with Venice its “two distinct milieus of sexuality” and its largely pragmatic treatment of criminality. In both societies there was more than one type of court, but in general “each criminal case was judged by a substantial number of the ruling nobility, who took into account the status of the victim and the accused as well as the crime.”⁵

Yet the differences between the two societies are almost as significant as the similarities. Ruggiero’s index has no entry for divorce: Christianity excluded that escape from a defective or discontented marriage. In Rome of the late Republic either husband or wife could obtain a divorce unilaterally, and divorces were commonly encouraged by families to facilitate a politically advantageous remarriage. In Rome, the alternative sexual milieu was not, as in Venice, illicit but tolerated; it was lawful for married or single men to find sexual relief with slaves or prostitutes or seek a relationship with a courtesan of non-citizen status. Two less important but relevant differences were the father’s right at Rome to require the exposure of unwanted children, which eliminated the problem of illegitimate offspring, and the socially acceptable alternative to marriage, for the Venetian woman, of becoming the Bride of Christ and entering a convent. Christianity also affected but did not eliminate the decision to execute those found guilty of a sexual offence; no longer was there a family court, and we find no parallel to the private sanctions which served Rome for so long.

I shall take as my key to the examination of sexual attitudes the concept of *stuprum*, and its derivatives, the verb *stuprare* (*constuprare*) and the agent noun *stuprator*.⁶ We have records of public and private punishment for the offence of *stuprum* from earliest times, but the word had originally a much wider reference, denoting any public disgrace or disgraceful act, and it was only secondarily applied to unsanctioned sexual intercourse. There is a further lapse of time between its occurrence in non-legal texts to designate intercourse and our earliest legal texts using the word as a technical term. Thus in the mid-third century BCE, the *Bellum Punicum* of Naevius uses *stuprum* to stigmatize the mili-

5 The quotations are from the opening survey of the social and judicial organisation of Venice during the two centuries concerned in Ruggiero 1985.

6 On the legal definition of *stuprum*, see *RE* IV.1.423–24 (Pfaff); for a brief analysis of its semantics, see Adams 1983, 170; 199–201.

tary disgrace of desertion or cowardice, but to denote the shame of the unmarried Danae's seduction in his tragedy *Danae* Naevius uses a parallel euphemism, *probrum* (reproach).⁷ Within a generation, however, *stuprum* was displacing *probrum* as the euphemism for unlawful intercourse, and after Plautus it has become so much the *vox propria* that it is no longer found with any other referenece.

Before analysing the evidence for different types of private and public sanction imposed on those guilty of *stuprum* it is important to understand the grammar of the word and its cognates, the unvoiced social assumptions behind its application, and the difficulty in determining the nature of the sexual act or relationship where the context offers no supporting evidence.

The existence of an agent noun and transitive verb offer a clue. While *stuprum* itself can often be glossed as fornication, the verb *to fornicate* is intransitive, and can have a feminine subject, whereas the verb *stuprare* is transitive and requires a masculine subject, like the improper English verb *fuck*. On the other hand *fuck* covers only half the reference of *stuprare*, which also denotes anal penetration of the male: *stuprum* covers both fornication and sodomy. Its normal tone of formality and disapproval also coincide more closely with those obsolescent legal terms than with the familiar terms *fucking* and *buggery*.

Inherent in the use of the agent and verb is the notion of penetration as an assault damaging the woman/boy/man penetrated, and most uses of the noun *stuprum* in Republican authors treat it as either a form of corruption or violation of the passive partner by the penetrator, or (where the passive partner is held up for reproach) of self-corruption. Yet it would be misleading to assume that all intercourse outside marriage was *stuprum*. Neither society nor the law recognized slaves as legal persons: they belonged to their master, who could use them for his own sexual needs or hire them out for the pleasure of others. Similarly foreigners in practice had no legal standing, and even citizen women or men who had once accepted gifts in return for sexual favours were deemed to have removed themselves from the protection of the law. Thus we find no instances of *stuprum* that do not involve intercourse with male or female citizens, because the Romans would not have seen anything improper in such acts. The last distinction is one crucial to modern assessment of a sexual act, but seldom raised in Roman texts. For *stuprum* ostensibly blurs the distinction between

7 See Naevius *BP* fr. 46, 47 Strzelecki, and *Danae* fr. 4 Klotz.

rape and seduction, or even between the isolated act and the continued relationship. We may explain this variously. Whereas our society conceives an adult woman as capable of giving or withholding consent to intercourse and essentially responsible only to herself, Roman law saw the young man or woman in a father's household not as *sui iuris* but as subject to his consent. In addition popular male and female stereotypes condoned or admired sexual initiatives in the growing male but cherished timidity as a defensive virtue in the female.⁸ Thus unpremeditated rape, provided it was rectified by subsequent marriage, did less discredit to both male and female than a prolonged seduction. Our earliest evidence comes from domestic comedy in which the most common erotic situation was a single impulsive act by a young man at a chance meeting: such impulses were seen as natural,⁹ though the consequences would make a girl a potential outcast until marriage with the ravisher provided a happy ending.

Comedy avoids what we call adultery, though it may exploit the humour of the married man's attempts to enjoy sex outside marriage. It was probably seen as a social insult to the wife and her family, but it never counted as adultery in law for the husband in pre-Christian Rome to sleep with an outside partner. As for what the Romans called adultery—the relationship of the wife with an outside lover—this was traditionally viewed with extreme severity, and could prove fatal. Both a wife's adultery and the sexual activity of an unmarried woman of respectable status came under the term *stuprum*, and the term could also designate a lasting relationship, so that it is no contradiction to talk of a woman's voluntary or persistent *stuprum*.¹⁰ Some of the ambiguity of the term comes out in Ovid's rare use of the word. Ovid commands a range of euphemisms for sexual intercourse and is not afraid to use them. Yet in the *Ars Amatoria* when he comes to the problematic question of the role of force, his oscillation between encouragement and deterrence ends in the exemplary tale of Achilles and Deidamia, in which the hero, disguised as a female companion of the princess, finally expressed his masculine nature in taking her by surprise: whether

8 These popular stereotypes were not fundamentally different from those of classical Athens as described by Dover 1973.

9 See Fantham 1975 and, for example, Ter. *Ad.* 470–71.

10 The phrase *uoluntarium stuprum* is very rare, but attested at Liv. 38.24.3 in immediate contest with *uis* (rape).

rape, or something less, their intercourse is twice called *stuprum*.¹¹ The Romans did have a separate charge covering rape as assault, when the man and woman were strangers or she was victim of criminal violence,¹² but *stuprum* would cover both what is commonly called acquaintance rape and seduction, whatever the reality of consent.

The tone of the word is confirmed by its specific applications. *Stuprum* is not used to describe the speaker's actions or those of his friends, even the term has become approximate with overuse. Instead in post-Augustan authors it becomes a stick to beat with, and sexually promiscuous men are described as debauched with *stupra*¹³ even when their partners are likely to have been slaves or prostitutes.

If *stuprum* marks the spoiling of the young woman for marriage and motherhood, or the corruption of the young man, by preventing the proper development of his virility, the other side of this coin is the virtue of *pudicitia*,¹⁴ chastity, not in the Christian sense of sexual abstinence, but as restraint, confining sexual activity to the conventionally sanctioned partners: the woman's husband—and him alone: the man's wife certainly, but also the recognized outlets—his own slaves, brothel slaves, and courtesans. In practice, however, since there were so few restrictions on the man's immediate sexual satisfaction, masculine *pudicitia* most often alluded to his freedom from passive homosexual activity, while critical comment on his active male sexuality outside marriage would refer to *libido*. So taking *pudicitia* as a kind of negative, we can use discussion of the virtue to illuminate attitudes towards its opposite.

Pudicitia was originally the concern of the family and above all the *paterfamilias* whose honour was affected by the behaviour of his children of either sex. The son remained in his father's legal control until his father died or emancipated him, yet his *de facto* independence was probably established by the Roman practice of setting up the newly wed son in a separate home. The daughter was in a different position, depending on the form of her marriage: in the early and middle Republic, marrying *cum manu*, she would pass out of the moral control of her father into that of her husband, who became her *paterfamilias* when she was co-

11 Ov. *Ars* 1.698; 704.

12 See *Dig.* 48.5.14: women raped while prisoners of the enemy, for example, could not be accused of either *stuprum* or adultery.

13 Hence invective attributes *stupra et scelera*, at Cic. *Cat.* 2.9, *Mil.* 85, without knowledge of the legal status of the sexual partners involved.

14 On *pudicitia* and its cognates, see Adams 1983, 55; 126; 195–6.

opted into his household and descent family.¹⁵ But increasingly in the later Republic women were married *sine manu*, remaining part of their own descent family,¹⁶ and their father's legal concern, subject to his jurisdiction if he cared to exercise it. Marriage came early for women, but the relative ages of bride and groom, though the average gap of around nine years was less than in Ruggiero's Venice, must have led to the return to the natal home of many widows or divorcées in their early thirties, a category likely to rebel against paternal control.

From the mid-fifth century BCE Rome elected every five years two censors, whose function it was to review the citizen body and to demote those who had fallen below the requisite property qualification or who had caused scandal by their private lives. While debt or bankruptcy were unambiguous grounds for demotion or loss of civil status, the censor was also concerned with manpower and productivity: hence his official question, "Do you have a wife for the purposes of bearing children?", and the reply given on oath,¹⁷ not to mention the recorded cases of censorial stigma (the *nota*) against men guilty of adultery and other sexual offences. The censor's power over male citizens, like that of the *paterfamilias* over both male and female children and members of his household, was discretionary, to ignore or penalize according to his arbitrary judgement.

The Roman criminal courts were of two main kinds: the *iudicia populi*, consisting of all members of the citizen body who presented themselves as jurors at the appointed time of the hearing presided over by a magistrate of the people, and the later standing courts, the *quaestiones perpetuae*, constituted by a law of the assembly, and employing a jury panel of senators and/or *equites*, presided over by a magistrate or ex-magistrate.¹⁸ Both proceedings were cumbrous, and the *iudicia populi* were effectively used only for political trials, that is, trials not so much on a political charge as of politically prominent figures. It was easy for an enemy to allege sexual offences, but easier still to allege abuse of office such as bribery or embezzlement. Thus public prosecutions for *stuprum* were rare until the development of an imperial dynasty

15 See Lacey in Rawson 1986, 121–44. Cf. also J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, Ithaca 1966, 107–13.

16 On marriage with and without *manus*, see Watson 1971, ch. 2.

17 The oath is attested for the third century BCE in Gel. 4.3.1, no doubt because this was the formula used at the time of betrothal, as is attested in comedy.

18 See Jones 1972, 1–39; Kunkel 1962.

made sexual association with princesses into a form of high treason:¹⁹ this was the chief outcome, if not the purpose, of the *lex Iulia de adulteriis*.

Having set the stage, I would like to review the forms of public and private control of sexuality attested by our single most extensive collective of instances, the exemplary anecdotes collected by Valerius Maximus under the rubric of *Pudicitia* in his survey of illustrative material for forensic orators. Valerius himself put together his cautionary tales after the death of Augustus, but the collection derives from writers of the Republic and Augustan age, chiefly Cicero, Varro and Livy.²⁰ It can often be controlled by comparison with the original versions, and the episodes reported mostly date from the middle or late Republic. Valerius cherishes the myth of original virtue, and implies a code more often preached than practiced, but his examples offer a consistent representation of attitudes and an intelligible pattern of sanctions imposed.

Valerius' chapter on *Pudicitia* opens book six: he prefaces it with an address to the personified virtue associated with Vesta and Juno as goddesses of generative power and marriage respectively, and pays tribute to the sacred homelife of the imperial family and marriage bed of the dowager Livia Augusta. Next he honours *Pudicitia* as protectress of individuals in three categories:

Under your protection the tokens of boyhood are preserved, in reverence for you the flower of youth is kept unsullied, with you as guardian the costume of the wife is recognized.²¹

The first clause clearly alludes to the *praetextati*, teenaged boys whose free birth and protected status were marked by the *bullā* and purple bordered toga; Roman costume was hierarchic and only magistrates shared this kind of toga denoting a special claim on respect. The second, with its coded reference to *iuuentae flos*, suggests rather the young male than the flower, but perhaps does duty for both: *flos* was especially associated with the downy cheeks of the young entrants to the *uita castrensis* or the

19 Galinsky 1981, 126–7 quotes M. A. Levi's view that the anti-adultery legislation was "a piece of blackmail against the aristocracy because, as all legal blackmail, it could be applied selectively and one had only to look for moral delinquency to find it anywhere."

20 On Valerius' use of his sources, see A. Ramelli, "Le Fonte di Valerio Massimo," *Athenaeum* N.S. 14 (1936) 117–52.

21 *Tuo praesidio puerilis aetatis insignia munita sunt, tui numinis aspectu sincerus iuuentae flos permanet, te custode matronalis stola censetur.*

forum, the Roman parallel to the *ephebes* of 17 to 19 years. Only the third group, the *matronae* symbolized by their costume of the long robe, are women. In this, Valerius' focus differs from the conventional enumeration of wives, maidens and boys found in Republican texts and later in the *Digest*.²²

Thus in Plautus' *Curculio* when the young hero declares that he is in love, his slave confidant is alarmed until his master confirms that he is not trying to seduce a decent (*pudica*) girl: she comes from a slave dealer's establishment. She is actually a virgin, which is a bonus, but her status allows him sexual access. Reassured, the slave explains:

No one bans or prohibits you from buying what's for sale from this place, if you have the cash. No one prohibits a man from using the public street, so long as you don't cut a path through an enclosed property: so long as you keep off wives, widows and virgins, young men and boys of free birth, make love to anyone you choose.²³

The same pattern emerges from Cicero's defence, over a century later, of Caelius Rufus. His mistress was a freeborn lady, though a widow, and Cicero's line in rebutting the charge of immorality (not a formal charge) is to claim that the lady has forfeited her respectability and can be treated as a professional. Part of the prosecution in most politically inspired cases hinged on accusing the defendant of sexual licence, and for this purpose the suggestion of passive homosexual practice in youth was the most damaging. So Cicero in the section of the defence beginning "as to the imputations against his sexual purity (*pudicitia*)" declares in fastidiously obscure terms that his client has been free from sexual activity as a *praetextatus* when he was protected by his father's care and his own honour, and stayed pure after assuming the toga of manhood *in illo aetatis flore* (10) since he was being supervised by Crassus and Cicero himself. The stress on the danger of good looks in young men shows clearly Cicero's concern with the risk to the boy or youth as passive objects of male desire. Later indeed, when Cicero is defending Caelius against charges of heterosexual licence, he moves on to the next phase, *iuuentus*, and gives a prescription similar to that of Plautus' slave:

22 The typical rhetorical enumeration comprises *matres*, *uirgines*, *ingenui*: see Liv. 26.13.15; 29.17.15.

23 *Nemo hinc prohibet neque uetat / quin quod palam est uenale, si argentum est emas: / nemo ire quemquam publica prohibet uia / dum ne per fundum saeptum facias semitam / dum ted abstineas nupta, uidua, uirgine / iuuentute et pueris liberis, ama quidlubet*. Pl. Cur. 32–37.

Let youth spare its sexual purity, and not destroy that of others: it should not squander the family property, it should not ruin itself with loan payments, it should not invade another man's house and home, it should not bring scandal on the chaste, defilement on the pure or disgrace on honest folk.²⁴

Here the young man is equally counselled against submitting his own body to sexual abuse and abusing that of another (whether male or female); similarly the allusion to another man's house and home puts off bounds both the freeborn family and the slave household, male and female, whose sexuality was controlled by the master, whether positively for breeding and personal pleasure, or negatively to protect their value as chattels. The euphemistic nature of Roman language about sexuality blurs the point of the last three phrases, so that they could as well refer to fact or reputation. While the tone of Cicero's defence is determined by the undeniable vigour of Caelius' sex life, it follows a general pattern of recognizing the need for young men to release sexual energy, and channelling it towards those not enjoying the private rights of a citizen or protection of a slave chattel.

The jurists confirm Plautus' categories as those with whom intercourse was defined as *stuprum*. Compare the comments from Papinian *De Adulteriis* I and Modestinus *Liber Regularum* I:

The law refers to *stuprum* and adultery indiscriminately and with rather a misuse of terms. But properly speaking adultery is committed with a married woman, the name being derived from children conceived by another (*alter*): *stuprum*, however, is committed against a virgin or widow; the Greeks call it corruption.

Stuprum is committed by someone who keeps a freewoman for the sake of sexual relations not marriage, unless indeed she is a concubine. Adultery is committed with a married woman; *stuprum* is committed with a widow, a virgin or a boy.²⁵

24 *Parcat iuuentus pudicitiae suae, ne spoliēt alienam, ne effundat patrimonium, ne faenore trucidetur, ne incurrat in alterius domum atque familiam, ne probrum castis, labem integris, infamiam bonis inferat.* Cic. Cael. 42.

25 *Lex stuprum et adulterium promiscue et katachrestikoteron appellon. sed proprie adulterium in nupta committitur, propter partum ex altero conceptum composito nomine; stuprum uero in uirginem viduamque committitur, quod Graeci phthoran uocant. stuprum committit qui liberam mulierem consuetudinis causa, non matrimonii, continet, excepta uidelicet concubina. Adulterium in nupta admittitur, stuprum in uidua uel uirgine uel puero committitur.*

According to mythology, Roman marriage had begun with a collective act of rape—that is, the abduction of freeborn respectable girls. The tale, told in turn by Cicero, Virgil, Livy and Ovid,²⁶ justifies Romulus' legendary rape of the Sabine women during a festival truce by the refusal of the women's fathers governing the community of Sabines to grant marriage rights to the new Roman community. The war that threatened as a result was resolved by the intercession of the women between their new *patresfamilia* and their actual fathers, heads of their natal families.

Such a myth could be moralized but resists adaptation as a pattern of Roman respect for purity, and Valerius does not try to assimilate it here. But he could not leave out two of the charter myths of the Republican constitution,²⁷ in which first the defence of a wife's honour had led to the expulsion of the Etruscan dynasty and then two generations later, the defence of a daughter's virginity had brought on the abolition of the decemviral junta. It is significant that Cicero reserves the use of *stuprum* in his rhetorical and philosophical works for the representation of these two episodes at *De Finibus* 2.66 and 5.64. The briefer second version makes the same claim as Valerius:

In our free state a woman was found who would expiate enforced rape (*per uim oblatum stuprum*) by suicide, and a man who would kill his daughter to save her from being raped (*ne stupraretur*).

Valerius' vignettes exploit gender and social hierarchy and stress the importance of *paterfamilias* and family *consilium*. Lucretia, "whose masculine spirit a cruel blunder of fortune had assigned to a woman's body," forced to endure rape, reveals her victimisation at a family council before killing herself. As in Cicero and the Augustans her deed is valued for its political consequences. The fate of Verginia demonstrates the sense of honour of her father Verginius, "a mere plebeian with a patrician spirit," but the longer account of Valerius' source Livy²⁸ shows something the Romans took for granted. A free girl of good reputation could not be seduced with legal impunity: thus in Livy's version the lustful decemvir Appius Claudius needed not only to get the girl in

26 Cic. *Rep.* 2.11–12; Virg. *Aen.* 8.635–38; Liv. 1.11–12; Ov. *Ars* 1.101–32.

27 These charter myths are discussed separately by Watson 1975, 166–72.

28 Note that Livy 3.44.1 draws the analogy between the sexual occasion of the offences against the persons of Lucretia and Verginia and their public outcome in the abolition of the power abused. For the detailed legal issues of the episode in Livy, see R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5*, Oxford 1965, 476–78.

his possession but to get her status as a free person overturned in law; once she was deemed a slave, her sexual favours were the gift of Appius' dependent, her alleged master.²⁹ Thus Appius' dependent claims her as his slave; her betrothed, in her father's absence, counterclaims her right to remain at liberty until the legal decision, arguing that even a brief period outside the paternal home would destroy her reputation. In a second phase the man of straw changed the civil suit to a criminal charge of kidnapping against her father, alleging that Verginius had stolen a female slave and was falsely claiming her as his daughter. Since Appius was the presiding magistrate, he decided the case for his own client, and Verginius then demonstrated his convictions by publicly stabbing his daughter to death as the only way to defend not her chastity, but her liberty, which was her legal protection against sexual abuse. The father's role as head of his family was to protect his wife, children and other dependents and ensure his daughter's fitness to serve the community and the *gens* of her future marriage as mother of legitimate children. The community's role was to guarantee the power of its family heads to protect their households, and Appius' violation of this right justified the popular uprising that overthrew the regime of the decemvirs.

Since Valerius was writing for lawyers, he classified his exemplary anecdotes by the disciplinary action, domestic or public, the court, and procedure: he also selected extreme instances, mostly involving quasi-judicial execution. For our purposes it is useful to separate his heterosexual episodes from the homosexual, and to take them out of order so as to illustrate common elements in the handling of both categories of sexuality.

The group of episodes in which fathers exercised their *ius vitae necisque*, the right of taking the life of domestic dependents, includes three occasions when the *paterfamilias* acted to punish a daughter's dishonour. The knight Pontius Aufidianus killed both his daughter and the *paedagogus* who had procured her for the seducer Fannius Saturninus (6.1.3). P. Maenius similarly executed a favourite freedman, merely for an embrace of his daughter, but seems to have been content with reprimanding the girl. This is an odd case, as Valerius makes clear that the girl was little more than a child, and the freedman had acted from affec-

29 It is telling that Verginius should protest in terms of his daughter's status, "his daughter would have been dearer to him than life itself if she had been allowed to live free and chaste: but when he saw her dragged off to be raped like a slave girl ..." (*uelut seruam ad stuprum rapti*); Liv. 3.50.6.

tion, *non libidine sed errore* (6.1.4). Finally he cites Atilius Philiscus, who had himself served as a boy prostitute but who showed his respect for Roman morality by executing his daughter *quod se stupri crimine coinquinaverat*, “for sully herself with the guilt of fornication.” The rhetorical turn of phrase blurs any possible distinction between a single lapse and a career of promiscuity, but we could hardly wish for a more vivid illustration of the double standard. None of these cases is dated but the Samnite name of Pontius suggests an Italian, who would not have enjoyed citizenship before the last century BCE, while Philiscus’ early career could have little scope at Rome before the return of Roman armies from Greece and Asia in the second century.

Still in the general category of domestic jurisdiction, Valerius gives a rather summary list of husbands who exercised their right of revenge on adulterers caught in the marital home, a right the husband held whether or not he had *manus* and stood as the wife’s *paterfamilias*. The list includes one thrashing, possibly fatal, one beating up, two castrations, and the extreme misfortune of Furius Brocchus, surrendered to the domestic staff to be bugged.³⁰

Valerius can cite only one occasion when seduction was the subject of a *iudicium populi*, and it contains some surprising features. He reports (6.1.8) that Metellus Celer charged Cn. Sergius Silus with attempted seduction (*stuprosae mentis*, which we might gloss “fornicatory intent”) and bribery of a married woman. He obtained his condemnation on this single charge. Celer is almost certainly Metellus Celer, the tribune of 90 BCE, and Silus, a man of his own age, the quaestor in Asia of the previous decade. This was a fairly sophisticated period, and a trivial offence: the penalty can hardly have been more than a fine. Surely there must have been a political motive, perhaps as a device for eliminating an electoral competitor by a timely prosecution. The affair is best explained in the context of some of the aedilician trials recorded by Livy, to which we will return.

Valerius balances his half dozen instances of heterosexual *stuprum* with as many homosexual incidents. There is even a charter myth, a political *cause célèbre* to match that of Verginia. Valerius’ story (6.1.9) is an aetiology for the abolition of personal *nexum* (debt bondage) confirmed in essentials but not in its formal consequences, by Dionysus of Halicarnassus (16.5.) and Livy (8.28 f). All agree that a youth of good family was

30 Cf. the fates which Horace, *Sat.* 1.2.43–46 lists in his caution against adultery: being beaten to death, sodomised, and castrated.

forced into bondage by inherited debt and brutally beaten by his creditor and master when he refused sexual advances. All agree that the scandal provoked the abolition of this form of service for debt. But there is conflict over the names of offender and victim, and the form of public intervention. If he had been a slave instead of a citizen bondsman, the youth could legally have been beaten and raped, and Valerius, status-conscious as always, stresses the *servilia uerbera* of the young citizen. Apparently he escaped and informed the consuls, who consulted the senate and had the creditor led off to prison, but Valerius gives no hint of the criminal procedure and we are left to infer the creditor's execution. Livy and Dionysius make the creditor a moneylender, but while Livy moves straight to the political consequences and abolition of *nexum*, Dionysius has the tribunes indict the creditor in a public trial (*eisangelia* = *iudicium populi*) which condemns him to death. Whichever version is the more authentic it is clear that the violence done to a free man, not the sexual offence, was the real charge.

Since the Roman householder or his sons were entitled to satisfy their sexual desires by force or persuasion on the household slaves, it is not surprising that Valerius has only one case of a *paterfamilias* penalizing his son for a sexual offence. What matters to Valerius is the authority of the father, Q. Fabius Maximus, and his status as a former censor. Almost every other detail in the report is either uselessly vague or incorrect, but the fuller versions in Orosius (5.16.18) and a declamation attributed to Quintilian (*Decl. Maj.* 3.17) show that Fabius Maximus Eburnus had first relegated his son to the country estate then later sent two slaves to kill him, rewarding them with their freedom. Orosius reports that Eburnus was prosecuted (the form of trial is unclear) by Cn. Pompeius, and condemned. Was he condemned because he had not observed the correct procedure of a domestic trial and consulted other members of his *gens*? The declamation refers to a domestic hearing, but one possibility is that the son's relegation was the relatively mild decision of the domestic court, and the secret execution a unilateral decision by the father. Such an act, occurring as late as 108 BCE, whether taken by or in spite of a family *consilium*, would offend tradition. The son was *dubiae castitatis* "of doubtful chastity": this and his father's decision to remove him from public life may imply that he had been publicly accused of homosexual promiscuity, perhaps in return for money.³¹

31 Public homosexual activity is more commonly coded as *impudicitia*, but for *castitas* in this connection cf. Suet. *Aug.* 71, where a reference to lust contrasts Au-

If he had been a seducer of either male or female citizens he would have been charged with *stuprum* and Valerius' sources would have been less coy.

If one can support this speculation by contrasting the actions of two contemporary fathers dealing with heterosexual offenders, we might note from Valerius the behaviour of Gellius Publicola, censor of 70 BCE, who received information that his son had committed adultery with his stepmother and planned to murder him. Although these charges were virtually proven (*prope explorata* 5.9.1), Gellius invited a body consisting of the majority of the senate to act as his *consilium* and joined them in voting for his son's acquittal. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus, the cousin of Eburnus, did not even disinherit his son although the young man's debauchery was ruining the family estate: it was left to the *praetor urbanus*, Q. Pompeius, to exclude the son from inheritance, presumably at the request of his kinsmen (Val. Max. 3.5.2). These cases from the generation after Eburnus' last ditch exercise of *patria potestas* may suggest a hierarchy of sexual offences, in which even adultery was not so offensive to a father as overt homosexual practice: more likely however, we are witnessing the weakening of *patria potestas* that led in the end to public law taking over the disciplinary role of the family.

We come at last to instances where the offence is explicit. One notorious case reported by both Valerius (6.1.7) and Plutarch (*Marc.* 2) is the prosecution of Scantinius Capitalinus. In both sources M. Claudius Marcellus, as aedile (probably in 226 BCE), prosecuted Scantinius for soliciting Marcellus' son *de stupro*.³² Scantinius was himself a tribune and appealed to the college of tribunes to veto his appearance at the trial, but according to Valerius the entire college refused to interfere in a case where *pudicitia* was at stake. Valerius presents the trial as a *iudicium populi* in which Scantinius was condemned on the evidence of the young man alone, whose bashful silence on the rostra convinced the

gustus' weakness for womanizing with his abstention from homosexual experience. For *impudicus*, *impudicitia* associated with passive homosexual practices, cf. Cic. *Cael.* 30; Sall. *Cat.* 14.2; Sen. *Contr.* 10, 4, 17–18; Quint. 7.2.28; Suet. *Jul.* 52–3; Gel. 18.3.

32 The phrase *de stupro appellasset* is technical: cf. *de stupro* / *stupro causa appellare* / *compellare* in Val. Max. 6.1.10; 11, and Quint. 4.2.97. Plutarch too speaks only of an attempted seduction.

people of Scantinius' guilt.³³ Plutarch differs in important respects; he calls Scantinius a colleague, speaks of a senatorial hearing and adds that Scantinius was condemned to a fine. The discrepancy between these accounts involves much disputed aspects of criminal procedure, which will need separate discussion. For the moment note that Valerius was probably working with the lost books of Livy and would be closer to the facts, but his rhetorical purpose casts doubt on his accuracy. In particular, since he is concerned to prove the severity with which Romans once viewed sexual offences, he has probably suppressed Scantinius' penalty because it was relatively light—the fine suggested by Plutarch instead of death or exile.

The remaining three episodes of Valerius' catalogue all concern military discipline, or its absence. The earliest is that of M. Laetorius Mergus, a military tribune in the fourth century, charged by the tribune Cominius before the popular assembly with soliciting his attendant *stupri causa* (Val. Max. 6.1.11). Although he fled before the final hearing and committed suicide, the verdict was given against him posthumously. Valerius alludes to the charge as *crimen impudicitiae*, but this is a rhetorical substitute for what was certainly a charge of *stuprum*; Dionysus' account (16.4) coincides with Valerius' in procedure and verdict, but represents the affair as actual rape.

The case of Cornelius, described in Valerius 6.1.10, bears some resemblance to that of Scantinius. It was identified by Münzer with the scandal of 150 BCE when the young Decius Subulo accused C. Cornelius Cethegus of *stuprum*. Valerius describes the young Cornelius as a centurion with a distinguished military record. The affair seems to have been handled summarily by the triumvir Prescennius, who took Cornelius into custody "because he had had sexual relations with a free-

33 We should note the protectiveness of Roman attitudes towards youths perceived as innocent victims of homosexual rape or seduction. Disapproval of those who played the passive role in a homosexual act would lead to denial in the case of the young, whereas it was manifested in social hostility towards adults identified as passive homosexuals. This contrasts only in part with the attitudes documented in Ruggiero 1985, 121–25; the relative indulgence of young passive partners in Venice springs from the same recognition of youth as easily misled, but the extreme severity towards the active partner derived from the conviction that sodomy was a sin against God incurring His anger against the whole society unless punished. Rome, in contrast, saw only the offence against the individual; if he were of no account the act was neutral.

born youth.”³⁴ Cornelius did not deny it but appealed to the tribunes to intercede and offered a counterclaim that the young man had openly practiced prostitution: if this could be proved, then Cornelius would have committed no offence. But the tribunes refused to veto his conviction and he was imprisoned; but he was allowed the option of suicide instead of execution as a concession to his military record.

The offence of Marius’ nephew is far better attested: in Valerius’ version (6.1.12) the great commander exonerated the ranker C. Plotius for the slaying of his own nephew C. Luscius, as a justified homicide on the grounds that Luscius had solicited him *de stupro*. The story was taken up as an *exemplum* both of the heroic defence of *pudicitia* by the young man and of enlightened justice by the commander. Cicero exploits it as a precedent for justified homicide in *Pro Milone* 9, where his facts are essentially those in Valerius. But Plutarch (*Marius* 14.3) provides more details. He dates the affair to Marius’ Cimbric campaign of 104 and describes the murder, which took place in Marius’ absence. The young man was given a military trial on Marius’ return, at which, since no one would defend him, he conducted his own defence. He produced witnesses that Luscius had often solicited him unsuccessfully and that in spite of lavish offers he had never prostituted himself. Thus the young man’s defence depended on establishing the attempts of the dead officer and his own chastity. The importance of the second element is shown by the countercharge of Cornelius Cethegus in the previous case and Polybius’ statement that the military penalty for any youth “who abused his body” was *fustigatio*, being clubbed to death.³⁵ Thus by the military code the young man risked as much or more, by yielding, as the officer did, if he were informed on and charged with homosexual rape.

Unfortunately none of our sources tells us enough. Polybius, the only source for the military court (6.37.9), does not specify any penalty for proven seducers of chaste youths: the evidence for their punishment

34 On Cornelius, see F. Münzer, *Klio* 5 (1905) 13 f. and E. Badian “Decius P.f. Subulo,” *JRS* 46 (1956) 91 f. A damaged section of the Oxyrhynchus Epitome of Livy book 48 confirms that Cornelius was condemned for rape, not attempted rape; *quod P. Deci<u>m Su<bulonem ...> ingenuum stuprauerat*. This removes any doubt about Valerius’ ambiguous phrase *commercium*, which normally denoted trading, but in its sexual reference denotes intercourse without necessarily implying payment received.

35 Polybius 6.37.9: see F. W. Walbank, *A Commentary on Polybius*, I, Oxford 1957, 720.

comes entirely from the civil cases like those of Scantinius and Pescennius. In the nature of things the officer class, who may have exploited their authority to impose sodomy, would reject allegations against a member of their own group. In the second century as distant campaigns increased in number and length, we might expect an increase in such offences, but our limited sources prevent any inference of frequency from the statistically trivial reports. The civil prosecutions of the soldiers Mergus and Cornelius in the earlier period may be due not to a lack of military penalty for sodomy, but to deliberate neglect or dismissal of charges at the military level. If so, it is not surprising that Marius, with his professions of populism set a precedent in overriding the class solidarity of the officers. According to Valerius he was not content with acquitting the soldier for defending his manhood, but actually rewarded him.

We can expand Valerius' scanty material with three reports from Livy of aedilician prosecution for *stuprum*. Both Livy (8.22) and Valerius (8.1.7) report the prosecution of Flavius Augur in 329 BCE. Livy simply says that Flavius gave a public banquet ostensibly to honour his kinswoman's funeral, but in fact to reward the people for his acquittal "when he had been charged by the aediles with the seduction (or possibly rape, *stupratae matrisfamilias*) of a married woman." This may suggest a purely political charge against a popular figure: if the prosecutor mobilized a *iudicium populi* for the affair, he probably had strong personal motives. Certainly the more detailed version of Valerius reports that when Flavius' case came to the vote, and fourteen of the then twenty-nine tribes had already declared him guilty, he cried out that he had been framed, which with the aedile's evident disregard of justice caused a reversal of opinion: the remaining fifteen tribes provided the necessary majority for acquittal.

But there can hardly have been a political motive behind the popular trials of women attested for 295 and 213 BCE. The first event is reported incidentally by Livy (10.31.9): Q. Fabius Gurgus, son of the consul Fabius Maximus, erected a temple to Venus from fines raised by prosecution of married women *ad populum stupri damnatae*. Gurgus, tribune in 297, must have been aedile in this year and I would connect these prosecutions with the concern of aediles for public order. Measured against the cases in Valerius, the low penalty of a fine suggests something less than the adultery of a well-bred noblewoman, and the number of women tried tallies better with a clean-up of pros-

titution than separately apprehended adulteresses.³⁶ From what other sources would a woman produce fine money? In the similar incident of 213 BCE when Italy was overrun by the Punic forces and all able-bodied Romans drafted into the exceptionally large army, we hear again that the plebeian aediles Tappulus and Fundulus accused a number of women of *stuprum* and drove those found guilty into exile. Clearly these women had no families to control or shelter them: after Cannae there were many widows, and loneliness or poverty would quickly turn them to irregular unions or outright prostitution.

Just because most female offences are associated with sexual licence it is worthwhile digressing briefly to outline other instances of group prosecutions of women from the middle Republic. The earliest group prosecution recorded occurs in 331, when Fabius Maximus, the father of Gurgus, was aedile. Livy admits that his report is based on slim authority and the vagueness of the legal contexts confirms that the story is apocryphal, probably garbled beyond retrieval. According to Livy's source a servant informed against her mistress and some other women, accusing them of poisoning their husbands. Fabius referred this to the senate, and the women, when questioned claimed that they had given a remedy to their husbands, but that some of them had died of poisoning when they drank a sample of their own brew. As a result some 170 women were arrested and condemned. Poisoning of husbands was linked in the Roman mind with adultery,³⁷ and yet the scale of this operation goes beyond such an explanation. The main import of the story is to reflect the suspect, alien nature of women, as if they were some defeated enemy mistrusted by their conquerors and rulers. The comparable and much better attested affair of the suppression of the Bacchanal cult is less overtly aimed at women, but equally associated with sexual irregularity by Livy's sources although the contemporary decree of the senate reveals a far more obvious political motive in the need to suppress a powerful organisation that had created a rival focus of loyalty across Roman-dominated Italy.³⁸ Yet the exposure and suppression is reported by Livy in terms similar to the poisoning affair;

36 See Balsdon 1962, 31 and n. 27.

37 Cf. Cato *Orat.* fr. 240 Malcovati, cited by Quint. 5.11.39, "every adultress is also a poisoner."

38 For the political motivation of senatorial action against the Bacchanalia, see North 1979. Livy, however, stresses to the point of paranoia sexual violations, especially of young males, as the threat to society that provoked the senate: see especially Liv. 39.8.7; 39.9; 39.13.11; 39.13.14; 39.15.9; 39.18.4.

an informant with private motives brings to the consuls evidence of dangerous orgies in which young men and women of good family are subjected to rape: both heterosexual and homosexual violation of the innocent are stressed. As in the subsequent cases of the noblewomen condemned for husband poisoning in 180 and 154 BCE, the senatorial *quaestio* handed over the women implicated in the Bacchanalia who had families or husbands *in quorum manu essent* to their households for private punishment;³⁹ only those without kin were directly punished by the state. In both narratives the euphemistic verb *animaduertere* ("punish") probably implies execution.

The records examined show that women citizens were dealt with by domestic courts in the first instance. If their behaviour caused a public scandal, individual women without kinsmen would be summoned for aedilician trial. If a widespread public crisis provoked a senatorial investigation, women incriminated and found guilty would again be returned to their families for punishment, and only dealt with by the state where no family existed. Because most of the affairs we hear of have sexual overtones, the disciplining of women is a good index of the attitudes of both private and public masculine authority to female sexuality.

When Kunkel reconsidered the possibility of criminal prosecutions for adultery during the Republic, he was partly moved by the evidence of jurists that laws related to adultery existed at the time of the Augustan legislation.⁴⁰ But whereas we have no evidence for any laws authorizing criminal charges against the adulterer by either husband or wife's father, we have evidence from as early as the third century BCE that the law was concerned with the restitution of dowry to the wife's family in the event of a divorce. Indeed it was the legal problem of dowry which made the divorce of a virtuous but infertile wife by Sp. Carvilius

39 The women punished as *incestae* after the Bacchanal investigation and the alleged poisoners of 154 are treated successively by Valerius 6.3.7–8 as examples of *seueritas*. Watson 1975, 37 notes that the poisoners of 154 had no husbands to supervise their punishment and so had to revert to their natal family for judgement.

40 Kunkel 1962, n. 443 (cf. n. 448) argues for previous criminal legislation against adultery on three counts: Paulus' statement at *Dig.* 4.2.2. that the first clause of the *Lex Julia* cancelled several prior laws; the prosecution of Flavius Augur, discussed above, and the claim in *Rhet. Her.* 4.12 that "our ancestors employed the most severe punishments on those who raped a freeborn youth or violated a married woman."

Ruga into a landmark.⁴¹ Fragments of speeches by Cato the Censor in the second century attest the prominence given to civil lawsuits between the wife's family and her ex-husband after divorce and the evaluation of a system of deductions from the sum at issue for fault on either side. In the last century of the Republic the jurist Servius Sulpicius devoted a whole book to legal issues of dowry. We have far more substantial evidence for the interest of the Roman courts in dowry during the late Republic than of any concern to punish adultery or seduction as such. Yet the same Cato who reported how the arbitrator in a civil divorce case assessed the penalty to be paid by the wife from drinking wine or committing a disgraceful act with another man, also reaffirmed the husband's right to kill the wife if he caught her in the act:

If you caught your wife in adultery, you could kill her without legal penalty, but if you committed adultery, she would not dare to lift a finger against you, nor is it her legal right.⁴²

What we seem to have is the continued recognition of adultery as a private wrong, justifying extreme action by the wronged husband against his wife, but no business of the criminal court. In contrast the civil courts quickly geared up to regulate and classify the financial aspects of marriage, involving the transfer of properties between families. The Romans of the privileged classes were clearly realists about adultery and divorce.

It is time to turn to matters that Republican Rome took more seriously. The punishment of adulterous wives could still be safely left to husbands and fathers: the rape or seduction of young girls in the paternal home came under the father's control, extended by the consultation of the family council. But the many fathers who suppressed a scandal and preserved their daughters, like husbands who made the best of a bad marriage, did not reach history or anecdote. There is, however, in an-

41 On Ruga's divorce because he felt bound by his oath to the censor that he had married to beget children, and on the subsequent formation of the *actio rei uxoriae*, see Gel. 4.3.1 citing Servius Sulpicius *De Dotibus*.

42 *In adulterio uxorem tuam siprehendisses, sine iudicio impoene necares; illa te, si adulterares siue tu adulterarer digito non auderet contingere, neque ius est.* Cato *Orat.* fr. 222 Malcovati, cited together with fr. 221 on the fine imposed by the *iudex* in the civil suit for return of dowry, by Gell. 10.23.1–2 and apparently from a speech of advocacy in a civil suit *de dote*. Watson 1975 interprets fr. 221 to mean that the wife found guilty of adultery was condemned (*condemnatur*) to death, but the context provided by Gellius shows that he understood *condemnatur* to mean condemned to a fine.

ecdote a hard core of public trials of women involved in open scandal and men accused of homosexual rape. The details in which such trials are reported, including the victim's name, guarantee the importance which public attitudes attributed to them.

These trials before the people were not all equally elaborate, and their penalties varied. Of the *iudicia populi* reported by Livy and Valerius two were launched by aediles, and two are attributed to tribunes.⁴³ Tribunician comitial trials required a system of four successive hearings before the centuriate assembly and were limited by their sheer complexity of organisation to major offences such as the abuse of authority by magistrates or crimes committed by men in office: the simpler aedilician procedure was confined to charges incurring not a capital penalty but a fine, such as individual breaches of public order like the morality offences we suggested for the married women who were merely fined. But this distinction between the powers of the two courts implies that in our group of cases of rape or seduction Scantinius was only condemned to a fine, whereas Mergus and Sergius Silus were condemned to loss of *caput*, equivalent to the death sentence, and Cornelius the homosexual rapist was not even given a public trial, but summarily condemned by the *tresviri capitales*. It is only since Kunkel's definitive work on early Republican criminal procedure that we have recognized the importance of the *tresviri*,⁴⁴ who seem to have had powers concurrent with the *iudicia populi* to decide a whole range of criminal cases; but homosexual assault is included solely on the basis of Cornelius' fate. The summary trial may fit his relatively low status: centurions were not—as it were—gentlemen. Again, he apparently succeeded in his act of rape. But we cannot get past the apparent leniency of Scantinius' treatment: why was he not hauled before a tribunician court by one of the college of tribunes so eager to support Marcellus' weaker aedilician procedure? The answer may lie in his status as a magistrate, or more likely in the Roman sense of family honour which gave preference between rival candidates for prosecutor to the one with a family grievance to avenge. Thus the victim's

43 Tried by aediles: Flavius Augur, in the fourth century, and Scantinius in the last quarter of the third century BCE. Tried by tribunes: Laetorius Mergus, in the fourth century, and apparently Sergius Silus as late as the first quarter of the last century BCE.

44 See Kunkel 1962, 70–75; cf. Jones 1972, 2.26–27; they were also known as *tresviri nocturni*, the forerunners of Ruggiero's *signori della notte*. They performed arrests, received and acted on information, took offenders into custody and kept them in prison before condemnation and until execution.

father could himself prosecute and revenge the insult to his son. In the later days of specialized standing courts we regularly find magistrates allotting the right to prosecute an offender on this principle, which no doubt reduced the urge to seek private vengeance outside the system of justice.

But by the end of the Republic we hear of a new law controlling prosecution of homosexual rape, the *Lex Scantinia*. The name piques curiosity, since the Romans did not name their legislation after famous offenders. My last legal speculation is concerned to support a proposed dating for the introduction of this law that can be reconciled with the material we have reviewed. The law is first mentioned in 50 BCE in two letters⁴⁵ of Caelius Rufus (the same cheerful rake from the earlier discussion of *puđicitia*) reporting several prosecutions expected under the *Lex Scantinia*: he treats these charges as purely vexatious, and the trials undoubtedly aborted. We have no hint of either procedure or penalty. Domitian reimplemented the law (Suet. *Dom.* 8) and Juvenal refers to it in his invective against homosexuals, regretting its neglect and urging its renewed application.⁴⁶ Voigt suggested that the law was passed after the condemnation of Scantinius by a tribune related to him in order to vindicate the family honour.⁴⁷ But he could not then explain the later procedure against Cornelius, and for this reason Rotondi, followed by Niccolini,⁴⁸ subsequently suggested a later date for this legislation. The Oxyrhynchus Epitome which reported the condemnation of Cornelius has a damaged entry for the following year (*Periochae* 50, lines 115–6), which reads:

M. Sca[]tius
]am tulit in stupro deprehensi.

While this does not give complete sense, Rotondi suggested restoring the text to read *M. Sca<ntin>ius .. <plebescit>um tulit <de> in stupro*

45 Cic. *Fam.* 8.12.3; and 8.14.4. The first letter reports that he himself has been accused; the second that a case or cases under this law will be heard before a praetor unsuited for the role.

46 Juv. 2.44 opposes his own demand for the revival of the *Lex Scantinia* because of the abundance of *molles* (effeminates) to the earlier demand for the application of the *Lex Julia* (2.37) against female sexual licence.

47 See M. Voigt, *Berichte der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft XLII* (1890) 273, who dates this immediately after Scantinius' condemnation.

48 See G. Rotondi, *Leges Publicae Populi Romani*, Rome 1912, 293, and G. Niccolini, *Fasti dei Tribuni della Plebe*, Milan 1934, 130–31.

deprehensi<s>, “M. Scantinius passed a law concerning those caught in the act of rape.” Although the text is speculative, the interpretation makes sound sense in the aftermath of a major scandal, in which the guilt of the condemned war hero could be in doubt. If there was a member of the *gens Scantinia* in sufficiently good standing to run for the tribunate the following year, this was his opportunity to avenge the wrong done his ancestor, profiting by public indignation to legislate a new and improved procedure. Like Calpurnius Piso, another tribune of this year, he will have legislated not against the offence but in order to change its current judicial handling, establishing a court in which offenders got more careful treatment.⁴⁹ It took the acquittal of a Galba, a flagrant offender, to provoke the establishment of Calpurnius’ new senatorial *quaestio* on abuse by senatorial magistrates; so the condemnation of this war hero may have shocked the public into realizing the injustice of current procedures and penalties for sexual offences. The *Lex Scantinia*, then, represents the adjustment of primitive black and white justice to a society in which sexual “crimes” were now acknowledged as part of the lifestyle of the non-criminal classes.⁵⁰

The constitution of a court under a regular *quaestio* would provide the defendant under this law with a presiding magistrate and a panel of jurors; he would have counsel and the right of rejecting a proportion of potential jurors; in the last resort he would have a chance to escape the ultimate penalty by going into exile during the prescribed adjournment before sentencing.⁵¹ But there are no records of specific cases tried under the law. If it covered only rape of a citizen and could not be used for consensual sexual relations, the assaulted man or his advocate would have to establish his own innocence of previous homosexual relations and produce witnesses or proof of molestation by the offender.

The law still may have functioned as a deterrent to malicious prosecution. Otherwise it seems to have come too late to be put to positive use. A full generation before Cornelius’ alleged crime, Rome’s armies

49 See for this comparison, Kunkel 1962, 95–96, and on the *Lex Calpurnia* of Piso, cf. E. S. Gruen, *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts*, Berkeley 1975, 12–15.

50 The details of Caelius’ letters suggest that the law could be used to harass anyone with a homosexual lifestyle, and perhaps not only the active “seducer” or rapist. The young Saturninus is spoken of as if he were a well known pathic, but on the other hand his prosecution is not explicitly one of those under the *Lex Scantinia*.

51 On the penalty, see Kunkel 1962, 73–74 and n. 275.

and her army officers had discovered a new level of luxury and new forms of both pleasure and extravagance in their campaigns in Greece and Asia Minor.⁵² The popularity of Plautine comedy, with its stress on infatuation with charming but expensive courtesans and music-girls, may be more a symptom than a cause of the new style in loving that replaced the quick satisfaction with a family slave or prostitute by youthful passions for expensive imported love objects. One of the earliest instances is the scandal for which Cato as censor in 184 demoted from the senate the former commander L. Flamininus. Of the two versions available to Livy, Cato's own speech had him execute a noble Gallic suppliant at a drunken victory banquet to please his lover Philippus,⁵³ an expensive Carthaginian *scortum*. The banquet is as much a part of the indictment as the luxurious sexual tastes and abuse of power. The Carthaginian most probably earned his freelance status for services to a Roman master after enslavement at the defeat of Carthage in 202 BCE, and Cato's stress on his high price shows the existence of a fashionable market for his skills even in the first decade of the second century. The attention paid to such professionals goes with the new interest in Greek-style *symposia*⁵⁴ as part of a fashion that would prove expensive and bemuse the old-fashioned father generation. We get a series of vignettes, not all directly connected with sexual indulgence. Cato denounced the erection of statues to the cooks Ochus and Dionysodorus, whom he calls *effeminati* (fr. 96 Malcovati); he complained that jars of saltfish cost more than teams of oxen, and pretty boy slaves more than whole farms.⁵⁵ Young aristocrats now wore Greek clothes to parties, and learned to dance and sing.⁵⁶ All these pastimes were harmless

52 Ruggiero comments on the new trend in homosexual activity in the mid-fifteenth century: "the timing of this transition and its upper class participation may imply that it was related in some way to the growth of humanistic studies and the respect for the classics and the classical lifestyle"; Ruggiero 1985, 137.

53 Livy quotes Cato's own speech for the homosexual version of the episode, rejecting the heterosexual account of the annalist Valerius Antias. The tale is also told at Val. Max. 2.9.3 (in Valerius Antias' version), Cic. *Cato* 42, Plut. *Cato* 17 and *Flam.* 18.

54 Ruggiero 1985, 138 notes that the desire to stamp out homosexuality among the upper classes led to legislation against the presence of young men at banquets held in the private homes of Venice in the mid-fifteenth century.

55 Polyb. 31.25, echoed by both Athenaeus 4.274 and Plut. *Cato* 18.2.

56 It is perhaps in imitation of Cato that the elder Seneca two centuries later includes in his denunciation of the effeminate young their interest in dancing and singing (*Contr. Pr.* 1–8).

enough, but the older generation either feared a decline into debauchery or pretended to do so in order to discourage expensive habits. Cato accused a smart young politician of dancing and performing lewd Greek songs. Another is supposed to have played prostitute at banquets, leaving the dining room to turn tricks in an adjacent chamber,⁵⁷ while Cato's son-in-law Scipio Aemilianus, the intellectual philhellene, is quoted for two prurient denunciations, the first of Sulpicius Galus, who plucked his eyebrows and supposedly his thighs, and went to parties "in Greek sleeved tunics with his male lover, addicted not only to wine but to men, and a lewd debauchee."⁵⁸ But he reserves his deepest horror, not for the high life of partygoing youth, but for the folly of parents who send their daughters and wellborn sons to learn Greek song and dance. The climax of this second denunciation is the sight of a *praetextatus*, a young boy protected by the costume of innocence, learning to dance the rhythms of lewd slaves:⁵⁹ this passage dated to 129 BCE is quoted by Macrobius five centuries later.

Two things are clear. The Romans were not panicked by their sons' hetero- or homosexual activity so long as it cost nothing, broke no laws, and satisfied the body without preoccupying the heart and mind. Aggressive homosexuality was as much evidence of virility and energy as legitimate heterosexual activity. We never hear homosexual activity called unnatural⁶⁰ in ancient Rome, though it may be called unmanly, and the passive role is denounced as lowering oneself to the position of a woman.⁶¹ Incest with kin is unnatural, and violation of religious

57 For the lewd Greek songs and dance, cf. Cato Orat. fr. 114–115 Malcovati; for the dinner party, fr. 212.

58 *Qui barba uulsa feminibusque subuulsis ambulet: qui in conuiuiis adulescentulus cum amatore cum chirodota tunica inferior accubuerit, qui non modo uinusus, sed uirosus quoque sit, eumne quisquam dubitet quin idem fecerit quod cinaedi facere solent?* Scip. Min. fr. 17 Malcovati.

59 Scip. Min. fr. 30 Malcovati. Again Ruggiero provides a parallel, in the restrictions imposed by Venice in the mid-fifteenth century on private or evening instruction in the dancing schools which were a favourite rendezvous for homosexual seduction.

60 The idea of acting *contra naturam* seems to emerge with Stoicism, but Seneca, who is its most articular representative, only once approaches the idea: see *Ep. Mor.* 122.7, where he objects especially to castration. He reserved the designation of unnatural, or contrary to nature for incest, on which see Fantham 1983, 61–76.

61 Note the comment of Quint. 11.1.84: "It is more distressing when someone has to complain of a shameful experience, such as *stuprum*, especially in the

chastity is called *incestum*, incest in a stronger sense, but a Roman man like Catullus might cheerfully threaten to bugger an associate to prove he is a real man.⁶² To have one's son play the woman in his dress and mannerism was humiliating whether or not it implied passive homosexual activity, and Romans in these and later centuries easily resorted to accusations of effeminacy when they wanted to insult each other, or discredit their oratory and political stance. The second issue is the fear of sexuality as a threat to status and finances. Whether the son spent his father's money and lost his self respect over a courtesan or a male freedman made little difference: these pleasures cost money and took the young fellow away from his pursuit of military or political success.

This century, however, shows little impact of fashionable luxury on the sexual initiative of daughters or wives, but the evidence suggests an increase in sexual licence among young married men that must have made nonsense of the old restrictions on non-reproductive sex. In another two generations the widow and divorcées of the upper classes adopted a similar expectation of sexual choice, and the continued exploitation of marriage as a form of political bonding between allies through the union of mature men with inexperienced and lively young girls increased the social factors harmful to real partnership in marriage and the temptation to adulterous escape. As always we have to depend on the exaggerated perceptions of orators with an axe to grind, but there is enough evidence to confirm the breakdown of youthful obedience to family sanctions and the decline of marriage in the prominent social classes that occupy Roman historical narrative.

It was this neglect of marriage and the family, rather than what we might call routine male sexual activity outside of marriage, that provoked Augustus to impose legal sanctions on certain kinds of sexual activity. To strengthen marriage itself, he relied on simultaneous legislation *de maritandis ordinibus* defining the limit of marriage across barriers of social status for his governing class, and offering rewards for fertility and penalties in inheritance law for those who neglected their duty of

case of males, or those forced to undergo oral sex ... there is more shame in such offences for the sufferers than the agents." For the standard condemnatory phrase *muliebria pati*, to suffer the woman's role, cf. Sall. *Cat.* 13; Tac. *Ann.* 9.36. See further Adams 1983, 189–90 on sexual applications of *pator*.
 62 Cf. Catullus 16.1; 16.14; 21.13, and see Adams 1983, 124–28. This type of boast or threat is common from Plautus to Martial, and in later authors at the vulgar level.

marriage and reproductivity.⁶³ What did the fierce new adultery law add to this? The discontented husband could still legitimately enjoy slaves, prostitutes and courtesans: only the enjoyment of other men's wives was barred to him, as it always had been in custom and tradition. If his taste was for his own sex, he still had free access to any man or boy not of respectable citizen status without fear of legal retribution. The difference only becomes apparent when we consider the situation from the woman's angle. It had always been a matter of scandal and originally of severe domestic punishment if the woman before, during, or after marriage indulged in a sexual encounter or relationship. But now, for those of the conspicuous upper classes any intercourse except with a recognized husband was *stuprum*, as severely punishable as adultery during marriage: either could cost the woman and her lover their wealth and enjoyment of civilian life. From now on free sexuality would be a luxury of the woman beneath notice, denied to her social superiors. Yet by its nature this kind of law would always be applied selectively, and those without enemies would have little to fear.

Ironically as Foucault and most recently Veyne have shown,⁶⁴ though Augustus' legislation against adultery did little except provide a tool for political rivals or enemies to wield, the rise of Stoic and other Greek ethical movements brought within the first century of the Christian era a new expectation of equality in sexual restraint for man and wife, and a pattern of companionship in marriage which has survived as a lasting ideal.⁶⁵ It was left for Christianity to recreate the bogey of impurity that has been used for so many centuries to damn hetero- and homosexual love outside marriage more absolutely than even the severest Romans of the Republic would have wished.

63 On the *Lex de maritandis ordinibus*, see Rawsom in Rawson 1986, 9 n. 18; 14 n. 36, and Csillag 1976.

64 M. Foucault, *Le souci de soi*, III, 1: *Le rôle matrimonial* 91–100; P. Veyne, *Histoire de la vie privée*, Paris 1986, 45–59.

65 For a sample of this new reciprocity, see Seneca *Ep. Mor.* 94.26.

Bibliography

Since this article was originally composed in 1986 (designed for another collection, which later decided to use only Greek material) Rawson's invaluable *The Family in Ancient Rome* has been followed by other important works on Roman women, the family and sexuality, all of which I have read and consulted with profit. Although none of them has affected the validity of my interpretation, the reader will want to consult Jane F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society*, London, Sydney 1986; Jane F. Gardner and Thomas Wiedemann, *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook*, London, New York 1991; Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Mother*, London, Sydney 1988 and Susan Treggiari, *Marriage*, Oxford 1991.

Adams, J. N., *Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, Baltimore 1983.

Carcopino, J., *Passion et politique chez les Césars*, Paris 1958.

Csillag, P., *The Augustan Law on Family Relations*, Budapest 1962.

Dover, K. J., *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford 1973.

Fantham, R. E., "Nihil iam iura naturae valent: Incest and Fratricide in Seneca's *Phoenissae*", in A. J. Boyle (ed.), *Seneca Tragicus*, Melbourne 1983, 61–76 (= n. 24 in this volume).

Galinsky, G. K., "Augustus' Legislation on Morals and Marriage," *Philologus* 124 (1980) 126–44.

Jones, A. H. M., *The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate*, Oxford 1972.

Kunkel, W., *Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung des römischen Kriminalverfahrens in vorsullanischer Zeit* (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Neue Folge 56), München 1962.

Levick, B., *Tiberius the Politician*, London 1972.

North, J., "Religious Toleration in Republican Rome," *PCPS* 25 (1979) 85–103.

Rawson, B. (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, Ithaca 1986.

Ruggiero, G., *The Boundaries of Eros: Sex Crime and Sexuality in Renaissance Venice*, Oxford 1986.

Watson, A., *Roman Private Law Around 200 BC*, Edinburgh 1971.

Watson, A., *Rome of the XII Tables*, Princeton 1975.

7a. *Domina*-tricks, or How to Construct a Good Whore from a Bad One

Since the nineteenth century the public has become so familiar with the golden-hearted prostitute as a type of opera, operetta and indeed ancient comedy, that we may forget that this generous lady owes her effectiveness on stage to the pre-existence of her opposite, the thoroughly greedy gold-digger. Gold-digger and golden heart alike may tell us something about men's values—strictly on the gold standard—but I will keep feminist rhetoric out of this exercise in comic analysis. I would like to honour Eckard Lefèvre and his long record of stimulating work on both Plautus and Terence by returning to a favourite theme. I hope to show how the tricks of the greedy courtesan displayed in Plautine adaptation were re-used to create the intrigue based on misrepresentation of the golden-hearted courtesan as we know it best from Terence.

We owe to Eckard Lefèvre an insightful essay on the Plautine comedy which carries the art of the *meretrix* to its greatest height of effrontery, the *Truculentus*.¹ There the ruthless controlling intellect is Phronesium, “Practical Wisdom” or “clever lass,” with her equally heartless sidekick Asphanium. As in *Trinummus* Plautus has named his version after an incidental character, featured in only one or two scenes. There is no clue to the author or title of Plautus' Greek model. It recalls the young wastrels of Philemon or Diphilus, but Menander was certainly not too refined to stage such a villainous heroine. The prologue of his lost *Thais* invokes the muses to tell of a woman young, beautiful, proud, greedy, skilled at demanding money and excluding lovers.² Menander's *Thais* cannot

1 E. Lefèvre, “Truculentus oder Der Triumph der Weisheit,” in: E. Lefèvre, E. Stärk, G. Vogt-Spira, *Plautus barbarus. Sechs Kapitel zur Originalität des Plautus* (ScriptOralia 25), Tübingen 1991, 175–200.

2 Men. fr. 185 K.-Th. with its context from Plutarch: καθάπερ ὁ Μένανδρος ἐν τῷ προλόγῳ τῆς Θαιδος πεποίηκεν· ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν αἶδε τοιαύτην, θεά, / θρασεῖαν ὥραιαν δὲ καὶ πιθάνην ἄμα, / ἀδικοῦσαν, ἀποκλείουσαν, αἰτοῦσαν πυκνά, / μηθὲν ἑρώσαν, προσποιουμένην δ' αἰεί. The grand epic formula suggests that the playwright is claiming to present a sort of female Odysseus, reaching a

be dated and may not have been produced before his *Andria* or *Heautontimoroumenos* or the famous *Eunouchos*, but the archetypal gold-digger had to pre-exist in art, as well as in life, to explain the assumptions and suspicions of the citizen males and the powerful paradoxes of the honest girls and generous women of Menander's courtesan plays.

Jim Tatum called *Truculentus* "the most sardonic of Plautus' comedies," I suppose because it is a comedy of vice triumphant.³ Certainly *Truculentus* has often been condemned in moral terms as thoroughly unedifying, and in dramaturgical terms as lacking a proper intrigue. Yet the play's sexual morality is surely no worse than that of *Bacchides*, *Menaechmi*, or *Miles Gloriosus*, and its trickery no more outrageous. What then is its offence? Is it that the woman wins, and wins, not so much through clever deceptions as through an outright assertion of her sexual powers? Like a female Pseudolus Phronesium glories in her power to cheat and shares with the audience and her cronies her confidence in stripping her lovers of their assets.

Let's start by reviewing the play's *Dramatis Personae*, its setting and its mechanisms. To help readers follow the intricacies of the plot and show its affinities of cast and structure with Terence's *Eumuchus*, I have combined in one diagram stage-plan and named character types of both plays, indicating some of the correlations between them and noting the order of their appearance on stage.

new level of *poneria*. In another fragment (186) a victimised lover voices his self-reproach in the same style as Diniarchus.

3 *Plautus, the Darker Comedies: Bacchides, Casina and Truculentus*, translated with introduction and notes by J. Tatum, Baltimore 1983, p. 147. The comedy has also been helpfully discussed under the rubric "satiric comedy" by D. Konstan, *Roman Comedy*, Ithaca 1983.

1) **TRUCULENTUS**

	House 1	House 2
	lover (Act 3)	Domina
	STRABAX	PHRONESIUM
	Gatekeeper	Gatekeeper
	Truculentus	Astaphium
from city	Diniarchus	Stratophanes from harbour
	lover (Act 1)	soldier lover (Act 2)
		(Cyamus)
	Father-in-law (Act 4)	
	(maid, laundress etc.)	

AUDIENCE

Notes: both Phronesium and her newest lover Strabax have gatekeepers. Diniarchus, like his prospective father-in-law, lives offstage. Each act brings a new lover on stage. Cyamus is Diniarchus' boastful representative in Act 2, parallel to function of Gnatho in **Eunuchus**

2) **EUNUCHUS**

	House 1	House 2
	lover (Act 1)	Domina
	PHAEDRIA	THAIS
	Slave	maid
	Parmeno	Pythias
	Chaerea	Sister
from country		from harbour
Phaedia (Act 4)		Thraso
		soldier lover (Act 3)
		Gnatho Parasite
		Chremes (brother: Act 3)
Father (Act 5)		

AUDIENCE

Notes: Phaedia opens play like Diniarchus: Thais appears early in dialogue with him. Pythias is her chief maid, but more a positive go-between than negative gatekeeper. Second plot has Phaedia's young brother Chaerea rape Thais' 'sister'. As Father-in-law appears in *Truculentus* to settle Diniarchus so Father (and Chremes, the 'sister's' brother) settle Chaerea's case through marriage.

Some minor characters such as the eunuch Dorus, the lesser maids of Thais and the kitchen staff of Thraso, have been omitted.

The Prologus of *Truculentus* opens by identifying the house of Phronesium, a woman of modern morals (*huius saeculi mores*) who never demands from her lover—what he has already given—but makes sure he has nothing left to give. We will learn that at least one other character, the rich country boy Strabax, has a house on stage, but the playwright does not want to weaken his focus by mentioning him too soon. Instead this outer, impersonal, prologue gives as sole starting point of the action that Phronesium is pretending to have had a child by a soldier lover in order to get his money. This is supplemented by the inner prologue of young Diniarchus, who serves to voice the playwright's take on the crazy behaviour of lovers in general, before he gets round to confessing his own record. He is the *intimus*, the old trusted lover of this powerful courtesan; but now she has found a richer lover in the Babylonian soldier who is expected today, and she is claiming to have born his child, so she will need to shut out Diniarchus. Unlike the external prologue he is not certain that her claim is fraudulent, because of his absence on a mission to Lemnos, but he suspects she has borrowed a baby for the purpose: he would have known if she were pregnant.

Thus Phronesium has already had two lovers, the young townsman and the foreign soldier: before the first act is over we learn that she has just acquired a third admirer, the country boy, and is using her maid Astaphium as a go-between. In fact Astaphium is the mistress of ceremonies, the doorkeeper who controls the comings and goings of the play. Like those odd little weather houses, Phronesium's house is one into which one figure is expelled as another is admitted: the stage street is more of an antechamber for her clients than a public thoroughfare, and virtually everyone who comes on stage is hoping to enter her house or reluctantly leaving. The actors and the action rotate through her revolving door, with a miniature procession of lovers admitted so long as they are future givers, and expelled once they have given. As each man is drained she moves on to the next, and the plot will give each man his turn of hoping for satisfaction, moving his predecessor outwards and away. In this truly Brechtian world it is the duty of both victim and predator to keep the money passing from innocent to professional.

A brief outline of the action will display its cyclic form and its lack of anything like a *Peripeteia*.

ACT 1, introduced by Diniarchus's prologue, shows him sparring with Astaphium. Diniarchus overhears her undertake to fetch a male (*eumpe* 114) from his home to Phronesium, and disputes her claim that she is going to get the midwife: isn't this a new lover? They fence verbally until he mentions a new source of money (174) and she changes to inviting him in: challenged about the new baby she maintains the fiction and confirms that the soldier is expected to arrive any minute, but still urges him into the house (209). Astaphium sings a song of triumph that she has got him out of the way and can go to fix the rendezvous with the young country lad in the house next door. But that door is opened by the hostile Truculentus, after an exchange of insults he goes back in, leaving Astaphium to boast of her plans to tame him.

Now (322) Diniarchus returns to the stage from Phronesium's house, tired of waiting for her. After a few minutes of his complaint she follows to invite him back and tell him the truth about her feigned pregnancy and her maid's quest to borrow a baby.

At this stage Plautus' audience has no reason to suspect that Diniarchus is this baby's father, but the Greek audience may well have been alerted in the prologue. Phronesium promises to let Diniarchus is taken in and leaves, telling the world his faith in her affection for him. This 'first act' is almost half the play.

ACT 2, focussed on the soldier Stratophanes, opens with a flamboyant childbirth scene, as Phronesium parades her delicate condition for his benefit. The soldier enters confidently but is quickly reduced to misery as Astaphium plays up Phronesium's sufferings and the child's talents, and Phronesium disdains his costly gifts—which she nonetheless takes in. The action is turned round when Diniarchus' cook Cyamus appears bringing mules loaded with gifts. Exaggerating her thanks to the absent Diniarchus Phronesium humiliates Stratophanes further and soldier and cook face off, his sword against the other's cleaver. When Cyamus beats a retreat, Phronesium shuts her door in the soldier's face, and he leaves in despair for the forum at 644.

ACT 3. Two short scenes show Astaphium welcoming in the country boy Strabax, who has taken 20 minae due to his father; returning to the door she finds Truculentus himself, now converted to charming ways, and asks him on her own account.

ACT 4. Without a significant pause, Diniarchus appears, encouraged by Cyamus' report, and meets Astaphium, still mounting guard at the door. If she has got rid of Truculentus it is not explained; certainly the country boy Strabax is still inside with Phronesium and Diniarchus is sent away with the message that he has been outbid.

Here opens the only phase in the action that is not controlled by Phronesium and her maid. As Diniarchus stands outside threatening to sue them, he sees his former father-in-law Callicles with his maid and Phronesium's hairdresser, and laments that his sins have caught up with him. In the only real reversal of the play Callicles discovers from the maids that Phro-

nesium has his daughter's baby and Diniarchus is the father. Diniarchus escapes trouble by asking to marry her (841) and promising to retrieve the baby. But in the next scene he succumbs to Phronesium's counter-claim and leaves the play with the baby still in her possession.

ACT 5. Plautus still has to resolve the rival claims of Strabax and Stratophanes. The soldier returns with a mina of gold, to be treated with renewed complaints and contempt. When Strabax comes out from the bedroom after 'his girl', Phronesium again insults the soldier and wheedles Strabax; Stratophanes challenges him in a full scale reprise of the vicarious confrontation with Diniarchus, but Strabax flashes his ready money and Phronesium arbitrates accordingly. She will sleep first with Strabax, giving priority to the one who still has money to offer, then with the soldier. They are in no position to object and she closes the action congratulating herself on her business sense and thanking Venus who has controlled the drama.

In the end, then, it is only Strabax— the newest lover— who scores; while Diniarchus is kept on the hook until his own change of status removes him in Act 4 and Stratophanes is kept dangling from his arrival in Act 2 to a moment after the play which may never actually happen. Those two, after all, have had their time with Phronesium, so that there is a certain poetic justice, which Astaphium clearly affirms in 733–5:

plus enim es intromissus quom dabas;
sine uicissim qui dant [operam] ob illud quod dant operis utier.
litteras didicisti: quando scis, sine alios discere.

This is really a play not of one but two skilled courtesan protagonists: a mistress who screens herself through her maid, and a maid who both protects her mistress and does her own business on the side. Astaphium once did business with Diniarchus, and clearly expects to entertain Truculentus. Her double function makes her if anything even more powerful than Phronesium: while the audience sees or is told about Phronesium's exploitation of her lovers, it is Astaphium who provides the running commentary: Like Mercury in *Amphitruo* she mediates the action for the audience, and it is not surprising that she actually has the longest role and most songs.

Through Astaphium *Truculentus* voices an explicit code, using the language of analogy to instruct the audience in the rules of the courtesan's game. This women's code is actually preceded and complemented by Diniarchus' account in the prologue of what the lover gains and loses from mercenary love. No lover, he declares, could ever learn all the ways of ruining himself; with wheedling and scolding (28) the woman can sting him for a year's support— then give him a mere

three nights, collecting oil and grain and wine on the side. The lover is like a fish; she dangles her line until he bites the bait: after meeting her demands he gets extra nights until he is truly hooked; then when she quarrels with him, he loses his cash and his heart, or if he gets the occasional night, his heart is happy but his cash is gone. Her household constantly generates new demands—replacements for lost money, for clothes, maids, silver plate, furniture. All this we will see in the play.

But the next embarrassment of the lover which Diniarchus describes—his need to conceal losses from parents—plays no role in *Truculentus* as adapted. His loss of all his money to the courtesan was almost certainly the cause of the broken engagement implied in Act 4.⁴ This aspect of the action must have been prominent in the original Greek comedy. But this extravagance also reflects a changing social pattern in the world of Plautus' audience. It is in their world that Diniarchus imagines pimps and courtesans swarming around the bankers' tables to add new payment to their accounts. It is in their world that victory (over Macedonia ad Syria?) has brought peace and prosperity, so that men with money have an obligation to spend it on love; *amare oportet omnes qui quod dent habent* (76).

A different version of lover-mistress relations offered in Astaphium's song is also left unsubstantiated in this play—the invasion of the courtesan's establishment by gangs of young bloods who descend on them and strip the place of food and drink, thinking it fair fighting to plunder those who plunder them. In this play no lovers invade the courtesan's house by force, or have to conceal the loss of money from their parents. Only the theme of wasting their goods has come to stay; in a series of financial metaphors Diniarchus admits having squandered his liquid assets of Phronesium's household, which has put him out of business and taxed his capital away. But he can still realize on his house and small-holding.⁵ This is the information that turns Astaphium's indifference to a warm welcome, and restores the discarded lover to being *noster*, "one of us".

-
- 4 Cf. *Truc.* 770 *Calliclem uideo senem / meus qui adfinis fuit* and 848–9 *iam illi remittam nuntium adfini meo, / dicam ut aliam condicionem filio inueniat suo*, which show that Callicles' daughter was first engaged to Diniarchus but her father had cancelled the engagement (as in *Andria*) and found another young man to be her future husband. See now the discussion of A. C. Scafuro, *The Forensic Stage*, Cambridge 1997, 258–9.
- 5 Diniarchus must either be fatherless, or like Lesbonicus in *Trinummus* and Philolaches in *Mostellaria*, taking advantage of his father's absence on business.

In her second solo song the image of hook and line gives away to more likenesses for the courtesan's talents; she must have fine teeth and a skilled tongue to smile and speak nicely despite her wicked intentions; she must be like a bramble catching at and stripping the passing male, but if he stops giving, she would discharge him as a deserter from military service. Let him love while he has cash, and find a new profession when he runs out of funds, or make way for those who still can give; the real lover forgets that he has already given and cheerfully ruins his fortune. For the courtesan there is no such thing as enough.

Phronesium and Astaphium have only one enduring principle: to take without giving; the lover-customer who has still something to give is welcome, while he who has given his all is discarded as dead and empty of promise. But if their art of taking without fulfilling their side of the bargain is simply a repetitive cycle from one act to the next, there is more potential comedy in their juggling of the comings and goings of each of the three customers to ensure an endless postponement of satisfaction. If Phronesium comes closest to honesty with her old lover Diniarchus, the fact remains that he too gives without being gratified; persuaded to stay away while Phronesium cajoles the soldier, he follows up his lavish gifts to find another man in occupation, and is overtaken by the obligation to marry before he can claim his turn.

It is this dark satiric world of greed and folly which haunts the fears of the elderly Fathers who populate Terence's Menandrian comedies. Yet Terence's plots do not revolve around his money like the plays of Plautus, nor do his slaves and courtesans gloat over getting it. Deception is too obvious a dramatic engine: instead self-deception is exploited for its own comic value. Instead of the less respectable characters misbehaving, the respectable elders assume their misbehaviour and confuse the circumstances. Phronesium fakes having given birth, so when the innocent Andrian girl of Terence's first adapted play goes into labour, the suspicious elderly father Simo tells his son's intriguing slave that he is not deceived; first they have sent for the midwife and now they are simulating the sounds of childbirth (470–76): soon a woman will arrive with a baby concealed in her baggage so that they can blackmail his son into this marriage with a pauper of no family (490–94). And when the slave takes the baby and sets it out on the path of the prospective wealthy father-in-law Chremes, he stages a quarrel for the old man to hear, in which the same accusation of borrowing the baby to pretend motherhood provokes the Andrian girl's maid into confirming that the

baby is the Andrian girl's child by young Pamphilus. Although *Truculentus* is the only surviving play to involve a suppositious baby, the fact that *Andria* makes open sport of the trick proves this was an established variant in traditional courtesan comedy. But there is no courtesan in *Andria*: old father Simo's mistake is to assume that an unprotected girl who has lived in the house of a courtesan—the dead Chrysis—must have learned such tricks from her environment.

The best demonstration of this half-submerged tradition is rather *Eunuchus*, both in its construction of Thais' behaviour and in the misrepresentations to which she is subjected, not only by suspicious slaves and fathers, but even by the leading lover of the play. You will remember that *Eunuchus* combines two plots, both centred on the house of the courtesan Thais. Thais has taken in and brought up respectably the orphaned citizen girl she calls her sister. Thais and the sister are loved, with very different modes of loving, by the two sons of a respectable neighbour. While the older boy, Phaedria, just through his ephebic training, loves and has frequented Thais, the young lad Chaerea has only just discovered women, and is smitten with passion for the young girl he has seen escorted in the street.

In the absence of a narrative prologue the audience has to be introduced slowly to the honourable reality of Thais' motives through her words and deeds, but is given the standard negative reading of Thais' behaviour early on by the slave Parmeno. Keeping *Truculentus* in mind, we realize that Terence's audience may have heard with complete disbelief Thais' explanations to Phaedria of why she is denying him sexual access. Phaedria is angry that he is both summoned and dismissed—*non eam ne nunc quidem / quom accersor ultro? an potius ita me comparem / non perpeti meretricum contumelias?* (46–48). Like Diniarchus he realizes he is too deeply in love to resist, and assumes that once she sees he is in her power she will cheat and deceive him (54–55). Even Parmeno, his slave, can only advise him to ransom his heart as cheaply as possible—that is to pay out as little as he can (74–76) and try not to kick against the pricks. Phaedria must have squandered quite a sum, since Parmeno hails Thais as *nostrī fundi calamitas* (79).

Like Astaphium or Phronesium, Thais begins by asking Phaedria why he has not come in to her, then provides the prehistory of this comedy as she explains to Phaedria why he has recently been shut out of her house. Parmeno, the cynical witness to this dialogue, undertakes to interrupt as soon as he thinks she is lying. Thais' explanation is that her mother was given a young girl of citizen birth, and when Thais

moved to Athens with her protector, she brought the girl with her. She claims that she inherited all she has from this protector: but by Thais' own admission she has received many gifts from Phaedria. Before him there was a soldier lover, who went to campaign in Caria; it is only since he left that Phaedria has been her trusted lover, her *intumus* (the same word used for Diniarchus). When Thais' miserly uncle sold the young girl as a slave, her soldier lover bought her as a present for Thais, but now that he has found out that Thais is having an affair with Phaedria he is making excuses not to give her the girl and may even have taken a fancy to her. This is the reason she wants Phaedria to stay clear until she can get the girl away from the soldier and restore her to her citizen family.

At this point it is not Parmeno the slave but Phaedria himself who rejects her story: the whole sad tale of the girl means only one thing; Phaedria is to be shut out and the soldier welcomed in! (158) The real explanation is that she prefers the soldier and is afraid the girl will steal him from her. Angrily he begins to reproach her with the gifts he has obtained for her—the Ethiopian maid and eunuch she asked for. Thais offers to abandon her plan rather than offend him, then returns to her request; just two days! Phaedria does not believe her: do the audience? Not, I think, until she gives the proof of her sincerity when she is left on stage.

me miseram! forsan hic mihi paruam habeat fidem
atque ex aliarum ingeniis nunc me iudicet.
ego pol, quae mihi sum conscia, hoc certo scio
neque me finxisse falsi quicquam neque meo
cordi esse quemquam cariorem hoc Phaedria. (197–201)

This day will be decisive because—this she has not told Phaedria— she is expecting the arrival of the young girl's citizen brother: the implication is that once identified the girl will be safe in the control of her family.

As in the *Truculentus*, *Eunuchus* moves to a competition between rival lovers; in *Truculentus* the soldier brought exotic slave girls, while the townsman Diniarchus sent his slave Cyamus to deliver food supplies, in *Eunuchus* it is Parmeno who parades across the stage with the eunuch and Ethiopian just as the soldier's parasite Thraso enters to make Thais a present of the young girl; thus neither rival is involved in the exchange of insults, only their deputies, each of whom is reluctant to leave Thais' doorway open to the other. There is no scene with Thais herself, who thus escapes the contamination of being seen to take gifts from both ri-

vals at once. Instead the plot takes an entirely new twist when the lustful young Chaerea acts on a casual jest of Parmeno and demands to be substituted for the eunuch so that he can 'get' the girl. There can be no doubt of his intentions, since Parmeno reacts by protesting that this is a crime (*flagitium facimus*). But Chaerea draws on the stereotype to justify his plot (382–5).

an id flagitiumst, si in domum meretriciam
deducar et illis crucibus, quae nos nostramque adulescentiam
habent despicatam et quae nos semper omnibus cruciant modis,
nunc referam gratiam atque eas itidem fallam ut ab illis fallimur?

Passing over the complications introduced by Chaerea's impersonation and rape, we might note that the famous scene where the soldier lover leads his kitchen troops to besiege the courtesan's house is a trick; the soldier thinks she has been thrusting a rival under his nose (794–5). In fact the man he has seen with Thais is not his actual rival Phaedria, who has been sent to the country, but the young girl's brother, who has come to identify her. Once Thais is confident of the girl's free status she does not bother to disabuse the soldier, but leaves the brother to declare the girl's free birth and drive the soldier from the field. When the rape is discovered and Chaerea identified as the rapist, Terence again uses the expectations of both his respectable characters and his audience to highlight the paradoxical virtue of his heroine Thais. Parmeno returns pleased with himself that he has obtained a particularly difficult and expensive love object for Chaerea from a money-grubbing courtesan, at no cost or trouble. In more general terms he congratulates himself on educating Chaerea in their nature and habits.⁶ Thus even slaves voice the usual bourgeois prejudices.

But the audience has already seen Thais treat the wretched Chaerea with the utmost generosity, acknowledging her own status as perhaps worthy of *contumelia*, but distinguishing the higher standards he should have maintained (865–6). We began the play with Phaedria indignant at the *contumelia* of courtesans.⁷ At its climax Chaerea is shamelessly optimistic that his rape will turn out well: instead of apologizing for his treatment of Thais he simply claims he took Pamphila not from *contumelia* but from love (877), and asks Thais' help in persuading his father to permit his marriage (885–8).

6 Cf. 927 *meretrice auara*, 932 *meretricum ingenia et mores*.

7 *Eun.* 48 above *meretricum contumeliae*: Thais' gentle protest provokes Charea's denial *non me contumeliae / fecisse causa, sed amoris* in 877.

There is one more reversal that is not usually seen as a link between these two plays: Phronesium triumphs at the end of *Truculentus*, graciously declaring that she will share her favours between Strabax and the soldier. Modern readers have often jibbed at the corresponding outcome of *Eunuchus*. When the father of Phaedria and Chaerea gives his protection to Thais in return for her forgiveness of young Chaerea's rape, Chaerea and Parmeno concludes that Phaedria will now monopolize Thais; *fratris igitur Thais totast* (1040). Instead the last fifty lines see Gnatho urge the brothers to share Thais with Thraso in order to help finance her needs: (1075–8, 1080)

quod des paulum est, et necessest multum accipere Thaidem.
ut tuo amori suppeditare possint sine sumptu tuo
omnia haec, magis opportunus nec magis ex usu tuo
nemost. principio et habet quod det et dat nemo largius ...
neque istum metuas ne amet mulier: facile pellas ubi uelis.

First Chaerea, then her lover Phaedria, accept this bargain, and Thraso is told his social graces have won him acceptance. The whole sequence is very Plautine, and would have fitted the *Truculentus* perfectly. It probably did fit the ending of the Menandrian *Kolax* that the soldier should pay to share in the courtesan's favours— and get very little in return.⁸ But if it offends that the anti-typical Thais of Terence's play, who has had to pardon so much, should be shared out behind her back, we might counter with three arguments, 1) Thais has already freely associated with the soldier; 2) it would be far more offensive if this generous woman were herself to propose the time-sharing arrangement to the infatuated Phaedria, and 3) not only *Truculentus*, but the proposed outcome of the Plautine *Asinaria* shows that such shared services were a normal arrangement.⁹ Indeed the contract previously drawn up by the rival lover in *Asinaria* 751–809 suggests that in comedy such exclusive long-term contracts could seem presumptuous.

If the bad courtesan keeps multiple lovers dangling in order to extract money from each in turn, if she uses their jealousy and competi-

8 On the 'problem' of the ending of *Eunuchus* see most recently P.G. McC. Brown in E. Handley and A. Hurst (eds.), *Relire Ménandre*, Geneva 1990, pp. 49–61.

9 At *Asin.* 917–8 the parasite of the defeated rival plans to persuade Argyrippus (who has paid 20 minae for a year's sole enjoyment of his girl) to shame her services, in view of the cost of her maintenance. We might also compare Demosth. 59.29 where Timanoridas and Eucrates club together to buy Neaera outright for 30 minae.

tiveness to raise their contributions, while temporising to keep their eagerness more intense, the good courtesan will either give herself to one lover, or if she takes on more than one, will act for some altruistic purpose. That purpose is all the more poignant is it is to save a younger woman from being forced to love as a courtesan in her turn. Terence's Thais (Menander's Chrysis) has always been admired, but she becomes even more remarkable when she is seen in the shadow of Phronesium or Menander's eponymous Thais. Did Menander perhaps create them both?

7b. Women of the Demi-Monde and Sisterly Solidarity in the *Cistellaria*

For Eckard Lefèvre, in friendship and admiration.

Matronae magi' conducibilest istuc, mea Selenium,
unum amare et cum eo aetatem exigere quoi nuptast semel.
(*Cist.* 76–77)

Among the happy events for Latin studies seventy years ago was the brief article in which Eduard Fraenkel applied the new manuscript discoveries of Bernhard Bischoff to confirm Prehn's conjecture that the original of Plautus' *Cistellaria* was Menander's *Synaristosae*.¹ His discovery was quickly followed by two epoch-making studies of Wilhelm Süss² but only after another generation was further progress made thanks to the discovery of the *Synaristosae* mosaic at Mytilene, displaying with identifying labels the three women of the first act: the hostess Plangon (Plautus' Selenium), with her guests Philaenis (Plautus' unnamed *lena*) and her daughter Pythias (Gymnasium) wearing the jewelled headdress associated with *hetaerae*.³ The Menander volume of the 1970 *Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt* contained both Lilly Kahil's exciting discussion of the Mytilene mosaics, and Walther Ludwig's definitive reconstruction of the Menandrian play,⁴ overcoming the central lacuna of the Plautine manuscripts to trace a systematic Menandrian action, from which, he convincingly argued, Plautus had suppressed an important early scene between Selenium's natural mother Phanostrata and her servant Lampadio, and much of the bourgeois family's formal recognition and reunion with their lost daughter, culminating in the marriage that gave the play its socially happy ending. Subsequent discussion by T. B. L. Webster and David Konstan added depth to our social understand-

1 Fraenkel 1932, 117–120; Prehn 1916, 10 n. 1.

2 Süss 1935, 161–187 and 1938, 97–141.

3 I shall leave both Greek *hetaera* and Latin *meretrix* untranslated in this paper, because there is no accurate and neutral translation: neither “courtesan” nor the abusive “whore” should be acceptable.

4 Ludwig 1970 and Kahil 1970.

ing of the play's context, but brought no substantial change in interpretation.⁵

In this, the last of three papers about the non-bourgeois women of Roman comedy written for my friends in the Freiburg group,⁶ I want to explore the half-world of unprotected women which is often wrongly dismissed as the life of *meretrices*, and revise the too distinct categories which I outlined twenty five years ago of dramatic and social roles open to women without verifiable citizenship, deprived of the safe environment of comfortable bourgeois families. Thus my concern with the morality of Selenium and her "mother" in their unstable context builds on a similar concern with the kidnapped Carthaginian girls of the *Poenulus*. The paper will be in three sections; first a brief outline of the opening scene and the two following prologue speeches: next a discussion of comic portrayals of mothers and daughters excluded from bourgeois security, setting our examples against instances from other genres to reconsider the relationship between civil and economic disqualification from marriage; finally I will focus on the novel concept implied by the *lena's* phrase *noster ordo* (33; cf. *hic ordo* 23) contrasted with the collective behaviour of *matronae* in 25–37, and the evidence for a recognized and definitive body of *summo genere gnata(e)* [...] *matron(e)* at Rome in the time of Plautus.

Ladies at lunch

Both the Mytilene mosaic and the older representation by Dioscurides⁷ show the three women seated at a little table, with a slave girl attending on the old *lena*, who has a wine goblet in her hand: but when the play opens the past tense of the verbs in both *Cist.* 19: *rarum nimium dabat quod biberem*, and *Men. fr.* 385 K., reporting that the slave girl has removed both table and wine, show that the meal has ended. There is a seated drinking party in front of Philolaches' father's house in *Mostellaria*

5 Webster 1974 with reconstruction of *Synaristosae* 187–189 (cf. also 1970, 23; Konstan 1983, 96–118 (under the odd title "non-citizen order")).

6 See Fantham 2000, 287–299 (discussing the *meretrices* of *Truculentus* and *Eunuchus*) and 2003 (discussing the Carthaginian citizen daughters of *Poenulus*).

7 Kahil 1970, 239 who illustrates both the (unlabelled) Dioscurides mosaic and the Mytilene mosaics (plates 2 and 3), and traces them back to a prototype more or less contemporary with Menander, from the first half of the third century BCE.

1.5, and we may presume something similar here. However as Kahil has noted, a problem of staging arises if the play is to open with the women already on stage. I shall assume that in Plautus they enter from one of the two house doors to sit together centre-stage in front of the apartment which it turns out Alcesimarchus has rented for Selenium: chairs are surely needed for a scene this long, but at this point a table would be superfluous, and may only have a symbolic value in the mosaics.

Lines 1–37 are canticum, in mixed bacchiacs and iambic dimeters, cretics and trochees, ending in three bacchiac tetrameters: this opening is surely where Plautus will have been most tempted to expand on his original. The canticum is followed by iambic septenarii from 38–58 before the scene moves into more emotional trochaic septenarii, for Selenium’s narrative. Her first speech of gratitude to her friend Gymnasium and Gymnasium’s mother makes it clear that she has invited them at short notice (*omnibus relictis rebus*, 6): Gymnasium replies with warmth and courtesy; her mother, after a punning play on the conventional formula *ventum gaudeo* (15) is characterized as the typical old drinker, and ungraciously complains that there was not enough, or strong enough, wine to drink: *rarum nimium dabat quod biberem, id merum infusabat* (19 = Men. fr. 385 K.). The remainder of the canticum is taken up with the old *lena*’s theme of mutual help between “women of our rank,” and the arrogant and suspicious treatment they experience in contact with married women. At 36 she identifies “our rank” for the spectators. “Your mother and I are both freedwomen, who reared you, born of casual fathers (*patribus conuenticiis*), and I would not have pushed my daughter here into the life of a *meretrix* except to escape from hunger!” (38–41) Selenium answers that it would have been better to give Gymnasium to a husband in marriage, which leads to a typical joke about marrying by day and night to avoid the household dying of starvation, and a realistic reminder that Gymnasium can only earn until she gets old: *numquam hac aetate fies, semperque istam quam nunc habes aetatulam obtinebis* (48–49). Gymnasium is a loyal and cooperative daughter (*addam operam sedulo* 52) but the function of this dialogue is rather to provide a contrast between both women and the more refined moral code which Selenium embodies. Gymnasium comments on her tears and her wan and dishevelled appearance (53–56; cf. 113–116) and asks what they can do for her. It is here, as Selenium tells her sad story, that the dialogue turns to trochaic septenarii as she explains her broken heart (*doleo ab animo, doleo ab oculis, doleo ab aegritudine, [...] at mihi cordoliumst* 60, 65),—but in Gymnasium’s world, men believe

that women are heartless (65–66). After more Plautine punning and jesting Selenium reaches the point. There is only one healer for her love sickness, the man whom she determined to live with as her only love. It is at this point that the audience will realize Selenium is not a routine *meretrix*, and begin to anticipate that she is a “*pseudokore*”, an unrecognized freeborn girl who will earn the reward of her fidelity by finding citizen parents and marriage before the play comes to an end. She now explains that her mother indulged her when she was reluctant to be called a *meretrix* (*meretricem dicier, not fieri*); as she was compliant so her mother was compliant with her wishes and let her live with the man she loved *gessit morem oranti morigerae*⁸ *mihi / ut me quem ego amarem grauitur, sineret cum eo vivere* (84–85). After she has reiterated that she has never slept with any man except Alcesimarchus, she tells the story of how they met, when he followed her home from the Dionysia, and won her mother’s goodwill with charm, gifts, and services: this is, then, a seduction, and not a rape narrative. From their intimate companionship (*consuetudine*) she came to love him, and he swore to her mother in formally binding terms (*conceptis uerbis*) that he would marry her. But now comes the blow which has caused her distress. Now his father is forcing him to marry another girl, his kinswoman from Lemnos, who lives next door (in the other stage house). Her mother is furious with her for not coming back home when she found out, and has summoned her back. She has invited them to ask the *lena* a favour; that she will let Gymnasium occupy the apartment in her stead for the next couple of days. (We are not yet told why, and only learn at 225–226 that Alcesimarchus’ father has sent him to the family farm for six days.) Again the contrast between Selenium’s values and those of her companions is emphasized when the *lena* grudgingly consents, despite the economic loss this will mean for her (*quamquam istuc mihi erit molestum triduom et damnum dabis, faciam* 106–107). As she leaves to go back to her mother Selenium begs her friend not to abuse Alcesimarchus, hands her the keys and urges her to use whatever supplies she needs (*si quid tibi opus erit prompti, promito* 109). Selenium leaves at 116, Gymnasium asks her mother’s leave and goes inside, and with a

8 Both *morem gerere* and *morigera* are associated with obedience in marriage: cf. 175 where the wife by dying obliges her husband: *facta morigera est uiro*, and Williams 1958, 16–29: thus although the epithet may evoke Selenium’s dutiful obedience to her mother, it may also allude to her wifely behaviour towards her partner Alcesimarchus.

last warning never to fall in love (119), the *lena* says goodbye. Now she is alone on stage she waxes confidential, warmed by the wine she has drunk (120–122, now in plain *senarii*) and tells the spectators that she rescued Selenium from where she had been exposed in a back alley:⁹ in case the audience have missed the background, she identifies Alcesimarchus as *adprime nobilis* (125): he lives “here” in Sicyon: his father is still alive (so he is not a free agent) and he and the girl are deeply in love. She herself gave the baby Selenium to her friend, a *meretrix* who had asked her to find a baby boy or girl for her to rear, so that she could pretend the child was hers. *Eam meae ego amicae dono huic meretrici dedi, / quae saepe mecum mentionem fecerat, / puerum aut puellam alicunde ut reperirem sibi, recens natum, eapse quod sibi supponeret* (133–136). Her friend (whom we will meet as Melaenis) wanted to pretend that the baby was hers by a foreign lover, (143–144: it is implied that she planned to extract money from this lover on the pretext of rearing his baby).¹⁰ But this is a secret known only to the two women. Selenium, then, really believes that she is Melaenis’ child, and her “mother” conceived her from a casual encounter. Now that the *lena* has told us all she knows she can be sent offstage, where she will notionally remain without returning during the action.

She is replaced by Auxilium, the personification of divine assistance, and in Greek the feminine divinity Boetheia. Although ‘he’ complains that the *lena* has usurped his function of explaining the *argumentum* (155) his divine omniscience is in fact needed to explain the complex history of Selenium’s original mother and father (156–187): he also retells the story of her love for the rich Alcesimarchus, and the new threat of his imposed marriage (190–196) without however explaining that Alcesimarchus is the intended son-in-law of her natural parents.

Some years back (in fact just over seventeen years) a young Lemnian merchant (Demipho, whom we will meet in the last act, 774–781) attended the Dionysia here in Sicyon, got drunk, and raped a respectable girl (Phanostrata, who will appear rather sooner, in 543): when he realized what he had done he fled back to Lemnos. Ten months later she had a baby daughter and trusted her father’s slave (Lampadio, who enters the action just before Phanostrata, at 536 in the surviving text) to expose

9 There seems a slight contradiction here with the later information that the baby was left *ab hippodromo* (549; repeated 552).

10 Compare the deception of her soldier admirer planned by Phronesium in *Truculentus*.

the baby: the slave watched to see if she was picked up and saw a *meretrix* take her away (166–169). But—as the audience have just heard from the *lena*—she did not keep the baby, but gave her to Melaenis who brought her up *pro filia*, / *bene et pudice* (172–173). Meanwhile Demipho, the Lemnian merchant, married a kinswoman who gave him a daughter and then conveniently died (175). He then moved to Sicyon (*huc commigrauit*) and married Phanostrata, the girl he had once raped, who told him about the baby she had exposed. They then commissioned her father's old slave Lampadio who had exposed the baby and seen it taken up by the *lena*, to search for the grown daughter, and he is even now trying to find the women in order to trace the baby. Now it is certainly possible that when Auxilium says *huc commigrauit* he points to the other stage house, thus identifying the present occupants as Selenium's real mother and father. But Plautus is usually more explicit (*in hisce aedibus* or the like) and this is still not enough to tell the spectators how the plans of this family concern Alcesimarchus. At this point in Menander's play either the prologue divinity or, as Ludwig has convincingly argued, "Lampadio" and "Phanostrata" should have appeared to explain to the audience that the family and Alcesimarchus' father were planning to marry him to Demipho's second, legitimate, daughter, the stepdaughter of Phanostrata.

But Plautus' audience does not know this, and on the basis of the surviving text must wait until the third act when Melaenis accosts Lampadio (at 597, after overhearing his account of his interview with the *lena*) to learn first, that his master and Phanostrata's husband and former rapist Demipho lives next door, and is bent on marrying his daughter to Alcesimarchus (600–601), and secondly that he is also now trying to find his other, lost daughter, (her pretended daughter Selenium) to bring her back into the family (621). At this point Melaenis announces that she will go and earn the thanks of Phanostrata and Demipho, by revealing Selenium's origin as a foundling (626–630) and, as the action unfolds, her maid Halisca will reveal in 672–694 that Melaenis has sent her to deliver the girl's birth tokens to her family to confirm the recognition.

Mothers and daughters

It is highly likely that in both Menander's Athens and Plautus' Rome there were widows and single mothers living in poverty and many of them might have to live by selling their sexual favours; if they had daughters these mothers would probably depend on their daughters to replace them as they grew older: in fact it is quite probable that many *hetaerae* / *meretrices* inherited their livelihood from mothers in the same trade. But drama does not have an equal use for all members of a household; so we find that Roman (and probably also Greek) comedy has many *meretrices*, but few of them come equipped with mothers. This in *Asinaria*, a sex-comedy with no happy recognitions or marriages, the girl loved by young Argyrippus has a money-grubbing mother Cleaereta, who displays her ruthless greed (or need for hard cash) over an extended scene, refusing to let him see her unless his is ready to pay twenty minae for a year's contract (*Asin.* 228–230). She does not reappear, except in the text of the contract drafted for the rival by his parasite, which begins: *Diabolus Glauci filius Cleaeretae / lenae dedit dono argenti uiginti minas / Philaenium ut secum esset noctes et dies / hunc annum totum* (*Asin.* 751–754). The kind of mercenary advice which Selenium receives in *Cistellaria* is usually either offered by a former *meretrix* reduced to acting as a servant, like Scapha in *Mostellaria*, or if the young *meretrix* is already hardened like Phronesium she may herself boast of her exploitation of lovers and would-be lovers. In Terence the young girls who will qualify for marriage by recognition have been separated from their parents (*Andria*, *Heautontimoroumenos*, *Eunuchus*, *Phormio*) but *Heautontimoroumenos* comes closest to our play in bringing the citizen girl on stage. This girl, Antiphila, is first described by old Menedemus as the daughter of a poor old woman from Corinth (96–97) but the next act reveals that the old woman, now deceased, was not Antiphila's mother: *quae est dicta mater esse ei antehac, non fuit. / ea obit mortem* (270–271): since the old woman's death the girl has been supporting herself in extreme but honest poverty by spinning. By Act 3 (614–615) the spectators will learn that she is in fact the exposed daughter of the bourgeois matron *Sostrata*, who was forbidden by her husband Chremes (626–627, probably before he went on a journey) to raise their expected child if it should be a girl: rather than kill the baby she gave it to an old Corinthian woman (629). When Chremes learns of this he is enraged with his soft-hearted wife and describes the probable consequences of such a subterfuge: either prostitution or

slavery: *nempe anui illi prodita abs te filiast planissime / per te uel uti quaestum faceret uel ueniret palam*. Antiphila, like Selenium, ends up by marrying the young man whom she loves and who loves her, with a dowry of two talents into the bargain (935–940). Two other Terentian heroines survive poverty intact and are recognized as daughters of a citizen father involved in the action, and so eligible for marriage to their young lovers: Glycerium in *Andria* is revealed by a kinsman in Act 5 to be Pasibula, the long-lost and legitimate daughter of Chremes, whose other daughter was now to marry young Pamphilus: Chremes cheerfully substitutes his lost daughter as bride with a dowry of ten talents (*Andr.* 949–951).

Finally the post-Menandrian *Phormio*¹¹ seems to borrow much of its pre-history from *Synaristosae*: in the absence abroad of both his father Demipho and uncle Chremes, Antipho has fallen in love with Phanium, a poor citizen girl, newly orphaned by her mother's death: the parasite Phormio helps him by lodging a false lawsuit compelling him to marry the girl as her next of kin,¹² and as the play begins they are already married (114–116; 136) and Antipho has moved his new wife into the family home.¹³ When he hears of his father's return he runs away in a panic, leaving his wife alone in the house. His terror is only ended when his uncle Chremes returns and recognizes Phanium's old nurse coming from his brother Demipho's house (736–737): Phanium is in fact his own child, born in Lemnos (where else?) fifteen years ago after he raped and married a Lemnian girl. Subsequently Chremes' Lemnian wife moved to Athens with the nurse and daughter but has recently died. The audience learns part of this story from the old nurse, and the rest when Phormio informs Chremes' wife, Nausistrata, that her husband had raped and married the Lemnian woman, who is now

11 This is the *Epidikazomenos* of Apollodorus of Carystus, named after the form of lawsuit by which Athenians could force the nearest male kinsman to marry an orphaned girl without male support.

12 On the legal basis of this *epidikasia*, see Scafuro 1997, 298 n. 45, citing Lefèvre 1978, with the reviews of Brown 1980, 194–196 and Fantham 1982, 365–370. Athenian law is explained to the Roman audience at 415–417: *ut nequid turpe cuius in se admitteret / propter egestatem, proxumo iussast dari / ut cum uno aetatem degeret*.

13 This is not immediately clear, but cf. *Phanium relictam solam* (316) [...] *ut maneat* (322), *nisi to properas mulierem abducere* (425), and the action of Act 5.1 where Phanium's old nurse Sophrona comes out of Antipho's father's house (748) and in a pardonable error, calls Antipho *harum dominus aedium* (753).

dead.¹⁴ Chremes, now terrified in turn by his wife, acknowledges Phanium (who has been and remains offstage) as his daughter, and thankfully marries her off to Antipho her cousin. This play probably shared another feature with *Synaristosae/Cistellaria*, in that Chremes and Demipho, like Phanostrata (*Cist.* 668–670), give thanks to chance for helping Antipho to bring about the marriage they both desired: this play too may have had a prologue spoken by a helpful divinity,¹⁵ such as *Tyche*.

As Süss points out,¹⁶ Wilamowitz recognized a very similar scenario to the opening lunch of *Cistellaria* in four fragments attributed to Sophron's *Gynaikeioi Mimoi* in which a woman is demanding drink and tables are supplied.¹⁷ Menander could have borrowed his opening scene from the fourth century Sophron's world, in which *hetaerae* were no doubt a dominant element of the cast. At Rome, fictional genres other than surviving comedy, such as love elegy, reflect this *demi-monde* of mothers and daughters. Tibullus' mistress, Delia, has a mother who is good to him, and even serves as a lookout, presumably protecting them from Delia's official protector: *tua mater [...] aurea cinct anus. / haec mihi te adducit e tenebris multoque timore / coniungit nostras clam taciturna manus. / haec foribusque manet noctu me adfixa proculque / cognoscit strepitus me ueniente pedum* (1.6.57–62): so he prays for her long life, urging her to teach her daughter fidelity: *sit modo casta, doce, quamuis non uita ligatos / impediatur crines, nec stola longa pedes* (1.6.67–68). Far more common are the old *lenae* who give their charges mercenary recommendations for

14 Cf. *Pho.* 1004–1006: *In Lemno [...] clam te [...] uxorem duxit [...] et inde filiam [...] suscepit iam unam*. Notice that *Cistellaria* / *Synaristosae* does not risk the complications of a “bigamous” form of marriage with a second woman while the first wife still lives. To say that Chremes in *Phormio* married his Lemnian rape victim raises a different set of problems: since there was *epigamia* between Athens and Lemnos this bigamous union may have been legally valid. By Roman law (cf. Treggiari 1992, 448 on *De oratore* 1.183) a second marriage would either be deemed to prove that the husband intended to terminate his prior marriage, (here to Nausistrata) if there was supporting evidence, or if there was insufficient evidence of the husband's intention, the law would consider the second woman as in the position of a concubine. In *Cistellaria*, where the Lemnian merchant's daughter Selenium was born outside any form of marriage, the question of *epigamia* between Lemnos and in Sicyon is irrelevant.

15 For the role of Auxilium's Greek model, Boetheia, in *Synaristosae* see Ludwig 1970, 67–71.

16 Süss 1938, 101.

17 See Kaibel 1899, *Sophron*, frs. 15–17 from Athenaeus, and 18 from a glossary.

bilking and cheating their lovers: compare Tibullus' other mistress, the courtesan Nemesis, whose sister corrupted by the *lena* of Propertius 4.5 and Ovid *Amores* 1.8 offer the same gold-digging advice to their young women as the old slave Scapha in Plautus' *Mostellaria*.

There is more comparative material in Lucian's *Hetaeron Dialogoi*. Three of the dialogues feature intimate consultations between mother and daughter, but dialogue 3 is simply a nameless mother scolding her daughter for getting drunk and provoking her lover into a quarrel at a party the previous night; the mother's only concern is not to strain his goodwill as their source of support. Dialogues 6 and 7 are far closer to the comic tradition, with 6 as the most circumstantial. The mother of this dialogue is named as Crobyle, and seems to be a citizen: in reassuring her daughter Corinna who has just slept with her first customer, she reveals their family history. The girl's father was a blacksmith, and after he died (293) the mother had to sell his tools for food; then she tried to live by spinning and weaving, but only managed to provide them both with a starvation diet. She says frankly that she placed her hopes in Corinna's reaching the age where she would keep them both, getting rich with a fine wardrobe and serving maids. Corinna asks how she can do this and is told that she should keep company with young men, drinking with them and sleeping with them for a fee, like Daphnis' daughter Lyra (294) who goes out in gold and fancy clothes with four maids. "But she's a *hetaera*!" "That's not so terrible." And so Crobyle follows up with instructions in her trade, such as being modest and sober at dinner, and keeping herself attractive and clean in bed. Her most cynical advice (295) is to prefer the less handsome and elegant lovers, like her last night's client, Eucritus, because they pay more than the handsome fellows. Here, we seem to have a citizen girl and her mother fallen from respectability. And there is some basic economic information: the two minae realized by selling the dead father's tools supported them for seven months: yet from dialogue 7 we learn that men offered *hetaerae* one or two minae just for a night. This is why the nameless mother of dialogue 7 scolds her daughter, the eighteen-year-old Mousarion, for staying faithful to the penniless young Chaereas, instead of taking better offers.

Both comedy and these dialogues imply two kinds of client for *hetaerae*. They can sleep with attractive young men, if their father will fi-

nance their services,¹⁸ but these young men have no money of their own. Or they can negotiate short or long term relationships with visitors to their city; merchants or professional soldiers. (There is also the possibility of becoming the concubine of a widower who already has an heir, like Demea in *Samia*). Chaereas is in the first category: young son of an Areopagite, and so what Romans would call a *filiusfamilias*. He has no money to give them either cash or clothes: he may promise marriage on oath, and talk about when his father will pass away, but when that happens his mother will find him a rich wife and a dowry of five talents. As it is, his jealous anger is preventing Mousarion from accepting good offers from lovers: she even gave him the ring she received from a Chian sea-captain and refused offers of two minae from an Acharian farmer and one mina from Antipho, son of Menecrates. The mother's attitude is that of the pimp Ballio to Calidorus' dilemma: if the youth had any initiative he would cheat his father or cadge from his mother to get her money. It is not clear whether the mothers of 3 and 7 go unnamed¹⁹ because they are not citizens, but they are certainly more mercenary than Crobyle in dialogue 6. Yet as in *Cistellaria*, the nameless mother of 7 does not assume marriage is legally impossible for Mousarion, only that Chaereas will not be allowed to marry beneath him. Lucian's scenarios are hardly everyday life in ancient small-town Syria: where did they originate if not from the comic tradition?

Now let us turn back to *Cistellaria*. Its opening situation is extraordinary in two different ways. Firstly, there is not the usual urgent reason for Alcesimarchus to marry Selenium; he has not raped her, and she is not pregnant. Yet he has apparently been allowed by his father to rent an apartment in which to cohabit with her. A more common attitude reflected in e.g. the comments of Gorgias in Menander's *Dyskolos*²⁰ sees the gradual seduction which is Selenium's story as more corrupting than an instant drunken rape and repentance. No other comic *adolescens* is allowed to move out of the family home. Should we hypothesize that in Menander (or lost scenes of Plautus?) this young man's father was away on business so that the youth controlled his own funds until the father returned and put a stop to it by dictating marriage? Hardly; for

18 Note that dialogue 7 (296; 297) specifies it as a disadvantage that the young man has a living father.

19 As with *Iena* in *Cistellaria* (see Süß 1938, 100) the absence of a name in dialogues 3 and 7 seems to indicate the worthlessness of the character.

20 *Dysk.* 2243–2245; 289–293.

when this father appears he is not stern but quite susceptible, (305–321) although he changes his tune in addressing Gymnasium, whom he mistakes for his son's girl-friend. Is he an old lecher, comparable to Lysidamas (*Casina*), Demaenetus (*Asinaria*) or Lysimachus in *Mercator*? Even indulgent uncle Micio in *Adelphoe* does not propose to give Aeschinus his own pad. We can only surmise that the separate establishment (next to Alcesimarchus' future in-laws, at that) was needed for Menander's plot: if the lovers had only recently moved next door to Demipho's household, they would not yet know that Demipho was planning the marriage of his other daughter to Alcesimarchus. And this is supported by the curious fragment of Caecilius' *Synaristosae* (197–198 Ribbeck) which mentions spying from the rooftop wedding preparations that were underway—down to the bride's veil—next door.²¹

But Selenium's situation is also abnormal. We can disregard the *lena*'s description of herself and Melaenis as *libertinae* (38): this Roman status of low-class citizenship had no Greek equivalent. We had better forget that Melaenis was a *meretrix* who wanted the baby in order to cheat a client. Since then she has somehow found the money to support them and bring the girl up decently. It seems that Selenium, who is of course actually citizen-born, believes even when the play opens that she is Melaenis' child by a casual lover, and yet, like Melaenis, assumes she can be lawfully married to Alcesimarchus.²² I can see two possible explanations. Either citizenship and the right of marriage to a citizen in Sicyon did not depend on *both* parents being citizens, as it did in Athens after 451 BCE: thus Selenium could either claim citizenship by virtue of her mother's status or be confident that any children she had by Alcesimarchus would be citizens. Yet it is far more likely that the choice of Sicyon as locale was motivated by Menander's commission for performance at the Sicyonian Dionysia, than by calculating the implications of local citizenship.²³ The alternative is to assume that Selenium knew she had a citizen father.

21 Cf. Süss 1935, 186–187.

22 Cf. Süss 1935, 178 on the “eigentümlichen sozialen Problematik der Synaristosae.” Yet it may be inappropriate to follow him in the counter-factual judgement: “Es ist kein Zweifel, dass sie ihn auch ohne anagnorisis gehalten hätte.” He reinforces this in Süss 1938, 135–136 listing all the foreshadowings of the youth's honourable intentions, his oath *conceptis uerbis*, his gifts comparable to trousseau, the keys and care of the household supplies, and of course the rented apartment.

23 Cf. Ludwig 1970, 47–49.

In my earlier paper “Sex, status and survival,”²⁴ I argued that there was a clear-cut division at Athens between citizen girls available for marriage and non-citizens, who did not have any option of marriage—unless indeed they had citizenship in another polis, and returned there. I was too categorical. There must always have been women citizens on the economic margins, fatherless or widowed, with or without children. We have seen that Lucian’s Crobyle seems to have been a married citizen before widowhood and poverty drove her to suggest her daughter become a *hetaera*. But then it is not Crobyle’s Corinna, but Mousarion, daughter of an anonymous mother, who makes no claims to citizenship, yet thinks she has a hope of marriage. Would this be achieved by deceit or default? The whole elaborate tissue of Pseudo-Demosthenes’ charges against Neaera and Stephanos may suggest that there was a “gray area” between children attested by their citizen fathers as born within a citizen marriage, and other born of irregular unions. Probably we are asking the wrong questions. This is a comedy, not a paternity case in court. Far more important for the fictional world of the *Synaristosae* is the knowledge given to the spectators in the two prologues that Plangon was born to the right kind of parents. After all, the plot also assumes that the raped Phanostrata stayed respectable and marriageable during the years when her rapist was married to another woman, until that woman’s death.

Sisterly solidarity among the underclass and the elite

I want to turn now to a different theme: the women’s world of this opening scene is a rarity in comedy, and it has been suggested that Plautus adapted the scene in this early play as he did the scene of the virtuous married sisters in Menander’s *Adelphoe A*, the original of *Stichus*, but dropped this kind of material after 200 BCE because he came to realize that this sort of thing did not interest his audience. In Terence the nearest equivalents are the discussions between the maids of Thais’ household in *Eunuchus*, and the expository dialogue between the *hetaera* Bacchis and his new wife. Whatever the civil status of these women, they had normally been brought to this unwelcome form of independence through the loss of male kinsmen. There must have been many more poor widows and single mothers near the poverty level than

24 Fantham 1975, 44–74; on *Cistellaria* and *Phormio* see 58–61.

with any likelihood of contact, let alone intermarriage, with comfortable bourgeois families.

When the *lena* of *Cistellaria* recommends mutual support for women of *hic ordo* (23, cf. *nostro ordini* 33) she is making an important claim: it introduces one of those prejudiced social utterances which Menander and Terence inserted early in a drama so as to first mislead and then enlighten the audience.* In *Eunuchus*, for example, Phaedria and Parmeno assume that Thais has dishonest and mercenary motives, and Parmeno conjures up a negative portrayal of life in the house of a *meretrix*; in the post-Menandrian *Hecyra* all the men in turn assume that Sostrata the mother-in-law is to blame for the bride's premature departure from her husband's home. So too in *Cistellaria* the *lena*'s assumptions about the arrogance of bourgeois wives (25–37) are reversed by the actual behaviour of Phanostrata. Despite the damage to the central acts of this play we learn from her slave Lampadio that he has had to supplicate and even bribe the *lena* for information (536–542), that he begged her daughter (Gymnasium, but he mistook her for Selenium) to return to her natal family (558–569) and that the *lena* only told him about giving the baby to her friend in order to retain control of her own daughter. We do not know what Melaenis said at 588–589,²⁵ but as she overhears this dialogue she is prompted to accost Lampadio and realizes she must do the right thing, although it will deprive her of her “daughter.” Far from having to supplicate the bourgeois *matrona*, she now expects to be rewarded (626–628): *nunc mihi bonae necessust esse ingratiis, / [...]: nunc egomet potius hanc inibo gratiam / ab illis quam illaec me indicet*. Within the play, then, the *lena*'s prejudices are disproved. But her demand for solidarity among the women of her marginalized world must have a wider resonance for Plautus' audience. Compare Süss' perceptive comment:²⁶ “Zusammenhalten wird ja auch von der *lena* als eine Notwendigkeit gepredigt für die kleinen Leute, so wie auch die vornehmen, hochmögenden Matronen, denen man nicht trauen darf, ihre Freundschaft pflegen.”

Indeed there is only one other passage where Plautus uses *ordo* in the sense of rank or class. In *Aulularia* when the wealthy Megadorus propos-

* See W. J. Tatum 1999 for a good discussion of the application of *ordo*.

25 Lindsay's text reads *me indicabit, et suas / ad meas miseras alias faciam consciam*. Clearly something is needed like Schoell's supplement *alias <adiunget mala / Seleniumque fraudis> faciet consciam*.

26 Süss 1935, 179.

es to marry the miser Euclio's daughter, Euclio pretends great poverty and worries that the disparity of their station will make him a laughing stock; *et te utar iniquiore et meus me ordo inrideat* (Aul. 232).²⁷ The word is associated with different language from that of *Cistellaria* 22–37, since Euclio calls Megadorus *factiosum* (226)²⁸ whereas the *lena* speaks of *summo genere gnatas, summates matronas* (25). It is also worth noting that the *lena* uses some of the Roman language of *clientela*: Selenium had thanked the women *quia me colitis et magni facitis*: the *lena* in turn not only talks of being *beneuolentes inter se* but of *amicitia utier*, and *amicitiam colunt* (24; 26). As for the *matronae*, they apparently want these humble women to be deprived of their own resources and in need of the matrons' wealth and power (*suarum opum nos uolunt esse indigentes* (29, repeated with variations at 32) *ut sibi simus supplices*. What Plautus seems to have in mind is a regular dependence of humbler women who need to appeal to wealthy matrons, person to person, in contexts where the *matronae* are openly courteous (*nostro ordini / palam blandiuntur*), but disparage and discourage them in private. But the imagined accusations of 36–37 show that the *lena* is speaking not so much of humble women as of her own particular profession. It is difficult to imagine a context for such encounters between *matres familiae* and *meretrices* (or *lenae*) in Rome or in Athens, where individual wives would usually shun courtesans and women in irregular unions, but freedwomen by Roman law and custom remained dependent on their patrons, and may have needed to resort to their wives or widows.

I have no better explanation to offer. Instead I want to turn to some evidence for the organisation of more privileged women, the elite *matronae*, in Plautus' time. Although the earliest reference to an *ordo matronarum* by that name comes from the triumviral period,²⁹ there is plen-

27 Oddly, in Livy's highly fictionalized narrative of the female protests on behalf of the repeal of the *Lex Oppia* in 195, an episode we should not treat as historical evidence, the women's spokesman, the tribune Valerius contrasts wives (*coniuges*) with *omnes alii alii ordines* (Livy 34.7.1) husbands or men, magistrates, priest, boy children, officials in colonies and *municipia* and even *magistri uicorum*, who wear the *praetexta*. This allows no inference about the formal recognition of an *ordo* of wives or women.

28 Süss compares Melaenis' retort to Alcesimarchus at *Cist.* 492–494: *eo facetu's quia tibi alias sponsa locuples Lemnia, / habeas. Neque nos factione tanta quanta tu sumus / neque opes nostrae tam sunt ualidae quam tuae*.

29 The occasion is the protest (against punitive taxation of the women of the proscribed) organised by Hortensia in 44/43 BCE, discussed by Bauman 1992, 82–83.

ty of evidence for women's collective action, and action that required a nucleus of privileged women, from the beginning of the Republic. The context is almost always religious. The *matronae* are reported to have mourned for a year for Lucius Brutus and Valerius Publicola (Livy 2.7.4; 2.16.7) and to have intervened effectively with Coriolanus, thanks to the scolding administered by his mother Veturia, (2.40.1–2) although Livy raises the possibility that their intercession was not official (*publicum consilium*) but spontaneous. Their success gave the women new dignity and the right to dedicate a statue and later temple of Fortuna Muliebris. When the citizens were reluctant to finance Camillus' vow after the fall of Veii the women held meetings (*coetibus ad eam rem consultandam habitis*) and offered gold from their own jewellery to the military tribunes *communi decreto* (5.31.3 recalled 5.52.11). But there are far more entries of this kind nearer to Plautus' own time. First a highly organised religious act reported and surely extracted from Livy by Valerius Maximus (8.15.12): *Sulpicia Paterculi filia, Q. Fulvi Flacci uxor, [...] censuisset ut Veneris Verticordiae simulacrum consecraretur, quo facilius virginum mulierumque mens a libidine ad pudicitiam conuerteretur, et ex omnibus matronis centum, ex centum autem decem sorte ductae, de sanctissima femina iudicium facerent, cunctis castitate praelata est*. This probably occurred during one of Fulvius Flaccus' four consulships, and most likely during the years for which Livy's record is lost, either 237 or 224 BCE. To choose a hundred *matronae* by lot implies a register of those eligible to be considered, certainly an elite sub-group of the respectable married women otherwise qualified as *matronae*, or even of senators' wives. I have found five or six similar occasions in Livy's extant decade covering the Hannibalic war: in 217 the *matronae* dedicated a bronze statue to Juno on the Aventine (21.62.8); the following year by decree of the *decemviri* not only were they to raise funds from each woman, *quantum conferre cuiquam commodum esset* and carry offering to Juno (22.1.18), but even the freed-women were to contribute whatever they could afford for offerings to their patron goddess Feronia: *ut libertinae ipsae unde Feroniae donum daretur pecuniam pro facultatibus suis conferrent* (22.1.18). Here at least is some hint of a collective for lower-status women, *libertinae*, as the *lena* described herself and Melaenis.

At 25.12.15 Livy includes a supplication of the *matronae*, which might not require separate organisation, and there are more specific examples of procedure for women's collective ritual in 207: at 27.37.8–10 the *matronae* respond to a prodigy damaging the temple of Juno Regina by electing a committee of 25 to receive contributions from their dow-

ries; and again perform supplications: there should perhaps be a distinction between the disorganised supplications of 27.50.5 and the victory celebrations after the battle of Metaurus when *matronae amplissima ueste cum liberis [...] omni solutae metu deis immortalibus grates agerent* (27.51.9). Finally, and surely closest in time to *Cistellaria*, the *matronae primores civitatis* went to Ostia to receive the image of Cybele, and bore it *per manus succedentes deinde aliae aliis* all the way to Rome to lodge it in the temple of Victory (29.14.12–14). Could this be managed without both organisation and transport to take the ladies to Ostia, and distribute them along the way?

Once organised, perhaps the women remained more aware of their potential collective social power. In the worst crisis of the Hannibalic war there was no social protest over the Oppian sumptuary law limiting expenditure on women's clothers and vehicles. Yet during this period of intensive warfare it is reasonable to assume that women were given, or took for themselves more prominence, both from a lack of men in the city and as distraction from their anxieties over their husbands and sons. But when wealth returned with the economic growth of the post-war period it brought with it the demand for luxury and display. So when the tribunes Valerius and Fundanius backed the proposal to repeal the law in 195 Livy gives as Valerius' argument for the repeal of the law a list of the civic-minded interventions of Roman women (34.5.8–11) very similar to the separate reports we have mentioned; from the negotiation of peace by the Sabine women under Romulus, to the Coriolanus episode, to the gold freely offered to ransom Rome from the Gauls, to their contributions during the Hannibalic war and the women's participation in the welcome to the Great Mother in 204.

At the same time his portrayal of Roman women still suffering austerity legislation and envious of the display of women from Latin and Italian communities, evokes an economic polarization of wealth: Livy's fictionalized Cato may be evoking a real social situation when he envisages the wealthy woman protesting in almost Plautine ethopoiea: "*hanc*" inquit, "*ipsam aequationem non fero*" illa locuples. "*cur non insignis auro et purpura conspicio?*" Just as readers of Plautus have recognized this kind of reaction to the demands of elite women in the tirades against female luxury in *Aulularia* (162–169,³⁰ 478–535) and *Epidicus*

30 The wealthy Megadorus speaks the same language that Süß commented on before (167–168): *istas magnas factiones, animos dotes dapsiles / clamores, imperia, eburata uehicles, pallas, purpuram / nil moror*.

(227–235), so I suggest Plautus is making the *lena* a vehicle of protest by humbler but respectable people against the collective power and arrogance of the wealthiest, *summo genere gnatas summates matronas*. The most successful *hetaerae* in fourth and third century Athens were indeed wealthy and famous, but many no doubt lived in no more ease and comfort than other single mothers or widows. Indeed even *libertinae* who kept their earnings may well have continued practice of living by sex imposed on them when they were slaves financially exploited by their owners. Livy is borrowing again from the romanticization of comedy in his version of the uncovering of the Bacchanal conspiracy in 186 BCE. When he depicts the young knight Aebutius as supported by the generosity of his mistress Hispala Fecennia,³¹ this presumes a level of professionalization among Rome's *meretrices* quite at variance with their real economic circumstances. *Libertinae* who lived by their charms or by running small snack bars and craft shops may have had some income to offer to Feronia, and may have been united by their shared cult of friendly divinities, but they will have had much to envy wealthy elite wives, and many occasions to need and perhaps seek their help. Even in the wealthier circumstances of the Augustan age, Ovid's *Fasti* only speaks of *meretrices* making an annual offering of incense, myrtle, mint and garlands to Venus Erycina (*Fasti* 4.865–870). There may be no social reality behind the formalization of association in *noster ordo* (23, 33) but there is surely some economic reality behind the old woman's indignation in *Cist.* 22–37 against the contrast in status, comfort and security, of wealthy Roman wives.

31 Cf. Livy 39.9.5 and 6: *scortum nobile libertine Hispala Fecennia, non digna quaestu cui ancilla adsuerat, etiam postquam manumissa erat eodem se genere tuebatur, [...] <Aebutius> maligne omnia praebentibus suis meretriculae munificentia sustinebatur*. Livy implies then, that Hispala was obliged to practice this livelihood under the orders of her owner, who remained her patron until his death (9.7).

Bibliography

- Bauman, R. A., *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome*, London, New York 1992.
- Brown, P.G. McC., Rev. Lefèvre 1978, *CR* 30 (1980) 194–196.
- Fantham, E., Rev. Lefèvre 1978, *CPh* 77 (1982) 365–370.
- Fantham, E., “DOMINA-tricks,” in: Stärk, E. / Vogt-Spira, G. (ed.), *Dramatische Wäldchen. Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre zum 65. Geburtstag*, Hildesheim 2000, 287–299 (= n. 7a in this volume).
- Fantham, E., “Maidens in Otherland,” in: Baier, Th. (ed.), *Studien zu Plautus’ Poenulus* (ScriptOralia) Tübingen 2003 (= n.7c in this volume).
- Fantham, E., “Sex, Status , and Survival in Hellenistic Athens: a study of women in New Comedy,” *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 44–74 (= n. 5 in this volume).
- Fraenkel, E., “Das Original der Cistellaria des Plautus,” *Philologus* 87 (1932) 117–120 (=Kleine Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie II, Rome 1964, 33–36).
- Kahil, L., *Remarques sur l’iconographie des pieces de Ménandre, Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt XVI, Ménandre*, ed. O. Reverdin, Geneva 1970, 231–254.
- Kaibel, G., *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Berolini 1899.
- Konstan, D., *Roman Comedy*, Ithaca 1983.
- Lefèvre, E., *Der Phormio des Terenz* (Zetemata 74) München 1978.
- Ludwig, W., *Die Cistellaria und das Verhältnis von Gott und Handlung bei Menander, Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt XVI, Ménandre*, ed. O. Reverdin, Geneva 1970, 43–110.
- Prehn, B., *Quaestiones Plautinae*, Diss. Breslau 1916.
- Scafuro, A., *The forensic Stage: settling accounts in Graeco-Roman New Comedy*, Cambridge 1997.
- Süss, W., “Zur Cistellaria des Plautus,” *Rh. Mus.* 84 (1935) 161–187.
- Süss, W., “Nochmals zur Cistellaria des Plautus,” *Rh. Mus.* 87 (1938) 97–141.
- Tatum, W. J., *The Patrician Tribune*, Chapel Hill, NC 1999.
- Treggiari, S., *Roman Marriage: iusti coniuges from the time of Cicero to the time of Ulpian*, Oxford 1992.
- Webster, T. B. L., *An Introduction to Menander*, Manchester, New York 1974.
- Webster T. B. L., *Greek Theatre Production*, London 1970.
- Williams, G., “Some aspects of Roman marriage ceremonies and ideals,” *JRS* 48 (1958) 16–29.

7c. Maidens in Other-Land, or Broads Abroad: Plautus' *Poenulus*

At the beginning of the last century the most careful scholarly treatments of Plautus' *Poenulus* were preoccupied with the implications of its double plot, which combine the young lover's fraudulent deception of the pimp controlling access to his mistress with a recognition of the girl by her father which seemed to render the first plot unnecessary. Knowledge that Plautus practiced *contaminatio* successively led Leo, Jachmann and Fraenkel to analyse the Plautine play for elements of inconsistency in the action and in characterization, especially of the Carthaginian girls in their prolonged entry scene:¹ indeed while Fraenkel recognized that most inconsistencies in the text originated with Plautus' active composition of jokes and tricks to enlarge the role of his intriguing slave, he continued to argue that 1.2, the scene of the girls' entrance, contained material "contaminated" from another play. Then Plautine scholarship began to shift its ground: Friedrich's approach, coloured by his concern to identify the authorial personality of Diphilus and distinguish his authorial personality from that of Menander, was perhaps a side-track, but contributed some clear definitions of the play's eccentricities.² More recently English-speaking scholars have approached the play with different assumptions: Adrian Gratwick's influential account in the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*³ advanced two arguments, one about the intrigue(s), the other about Plautine independence in crafting individual scenes: first, that the extraordinary location and circumstances of the play overrode the usual assumptions about the availability of legal action to establish free birth, and secondly that Plautus could and did expand scenes at will, without needing to borrow scenes from other plays.⁴ Earlier scholars' justified suspicion of the ex-

1 Leo 1912, 170–78; Jachmann 1911, 249–78; Fraenkel 1960, 253–267; 162–165 on *Poenulus* 1.2.

2 Friedrich 1953, 233–254 = 1973, 146–172.

3 1982, 98–103; 110.

4 Note however, that Gratwick himself (99–100) attributes the dramatic irony by which Milphio attempts to persuade the girls' actual father, Hanno, to pretend

tended scene 1.2 has now been followed up by Lowe's excellent specific analysis. It is not my intention to argue against his interpretation of the scene and reconstruction of Plautus' composition: rather I welcome and start from his discussion, using also his analysis of the similar scene 1.3 of *Mostellaria*.⁵

I will begin by abstracting the elements of the recognition plot from the *Poenulus* prologue: though this prologue speech may well contain actors' expansions, the neat structure of the *argumentum*, and its resemblance to the prologue of *Menaechmi*, demonstrates that it is Plautine (and may be little modified from his original).⁶

59–61: There were two Carthaginian brothers, of whom one is now dead, the other still alive.

64–78: The dead brother's son was stolen when seven years old, and his father pined away dying of grief six years later. The kidnapper sold the boy in Calydon to a bachelor who wanted an heir and adopted him.

In fact he unwittingly adopted the son of his guest-friend.

(At 1051 in the recognition scene this guest friend is named by Hanno as Antidamas, who is himself the adopted son of Demarchus: Agorastocles identifies his natural mother and father as Ampsigyra and Iahom, who are then identified by his uncle as his own *sobrīna* (first cousin) and *frater patruelis* (brother by the same father). This young man lives in one of the stage houses (*in illisce aedibus* 78).)

(As in *Menaechmi* 44–56, the Prologue speaker talks as though he is himself making the return journey (79: *reuortor rursus denuo ad Carthaginem* = *Men.* 56: *illuc redeo unde abii*) to the place of origin of the stolen child, before following up the actions of the remaining family members.)

83–95: The old man who is still alive, uncle of the young adopted heir (*illi patruo huius, qui uiuit senex*), had two daughters, who were lost at the ages of 5 and 4, along with their nurse, in the suburb of Magaria.

that these are his daughters, to Plautine imitation of the same device in Menander's *Sikyonios*.

5 Lowe 1998, 101–110; his contribution 1995, 29–30 builds on an influential analysis of the toilet scene in *Mostellaria* by Williams 1958, 22–27. For a statement of current assumptions about Plautus' practice of independent composition, see Lowe's review 1992, 241–242 of O. Zwierlein, *Studien zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus, I. Poenulus und Curculio*, Stuttgart 1990, who has recently revived the nineteenth century arguments for actors' interpolation of the Plautine text.

6 The text cited will be the Oxford Classical Text of W. M. Lindsay 1904. I have also consulted the edition and commentary of Maurach 1975. I do not have access to the 1984 edition.

Their kidnapper took them to Anactorium and sold them to a pimp, Lycus, who has just moved to Calydon for business; and he lives in the other stage house (*in illisce aedibus*).

(The first character in the play to mention this is the pimp's slave Syncerastus, who reveals (894–900) the pimp's secret that the girls are free-born Carthaginian maidens, bought by the pimp from a Sicilian pirate along with their old nurse Giddenis. Milphio replies that his master too was born there and kidnapped at the age of six, then adopted and left wealthy when his adopted father died.)

96–103: The young man has fallen in love with the older sister, unaware she is his cousin, but has not been able to touch her because the pimp is tormenting him (*macerat*) in order to sting him for a huge sum (101: *tangere hominem uolt bolo*). As for the younger sister, a soldier wants to buy her as a concubine.

104–115: The girls' father is searching for them, hiring girls in every port to ask them whether they were kidnapped and from what land or family they come: he has just arrived in town last night.

Thus the setting of this play is Calydon, an Aetolian town on the north shores of the Corinthian gulf, a place almost as unfamiliar to the Athenian audience of New Comedy as to Plautus' Romans, although some of them might have visited it in or after 189 BCE, on military service in Fulvius Nobilior's campaign against Aetolia. Friedrich⁷ has pointed to the accumulation of coincidences necessary to bring first Agorastocles, then the kidnapped girls, and finally his father and their uncle to this out of the way town, and the further coincidence that turns Agorastocles into the heir of his father's guest friend without knowing the connection. Hanno's arrival, like that of Menaechmus I in the even more remote town of Epidamnus, cannot be called a coincidence, since in both plays the surviving family member has travelled around the Ionian and Adriatic in search of his lost kinsman. But in contrast with these coincidences of place, Hanno's arrival on the eve of the Aphrodisia, when the girls will irrevocably begin their trade, is certainly a crucial coincidence of timing.

Why Calydon? This is not the only Plautine drama to be set in Aetolia, since *Captivi*, without a named town setting, is based on Hegio's purchase of Elian captives, during the war between Aetolia and Elis. Gratwick has stressed that the absence of international law to protect Carthaginian citizens in this community justifies the fraudulent intrigue with Collybiscus as a form of necessary *Selbsthilfe*. So it might be helpful

7 Friedrich 1973, 170.

to see Aetolia as a kind of lawless Wild West, whether we consider it from the viewpoint of an Athenian audience or the Italian perspective of Plautus. What is more, none of the *Dramatis Personae* is a natural Aetolian citizen. In order of appearance:

Agorastocles was born Carthaginian, was enslaved and is now a citizen by an adoption of a non-citizen child that would not have been legal in Rome or Athens.

Milphio (and Syncerastus too) is a slave.

Adelphasium and Anterastilis are now slaves, but born Carthaginian.

Lycus has come from Anactorium, but may have been a foreigner there also.

The soldier Antamoenides is a foreigner of unknown origin.

The witnesses (*aduocati*) claim (519–520) to have bought their freedom, like Roman *liberti*, but this would not automatically make them citizens in a Greek community.

Hanno is Carthaginian.

Thus for both Plautus' Roman audience and the Attic audience of Alexis, whose *Karchedonios* is now accepted as the original of Plautus' comedy,⁸ the place and personnel of this comedy are entirely foreign, and no one is dealing with a fellow-citizen until the fifth act recognition scene between Carthaginians. Foreigners, and persons foreign to each other at that, may be seen as licensed to behave quite differently from fellow-citizens. Indeed, in contrast with many Plautine comedies, which treat Romans as *barbari* and talking Latin as *barbare*,⁹ in this play, both in the prologue and the main text, Plautus uses the form *Latine* (54; 1029).¹⁰ The prologue of *Poenulus* actually alerts the audience to expect tricky behaviour from Hanno; 112–113 *dissimilat sciens / se scire: Poenus plane est*. Should we be prepared for the freeborn inhabitants of this place to be as irresponsible and unscrupulous as their comic slaves?

8 See Arnott 1996, 284–287 on the *Karchedonios*, and Arnott 1998 on Menander's play of the same name.

9 Cf. *Asinaria* 10–11; *Trinummus* 18–19 *Graece / barbare*.

10 For *Latine*, cf. *Casina* 32; 34; *Mercator* 9–10 and *Miles Gloriosus* Prol. 87 *id nos Latine "gloriosum" dicimus*.

Mighty Aphrodite

Almost as soon as the play opens, Agorastocles announces two things; that he loves the pimp's older callgirl (155 *meretricem maiusculam*) but her master is a terrible fellow—which the audience will understand from the prologue (98 f.) to mean that Agorastocles has not been allowed to touch her. This leads to the first outline of Milphio's scheme against the pimp (159–190) until Agorastocles announces (190–191) that he wants to go to the temple of Venus, because “today is the Aphrodisia.” Thus this scene already has introduced two pieces of mystification which seem to be related: 1) How is the pimp frustrating this rich young lover and why? And 2) what is the significance of the Aphrodisia to the drama?

This festival dominates the action: If Agorastocles never quite manages to leave the stage for the temple, almost everyone else does. Next to appear are the girls, freshly washed and adorned and on the verge of leaving; everything has been prepared to propitiate the gods:

Sed hoc nunc
responde mihi;
sunt hic omnia
quae ad deum pacem oportet adesse? ANTER: omnia accuravi
AG. Diem pulchrum et celebrem et uenustatis plenum,
Dignum Veneri, pol, quoi sunt Aphrodisia hodie (251–256).

But Anterastilis' eagerness to go (263) is frustrated first by Adelphasium's deliberate delay, then (329–330) by Agorastocles, who asks where they are going and why. Adelphasium claims she is going to propitiate Venus, to which her admirer retorts that Venus is already well-disposed to her (since he loves her?). Only then does Adelphasium explain that there will be a market of callgirls, and she wishes to show herself off: Again her admirer's reply is mystifying; instead of declaring outright that he is ready to buy her himself, he answers that only unsalable goods need a market, whereas she is a fine piece of goods (342 *proba merx*), and asks her without making any financial inducement when they can get together.¹¹ She rejects him, but seems more receptive to his oblique offer: “I have more tan I can count of gold coins frenzied for action,” “then pass them on to me and I'll see to it that their frenzy ceases.” (345–346 *sunt mihi intus nescio quot nummi aurei lymphatici. / deferto ad*

11 Line 343 seems corrupt. A reads *quando illi apud me mecum palpas et lallas: P mecum caput et corpus copulas.*

me, faxo actutum constiterit lymphaticum). But when Milphio intrudes, the subject is dropped. Any sense of Adelphasium's attitude to Agorastocles and its motivation is now diverted as Milphio takes over the scene in a sequence of horseplay interpolating himself between lover and beloved, as he pretends to be his master supplicating her.¹² All that is achieved by the time she escapes is a promise that she will kiss him when she returns from the sacrifice.

Their master Lycus is already at the temple, as Anterastilis mentions in 264, and he will return at 449, after Milphio has instructed Agorastocles how to implement the trick against him (410–448). Lycus' failure to propitiate Venus even after sacrificing six lambs, has led him to leave the ill-omened *exta*, in anger with goddess. He foolishly believes he has been rewarded for disappointing her with a mina from his soldier client (449–470). The pimp goes into his house, but is still talking of his bad omens when he re-emerges, and Agorastocles approaches him with a request to entertain Adelphasium *die festo celebri nobilique Aphrodisiis* (757–759). Lycus refuses outright, prompting Agorastocles to denounce him with the fraudulent accusation which completes Milphio's trick of the supposed theft of the bailiff. This accusation vindicates the priestly warnings of evil omen from the sacrifice and drives the pimp from the stage and the action.

Venus' temple and the Aphrodisia return with the entry (in fact the only appearance) of Lycus' slave, Syncerastus, bringing back the *exta* and the ritual containers (*uasa*). Dramatically his function is to tell Milphio that the girls are stolen property and freeborn Carthaginians (894–900) and Milphio leaves the stage in order to give this news to Agorastocles. But the Peripeteia of Hanno's arrival and recognition of his nephew will be completed before the girls return from the temple (Act 5 scene 4) triumphant from their successful sacrifice and full of the splendour of the occasion (1174–1195). Their ensuing meeting with Hanno and Agorastocles up to Hanno's revelation in 1251–1257 forms a counterpart to the extended scene (1.2) which we have still to analyse.

12 There is a close parallel to the business of this scene in *Asinaria* 3.3. There after some seventy lines the two slaves take turns to humiliate lover and beloved demanding to be supplicated with fantastic endearments (661–663 answered 664–665; 691–692; 693–695) offering unwanted embraces and forcing the lover to serve as piggyback (701–710).

I have gone through the action in order to highlight the apparently unexplained connection between the festival and Agorastocles' frustration; but I have left out what I would suggest is the key to the mystery. When Hanno calls on the pimp's house and is answered by his former servant, the old nurse Giddenis (1120), she tells him what the audience already knows: that his daughters are at the temple and are asking Venus to be well-disposed to them: *Aphrodisia hodie Veneris est festus dies: / oratum ierunt deam ut sibi esset propitia* (1133–1134).

How would Venus show her favour to these freeborn girls? Giddenis explains: their father's loyal devotion has brought him here in the nick of time: *in ipso tempore: namque hodie earum mutarentur nomina / facerentque indignum genere quaestum corpora* (1138–1140). This was probably no surprise to Plautus' audience: they may even have assumed from the first naming of the festival, that neither sister would be exposed to any man until the completion of the ritual offering to Venus: this would be the beginning of their career, and an irreversible change in their status. The chief problem arises in interpreting what the girls themselves were expecting and/or wanting, and to this we will return. But first we should look at Venus Calydonia and her festival (1180–1181).

When Leo proposed his theory of Plautine contamination of the recognition comedy *Karchedonios* with a second play based on intrigue, he was prepared to see the festival of Aphrodite as part of the action in both plays. As he showed, this festival and others like it featured in many comedies: Menander himself wrote an *Aphrodisia*, whose surviving fragments reflect a foolish lover: according to Athenaeus the *Kolax* contains a scene in which a cook prepares for the monthly feast of Aphrodite Pandemos (Gomme/Sandbach fr. 1; Arnott 1998, *Kolax* fr.1, pp.184–185), though it is clear that this was a male celebration and not a festival of *hetaerae*. But *hetaerae* certainly celebrated a variety of festivals in many cities, as Athenaeus demonstrates (XIII.572–580) from Magnesia and Samos to the best attested example, at Corinth (573 c–d): Athenaeus actually quotes a fragment from the *Philousa*, or “Loving girl” of Alexis—the author of Plautus' model *Karchedonios* – which claims:

The city celebrated a festival of Aphrodite for the prostitutes, but it is different from the one for freeborn women. On these days it is the custom for the prostitutes to revel and it is their practice here to get drunk in company” (XIII.574 c, Alexis Kock 2.389).

Although the actual carousing was normally kept offstage, these festivals were still regular ingredients in comic action,¹³ and not simply as occasions for young strangers to rape innocent maidens. Leo cites a number of dramatic titles which name comedies after the women celebrants: *Dionysiazusae*, *Adoniazusae*, and other women's activities also gave titles to comedies such as the *Synaristosae*, model of Plautus' *Cistellaria*.¹⁴ We note that Plautus neither could provide an equivalent to this last title nor did he try. Whether the festival of Calydonian Aphrodite was an anthropologically observed fact, or a generic fiction, if it was a festival of *hetaerae*, they would pray to the goddess for profit in their trade, and conversely, if girls sacrificed at the festival, it would be to mark their maturity and readiness for business. For *hetaerae* the goddess would show her favour by bringing them rich lovers, or lovers willing to pay for their freedom and become their patrons. We do not know exactly what form the cult of Venus took in Rome of Plautus' day, but we do know that the original Veneralia of April 1st had already been supplemented in 212 BCE by the feast of Venus Erycina at the Colline Gate held on April 23. Our source for women's actual rituals is Ovid, supported by the inscribed Augustan *Fasti* of Praeneste. These show that April 1st actually witnessed ceremonies for wellborn mothers and brides (*matresque nurusque*, *Fasti* 4.133) and another ritual to Fortuna Virilis for humbler women: the latter asked the goddess to conceal their physical flaws from men, whereas the respectable ladies prayed to Venus Verticordia for lasting *forma et mores et bona fama*.¹⁵ Closer to the Aphrodisia, however, was the feast of Erycina, at which call girls (*uolgaes [...] puellae* 4.865) offered incense and wreaths of flowers in return for *formam populique fauorem [...] blanditias dignaque uerba ioco* (4.867–868). This contrast of ambitions nicely evokes the different models of behaviour for freeborn citizen daughters, designed for marriage, and non-citizens, whose best hope it was, if they were slaves, to earn freedom by their beauty and *blanditiae*, and if they were free foreigners or freedwomen, to gain either an independent income or support as a concubine.

13 Note that the rape which generates the plot of Menander's *Samia* occurs when the women are celebrating the feast of Adonis; that of *Epitrepontes* at the Tauropolia.

14 After all, two of Aristophanes' comedies are called after the activities of groups of women; the festival *Thesmophoriazusae* and the political absurdity of the *Ekleisiazusae*.

15 See this author's commentary (1998) and headnote on Ov. *Fasti* 4.133–166.

Meretrices seruolae / filiae ingenuae

Respectable unmarried girls are a necessary ingredient in the action of a number of Greek and Roman comedies, but like inoffensive wives, they are often kept offstage. In Plautus, for example the daughter in *Aulularia* remains offstage, as does the title-role of *Casina*, the virgin sister in *Trinummus*, and the raped girl of *Truculentus*, while Terence keeps the decent girls of *Andria*, *Eunuchus*, *Phormio* and *Adelphoe* offstage, as well as the pregnant wife of *Hecyra*. Less respectable girls—the *meretrices* who are the objects of love of e.g. *Pseudolus*—may also stay out of the action. But girls exposed to the life of a *meretrix*, whether they were merely emancipated, like Philocomasium in *Miles Gloriosus*, or Philematium in *Mostellaria*, or were subsequently revealed as citizen-born and married off, like Selenium in *Cistellaria* and Ampelisca in *Rudens*, were more articulate: the chief divergence between them is the extent to which their outlook has been coloured by their upbringing.¹⁶ In the Menandrian *Cistellaria*, the girl Selenium resists the materialistic advice of her “mother” out of love for her young man, and is rewarded for keeping to him alone by being identified as a citizen and neighbour’s daughter, and so destined for marriage. So too Ampelisca, rendered pathetically interesting by her shipwrecked condition, is faithful to Plesidippus, and betrothed to him as soon as she is identified as Daemones’ daughter. In Terence’s *Heautontimoroumenos* Antiphila—the only decent girl allowed a voice—is recognized as Chremes’ legitimate child and betrothed to her only love, Clinias.

There are exceptions to this binary pattern, and Philematium of *Mostellaria* provides one that is almost antithetical to the two Carthaginian girls. Her toilet scene *Most.* 1.3 (157–307) has much in common with that of Adelphasium and Anterastilis in *Poenulus*, but significant differences. For while the freedwoman of *Mostellaria* is grateful and loyal to her lover, the citizen daughters of *Poenulus* are far more meretricious. Philematium is accused by the superannuated *hetaerae* who is now her maid of acting like a matron (190): *matronae, non meretricium est unum inseruire amantem*.¹⁷ Although she is concerned to dress well,

16 For this binary classification of citizen maidens and non-citizens/unidentified citizens, see this author 1978, 44–74.

17 The contrast between her status and the security of marriage is more strongly expressed at 226 *solī gerundum censeo morem et capiundas crines*. Williams 1958, 22–27 shows that Plautus has inserted the allusions to Roman marriage customs

it is to please Philolaches (168: he has already freed her 204), Scapha claims the best ornaments are *mores lepidi*. Philematium is eager to humor him and oblige him alone (205 *ille me soli censeo esse oportere opsequentem*) and better still, preoccupied with keeping and deserving her good repute (228 *bona fama*). She is eager to adorn herself, but for Philolaches (249) and accepts Scapha's reasons for rejecting an elaborate hairstyle (254–255), make-up (258–264), perfumed ointment (272–279), and purple clothing (288–290). One begins to expect this paragon of loyalty to be recognized as citizen-born. But the explanation for Philematium's protestations lies in Scapha's response to them. Philematium is virtuous, yet Scapha both scolds her for being faithful to Philolaches and then sermonizes against adornment, because Plautus is using her to attack the audience's middle-aged wives. Repeatedly Scapha uses Philematium's youth to mock older women (263 *non istanc aetatem oportet pigmentum ullum attingere*), 273–281, on the offensiveness of perfume combined with sweat on *istae ueteres*. Scapha's last diatribe at 287–291 irrationally combines abuse of age and ugliness (288: *aetati [...] turpi mulieri*) with condemnation of bad behaviour. The ugly ways of 290–291 *si morata est male / [...] turpes mores*, bring the exchange back to Scapha's original—and seemingly gratuitous—stress on nice ways (168 *lepidi mores*).

Thus the scene is not primarily interested in Philematium's decency, although it opens with the predictable exchange of youthful innocence and disillusioned age over the young woman's toilet. The *lepidi mores* can just as well be “charming” as actually “nice”, and so suit perfectly her natural desire to be charming and please her lover who is now her patron: only the end of the scene becomes progressively less motivated by her character, until it is interrupted by Philolaches, weary of eaves-dropping. We might also notice another small ambiguity. When the old woman calls Philematium a smart girl, well trained as well brought up: *tam catam, tam doctam te et bene eductam* (186–187), she is applying the materialist standards of her old profession. Plautus first exploits the audience's persistent fascination with the *ars meretricia* which we know from *Truculentus* and from the Procuresses of elegy¹⁸ and then the cruder vein of wife-baiting.

here, with misleading effect. For unlike Selenium in *Cistellaria* (cf. 78 *matronae magis conducibilest istuc*) Philematium is not destined for marriage.

18 Notably Prop. 4.5 and Ov. *Amores* 1.8.

Now if we turn back to the Carthaginian girls, we will see a similar but faster decline from a quasi-moral code into materialism. The opening canticum of each sister is wrapped around a simple analogy, based on two items of Greek daily life that are—like the newly washed sisters—soaked in water. Latin lends itself through the technical sense of *ornare* as equipping a vessel, to protracting the ship-analogy. The girls have spent hours being washed and rubbed and dried (220 *lauari aut fricari aut tergeri*) and equipped (*ornari*) by their maids: add to these synonyms less appropriate to women perhaps than ships; being polished and shone and painted and moulded (221).¹⁹ If one woman is a lot of work, imagine the toil from two: they could exhaust a community; finally Adelphasium refocuses on her own aspirations; the woman who is washed without being utterly well groomed (232 *perculata*) might as well go unwashed. Anterastilis, like Scapha, calls her sister clever and well trained (*callida et docta [...] et faceta*, 234) but uses the words according to the professional code, for she then complains that despite their elegance they can barely find themselves lovers. How can this be reconciled with the facts? Each of them already has an admirer, and the girls are known by the audience to be destined for respectability. Indeed, if my contention about the function of the Aphrodisia is correct, they should not yet be expecting admirers. If this introductory dialogue is following a Greek model, Plautus has already begun to tamper with it. The imagery of the ship finds a nice counterpart in Anterastilis' comparison between their need for soaking and that of saltfish (Greek *tarichos*), which has no appeal or pleasantness unless it is soaked repeatedly in large quantities of water. Until it is prepared saltfish smells offensive, and is so salty you would not touch it;²⁰ women too are *insulsae et inuenustae* (246) without elegance and expense. Has Plautus aimed at the contradiction implicit in *insulsae*? After all, its regular meaning is insipid for lack of salt! He brings the women's exchange to a temporary close as Adelphasium warns her sister to avoid criticizing her sex. Adelphasium wants to know if everything is ready for the sacrifice to Venus on this special holiday.

19 221 *poliri, expoliri, pingi, fingi*: Maurach 1975 *ad loc.* Is surely mistaken to relate all these verbs to female make-up, for painting would have to precede any kind of blending and toning.

20 Maurach 1975 *ad loc.* compares *Asin*. 178–179; like a fish, a lover is only good when fresh; then he has juice and *suauietas*.

All this time Milphio and Agorastocles have been listening in, and the girls' conversation will be suspended five times for exchanges between the eavesdroppers, from 257–262, from 271–282, 289–297, 307–312 and 324–328 before Agorastocles accosts them at 330–332. Not knowing that they are being overheard the girls can be assumed to express their actual attitude and desires; so let us examine the tone and content of their talk amongst themselves.²¹ First Adelphasium rebukes her sister for her haste; surely she does not want to be mixed up with the rabble of girls forced to sit on display (*prosedae*) and turn tricks, girl-friends of millers, dirty attendants on slaves smelling of the stables and straw, whom no free man would lay hands on or hire, the twopenny hides of scruffy slaves? This diatribe needs and gets no answer from her sister: reminiscent of the abuses of Ballio in *Pseudolus*, it is a matter of snobbery, not morality, but it does provide a handle for Milphio's intrusion at 271–274. The next exchange 283–288 is equally materialist. She answers her younger sister's complaint at their inadequate adornment with the reply that they are well enough dressed for their trade; certainly profit requires expense, but there will be no profit if it is outdone by expense: their present costume is more than good enough. Anterastilis persists at 297: you think yourself well enough turned out, but when you compare other callgirls you'll be cut to the heart if you see another girl better turned out. Now the appeal to professional jealousy does provoke something like a virtuous reply. Adelphasium takes the moral high ground with a full speech rejecting envy, and putting good character above gold jewellery, virtue above wealth and modesty above purple. A callgirl should wear modesty rather than gold—after all ugly ways disfigure a fine outfit worse than dung, while nice ways easily win approval for ugly outfits by their reality.²² The sermonette ends with the same moral sententiae that rounded off Scapha's denunciation in *Most.* 290–291. This is what we would expect from future brides, and yet it hits false notes. Modesty in a callgirl? Is Plautus trying to patch up his own travesty of female virtue? Surely if Adelphasium thinks of herself as a *meretrix*, he has not just muddled

21 Lowe 1995 has concentrated on the servile interruptions and established their Plautine patterns; my interest is specifically in the conflicting moral and professional codes reflecting in the girl's dialogue.

22 Adelphasium's rejection of envy and malice, and her exaltation of *bonum ingenium* and *pudor* (297–307) are comparable to the claims of the good girl Philematium. See below nn. 24 and 25 for parallel topics in 1.2 and of 5.4.

the maiden simplicity of the *Poenulae*, but has consciously professionalized the girls. When Anterastilis again laments their lateness (317–319) Adelphasium again has a professional retort based on vanity, not virtue; only girls with faces not fit to be seen (*nocturna ora*) should sacrifice by night before Venus has woken up. For if these ugly women come when she is awake, they will drive her from her own temple.

At 329 she assents to Anterastilis' urgency, but they are intercepted by master and slave. This is where Adelphasium repeats that she has Venus' favour (334) and tries to fend off Agorastocles because she "wants to see other women and be seen herself" (337 *quas spectare ego et me spectari uolo*)²³ at the callgirls' market. She prefers to show herself off at the temple. First, she refuses his request for an intimate rendezvous (343) and cuts off his approach, claiming to be ritually pure. Then at 359 this turns into an active scolding: she clearly has written him off, because he has promised repeatedly to free her, and with no other man to help her, she is still as much as a slave as ever. Inevitably we the audience echo her demands. He is rich; why hasn't he produced the cost of her freedom? If the pimp has refused to sell her, why doesn't he say so now? Why doesn't she invoke the urgency of the Aphrodisia, if it is the deadline for her to lose her virginity? Clearly Plautus does not want to exploit this element of the plot. As far as he is concerned, Adelphasium is ready to embark on her trade: she does not think of herself as freeborn or fear the loss of status which sex will bring her. All Milphio's horseplay from 364–399 only produces an exasperated question: "do you expect me to stop him beating you, rather than to make him stop deceiving me? (400 *magi' quam ne mendax me aduorsum siet?*) This is a woman whose goal is freedom from slavery, not chastity. Yet at the end of this prolonged scene with no apparent love lost, she relents and claims to forgive Agorastocles (404 *non sum irata*). She will even kiss him when she returns—if he will only let her go, which he finally does at 408–409. Again Plautus gives no hint that this is Agorastocles' last chance to save her from a promiscuous future dictated by her master: since the crisis will be resolved by her recognition as a citizen he has indulged himself in constructing a real gold-digger after the style of Phronesium in *Truculentus*, without a thought of constructing an acceptable set of attitudes and beliefs for this future bride. Plautus could have lim-

23 This is exactly Ovid's claim (*Ars Amatoria* 1.99–100: *spectatum ueniunt, ueniunt spectentur ut ipsae, / ille locus casti damna pudoris habet*) about the kind of girls who attend the theatre.

ited the girls to their initial laments about adorning themselves for the holiday/holyday and left his audience to wait for their rescue. These girls do not apparently need (or deserve) rescuing, but they do provide the *frisson* of spying on the *demi-monde* which seems to have been a major factor in Plautus' appeal to his public.

Should we object to the anomaly that they are quite unaware of their free birth, and its potential for a superior destiny? After all Gidde-nis their nurse has stayed with them throughout, and would surely have told them their origin. If anything was made by Alexis of the girls knowing their citizen rights, Plautus has eliminated it. No one will mention what the prologue has made quite clear to the audience—that the girls are freeborn Carthaginians—until the slave created for the purpose, Syncerastus, reveals the pimp's secret. However unlikely it might seem to us that the girls should not know their birth, Plautus has kept them and Agorastocles in the dark, and no member of the cast will mention their origin until the pimp has been stung by the Collybiscus trick in Act 4.

So let us wait for the girls to return in Act 5 (1176 f.) and see whether they are still as dominated by the values of their future profession in the last moments before they are recognized and take on their new identities. Adelphasium appears full of delight in the feast and the temple adornments, with the gifts of the other callgirls, 1178: *tanta ibi copia uenustatum aderat, in suo quique loco sita munde*.²⁴ She even compliments Venus on her smartness, and her sister echoes her with pride in their personal triumph, 1182–1183: *praepotentes pulchre, pacisque potentes, soror fuimus, / neque ab iuuentute inibi deridiculo habitae, quod pol, soror ceteris omnibu' factumst*.²⁵

24 For the aesthetic vocabulary of this smart world, cf. *uenus*, *uenustus*, *uenustates* (can this be *aphrodisia*?) in 1177–1178: *digna dea uenustissima [Venere]*, *neque contempsi eius opes hodie / tanta ibi copia uenustatum aderat in suo quique loco sita mune*, with 255–256: *diem [...] uenustatis plenum / dignum Veneri*; *munde* in 1178, with 1.2.235: *munditer*; 246–247: *iuuenustae sine munditia et sumptu* (see also Appendix). Add the standard use of *lepidus* at 1176 and 1198, and at 306–307; 323, where it is contrasted with *turpis*; another recurring negative root is *sordere*, *sordidus* etc. At 1179: *hau sordere*, to be compared with 279; 314–315.

25 For the motifs of competition, jealousy and mockery, cf. 1183: *neque ab iuuentute ibi inridiculo habitae, quod pol, soror ceteris omnibus factumst*; 1192: *inter alias praestitimus pulchritudine*, and 1202: *quod homo quisquam inrideat*, with 298–300: *exempla [...] meretricium aliarum, tibi, / erit cordolium, siquam ornatam melius forte aspexeris*, and Adelphasium's repudiation of *inuidia*. If Maurach is correct in

The only plot-related element in these boasts is *pacis [...] potentes*: the girls have obtained signs of the goddess' good will. But twice in their talk amongst themselves Adelphasium stresses their high birth as reason for good character and avoidance of blame: the first time (1186 *ingeniis quibus sumus [...] a culpa castas*) is separated from the expanded repetition at 1201–1204 by the devout thanksgiving of Hanno for this reward to his piety. Indeed the girls continue unaware of their male audience after the men's exchanges from 1187–91: first Anterastilis repeats the boastful theme of their triumph in beauty (1192–1193 *uictoria [...] inter alias praestitimus pulchritudine*), then after another exchange (1195–1200) we return to Adelphasium's sudden attack of respectability, stressing their birth and reproving her sister because women are too easily pleased with themselves when they should be trying to please men. All this dialogue is surely Plautine expansion, where the natural direction of the scene would have gone from describing the sacrifice and good omens (implied by 1182 *pacisque potentes*) to the interpretation of the *haruspices* that they would be freed: 1205–1207 *quod in extis nostris portentumst / [...] nos fore inuito domino nostro diebus paucis liberas*. Now for the first time, and just before they leave stage to go into the pimp's house (1210–1211) the girls mention their parents, that is as agents of their liberation.²⁶ Father and would-be lover must intercept the girls before they compromise themselves by re-entering the pimp's house. But now that Milphio has left the stage it is the turn of the citizen males to play the buffoon. Father and admirer together deliberately hold back the good news, for two more Plautine expansions.

First Agorastocles introduces Hanno ambiguously as a would-be benefactor (1216). When Hanno declares (1217) that he will bring them joy, Adelphasium declares like a good *meretrix* that they will bring him pleasure: *at edepol nos uoluptati tibi*. She also understands his promise of *libertas* in terms of a lover's offer: *istoc pretio tuas nos facile feceris*. His outlay, if he buys their freedom, will easily make them at his service. While Agorastocles is still besottedly marvelling at Adelphasium's modesty (!), Hanno delights in his own trickery 1223: *ut astu*

interpreting 1195 as a reference to pelting the girls publicly on display with ash and soot, then the mockery took a crude physical form.

26 Agorastocles' comment that the *haruspices* foretold the girl's *libertas* on the strength of his credit (*mea fiducia*), knowing that he was in love with her, recalls Adelphasium's unexplained allusions to his unfulfilled promises at 361.

sum adgressus ad eas. Before the inevitable betrothal the men indulge in a last trick, as Hanno announces (1239–1240) that he is suing the girls for unlawfully detaining his own freeborn and high-born daughters as slaves. The girls still do not understand and Adelphasium is still bent on resisting Agorastocles' advances (1243) while he repeats the false accusation about stolen daughters (1246–1247 = 1239–1240). Finally, after more female bewilderment (1248; 1249–1250) Hanno explains with much circumlocution that they are his daughters and Agorastocles confirms it 1256: *uos meae estis ambae filiae et hic est cognatus uester / huiusce fratris filius*. Not only has Plautus continued to write in “professional” attitudes for the girls: he has done so because this lack of innocence in the girls was necessary in order to let his male characters indulge in more teasing.²⁷ Recognitions were boring and predicable, so the action passes rapidly beyond the moment of recognition to joking that the girls' fervent embrace will suffocate Hanno before he can pronounce the betrothal (1266–1268). After this travesty of a recognition scene has been rounded off by a token speech from Hanno, giving thanks to the gods in 1274–1277 it will be the soldier's turn to protest at these legitimate embraces and misunderstand the situation in 1296–1304.

We see that if Alexis' original was a conventional recognition play, very little of this four-sided dialogue was necessary for the completion of the reunion; a brief entrance speech and exchanges between the girls reporting that good omens had led them to hope for rescue from their slavery; then the approach of the stranger Hanno with Agorastocles as his guarantor. If most Plautine scenes for four parts are the product of his own remodelling,²⁸ it is possible that in Alexis the younger sister was a silent figure here; at least I find it more likely than that his Carthaginian uncle effected the recognition without their neighbour and admirer. But did Alexis colour his Carthaginian and perhaps even the girls, with trickery to match their non-Greek race? Only if we

27 Here, as in 1.2, Plautus has given sentiments to the women not to construct female character, but to feed masculine wisecracks; cf. Williams 1958, 27 on *Most.* 1.3: “it seems likely that the forced dialogue between Scapha and Philematium is only intended to give an opportunity for the amusing asides of Philolaches.”

28 Cf. Lowe 1988, 108–109 and nn. 42–44. In n. 44 he points to the similarities between the two four-speaker scenes 5.4 and 1.2 in support of the claim that Plautus is the originator of the double dialogue between the girls and their eavesdroppers in both scenes.

are sure that Hanno's trickery was an added Roman sauce, pure *Punica fides*, and his oblique approach and teasing accusation had no equivalent in the Greek comedy, can we also be sure that Alexis' *Karchedoniae* behaved like self-respecting maidens—that is to say, had nothing to say for themselves beyond a minimal entry speech and a quick exit. Even the few affirmations of morality in 1.2 and 5.4 alike are more forward and articulate than we should expect on the lips of a good Greek daughter.²⁹ I am inclined to suspect that Plautus built up both the conventional and the disreputable elements in the girls' dialogue, “having his cake”—with the moralizing for the older female audience—“and eating it”—with the voyeuristic exchanges, for the delight of his male customers, for whom any callgirl of class would be a life-long inaccessible fantasy.

29 The confident moralizing of the parasite's virgin daughter in Plautus' *Persa* is exceptional, perhaps best understood as “in character” for the role she is to play of noble Persian captive.

Appendix

Ter. *Eun.* 932–934:

meretricum ingenia et mores posset noscere
 quae dum foris sunt, nil videtur mundius
 nec mage compositum quicquam nec magis elegans [...]

It seems no coincidence that the only instance of the root *mund-* in Terence concerns the appeal of *meretrices*. As is shown by the citations in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae VIII* s.v. *munditia*, and 1. *Mundus* (adj.), with adverbs *mundē*, *munditer*, and 2. *Mundus* (noun = Greek *kosmos*), the root *mund-* seems to have been specially associated with the charms of women, and to have been more common in Plautus than later authors. (The root is also common in a more general sense (neat, orderly, clean) in Cato's *De agricultura*, and in Horace's famous *simplex munditiis* (*Carm.* 1.5) and four times in Ovid; the more prosaic (?) adjective maintains the same association with easy women: Prop. 4.8.40, Horace *Serm.* 1.2.123, (more general in Prop. 4.2.38 and twice in Ovidian elegy). But *munditia* and *mundus muliebris* also feature exceptionally in Livy in two episodes from the 190's, 32.40.11 and 34.7.9, then speech advocating the repeal of the *Lex Oppia*: *mundum muliebrem appellarunt maiores nostri*, perhaps because Livy is seeking to evoke period atmosphere through the language of comedy. Certainly the dispute over the *Lex Oppia* must have provoked increased interest in Plautus and his audience in discussions of women's adornment. Is this why *munditia* and the distinction between neat grooming and superfluous (?) adornment are enshrined in civil law, as is shown by excerpts from Pomponius and Ulpian (*mulier potest esse munda, nec tamen ornata*) in *Dig.* 34.2.21 and 25. Could we infer that the jurists of the *Digest* are also reproducing material and ideas from the second century BCE?

Bibliography

- Arnott, W. G., *Alexis, The Fragments. A Commentary*, Cambridge 1996.
- Arnott, W. G., *Menander*, Vol. 2, Cambridge, Mass. 1998.
- Gratwick, A. S., "Light drama," in: *CHCL, II. Latin Literature*, Cambridge 1982, 95–127.
- Fantham, E., "Sex, Status and Survival in Hellenistic Athens. A study of women in New Comedy," *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 44–74 (= n.5 in this volume).
- Fantham, E., *Ovid, Fasti, book IV*, Cambridge 1998.
- Fraenkel, E., *Elementi Plautini in Plauto*, Firenze 1960.
- Friedrich, W. H., *Euripides und Diphilos. Zur Dramaturgie der Spätformen* (Zetemata 5), München 1953, 146–172.
- Friedrich, W. H., "Poenulus," in: E. Lefèvre (ed.), *Die Römische Komödie. Plautus und Terenz* (WdF 236), Darmstadt 1973.
- Jachmann, G., "Die Composition des Poenulus," in: *Charites. FS Friedrich Leo zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht*, Berlin 1911, 249–278.
- Lefèvre, E., "Römische und europäische Komödie," in: E. Lefèvre (ed.), *Die Römische Komödie. Plautus und Terenz* (WdF 236), Darmstadt 1973.
- Leo, F., *Plautinische Forschungen. Zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*, Berlin 1912.
- Lowe, J. C. B., Rez. I. Zwierlein, *Zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus, I. Poenulus und Curculio*, *JRS* 82 (1992) 241–242.
- Lowe, J. C. B., "Indoor scenes in Plautus," in: L. Benz / E. Stärk / G. Vogt-Spira (eds.), *Plautus und die Tradition des Stegreifspiels. FS Ehard Lefèvre zum sechzigsten Geburtstag*, Tübingen 1995.
- Lowe, J. C. B., "Plautus Poenulus I.2," *BICS* 35 (1988) 101–110.
- Maurach, G., *Plauti Poenulus*, Heidelberg 1975.
- Williams, G., "Some aspects of Roman marriage ceremonies and ideals," *JRS* 48 (1958) 16–29.

8. Terence and the Familiarization of Comedy

Let me start by quoting a paragraph from a century old edition of Terence, which will serve as a reminder of changes in our background knowledge of both comedy and this particular comic playwright:

Of the six extant Terentian comedies the *Andria* is the most pathetic, the *Adelphoe* in general more true to human nature than the rest, the *Eunuchus* the most varied and lively, with the largest number of interesting characters, and the *Hecyra* the one of least merit. All six are remarkable for the art with which the plot is unfolded through the natural sequence of incidents and play of motives. Striking effects, sharp contrasts and incongruities, which meet us in many plays of Plautus, are almost wholly absent. All is smooth, consistent and moderate, without any of the extravagance of exuberant humour or even creative fancy which characterises the writing of the older poet. But Terence was essentially an imitative artist and his distinguishing feature was his *artistic finish*, a fact fully recognised by Horace (*Epistle* 2.1.59).¹

There is plenty here to question, if not correct. What does it mean to call *Adelphoe* more true to human nature? What defines an ‘interesting character’? And do present-day readers still find *Hecyra* the play of least merit? As for the art with which Terence’s plots are unfolded, we still cannot guess how much of this is his own contribution rather than derived from Menander (whose plays were still unknown when this edition was written). However, scholars have used both the evidence given by Terence in the prologues and his commentator Donatus to identify where he has himself innovated in his plots—removing the expository prologues to replace irony with suspense, introducing a second lover and slave into *Andria*, working a braggart soldier and his parasite into *Eunuchus* and inserting an abduction scene into the second act of

A version of this paper was given at a colloquium on Post-Hannibalic Rome at the University of Southern California in April 2005. I would like to thank Tony Boyle, Sander Goldberg, Tom Habinek, Siobhan McElduff and other members of the lively audience for their stimulating contributions and criticisms, which I have tried to answer.

1 Ashmore 1908, italics original. ‘Artistic finish’ corresponds to *arte* in Horace’s comment *uincere Caecilius grauitate, Terentius arte* ([‘it is said that] Caecilius gets the prize for seriousness, Terence for art’, *Ep.* 2.1.59).

Adelphoe. And yet it was Terence's immediate predecessor Caecilius whom Varro, most learned of ancient critics, praised for his superior plots.² Certainly Terence does not indulge in the extravagance of Plautus, but is this because he is 'essentially an imitative artist'? On the other hand I would not challenge the editor's evaluation of his scripts as 'smooth, consistent and moderate' or his praise for the playwright's 'artistic finish'. Instead I would ask if this is what we want, or ought to want from comedy.

While the great writers of the previous generation, Ennius, Plautus and Cato, were clearly strong personalities whose power over words and ideas shines out even from damaged texts and half-line fragments, men we feel we know and admire for their sheer vitality, Terence is strangely muted. I was working on Terentian comedy when I first heard Professor Goldberg lecture, and have enjoyed and profited from his work ever since, not least his monograph on Terence, but even so I confess I have not succeeded in *Understanding Terence* and this is why I have returned to reviewing the ancient evidence for Terence's life in the cultural context of his generation, so as to offer a slightly different take on who he was and what he was aiming to achieve by his plays. And to do this, I shall also need to consider his nearest contemporary, Caecilius Statius.

A good place to start is with the life of Terence preserved by the commentator Donatus from Suetonius' *De Poetis*. On the more disputed aspects of Terence's life and work, Suetonius cites eleven different authorities, but probably none of them lived before the last century BCE, and most scholars have followed Friedrich Leo in believing that Suetonius was relying on Varro, the most learned of these sources, for his quotations from some or all of the others. But he quotes no single authority for the essential fact that Terence was born at Carthage (*Karthagine natus*) and served as a slave at Rome to the senator Terentius Lucanus, whose name he took on manumission, nor for the equally important comment that his talent and good looks won him a liberal education. Since he also reports that Terence died aged twenty-five (though some texts make this thirty-five) his education is a crucial issue. How did this slave born overseas acquire sufficient command of Latin to translate—or better *adapt*—a Greek comedy by 166, if he was only nineteen? The date cannot be put back, if we accept the circumstantial

2 Varro ap. Nonius 374, in *argumentis Caecilius poscit palmam, in ethesi Terentius, in sermonibus Plautus* ('Caecilius claims the prize for plots, Terence for characterization, and Plautus for dialogue').

anecdote that he read the script of his first play, the *Andria*, to the leading playwright Caecilius, who died in 168. Now the natural inference from *Karthagine natus* is that Terence was a native of Carthage, whether Semitic or Berber, and yet, as the scholar Fenestella pointed out, a man born in 185 (or even 195)³ could not have been a Roman prisoner of war, and since Romans had not begun to trade with Carthage, would hardly have been sold to Terentius Lucanus by African captors. I return to the question: how did Terence come into Lucanus' household, and what singled him out for special education? One suggestion, made by Tenney Frank in the 1930s,⁴ was that Terence was the Latin-speaking child of a South Italian prisoner of war. It is possible that Terence's mother was captured as a small girl by Hannibal's forces and taken to Carthage: she might even have been a Greek speaker from Apulia or Sicily, giving him the language which would in turn privilege him for access to education. Or if we disregard *Karthagine natus*, we could assume that Lucanus favoured the child because he had taken Terence's slave mother as a concubine (was she both Carthaginian and darkly attractive?) and fathered young Terence—hence his early manumission and the aristocratic friends he would make almost as soon as he left the schoolroom.⁵ The similar problem in the case of Caecilius, who is said to have been a slave and an Insubrian Gaul from Milan, requires less explanation of his Latinity⁶ only because Caecilius lived to middle age and enjoyed a sort of apprenticeship (*contubernium*) with Ennius; there is a longer period for Caecilius to acquire fluency in Greek, but if he had in fact been a Gaul he would also have had to learn Latin from scratch. A persuasive article by Donald Robson⁷ has shown that Caecilius was most likely the child of a Samnite or Sabellian from Southern Italy displaced by the Romans and resettled in Gaul—so

3 This would adopt the alternative MS reading *quantum et tricesimum annum* in Suetonius' report of Terence's final voyage and death (Rostagni line 80).

4 Frank 1933, 269–73.

5 We know that in the last century BCE Roman masters might educate chosen *uernae* as readers and secretaries, as did Crassus, who personally supervised their training (Plut. *Crassus* 2.6). But it is more surprising that Terence received a liberal education (in both *grammatike* and, as I will argue, rhetoric) in this earlier generation.

6 Cicero does in fact call Caecilius, like Pacuvius, *male locutus* ('linguistically poor', *Brutus* 258) and *malus ... auctor Latinitatis* ('a bad model for Latin usage'), *ad Att.* 7.3.10), but Caecilius' defects are not obvious from the surviving excerpts.

7 Robson 1938, 301–08.

that, like Ennius, he could have been a native speaker of Oscan and Greek, if not Latin. Be that as it may, both Caecilius and Terence match the provenance of Rome's first adapter of drama, two generations before them, the Tarentine prisoner, Livius Andronicus, and can be contrasted with the freeborn Italians Naevius, Ennius and Pacuvius. I shall return to the implications of Terence's slave origin shortly.

The text of Suetonius reflects earlier disputes over several aspects of Terence's work and life. The mystery of how he came to Rome led to the mystery of why he had received this literary education, or even whether he was capable of composing the plays produced under his name. Terence himself quotes in the prologue to *Adelphoe* (15–18) allegations that noblemen collaborated with him on his composition, and chooses not to deny this. But his tactful prevarication may have given rise to later allegations. In the early first century Porcius Licinius claims, in eleven lines of verse quoted by Suetonius, that Terence had been taken up by Scipio Aemilianus, Laelius and Furius for his sexual charms, but left in poverty, a story rejected by Fenestella.⁸ In turn two of Cicero's contemporaries, the biographer Cornelius Nepos and the orator-politician C. Memmius, quoted claims by Aemilianus and Laelius to have written specific passages of Terence's scripts. To this, arguing only from probability, the scholar Santra retorted that if Terence had needed help he would have sought it not from men as young as himself, but from his elders like Sulpicius Gallus, consul in 166, or Labeo and Popilius, men who were both consuls and poets.⁹ It seems then that Roman gentlemen were already diverting themselves by composing poetry, but it is more likely that they attempted epic than demeaned themselves by composing for the stage. If Terence's noble young friends offered contributions to his dialogue it might have been difficult to refuse them.

Suetonius also records favourable posthumous judgement of Terence's plays by Afranius in the prologue of his *Compitalia*, by Varro who prefers the first act of Terence's *Adelphoe* to the original of Menander, in the famous appraisals by Caesar who praised his love

8 Compare Quint. 10.1.99, *licet Terenti scripta ad Scipionem Africanum referantur, quae sunt in hoc genere* [i.e. *comoedia*] *elegantissima* ('even though Terence's writings, the most tasteful in this genre, are attributed to Scipio Africanus').

9 Popilius is presumably either the consul of 173 or his brother, consul in 172; Labeo is Fabius Labeo, praetor 189, consul 183, and so more than old enough to be Terence's father. But the comment only shows the scholar's lack of realism about Roman society, in which young men would be far more likely to collaborate in devising dialogue or versifying a drama than senior statesmen.

of *purus sermo* but notoriously lamented his lack of *uis* (or *uis comica*), and by Cicero, praising his refined emotions (*sedatis motibus*). But both Suetonius and Gellius (15.24) acknowledge that Volcacius Sedigitus downgraded Terence to sixth in his canon of comic dramatists, below not only Caecilius (whom he puts highest), Plautus and Naevius, but also Licinius and Atilius (it may be some comfort that he puts Terence's *bête noire* Luscius ninth). When we come to look more closely at the remains of Caecilius we may wonder why he was placed so highly by the otherwise unknown Volcacius, by Varro and by Horace.

After the production of his six plays between 166 and 160, Terence apparently left Rome in 159¹⁰ to go to Greece or perhaps to Asia, either because his fancy friends had left him penniless, or simply to acquire more Greek scripts. But he did not return, having either died at Stymphalus in Arcadia (a very circumstantial detail for anyone to invent) or drowned in a shipwreck, or in despair at the loss of the Greek scripts he was carrying home. But Suetonius, or rather Varro, knew better than to believe in Terence's poverty, arguing that he left *hortuli* of 20 iugera on the Appian way, and his daughter married a Roman knight.

How can we make sense of these contradictory and unlikely tales? Neither now nor then could a man support himself by composing plays. What did Terence do when he finished being educated and/or was manumitted? The obvious way to make a living was as a household tutor to the wealthy, but such private positions were not likely to be or remain a matter of public record. In the first century, men like Cicero and Caesar acquired their literary education first from *grammatici*, then from *rhetoires*, in both cases usually in Greek and from Greeks. But whereas the *grammatici* taught boys to read, that is, to read the poets, and gave them some elementary composition exercises, they did not really learn to write, in the sense of composing texts for oral delivery, until they moved on to the *rhetoires*. How early were these professions recognized? The practice of teaching reading and composition surely evolved before the professions were either identified or separated. Suetonius tells us in his introduction to *De Grammaticis* that Livius and Ennius were Rome's first literary critics, explaining and commenting on Greek texts and giving critical readings of their own work in public discourses. Now the freeborn Ennius had his own house on the Aventine and is generally reckoned to have been financially comfortable, but Livius

10 Cn. Cornelio Dolabella et M. Fulvio Nobiliore consulibus ('in the consulship of Cn. Cornelius Dolabella and M. Fulvius Nobilior').

seems to have begun his life at Rome as a slave tutor, composing his Latin *Odissea* before he was invited to adapt the first Greek tragedy and comedy for public performance at the games of 240 BCE, and receiving a commission in 207 BCE to compose a hymn to Juno Regina, when he was already old. Both men are poets, but we have Suetonius' reports on them not from what survives of his *De Poetis* but from his separate study of grammarians and rhetoricians, and it is clear that he found very little information at all about even the second century BCE. This returns us to the larger question of the emergence and identification of distinct professions, one implicit in some of Suetonius' own comments in *De Grammaticis* 4. There he tells us that *grammatici* were once called *litterati*, and cites the authority of Nepos, who distinguished *litterati* from *eruditi*: *litterati*, Nepos said, were commonly regarded as those who could either speak or write carefully and precisely, whereas the name properly was applied to men who interpreted the poets.

When Livius was first commissioned to adapt Greek plays he had the essential knowledge of a *litteratus*: he could read and write both Greek and Latin; he did not call himself a *poeta*, and may not have thought of himself as a literary artist. In this raw world men who could write clear characters were already distinct as *scribae*, whether they were simply copyists, or had enough language skills to serve as clerks and draft a business letter or legal document, or could also interpret or translate from Greek. In the absence of Greek dictionaries Romans used Greek slaves or freedmen as their dictionaries—what Nicholas Horsfall has called 'Rent-a-Greek'.¹¹ That translators of Greek plays were also called *scribae* seems to follow from the Senate's decision to honour Livius Andronicus by giving *scribae histrionesque* a club room in the temple of Minerva 'because Livius before wrote plays and performed in them'.¹² What I am suggesting is that in the first genera-

11 Horsfall 1979.

12 *Itaque cum Liuius Andronicus bello Punico secundo scribisset Carmen quod a uirginibus est cantatum, quia prosperius respublica geri coepta est, publice adtributa est [ei] in Auentino aedis Mineruae, in qua liceret scribis histrionibusque consistere ac dona ponere, in honorem Liui quia is et scribebat fabulas et agebat* ('So when Livius Andronicus had composed a hymn that was sung by maidens during the second Punic War, because affairs were going more successfully, the temple of Minerva on the Aventine was officially assigned as a place for scribes and actors to gather and make votive offerings: this was done to honour Livius because he both composed and performed plays', Festus 446.29 Ly). On this early Collegium

tion of Rome's awakening to Greek literature men with the requisite skills in reading and writing Greek and Latin either taught privately, or performed whatever linguistic or literary chores were needed by the masters of their households, or once freed, worked free-lance at all or any of these linguistic crafts.

So what would have happened to the young Terence when he had received all the education available to Terentius Lucanus' children? His prologues show that he was clearly well-trained, not only in *grammatike* but in rhetoric,¹³ and the moment would come when he passed from learning to teaching, from pupil to teacher's assistant and if he lived long enough, Terence would become a teacher in his turn. I shall argue in due course that this activity would shape the kind of plays he wrote, either from his own inclination or at the encouragement of his patrons.

There is evidence that knowledge of Greek and even instruction by Greeks was fairly common among the Roman elite by the time of Terence's youth.¹⁴ We know, for example, that Scipio Africanus the Elder enjoyed Greek culture and idled away some of his period commanding in southern Italy in the entertainments of Greek cities; he certainly sent an official letter to Philip of Macedon in Greek, but may have used a native translator. According to Polybius Aemilius Paullus debated with king Perseus in both Latin and Greek, and later confiscated the king's library on his defeat in 167 to send home for the education of his sons, including the same Scipio Aemilianus who supposedly associated with Terence. By 161 there were apparently so many Greek

and the shadowy *Collegium Poetarum* see the somewhat negative article of Horsfall 1974.

- 13 On the rhetorical power of the prologues see Leo 1960, 134–49, esp. 136: *Terentius ... succinctas et oratorias et ex arte compositas atque controuersiis etiam iudicialibus similes fabulis praemittit ... haec quidem ipsius Terenti poemata sunt ac nullo Graeco poeta praeunte concepta* ('Terence prefaced his plays with concise speeches artistically composed, rhetorical and like those in private lawsuits ... for these are compositions by Terence himself, not following the model of any Greek poet').
- 14 This argument for some rhetorical education in the first half of the second century seems to go against the evidence of Cicero in *De Oratore* 1.14. He lists a sequence of three stages in the acquisition of rhetorical skills at Rome without attaching them to a specific generation: first after hearing Greek envoys (*auditis oratoribus Graecis*), as they did with the three leaders of the Athenian schools in 155 BCE, then from acquaintance with Greek texts (*cognitis eorum litteris*), and finally in the employment of Greek teachers (*adhibitisque doctoribus*).

teachers of rhetoric and philosophy at Rome that the Senate decreed their expulsion.¹⁵ Had they all arrived only after the victory over Macedon in 167? They had probably begun to appear in Italy after 191, and might hope to remain undisturbed so long as they kept their heads down and were content to teach in private mansions: it was surely public lecturing that made them unwelcome. To what extent then did the activities and persons of teachers and poets converge? Poets had begun to make claims for themselves soon after 200 BCE. Plautus has the intriguing slave-hero of the *Pseudolus* (performed in 191) compare himself to a *poeta* who takes up his writing tablets and devises something out of nothing.¹⁶ Ennius associates himself and his *poemata* with the *poeta* *Homerus* in the preface to his *Annales* (1–4 Sk.), and when he returned with Fulvius Nobilior from Nobilior's conquest of Ambracia in 187, he probably helped to inspire Fulvius' project of transferring the shrine of the Latin goddesses of poetry, the Camenae, into the temple of Hercules, now renamed Temple of Hercules Musarum. Horsfall is prepared to believe that this led to the transfer of self-styled poets from the artisan association of scribes and actors to their very own *Collegium Poetarum*, but such associations usually worked by cooption. We do not know when this organisation began, or that Ennius himself was a member, or any other known poet before Accius.

Did Terence live long enough to gain admission? When did he gain enough from the sale of his scripts to live like a gentleman, free from the demeaning status of employment? The answer is probably only after the runaway success of *Eunuchus*. According to the *Didascaliae* he had *Andria* presented at the Ludi Megalenses of 166, then *Hecyra* failed to hold the stage in 165: after a gap of two years *Heautontimoroumenos* was presented in 163, then after another two-year gap *Eunuchus* at the Megalenses of

15 Suet. *Gramm.* 25.1 calls the acceptance of both grammar and rhetoric at Rome belated (*sero*) but notes that rhetoric met more resistance, quoting the proposal of the praetor M. Pomponius and consular decree of 161 BCE. Kaster 1992 stresses the scanty information available to Suetonius, which we might contrast with the abundant earlier discussions available to him of Terence's career as a poet.

16 Plautus *Ps.* 401–04: *sed quasi poeta, tabulas quom cepit sibi, / quaerit quod nusquamst gentium, reperit tamen, / facit illud ueri simile quod mendaciumst, / nunc ego poeta fiam* ('but just as a poet, when he has taken up his writing tablets, seeks something that does not exist, yet finds it, making a fiction / lie plausible, so I shall now become a poet').

161.¹⁷ Its success and deliberate repetition explains the performance of a second play in the same year (*Phormio*, at the Ludi Romani), followed by a private commission to present *Adelphoe* and the revived *Hecyra* at the funeral games for Aemilianus' father Aemilius Paullus in 160, and a last, successful, attempt to present *Hecyra* at the Ludi Romani. So he may not have approached financial independence until a year or two before his departure on the voyage to Greece from which he never returned.

Why have I lingered over this attempt to reconstruct Terence's short life? Because I believe the ethical and social tone of his plays can best be explained not simply in terms of his elite associations but—and here I think I am saying something new—by the role as an educator that I am positing for him. If we consider the plots and dialogue of Terence's six plays it is difficult to miss his obsession with the maturing of the *filiusfamilias*, and problems attending the emergence of young men into adulthood and a new relationship with their fathers. Four of Terence's plays come from Menander, and two from Menander's follower Apollodorus, yet Menander himself, to judge *not* from Latin adaptations but from the plays and scenes surviving in the papyri, had broader interests in e.g. socio-economic differences and citizen-alien relations, and was relatively uninterested in young men's passions for *hetaerae*, or in the father-son relationship. He can create the type of spoilt lad called Moschion in *Perikeiromene* and *Samia*, but only *Samia* offers the Terentian form of rape-plot leading to a serious misunderstanding and reconciliation between the father and son. In *Dyskolos*, for example, Sostratus' pursuit of the virgin daughter of Knemon has to face opposition from her misanthropic father, but obtaining permission from his own father is a walk-over. *Samia* comes closest to a Terentian scenario, but what most distinguishes Menander's play from the comedies of Terence is that the adoptive father Demea has actually wronged his son by accusing him of seducing Demea's Samian concubine, so that when the fifth act brings the reckoning between father and son, although the son is guilty of raping the neighbour's daughter during a festival, it is the father who has to apologize, and the son apparently learns nothing.

17 These gaps invite speculation. Did Terence take two years to compose *Heautontimoroumenos* and *Eunuchus*, or did he offer them to producers in 164 and 162 and find no takers? This might make business sense after *Hecyra* in 164, but would be most unlikely in the case of *Eunuchus*.

All Roman comedy puts more emphasis on the loves and escapades of young men. From Plautus' corpus, for example, only six plays (*Amphitruo*, *Captivi*, *Casina*,¹⁸ *Menaechmi*, *Persa*, *Stichus*) do not concern the loves of young men still dependent on their fathers.¹⁹ The others are equally divided between escapist tales in which young men or their slaves deceive their fathers to obtain money in order to enjoy the favours of *meretrices* (*Asinaria*, *Bacchides*, *Epidicus*, *Mercator*, *Mostellaria*, *Pseudolus*) and recognition plays (*Aulularia*, *Cistellaria*, *Curculio*, *Poenulus*, *Rudens*, *Truculentus*) in which the beloved turns out to be a citizen available for marriage—if not actually the well-dowered daughter of his father's best friend or neighbour—and the young man loses his sexual liberty with his father's blessing. The escapist comedies do not trouble with morals, or even with the financial implications when the spendthrift son, the *asotos*, needs to buy his girl—at the end all is forgiven. The recognition plays usually observe a more serious Ethos and end in the moral redemption of the offending lover through marriage.

We have the titles of forty-two plays by Caecilius, who died in 168: supposing that he presented two plays in most years, this would suggest that he overlapped for several years with Plautus. Since Terence gives his producer Ambivius Turpio an extended special plea in the second prologue to *Hecyra* (10–27) arguing from his perseverance and ultimate success in producing Caecilius' comedies, despite initial public rejection, to justify a sympathetic reception of this new play, I would suggest that we should expect strong continuity between the types of plot staged by Caecilius and those of Terence. Like Terence Caecilius seems to have based many of his plays (apparently 14 out of 42) on Menandrian originals, and the only way in which the younger dramatist may have broken the precedent of Caecilius is in his willingness to introduce elements, scenes or characters from a second play into his primary original.²⁰

18 In fact Plautus himself tells us that he has eliminated from his action the young son of the family and his love for the unrecognized citizen *Casina*.

19 In two plays, *Trinummus* and *Miles*, the young lover does not need to deceive a father. Pleusicles in *Miles* is independent of any parent and regains his girl-friend by trickery from the rascally soldier who has kidnapped her, while Lysiteles in *Trinummus* has his father's support in his desire to marry the sister of the impoverished Lesbianus.

20 On Caecilius the only detailed study since that of Leo 1913, 217–26, is the chapter by Wright 1974, 87–126.

Like Terence, for whom the *Eunuchus* is very different from his other plays, Caecilius may have written widely different kinds of comedy; certainly his best known adaptation from Menander, the *Plokion*, is cited extensively by Gellius 2.23.10–20 for its distortion of Menander's refinement. If it was a recognition play, this aspect does not emerge from the forty surviving lines, which focus on the lecherous old husband. As Leo noted, Caecilius seems to have adapted the script speech by speech, but to have changed the tone as well as the phrasing and versification of his model.²¹

More relevant to Terence is the high proportion of Caecilius' plays that concern themselves with young men's love affairs, whether ending in recognition and marriage or depending on slave intrigue to obtain money for the spendthrift from his father. Caecilius was famous for his angry fathers, and Cicero makes capital out of quoting such fathers from at least two comedies in his defence of Caelius.²² But this anger does not seem to be ethically motivated. The father rages not in moral but in material terms, scolding the son for the havoc his financial waste will wreak on the family estate: 'Why did you betake yourself to that whorish neighbourhood? Why didn't you run right away when you learnt of the allurements there? ... Why did you get to know any strange women? Scatter and squander your money for all I care ... if you fall into want it will be your funeral; I've got enough to keep me content for the rest of my life.'²³ Of course Cicero has picked out the lines appropriate to Caelius' situation, and ones that will not suggest his client's moral danger but only his potential extravagance.

21 Gellius' citations of Caecilius' *Plokion* are perhaps the best evidence for the way in which translation can be viewed simultaneously as faithful and divergent. On Terence's views of his own and others' 'translations', see McElduff 2004, with which I am basically in agreement. But I would see Terence as distinguishing between faithful translation and literal translation. Luscus may have been a clumsy and literal translator, or, as McElduff argues, Terence may be exploiting a stock accusation against his opponent. Thus while Terence accuses Luscus of literal translation, he also blames him in *Eun.* 10–13 and *Phorm.* 6–8 for inept presentation of the action in his *Phasma* and *Thesaurus* that can only have arisen from radical changes within the action of his model.

22 *Pro Caelio* 37 runs through four excerpts from unnamed plays; cf. Quint. 11.1.39.

23 Caecilius 228–35 W, in Warmington's translation. Note especially the emphasis in the last two lines on extravagance and the need to preserve inherited income for the rest of life: *si egebis, tibi dolebit, mihi sat est / qui aetatis quod reliquom est oblectem meae*.

This father is closer to the materialist Chremes of Terence's *Heautontimoroumenos* than to his good fathers Simo, Micio or even Demea.

From the titles or fragments of Caecilius' other plays we can see that seventeen dealt with young spendthrifts or rapists (or lads who were both?), and many have Greek titles, like the *Asotos*: add *Chrysiön*, named after a *hetaera*, *Davus*, including a rape (23 W), *Gamos*, *Harpazomene* (another rape, cf. 57 f. W), *Hymnis* (a father imposes marriage at 59 f.), the much cited and multi-titled *Hypobolimaëus*, in which a father (probably one of the angry fathers cited in *Pro Caelio*) keeps one son, Eutychus, at hard labour in the country, while his brother is pampered and receives a fancy education in the city,²⁴ *Imbrii* (a pregnancy, 91 f. W), *Karine* (a recognition) *Meretrix*, the *Obolostates* or *Faenerator*, *Pausimachus* (a courtesan speaks in 128 f., 130 f. W), *Synaristosae* (the same original as Plautus' *Cistellaria*), *Synephebi*, *Syracosii* (cf. 208 W) and *Titthe* (another rape, 214 f. W, 216 W). We can soon expect to have a better understanding of the *Obolostates*, in which a young man has borrowed heavily from a moneylender to buy his girl-friend, because Knut Kleve is working on the publication of a Latin papyrus²⁵ from Herculaneum containing more than fifty lines of this play, but their content, apparently the objection of a co-heir to the father paying off the son's debt to the moneylender, is so far rather difficult to understand either in legal or psychological terms—it is quite anomalous that the father should be willing to pay off his son's debts, and is only prevented by the mysterious *heres*.

It seems, then, that even more than Plautus, Caecilius transmitted to Terence a tradition of comedies focused on youthful love affairs and friction between father and son. Did this reflect current social change? Certainly the years from Cato's censorship in 184 are full of conflict over public and private expenditure, attempts to build stone theatre

24 There are significant quotations in Cic. *Rosc. Am.*, Varro *R.R.* 2.2, and evidence for Menander's play at Quint. 1.10.18. This refers to a scene where the father demands the return of his son from the old townsman who has been educating his, and in return the townsman asks for reimbursement on his expenses for teaching geometry and lyre playing—presumably the young man has abused his time in the city in extravagance and debauchery. It would be interesting to know how Caecilius adapted this speech!

25 See however Kleve 1996. I owe information about this play to Gualtiero Calboli, who kindly showed me an advance copy of his forthcoming article associating this play with the *faenerator Alfius* of Horace, *Epode* 2. For the role of the moneylender, compare Plautus' *Mostellaria*.

auditoriums that had to be abandoned, sumptuary laws, and tales of luxury food, furnishings and slaves. Is this why Terence concentrated on adapting plays about young men tempted by sexually available women, like Clitipho in *Heautontimoroumenos* and Chaerea and Phaedria in *Eunuchus*, Antipho in *Phormio* and Ctesipho in *Adelphoe*? In fact these boys are only the secondary leads in his plays, whereas the leads are the honourable Pamphilus in *Andria*, Clinia (in *Heautontimoroumenos*), Phaedria (in *Phormio*) and Aeschinus (*Adelphoe*) who will end in marriage to the newly recognized citizen they have loved.

But before we focus on Terence's presentation of his young men we need to consider his handling of entire casts. We will see that apart from the parasite Phormio and the braggart Thraso with his sidekick, Terence plays down the lowlifes in his dramas: there are decent loyal slaves (in e.g. *Phormio* and *Adelphoe*) and even his intriguing slaves are not impertinent; indeed Davus in *Andria* and Parmeno in *Hecyra* are not even successful schemers, and survive in spite of themselves.

Sixty years ago P. S. Dunkin proposed an interpretation of Roman comedy which opposed Plautus, as a man of the theatre and true democrat, to the snobbish or elitist Terence, pointing to Terence's respectful treatment of father figures.²⁶ It seemed to follow from Terence's association with an aristocratic patron and young noblemen like Scipio that he would favour the upper-class or at least bourgeois characters in his plays. So Terence has no dirty old men like Lysidamas in *Casina*: his only adultery occurs in the prehistory of Demipho in *Phormio*, while Simo and Menedemus and Micio are well-meaning, and even the foolish Chremes of *Heautontimoroumenos* and the irascible Demea vindicate themselves by their firm decisions in the finale of their plays. The two old fathers of *Hecyra* may deserve reproach for their automatic tendency to blame their wives for the family crisis and assume the viciousness of the *meretrix* Bacchis, but like Chremes they make their mistakes without the playwright drawing attention to them through overt comment or criticism by other characters.²⁷ No father in Terence is mocked by slaves or makes lewd remarks and coarse boasts. Of the freeborn men, only the outsider Thraso in *Eunuchus* is ridiculous. But is this the proof of social prejudice? Let us turn to the wives. Good wives and respectable women

26 Dunkin 1946.

27 On Chremes' bad judgement but ultimate recovery of good sense see Fantham 1971. Terence represents him as boasting of his misdeeds to his son, something Plutarch disapproves of strongly in fathers (cf. Bettini 1991, 12).

in general make poor comedy, which is more easily extracted from nagging or bullying shrews like the wife of Plautus' *Menaechmi*. Terence actually eliminates the wife from his first play, when he turns the expository monologue of Menander's *Simo* into dialogue like that of Menander's *Perinthia*, but replaces the wife of that play with a freedman: he may have chosen this as a way to show gratitude and loyalty to his own patron Terentius, or he may simply have wanted not to introduce a wife and mother for whom he had no further use. Both the *matronae* of *Hecyra* are decent and modest, as is the pregnant victim's mother in *Adelphoe*, and the soft-hearted *matrona* Sostrata of the *Heautontimoroumenos*, who disobeyed her husband before the play began because she could not bring herself to kill her baby daughter, and will indulge her errant son in the last act. In *Eunuchus* the father of the two young men is an amiable cipher and there is no mother. Only in *Phormio* is there a wife of some spirit, and Nausistrata shows dignity and restraint in her sarcastic reaction to the stepchild produced by her husband's old infidelity. Even the independent women in Terence are decorous, ranging from the humility of Antiphila in *Heautontimoroumenos* and generosity of Thais in *Eunuchus* and Bacchis in *Hecyra* to the honest realism of the subordinate figures. So do we blame him for sparing the elite males, or praise him—as I once wanted to—for appreciating the needs and circumstances of his women?

Neither, I think. Terence is trying to preserve decorum and keep the proper balance of power within his families: but why is he so keen to do so? Does he want to maintain the respect of the plebeians in the audience for their social betters? If Sander Goldberg is right²⁸ that there was only room on the steps of the temple of Cybele for one to two thousand spectators at the Megalensia, were there enough repeat performances to include many ordinary Romans in the audience? I am going to suggest a different purpose—the maintenance of respect for authority within the Roman family: that Terence's target audience was really the fathers and more particularly the sons of Rome's elite.²⁹ We might note that the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* illustrates

28 See Goldberg 1998.

29 It is significant that the exceptional act of T. Manlius Torquatus (consul 165) in demanding his right as *paterfamilias* to try his own son for a public offence of embezzlement while commanding in Macedonia must have occurred during the years of Terence's productions. (He condemned his son, who then killed himself out of shame.) I owe this reference to Bettini 1991, 10 f., citing the detailed summary of Val. Max. 5.8.3.

the figure of maxim in 4.17.25 with an elaborate maxim about the firm correction of *adulescentium peccata*, and that Augustus, a century later, took pains to set aside special seating for these young men (and a parallel block of seats for their *paedagogi*) in his theatre.³⁰ The same preoccupations are reflected in many scenarios of the *controuersiae* that exercised young elite Romans in the declamatory schools. Where Plautus aimed to entertain, Terence was aiming to educate, or better to edify. It is time for us to look more carefully at Terence's young men.

The young hero Pamphilus of Terence's first play, *Andria*, shows as much concern for his father as Simo has already shown for his son in his introductory speeches describing Pamphilus' emergence into manhood. We see that Pamphilus is a good boy, and that Simo himself feels restraint in tackling the delicate issue of marriage: unwilling to accuse his son outright he imagines out loud the reply that Pamphilus might legitimately make to any sudden reproach. Simo himself does not name his own inhibitions, but you cannot read very far in Terence without coming upon the concept of shame.³¹ Menedemus in *Heautontimoroumenos* feels no less when his son has yielded to his scolding and gone to fight as a mercenary; *Ht.* 121–35 reflects this (*reuertor maestus atque animo fere / peturbato ... prae aegritudine*, 'I returned sad and pretty much disturbed in my mind ... in this distressing situation', 122 f.). He reproaches himself for driving his son away from the comfort he himself is enjoying: *gnatum unicum / quem pariter uti his decuit aut etiam amplius / ... eum ego hinc eieci miserum iniustitia mea* ('My only son,

30 *Rhet. Her.* 4.25 (the 'double maxim with a reason'): *qui adulescentium peccatis ignosci putant oportere falluntur, propterea quod aetas illa non est impedimento bonis studiis. at ii sapienter faciunt qui adulescentes maxime castigant, ut quibus uirtutibus omnem tueri uitam possint eas in aetate maturissima uelint comparare* ('Those who think we should pardon the sins of youth are mistaken, because that age is no obstacle to good pursuits. But men act wisely in severely punishing young men, so that they will want to acquire as soon as possible the virtues with which they will be able to protect their entire life'). On special theatre seating for youths cf. Suet. *Diu. Aug.* 44.2, *praetextatis cuneum suum et proximum paedagogis* ('[he assigned] the young boys their own section, and one next to it their attendants').

31 The definitive study on shame is now Kaster 1997; compare his comment that *pudor* is the test-quality of the adult elite male (12) and definition of *pudor* as 'a displeasure with oneself caused by vulnerability to just criticism of a socially diminishing sort ... generated from within' (4 f.). Kaster sees *pudor* as the counterpart of *reuerentia* for another, citing what is surely another Roman father from Varro's *Menippea* 449 (*non te tui saltem pudet, si nil mei reueretur?*, 'aren't you even ashamed on your own account, if you feel no respect for me?').

who should have been enjoying these things just as much or even more ... I have driven him out, the poor boy, with my unjust treatment', 131–34). Many times, often without justice, characters in Terence ask 'aren't you ashamed?'³² but it is the young men themselves who feel and acknowledge their shame before the fathers they have deceived. Thus Pamphilus is moved in *Andria* by shame both before his father (*patris pudor* 262) and towards his unacknowledged mistress (... *ut neque me consuetudo neque amor neque pudor / commoueat neque commoneat ut seruem fidem*, 'so that neither familiarity nor love nor shame moves me or urges me to keep my word', 279 f.). In the crisis of Act 5 scene 3 his father first reproaches Pamphilus, despairing of seeing any sign of *pudor*,³³ but then rejoices when his son is shamed into obedience (*tibi pater me dedo, quiduis oneris impone, impera*, 'I surrender to you, father; impose any burden upon me, command me!', 897). It is this emotional surrender that provides the climax of the play. In *Heautontimoroumenos* young Clinia, believing that his Antiphila has sold herself, feels shame at the memory of his father's warnings about foreign women (*quoniam nunc pudet me et miseret, qui harum mores cantabat mihi*, 'on whose account I

32 Cf. *And.* 871: *age Pamphile, exi Pamphile, equid te pudet?* ('Come, Pamphilus, come on out, aren't you ashamed?'); 877 f. *num cogitate quid dicat? Num facti piget? / uide num eius color pudoris signum usquam indicat*, ('Is he thinking about what he is saying? Is he discontent with his actions? See whether his complexion shows any sign of shame'); and *Hec.* 231: *cum puella suscepisse inimicitias non pudet?*, ('Aren't you ashamed to quarrel with a young girl?'). On this type of question, common in Roman comedy and oratory from Plautus on, see Kaster 1997, 11 f. The denouement of *Phormio* offers a nice contrast between Demipho's indignation at his son's marriage: *nec meum imperium, ac mitto imperium, non simultatem meam reuereri saltem! non pudere! o facinus audax!*, ('And he does not even respect my authority, or let alone my authority, my resentment! To feel no shame! What impudent behaviour!', 233 f.) and his wife's reaction to his adultery: *adeone indignum hoc tibi uidetur, filius / homo adulescens ut habeat unam amicam, tu uxores duas? / nil pudere? quo ore illum obiurgabis? responde mihi* ('Does it seem so improper to you that your young son has one girl-friend, when you have two wives? Have you no shame? How will you have the nerve to scold him? Answer me!', 1041–43).

33 *And.* 878, quoted in n. 32 above. Donatus draws special attention to this moment: *paterno animo dicit, namque patribus uelle erubescere filios pudentesque esse familiare est. cui contrarium est [Ad. 643] erubescit: salua res est. hoc ergo dicit nec timet inquit neque eum paenitet nec pudet* ('He is speaking in a fatherly spirit, for it is natural for fathers to want their sons to blush and feel proper shame. The opposite is "He's blushing: it's going to be all right." So this is what he is saying: "He isn't afraid nor discontented nor ashamed."')

now feel shame and regret, as he it was who kept on at me about the way they behave', 260), but it is his silly friend Clitipho who must learn shame when his father realises that the gold-digging Bacchis is his son's girl-friend, and this is developed to the full in the play's climax: 'Weren't you ashamed to cheat and bring before my eyes a—I'm ashamed to use a dirty word in your mother's presence, but *you* did not feel any shame at all.' The moment has come for Clitipho: 'Alas, how utterly I loathe myself, how ashamed I feel.'³⁴ The *Eunuchus* is perhaps least typical of Terence's natural manner, and the rapist Chaerea, who really does have cause to feel shame, diverts the issue by volunteering his desire to marry the girl he has just raped; Thais herself handles him delicately by distinguishing between what might be fit treatment for her profession and what behaviour was proper for him (864–66), and later, when he does not want to be seen by his brother wearing the eunuch's costume, gives Pythias the chance to rib him 'What, does it make you feel ashamed?' (907). The special circumstances of *Hecyra*, in which one man is both wronged husband of his pregnant wife and wronging rapist, call instead upon a parallel moral value, that of *pietas*: from the expository opening when Terence stresses his 'respectful and loyal nature' (*pudicum et pium ingenium* 152) to the expression of *pietas* towards his mother at 301, and again at 447, 'provided I can observe family loyalty (*pietatem*), for I should pay attention to my mother not my own love', 481 (where family loyalty have become a pretext to avoid his wife) and 584 where his mother volunteers to take herself out of the way as a reward for his loyalty (*apud me praemium esse positum pietati scias*). But *Hecyra* is different in several ways: the hero, Pamphilus, has no moment of self-knowledge, and the audience itself is denied the knowledge to evaluate the actions of its characters because Terence has suppressed the expository prologue that would have told them of Pamphilus' own offence and guaranteed a happy ending. Instead they do not know why Pamphilus' wife has left his home until he repeats the extenuating narrative of her mother at 382–401 (perhaps adapted from the *argumentum* of Apollodorus' prologue). Even when they learn that she has been raped and impregnated they cannot guess that he is himself the rapist. This is only reported in Act 5 scene 4, 50

34 *Ht.* 1041–44: CH: *non mihi per fallacias adducere ante oculos—pudet / dicere hac praesente uerbum turpe; at te id nullo modo / facere puduit.* CL: *eheu quam nunc totus displiceo mihi / quam pudet.* But Chremes has already shown that his own sense of shame is superficial and misplaced at 576 and 581.

lines before the end of the play (821–32), after Bacchis tells Parmeno that Myrrina has recognised the ring, and goes on to tell the audience about how Pamphilus snatched it from his victim—and gave it as a gift to her. When Parmeno incomprehendingly repeats what he has been told to Pamphilus he simply rejoices in his luck (845–48); not only does he have no further encounter with his father, or mother or in-laws or wife, but he decides to keep the story from the old folk: ‘I don’t like things happening the way they do in comedy when everyone finds out everything’.³⁵ Donatus reports that Terence has converted action into narrative at this point, but this does not affect Pamphilus’ escape from a reckoning. Modern parents would be ashamed if their young son raped a strange girl when he already had a mistress whom he claimed to love, and even more ashamed if he stole the girl’s ring and gave it to his mistress, but New Comedy seems to have accepted such behaviour as predictable. Even if Terence cut short Apollodorus’ denouement it is unlikely that the Greek Pamphilus had a moment of shame or self-realisation or expressed any apology.³⁶ Nor do the old men ever apologize for their unjustified suspicions of their wives,³⁷ just as neither Demea nor Moschion in Menander’s *Samia* apologizes to poor Chrysis: the females have served their purpose in the action and can be forgotten.

But the crowning example is *Adelphoe*, the play perhaps closest to Caecilius’ *Hypobolimaheus* in its pointed antithesis between the behaviour of true brothers subjected to contrasted upbringing. Nine times the verb *pudere* recurs, four times on Demea’s lips: first in indignant denial that his son feels any shame (84), then in shame over his brother’s indulgence (speaking to the indifferent slave: *fratris me pudet pigetque*, ‘I’m ashamed and dissatisfied with my brother’, 392), thirdly and more appropriately for shame over the wronged girl’s rape as he talks to her kinsman (485) and finally in reproach towards his indulgent brother (754). The weak

35 *Hec.* 866 f.: *non placet fieri hoc item ut in comoediis / omnes ubi resciscunt*. Donatus on 825 notes *breuitati consuluit Terentius, nam in Graeca haec aguntur non narrantur* (‘Terence has shown concern to keep things short, for in the Greek play these things are performed, and not reported’). But what is *haec*? The dialogue between the girl’s mother Myrrinha and the *meretrix* Bacchis? If so there is no reason to assume that Pamphilus ever has to account for his actions.

36 See Fantham 1975, 68–71, on the probable difference in emotional and moral impact between Terence’s comedy and his Greek original.

37 As late as 662 Laches is still pontificating; *censen te posse reperire ullam mulierem / quae careat culpa*? ‘Do you think you can find any woman free of blame?’

Ctesipho confesses to his brother Aeschinus that he was ashamed to admit his desperation (274), just as we hear later that Aeschinus was ashamed to tell his father that he had got the girl pregnant (690): but the crucial moment comes not in Act 5 but slightly earlier (Act 4 scene 5) when Micio catches his adopted son coming to visit the girl, and the boy blushes with shame (*erubuit: salua res est*, 'he blushed: it's going to be all right', 643). Micio pretends that the girl is to be taken away by a kinsman, then confronts his blushing son with his knowledge and forgiveness of the boy's act. It is this that finally drives the youth to confession: but then it seems that this confession alone is sufficient atonement for all that the boy has done and failed to do (*id mihi uehementer dolet / et me tui pudet*, 'I'm desperately sorry about this, and ashamed before you', 683 f.).

In this scene, as in the moments of reconciliation in Terence's other plays, the message is the need for sons to honour and obey their fathers, and the guarantee of forgiveness if there is true repentance and submission. Surely only a professional teacher could so persistently harp upon this particular aspect of the Roman family, writing not so much to gratify the fathers in his audience as to impress their young sons, who must be encouraged to grow up as good citizens and given hope that their sins of youth could be outgrown and forgotten. What I would like to suggest is that Terence's dramatic scripts—whether they are entirely his own adaptation from the Greek plays, or were influenced by the company he kept—are moved by the same didacticism that shapes many of the Augustan declamations known to us from the elder Seneca. Hence Cicero may praise his skill in economical and effective narrative, both in *De Inuentione* and the later *De Oratore*,³⁸ but he includes no word of Terence in his extended survey of wit, nor does Quintilian, in his study of humour (6.3). Indeed Quintilian's interest in Terence is limited to citing the mild Terentian father from *Pro Caelio*, a comment on a proverbial phrase from the *Andria* narrative, and four citations of the famous lover's soliloquy from the opening of *Eunuchus*.³⁹

But if this is an explanation it does not provide a justification. However moral his motivation, Terence was depriving his comedies—or

38 *De Inuentione* 1.27, *De Oratore* 2.326–28. (Cf. also 2.172 citing Terence for an *argumentum e minore*).

39 Quint. 11.1.39 for the comic fathers; 8.3.35 and 8.5.4 for *Andr.* 68, *obsequium amicos ueritas odium parit* ('obsequiousness gains friends, truth enemies'); 9.2.11, 9.3.16, 9.4.46 and 11.3.182 for *Eun.* 46, or 46–48.

most of them—of their vitality and power to offer release from earnest reality. He may also have thought like a teacher in offering to his audience a model not only of good manners but of plain and elegant dialogue—one that would in fact provide a template for Latin speech as late as the Renaissance. But moral or even stylistic teaching are poor bedmates for comedy, and I can only agree with Sander Goldberg's regretful verdict that Terence 'won his lasting fame as a stylist, not as a playwright, and his dramatic tradition does not long survive so bookish an achievement.'⁴⁰

Bibliography

- Ashmore, S. G., *The Comedies of Terence*, New York 1908.
- Bettini, M., *Anthropology and Roman Culture: Kinship, Time, Images of the Soul*, Baltimore 1991.
- Dunkin, P. S., *Post-Aristophanic Comedy; Studies in the Social Outlook in Middle and New Comedy in both Athens and Rome*, Urbana 1946.
- Fantham, E., "Hautontimorumenos and Adelphoe: A Study in Fatherhood in Terence and Menander", *Latomus* 30 (1971) 970–98.
- Frank, T., "On Suetonius' *Life of Terence*", *AJP* 54 (1933) 269–73.
- Goldberg, S. M., *Understanding Terence*, Princeton 1986.
- Goldberg, S. M., "Plautus on the Palatine", *JRS* 88 (1998) 1–20.
- Horsfall, N. M., "The Collegium Poetarum", *BICS* 23 (1976) 79–95.
- Horsfall, N. M., "Doctus sermonis utriusque linguae", *EMC/CV* 23 (1979) 85–95.
- Kaster, R. A., *Suetonius: De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*, Oxford 1992.
- Kleve, K., "How to Read an Illegible Papyrus: Towards an Edition of Caecilius Statius *Obolostates sive faenerator*", *CErc* 26 (1996) 5–14.
- Leo, F., *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Berlin 1913.
- Leo, F., *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, Rome 1960, 135–49 [orig. pub. As *Analecta Plautina: De figuris sermonis II*, Göttingen].
- McElduff, S., "More than Menander's Acolyte: Terence as Translator", *Ramus* 33 (2004), 120–9.
- Robson, D. O., "The Nationality of the Poet Caecilius Statius", *AJP* 59 (1938) 301–08.
- Wright, J., *Dancing in Chains: The Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Pallatia*, Rome 1974.

40 Goldberg 1985, 192.

9. Roman Experience of Menander in the Late Republic and Early Empire

Behind the title of this paper lurks a problem which I have tried to address by examining two different types of ancient evidence. The problem is to determine the medium or media through which educated Romans from the time of Cicero to that of Pliny and Juvenal knew Menander: in the original Greek, or through more or less faithful Latin adaptations; in written form, in undramatised recitation, or in stage production; in excerpts, or as complete plays; performed in private or in public, at Rome or in the Greek communities of Campania or in Greece itself. So many variables justify a careful reconsideration of the established literary testimonia. But at the same time, if we are to go beyond acknowledging the familiarity of these generations with Menander as a literary text, we have to sift the much vaguer evidence for the performance of comedy, and relate the known use of *comoedi* in rhetorical training to their less verifiable activities as private or public entertainers. This may seem negative and unrewarding in comparison with questions that could be raised about Menander's general influence on the major writers of the period, but it will, I hope, provide a clearer background against which we can measure the discrepancy between Menander's reputation at Rome and his direct influence.

The abundant papyri of Menander and allusions to his plays in Greek authors of the early Roman Empire leave no doubt that he was more than a recognized classic: he was a favourite of the Hellenistic world, alongside Homer, Euripides, and Demosthenes. Indeed the *Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander* attributed to Plutarch shows that he was not only studied but performed both publicly and on private occasions. "He has made his poetry, of all the beautiful works Greece has produced, the most generally accepted subject in theatres, in discussions and at banquets, for reading, for instruction, and for dramatic compet-

This is an expanded version of a paper given to the panel on *The Influence of Menander on Latin Literature* at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association at San Francisco in December, 1981.

itions.”¹ Two details drawn from Plutarch’s comments in the Table-Talk, however, may suggest some reservations about the level at which Plutarch and his contemporaries appreciated Menander’s artistry. At 711F, he praises Menander because guests who are entertained by his work are not disturbed by eroticism, but return to their wives content with their lot: an earlier passage (673B) shows that actors performed Menander at parties as an alternative to mime-artists and the character-sketches of *ethologi*; this suggests the selection of scenes or long monologues rather than complete plays.² It is probable that the twin evils of post-classical society, moralizing and excerpting, were already at work in the Greek part of the Empire.

How different was the situation at Rome itself? In Cicero’s time? In the generation of Horace or Ovid? The time of Seneca and Pliny the Elder, or that of Quintilian? We cannot assume a constant level of interest, or even a linear increase or decline in familiarity. Would it be fair to compare Roman experience of Menander with, say, the knowledge of Molière enjoyed three centuries after his death by Americans or Britons with a literary education? Or would it be closer to their knowledge of Shakespeare? We refer quite casually to his plays, and bandy quotations from them; yet this too can be misleading. We may have seen a live performance of the play, whether professional or amateur;³ we may have studied the play formally, subjecting it to the type of analysis favoured in examinations; we may have read it from curiosity or merely met the synopsis and some passing critical comment, inheriting fragments of quotation as we read. We may not even know the source of our allusion.

Attempts to assess the Romans’ familiarity with Menander’s plays must also take into account the popularity of Latin adaptations, includ-

1 Plut. *Comp. Ar. et Men.*, *Moralia* 854B (Loeb Classical Library edition, 10.469). This is Testimonium 41 in Menander, *Reliquiae* 2, ed. Körte/Thierfelder, Leipzig 1953. All excerpts cited in Körte/Thierfelder will be provided with references in these notes (K-Th).

2 *Quaestiones Convivales* 5, *Moralia* 673B. The Loeb translation “performances of mimes, impersonations and scenes from Menander” (LCL 8.375) is more specific than Plutarch’s text, which literally reads “men performing Menander.” As a referee has kindly pointed out to me, the verb *hypokrinomai* would allow us to understand this either as a full dramatisation, or as declaiming in a recitation.

3 I would consider film or television versions of the plays as equivalent to stage productions from this point of view, and compare radio-productions with ancient recitation.

ing what we know of the lost *palliatae* of Caecilius⁴ with the surviving plays of Terence and Plautus. The *plebs Romana* in Cicero's day might still attend Roman versions of New Comedy, but educated contemporaries had the choice of reading either the *Andria* of Terence or that of Menander. There is only one undisputed reference to Menander in Cicero, and it occurs not in a speech, but in the preface to a philosophical dialogue.⁵ Now Cicero often quoted the lines from Roman adaptations of Menander in court, and when he alluded to his plots, in tact or deference to national feeling referred his audience to the Roman playwrights, Caecilius for the *Hypobolimaesus*, or Terence for the *Adelphoe*.⁶ But in the preface to *De finibus*, when Cicero argues against Varro the case for adapting Greek philosophy into Latin, he conjures up the figure of an intellectual snob pretentious enough to object to reading Caecilius or Terence instead of the original plays of Menander.⁷ This figure may well represent a trend in the next generation, for twenty years later Caecilius is forgotten, and by the time of Quintilian it is Menander's text of the *Hypobolimaesus* which is recommended to the trainee orator.⁸

4 The best recent study of Caecilius is in John Wright's *Dancing in Chains: the Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata*, MAAR 25, Rome 1974, 87–126.

5 I do not accept the authenticity of *De optimo genere oratorum*, but it may well belong to the period under study in this paper. The pamphlet contains two references to Menander: at 6, where the author argues that Menander did not wish to imitate Homer because he was writing in a different genre, and at 18 where the corrupt text seems to be a reminiscence of *De finibus* 1.4 (cited below). The manuscripts reads: *quid istas legam potius quam Graecas? Idem Andriam et Synephebos nec minus Terentium et Caecilium quam Menandrum legunt*. Note that the sole quotation attributed to Menander in Shackleton Bailey's edition of Cicero *ad Atticum* (13.42.1 = 354 SB) is only probable, though the parallels cited on the authority of Lloyd-Jones *ad loc.* (5.397) give strong support. The excerpt is certainly from New Comedy, which is highly appropriate to the domestic scene with the young scapegrace Quintus *filius*.

6 Cicero uses an episode from *Hypobolimaesus* in his first speech, *Rosc. Am.* 47, with the tag *senex ille Caecilianus*, and again contrasts the *patrem ... Caecilianum ... uehementem et durum* (illustrated by three excerpts from Caecilius' version) with *leni uero et clementi patre* (Micio from Terence's *Adelphoe*, so well known that he needs no identification) in *Cael.* 37–39. Varro himself quotes his play as *apud Caecilium in Hypobolimaeo* in *R. R.* 2.11.11, see K-Th 146–47.

7 *Fin.* 1.4: *Synephebos ego, inquit, potius Caecilii aut Andrian Terenti quam utramque Menandri legam?*

8 Quint. 1.10.18 and 10.1.70. We should note that like Menander's and Terence's *Adelphoe*, this play was concerned with the moral education of

Thanks to the work of Glen Bowersock and Jasper Griffin⁹ we now appreciate the strong influence of Greek culture at all levels in the early Principate and the extent to which fashionable and leisured Romans adopted Greek dress, manners, and entertainment at home and in social gatherings. Their reading too seems to have become more Greek. Certainly Ovid mentions Menander as reading for the young of both sexes, like his own elegy.¹⁰ Did they read the plays for diversion, as they read elegy—on a bench while awaiting a rendezvous? Or was this educational? Both Propertius and Horace talk in the same breath of reading Menander and Plato, Horace when at leisure in the country, while Propertius plans to go to Athens to do so.¹¹ But what did Menander and Plato have in common? Surely their depiction of human behaviour and their marvellous dialogue. It rather looks as though Menander is to be a means to an end, providing raw material for Horace's *Satires* and Propertius' *Elegies*. Propertius is also planning to study Demosthenes to provide fighting argument: what he is seeking, thus, is to enrich his rhetorical invention and perhaps also his wit from Menander.

But oddly, when Propertius or Horace or Ovid, or even the sober Manilius, evoke Menandrian comedy, they give no hint of the subtle family dramas, pregnant with misunderstandings, which we value in *Epitrepontes* or *Samia*, but only the standard features of a comedy of deception. The poets list the stock types of a *hetaera*-comedy, or name certain roles, but neither the names nor the details of action evoke a par-

young men, which might explain its popularity both with the Romans and (in Greek) with the Byzantine moral excerptors (Strobaeus preserves nine fragments amounting to 41 lines; K-Th fr. 416–24). As Quintilian recommends the memorizing of excerpts from the Menander play to his students, so Caecilius' text may have been known from the schools rather than the theatre.

- 9 G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford 1965 and Jasper Griffin, "Augustan Poetry and the Life of Luxury," *JRS* 66 (1976) 87–195.
- 10 Tr. 2.369–70: *fabula iucundi nil est sine amore Menandri / et solet hic pueris uirginibusque legi* (K-Th Test. 35). On Ovid's use of Menander see L. Alfonsi, "Ovidio e Menandro," *Aegyptus* 40 (1960) 73–76 and n. 14 below.
- 11 Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.11–12: *quorsum pertinuit stipare Platona Menandro / Eupolin Archilochum, comites educere tantos?* and Prop. 3.21.25–28: *illic aut stadiis animum emendare Platonis / incipiam, aut hortis, docte Epicure, tuis: / persequar aut studium linguae, Demosthenis arma, / libaboque tuos, docte Menandre, sales.* (*Docte* is an unusual epithet for Menander; if genuine, it presumably alludes to his philosophical education, but it seems likely that in either 26 or 28 *docte* has displaced the original epithet by a dittography).

ticular known play. Consider Prop. 4.5.43–44: *sed potius mundi Thais pretiosa Menandri / cum ferit astutos comica moecha Getas*. We know of no play in which the courtesan cheats a slave; usually they are allies in cheating some aged father or intrusive soldier. We know that Plautus and Terence alike changed the Greek names of roles, from Syros to Chrysalus, or Chrysis to Thais,¹² but it seems most likely that Propertius has simply associated a famous title character of Menander with his own conception of a Menandrian plot.—a conception which in fact resembles more closely the plots of Plautus than any extant play. Horace in the *Ars Poetica*¹³ comes close to Terence, since Davus and Simo were certainly adversaries in *Andria*, but it is Pythias, found only in *Eunuchus*, who is said to cheat Simo, and yet neither of these plays involves the cheating of an old man under any name. The allusions of Ovid and Manilius, without names, offer only stock types and a stock intrigue, again, however, closer to the surviving Roman than Greek scripts.¹⁴ Even Horace, after opening *Sat.* 2.3 with talk of reading Menander, later in the same satire adapts line for line Terence's famous opening scene from the *Eunuchus*, portraying the weak, irresolute lover who can-

12 Chrysalus actually plays on his original name Syros at *Ba.* 649: *non mihi isti placent Parmenones, Syri*; see F. H. Sandbach (ed.), *Menandri Reliquiae*, Oxford 1972, *Dis Exapaton* 59. For Chrysis as the original name of Terence's Thais in *Eunouchos/Eunuchus*, see Schol. Pers. 5.161 (K-Th 2.66)

13 A. P. 237–38: *Nil intersit Davusne loquatur et audax / Pythias, emuncto lucrata Simone talentum*.

14 Ov. *Am.* 1.15.18: “Dum fallax seruus, durus pater, improba lena/uiuent et meretrix blanda, Menandros erit” (K-Th Test. 34). Compare Manilius 5.471 f. (K-Th Test. 35), enumerating (*ardentis iuuenis raptasque in amore puellas / elusosque senes agilesque per omnia seruos*). The single instance in which Ovid names a Menandrian character (but does not name Menander himself) is at *A.A.* 3.332: *cuiue pater uafri luditur arte Getae*. Writing in the first years of enthusiasm for the newly discovered *Dyskolos*, Alfonsi (above, n. 10) wanted to understand this as a specific reference to the baiting of Knemon by Geta in the last act of the play. But (1) without an identifying adjective such as *truculentus* no reader would think of Knemon, rather than of the standard situation in which a slave tricks his young master's father; (2) *luditur* implies a material deceit, as in the parallel allusions of Propertius and Horace; (3) Geta is a name common to many plays: *Heros*, *Misoumenos*, and *Perinthia* of the extant plays of Menander and two of the six plays of Terence. It is more probable that like Propertius (4.5.54, cited p. 302) Ovid has inserted the name to give specificity to a general allusion.

not leave his mistress' door.¹⁵ There is a clear contrast here with the treatment of the same episode by Persius, who uses the names given by Menander in the original Greek play;¹⁶ indeed not only Persius, but the scholiast on this satire is able to quote the names of Menander's roles from his own reading.¹⁷

But if we grant that the authors of this generation read and were influenced by Menander, can we believe they ever saw a whole play staged? The evidence is uncomfortably vague. Strabo stresses the Greek festivals of Naples with their performances of poetry: one would expect this to include dramatic poetry.¹⁸ A peculiar passage in Statius' encomium of his native city seems to suggest dramatic performances of Menander, but the allusion is out of context and strained: should it be emended out of the text or harmonized instead of tampering with its context?¹⁹ Again, Suetonius, after noting Augustus' interest in Greek literature (Aug. 89), mentions his love of *uetus comoedia*. Is this the Greek Old Comedy or the old Roman comedies, as most editors assume? Is there reason to relate his apparent preference for comedy to his attendance at the Neapolitan games, from which he was returning when he died in AD 14? Greek Old Comedy can hardly be cited by Suetonius as a source of *praecepta salubria*, but Menandrian reflective monologue and one-liners would be highly apposite in this context. Again we are told that Augustus put on productions of *uetus comoedia* at public shows: this hardly suggests performance of Greek rather than Latin comedy.

15 Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.259–71, cf. Ter. *Eun.* 46–49 and 57–73. For a brilliant analysis of Horatian adaptation from Terence disguised as autobiography, see E. W. Leach, "Horace's *pater optimus* and Terence's Demea: Autobiographical Fiction and Comedy in *Sermo* I, 4," *AJP* 92 (1971) 616–32. Horace has clearly built on the inspiration of Ter. *Ad.* 414–19 to portray the moral lessons he received from his father in *Sat.* 1.4.103–39.

16 Pers. 5.161 f.: *Daue cito, hoc credas iubeo, finire dolores / praeteritos meditor, crudum Chaerestratus unguem / adrodens ait haec* (K–Th 2.66).

17 Donatus adds that in Menander Chaerestratus' father is called Simo.

18 Strabo 5.4.7 (on Greek theatrical performances at Naples): "At the present time a sacred contest is celebrated among them every four years, in music as well as gymnastics: it lasts for several days, and vies with the most famous of those celebrated in Greece."

19 Statius *Silvae* 3.5.91–94: *et geminam molem nudi tectique theatri / et Capitolinis quinquennia proxima lustris. / quid laudem litus, libertatemque Menandri / quam Romanus honos et Graia licentia miscent?* Baehrens proposed *luis* for *litis*: Phillimore, however, follows earlier editors in regarding the name *Menanadri* as corrupt.

From the Neronian period the evidence points to tragedy and para-dramatic forms like mime and melodrama rather than to public staging of comedy: the Emperor clearly had neither a sense of humour nor a sense of proportion, so that interest in comedy would be surprising at the time. Seneca on one occasion quotes what looks like a reminiscence of *Dyskolos*:

aut illud Menandri ... omnes ait malos uiuere et in scenam uelut rusticus poeta prosiliuit, non senem excepit, non puerum, non feminam, non uirum et adicit non singulos peccare, non paucos, sed iam scelus esse contextum.²⁰

This looks like a genuine quotation, whereas the many citations of Menander by the Elder Pliny for various herbs, spices, and gems are more likely to be taken over second-hand for his Greek prose authorities.²¹

Whenever we have explicit reference to recitation of Menander, it occurs in connection with a significant but ambiguous figure in Roman life attested from the time of Cicero (if not earlier) to that on Quintilian. The name *comoedus* is applied to Cicero's great contemporary, Roscius, the knight of Lanuvium, who performed into his old age; it is also applied to what seem free-lance drama-coaches employed in the training of young orators, to individual private slaves valued as recitalists, and to troupes of seemingly young or artificially boyish performers who may be assumed to have given performances in private houses, if not in public. Apart from implying the ability to perform or recite comedy, the title does not specifically guarantee performance in Greek rather than Latin; certainly Trimalchio, who had bought himself a troupe of *comoedi*, claims to have used them to perform Atellanes because he found them more amusing than comedy.²² But to return to the beginning of our period: Cicero came quite early in his career to defend the great actor Roscius in a civil suit brought by a partner over their share in

20 Sen. *N.Q.* 4a pr. 19. It seems to represent Men. *Dysk.* 718–21, but as paraphrase rather than translation.

21 Pliny *N.H.* 23.169 is exceptional in naming the play from which the item of diet is drawn, but cf. 13.13 (fr. 920 K-Th), 18.72 (863 K-Th), 19.113 (831 K-Th), 20.252 (832 K-Th), 32.69 (not in K-Th), 36.44 (875 K-Th), and 37.106 (908 K-Th). Despite his claim in book 1 (index of book 31) to have used Menander, it would be rash to assume that Pliny had personally consulted the text.

22 Sat. 53.13: *reliqua acroamata tricas meras esse, 'nam et comoedos,' inquit, 'emeram, sed malui illos Atellanam facere, et choraulen meum iussi Latine cantare.'*

an acting pupil. How had they met? He puts into the mouth of his protector, L. Crassus, at a dramatic date of 91 BCE, an eloquent account of Roscius' method of pupil selection and training.²³ This could be referred to pupil actors, were it not for the fact that Cicero is so aware of the usefulness of this kind of training for young speakers. There were social factors inhibiting him from direct admission that he had taken coaching from a man of the theatre, but his repeated and well-informed analogies from theatre to courtroom in this work bear out the suspicion that he had met Roscius as a pupil and incurred the obligation which he discharged by his defence in 76 BCE. Quintilian makes it very clear that the *comoedus* was a valuable part of the teenage student's basic training in his own day. The student is to avoid vulgar mimicry, but learn diction from the *comoedus*, correcting faults of enunciation and deportment; he will also learn how to narrate, how to persuade with conviction, and how to stir up anger and fear by his excited or pathetic tone.²⁴ He will use as the medium passages selected from comedy which are closest to *actiones*—disputes; but this is seen only as a preliminary before he is able to read and absorb whole speeches. Earlier in the first book, dealing with this transitional phase of education, Quintilian had singled out comedy, but especially Menander, for this function; the Latin authors are mentioned only as a concession.²⁵ When he comes in Book Ten to his advanced programme there is the same stress on Menander;²⁶ even alone, Quintilian declares, Menander can supply the orator with all the resources he needs of argumentation and diction, since he adapts himself to every circumstance, role and mood. Quintilian commends especially the scenes of dispute from *Epitrepontes*, *Epideros*, *Locroe*, and the *meditationes*²⁷—practice-scenes—from *Psophodees*, *Nomothetes*, and *Hypoboli-*

23 Cf. *De or.* 1.129: *saepe enim soleo audire Roscium, cum ita dicat, se adhuc reperire discipulum potuisse neminem ... ipsi illi Roscio, quem saepe audio dicere caput artis esse decere.* Cf. also *De or.* 2.233 (on gesture) and 3.221 (on the effect of the mask in concealing expression).

24 *Inst.* 1.11 avoidance of unmanly mimicry (11.1) and theatrical excess in gesture (11.3); training in enunciation (11.4–8), in correcting grimaces and facial ticks (11.9–11), and in adjusting delivery to the functions of narrative, proof, and emotional impact (11.12–13).

25 1.8.8: *nec tamen excluserim alios; nam Latini quoque auctores adferent utilitatis aliquid.*

26 10.1.6: *uel unus meo quidem iudicio diligenter lectus ad cuncta quae praecipimus effingenda sufficiat.*

27 *Nomothetes*, *Locroi*, and *Psophodees* are known only from this reference and isolated glosses in the lexicographers. *Epitrepontes* survives in the Cairo papyrus and three others, plus ten fragments; Menander wrote two plays called *Epikleros*,

maeus. We might note that this list includes a different selection from those plays preserved for their literary merits. Quintilian recommends the playwright equally as a training for declamation, since he provides samples of different social types and temperaments. His praise of Menander is second only in enthusiasm to his treatment of Homer, and he is explicit in noting that other Greek comic dramatists were far inferior for his purpose.²⁸

If this training, either from the *comoedus* for the technique of delivery or the rhetor for techniques of composition, laid such stress on Menander, then he would have become a major part of the young public speaker's stylistic, if not literary, equipment. But Quintilian had also watched the *comoedi* perform Menander. Where and what did *comoedi* perform in the generations after Nero's death?²⁹ Was there a revulsion from his philhellenism or a decline in interest in the theatre?

The sober society of Pliny's friends offers a parallel to Plutarch's dinner: in an early self-descriptive letter to Septicius Clarus he describes his dinner entertainment as *comoedos uel lectorem uel lyristen uel ... omnes*

one, translated by Turpilius, Terence's immediate successor, involved a court scene cited by Cornutus (a protégé of the Senecas); see Spengel-Hammer, *Rhetores Graeci* 1.359 (K-Th 2.63). On *Hypobolimaus* in both versions, see above, n. 6.

Meditationes may refer to the practice speeches reported by Menander's young men in *Sam.* 121 (*meletesas*) and *Perik.* 550; cf. *Ter. Andr.* 406–7: “*uenit meditatus alicunde ex solo loco: / orationem sperat inuenisse se.*” There is a fine example of such a set speech at *Ter. Phormio* 270–77.

28 10.1.71: *habent tamen alii comici, si cum uenia legantur, quaedam quae possis decerpere, et praecipue Philemon.*

29 For a review of the evidence on comedy and *comoedi* in the early empire, see L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms* 2, Leipzig ⁹1920, 119–21 (unchanged from the seventh edition, translated as *Roman Life and Manners* by L. A. Magnus and J. H. Freese, New York 1908–13, 2.95–97; this translation will be cited as the first reference to Friedländer in subsequent notes). More recent studies have not been able to recover much additional evidence about the performance of comedy in the first century AD: for archaeological evidence see M. Bieber, *History of the Greek and Roman Theatre*, Princeton 1961, 241–42 and 244. Charles Garton, *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre*, Toronto 1972, has put together a register of Augustan actors (Appendix 2, 267–83) making full use of the epigraphic material, but comments in his introductory note on the dearth of information. He estimates seven actors (tragic and comic) known from the period 31 BCE to AD 60, while a further seven can be assigned to the first century AD without the possibility of a more precise date (272). Ten of his entries report performers of comedy (273) but add no information about performance.

(1.15). The plural might suggest a whole troupe; elsewhere his claim is more modest; his skilled recitalist in 5.19.3 is technically a *comoedus* but he can also read prose or sing to the lyre. Usually he talks of *hearing* comedy: *comoedias audio et specto mimos et lyricos lego* (5.3.2); and Sherwin-White, following Guillemin, notes that recitation became the principal means by which the educated classes heard drama. But although he is right in general terms to add that “the *comoedus* recited plays of the New Comedy—Menander, Plautus, Terence,”³⁰ I do not see a way of establishing whether Pliny and men of his seriousness and culture would normally listen to the Greek versions.

From Statius, and from closely similar allusions in Martial and Juvenal, we catch a glimpse of a rather unpleasant aspect of these domestic *comoedi*. Lamenting the death of Atedius Melior’s boy favourite in *Silvae* 2.1, Statius praises his talents as a reciter/performer:

Alcides pensaret Hylan; seu Graius amictu
Attica facundi decurreret orsa Menandri
laudaret gauisa sonum crinemque decorum
fregisset rosea lasciua Thalia corona;
Maeonium siue ille senem Troiaequae labores
diceret aut casus tarde remeantis Ulixis,
ipse pater sensus, ipsi stupuere magistri. (*Silv.* 2.1.113–18)

This pretty slave-child certainly declaimed, perhaps enacted, Menander; so too it would seem, did the troupe upon which Martial composed two epigrams. The first is entitled *pueri comoedi* and puns on the leading-roles of two famous Menandrian comedies.³¹

30 See A. S. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny*, Oxford 1966, 161 on *Ep.* 1.15.2. Apparently (cf. *Ep.* 6.21.4) some of Pliny’s friends attempted to compose Roman comedies in imitation of Menander. Caligula had written Greek comedies (Suet. *Calig.* 3): compare the epitaph of Pomponius Bassulus (H. Brandon, *La Littérature latine inconnue* 2, Paris 1956, 217), who also claimed to have translated several plays of Menander into Latin.

31 On the popularity of *Misoumenos* see Gregson Davis, “Ovid *Metamorphoses* 3.442 f. and the Prologue to Menander’s *Misoumenos*,” *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 339–42, who argues for Ovid’s direct use of the *Misoumenos* prologue; in his view “Thrasonides’ plight was an exemplum of unrequited love,” a “well-known anthology piece” which “Ovid surely knew and expected his audience to recognise.” Beside the allusion found by Davis, cf. Martial and Epictetus 4.1.19 citing the soldier as an instance of a man who lost his freedom for love. (This is *Mis.* fr. 3 in K–Th 1 (1957); fr. 2 Sandbach, relying on the new papyri of this prologue.)

non erit in turba quisquam *Misumenos* ista
sed poterit quiuis esse *Dis Exapaton*. (14.214)

The second (14.215) interprets the infibulation of *comoedi* and *citharistae* as designed to make them more expensive and less accessible as sexual partners. In the first epigram, strong evidence for the performance of Menander, the allusion may also be sexual. Because the boys are *delicati*, encouraged to stay feminine and youthful, none of them will be shunned by a lover, like the Hated Captain, but any of these charmers could be a Double Deceiver. Juvenal bears out this method of inhibiting the sexual activity of *comoedi*: the diatribe against women sees matrons as clients for their expensive services (6.73) but the third Satire stresses instead the ability of the *comoedi* to act in drag, whether as Thais the Courtesan, as a matron, or as the Soubrette Doris (all roles to be found in Terence), they can flatten their underbellies and act like seductive women.³²

But Juvenal also overlaps with the most precise information we have from Quintilian about the public performance of Greek comedies. Quintilian's chapter on *actio* contains several references to contemporary comic acting. At 11.3.91 he criticizes professional *comoedi* who adopt the quavering voice of an old man or a woman, when they are planning a young man's role but reporting the conversation of a second persona, as in the prologue of Menander's *Hydria* or in his *Georgos*.³³ We could relate this to recital or a private staging, and perhaps we should not assume a public performance. Later, however, at 11.3.178f. his account of the two specialist *comoedi* Demetrius and Stratocles certainly belongs to the stage; they are called *maximos actores comoediarum* and their stage movement is praised as well as their voice and gesture: phrases such as *concupere ueste ... or risus quem non ignarus rationis populo dabat* must imply performance in the public theatre. Indeed Juvenal follows his praise of the female impersonations of *comoedi* with allusions to precisely these two actors: *aut Stratocles aut cum molli Demetrius Haemo: / natio comoeda est* (3.99–101).

But were they performing Greek comedy? No doubt they were Greek or Greek-speaking Levantines in origin (unless like some modern ballet-stars they assumed an exotic name to commend themselves in an

32 Juvenal 3.93–97: *an melior cum Thaida sustinet aut cum / uxorem comoedus agit uel Dorida nullo / cultam palliolo? mulier nempe ipsa uidetur / non persona loqui: uacua et plana omnia dicas / infra uentriculum et tenui distantia rima.*

33 Quint. 11.3.91: *cum mihi comoedi quoque pessimi facere uideantur qui etiamsi iuuenem agant, cum tamen in expositione aut senis sermo, ut in Hydriae prologo, aut mulieris, ut in Georgo, incidit tremula uel effeminata uoce pronuntiant* (K–Th 2.142).

exotic art). No doubt they could perform Menander and his contemporaries, but is there a single record that they did so in Rome, and for the general public?

My reluctance to draw conclusions may seem perverse, contrasted with Friedländer's optimistic assessment that "the New Comedy of the Greeks (represented chiefly by Menander, and imitated by Plautus and Terence) retained the firmest hold on popular favour. In Rome, in Italy and the provinces the stock figures ... delighted audiences for centuries. To keep interest alive in these well-worn plays, known to most of the spectators, at least at Rome, good acting must have been essential. A comedian's training was at the end of the first century a strict tradition" ³⁴

We need, I think, to discount this estimate in three ways, all clearly indicated by Friedländer's material. Firstly, although the theatrical games occupied some 48 days in the time of Augustus and up to 101 days in the fourth century, ³⁵ they were third favourite with the Roman audience, well behind the gladiatorial and circus games, and there is evidence that *ludi circenses* and *theatrales* might occur simultaneously. More to the point, in the theatre itself tragedy and comedy were less favoured than pantomime, whether tragic or comic in type, which was the delight of the upper classes, or than the mimes and Atellanes favoured by the groundlings. ³⁶ Secondly, although Suetonius and Tacitus both attest participation by Greek-speakers in games sponsored by Caesar, Augustus, and above all Nero—who may himself have performed his operatic one-man shows in Greek—we do not know what kind of act was in question; the most likely would be pantomime to a Greek libretto. ³⁷ Finally, when the English text of Friedländer speaks of "actors", it represents *histrion* in the Latin sources, and this word had come to denote Pantomime dancers, rather than "straight" actors. ³⁸

34 Friedländer 2.96 = *Darstellungen* 2.119–20.

35 Friedländer 2.11–12 = *Darstellungen* 2.13–14. The source for simultaneous performances in the theatre and circus is Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 8.10.24.

36 On the upper-class predilection for pantomime etc., see Friedländer 2.109 = *Darstellungen* 2.137.

37 Suet. *Jul.* 39 and *Aug.* 43 speaks rather oddly of *omnium linguarum histriones*; Tac. *Ann.* 14.15 declares that Nero let no obstacle prevent well-born Romans *quominus Graeci Latiniue histrionis artem exerceant usque ad gestus modosque haud uiriles*. Suet. *Nero* 46 quotes Nero's self-condemning line from the "Oedipus in exile" as a Greek trimeter.

38 See Friedländer 2.109 = *Darstellungen* 2.137.

Only when we read of successful *comoedi* can we be sure that actual comedy is in question: but the only allusions that certainly relate to *comoedi* performing in Greek come from Plutarch and from Epictetus reported by Arrian. And Epictetus' fascinating story of the procurator who was victimised by a riot in favour of the *comoedus* Sophron is set in Epirus, just as we assume Plutarch is speaking about mainland Greece. The evidence takes us no further.³⁹

While the cultured and sophisticated Romans of Domitian's day may have seen Menander staged, it is more likely that they read him only as a schoolbook, when they were still immature, and used him as a quarry for figures and arguments in the declamation hall. Between the schoolroom and the symposium the dramatist's real artistry must have gone unrecognized by readers concerned with momentary pathos or brilliance of riposte. A few scholars and men of leisure read whole plays, as Gellius did the *Plokion*,⁴⁰ but the tendency would be to excerpt monologues or *sententiae*, without interest in the relationships between different scenes and phases of the drama. Menander had become a classic, but it was as a textbook, frozen in black and white stills, with little chance of recovering the continuous action and living colour of the theatre.

39 Plut. *De Tranq.* 13, *Moralia* 473B declares that "men envy successful comoedians in the theatre"; for Epictetus' tale of the riot in support of Sophron, see *Diss.* 3.4.

40 See Gellius 2.23, but note that he began by reading Caecilius, in conformity with his antiquarian interests, and only turned to Menander or whim (*libitumst*) as a control over Caecilius.

10. Mime: The Missing Link in Roman Literary History

The last decade has seen a renewed interest among students of Latin literature in the mime: its themes, its flexible form and content, its occasions and history. Because mime is essentially a free form, improvised and irresponsible, the traces of its history that can be recovered from literary or scholastic texts are erratic but tantalizing. Yet with a little boldness something can be recovered of both its nature and its influence on the more orthodox genres, both mimetic and narrative. This paper owes a lot to other scholars and, in compensation for building on their careful foundations, includes an annotated bibliography of their books and articles for further exploration.

I suppose two of the best known episodes in the fragmentary history of Roman mime are anecdotes from the life of Julius Caesar and his antagonist Cato of Utica. Writers of the early Empire, the period when Cato was most revered, like to record that in a rare moment of indulgence Cato once left his seat at the *Floralia*—the Roman Festival celebrated with mimes—when he realized that his mere presence was inhibiting the show from its customary climax.¹ The story is used by many writers as an indication of the indecency of this form of theatre, which brought women on stage and even—at the given signal—stripped them for public entertainment. The other anecdote is more serious and cited as an example of Caesar's arrogance towards his own class. He forced the mimewriter Decimus Laberius, an *equus* and a gentleman, to appear in his own mime in competition with the ex-slave Publilius Syrus. Laberius spoke his own prologue, protesting at the humiliation, and embodied his protest by acting the role of a Syrian slave—*Syrus*, who rushed on stage as if he had been beaten and thrashed, crying

1 Val. Max. 2.10.8 [*Catone*] *ludos Florales, quos Messius aedilis faciebat, spectante populus ut mimae nudarentur postulare erubuit. quod cum ex Fauonio amicissimo sibi una sedente cognosset, discessit e theatro, ne praesentia sua spectaculi consuetudinem impediret.* The story is also cited by Sen. *Ep.* 97.7, and Martial 1 *Praef.* (Bonaria 2.28)

*porro cives! libertatem perdimus.*² Caesar gave the theatrical prize to his rival and then bestowed on Laberius the wealth and the gold ring that would reinstate him among his fellow knights.

Roman attitudes to the theatre were deeply conservative and based on an obvious double standard: actors like brothel keepers were useful but disqualified from public service; and the *Lex Iulia de adulteriis* explicitly allowed an injured husband to kill any actor found with his wife *in flagrante delicto*.³ Essentially acting was making an exhibition of oneself, and could only be condoned when freeborn lads performed the traditional Atellane farce, their identities protected by masks.⁴ The actors both in Plautine comedy and Ennian tragedy were slaves owned by the *dominus gregis*, himself a slave or freedman. But acting in a mime was much worse, for three reasons: the actors went unmasked; there were women in female roles;⁵ and the plots were often adulterous, with no inhibitions about sexual activity on stage. Ovid was doing some special pleading when he claimed that Augustus watched mimes which were all about illicit love: *minos obscena iocantes / qui semper uetiti crimen amoris habent* (Tr. 2.497–498), but this is the most frequent association of mime in allusions from the imperial centuries.

Yet mime actors and actresses could be fashionable like Cytheris, the mistress of Antony and Cornelius Gallus.⁶ It is fair to admit they never achieved the star status of the male dancers in pantomime, the degenerate popular offshoot of tragedy. In the same decade that saw Varius' *Thyestes* the two Augustan rivals Pylades and Bathyllus, the intimate of Maecenas,⁷ achieved a hysterical popularity comparable to that of

2 The full version of this story is reported by Macrobius *Sat.* 2.7.1–9, based on Gellius 8.15 (now surviving only in title). Testimonia, Bonaria 1.90–92, 2.34. Discussion in F. Giancotti 1967.

3 See T. Frank, "The Status of Actors at Rome," *CP* 26 (1931) 11–20.

4 This is the account (perhaps derived from Varro) given by Livy 7.2.12: [*fabulae Atellanae*] *quod genus ludorum ... tenuit iuuentus nec ab histrionibus pollui passa est; eo institutum manet, ut actores Atellanarum nec tribu moueantur et stipendia, tamquam expertes artis ludicrae, faciant.*

5 Their profession exposed such women to sexual harassment and assault. Wiseman 1985, 26, cites from Cicero an advocate's condoning of the rape of a mime actress (*mimula*).

6 Testimonia, Bonaria 2.39. Cicero condemned Antony (*Phil.* 2.20 and 58) for associating with her, but had been delighted to meet her at dinner with Volumnius Eutrapelus, her patron (*Fam.* 9.26).

7 For their rivalry and the public riots it generated in 22 and 17 BCE see Friedländer 2.101–02: Testimonia, Bonaria 2.50–55; for Maecenas' infatuation

Baryshnikov or David Bowie, and in later generations Mnester and Paris would become the lovers of Messalina and Domitian.⁸ Here we meet the perversity and inconsistency of popular attitudes to entertainers in all ages. But pantomime was an expensive extravagance for the court or public theatre; its humbler sister art could be performed in the street or in the *triclinium*, in public or intimate gatherings.

Mime is elusive for two reasons; first it is best defined negatively. Whatever did not fit the generic categories of tragedy or comedy, Atellan or the Italian togate comedy, was mime: a narrative entertainment in the media of speech, song and dance.⁹ Like Commedia dell' arte these performers were largely improvisational with a plot outline devised by the *archimimus*, who would roughly assign dialogue sequences (scenes) for the other players to *ad lib*. There would be traditional scenarios based on confidence tricks, disguise and cheating lovers, in which the leading role might vary between the trickster and his elderly miserly or foolish dupe. Literary mime was only the tip of the iceberg, and an unofficial genre like this demonstrates the inadequacy of our knowledge of Roman life, based as it is almost entirely on formal texts.

How far can we visualize a typical street mime? The *planipes* (old flat foot) wearing his motley patchwork tunic had no stage to distance him but spoke, sang and danced eyeball to eyeball with his audience, competing with the noise of the street intersections or *compita*. When mime was admitted to the official programme of the Floralia in or after 173 BCE,¹⁰ and had to be financed by the *aediles* (the *praetores* in Ovid's

with Bathyllus compare Horace's oblique allusion in *Epod.* 14., and Tac. *Ann.* 1.54.2. See Wiseman 1985, 28–30 and 45–47 and Griffin 1985, 12–13 on the fashion for mimes and pantomimes, but there seems to be a difference between the taking up of mime actors and actresses by the smart set and the almost universal adulation for the pantomime artists.

8 Bonaria 2.81–82.

9 This is an attempt at definition by medium; ancient scholars defined by content: Theophrastus' definition as "an imitation of life containing both acceptable and unacceptable material" becomes in Diomedes *sermonis cuiuslibet <et> motus sine reuerentia, vel factorum et <dictorum> turpium cum lasciuia imitatio* (GLK 3.8.487).

10 It is too easily assumed that because mimes were the entertainment at the Floralia in the time of Cato and Caesar, they had been presented since the inauguration of the annual games in 173. But Livy, otherwise so helpful on the *ad hoc* and then annual celebration of festivals in the period 212–167 BCE, has no notice when the Floralia became annual in 173. We owe that date to Ovid *Fasti*

day), the scenarios of the *archimimus* must have begun a process of formalisation. From that time the sponsored plays must have been subject to rehearsal for approval before purchase; thus they will have assimilated towards the regular structure of comedies and their dialogue will have abandoned improvisation for a formal script.

We do not know how soon this tamed the theatrical mime but by the age of Sulla these were composed by men of one class—like Laberius¹¹—and performed by those of another.

When Cicero writes on types of humour for orators he warns them against the exaggerated mimicry and obscenity of gesture and expression in the mime; he describes the *sannio*, the grimacing clown who must make himself ridiculous in voice and body,¹² like the grotesque statuettes and vases that were found in Pompeian dining rooms. The surviving fragments of mime show that this body language was combined with language about the body—lavatory jokes and jeering at physical handicaps. Yet Cicero lists in the same discussion as the butts of mime the Bad-tempered Man, the Superstitious Fellow, the Suspicious Man, the Boaster and the Fool—all types familiar from Menandrian comedy.¹³ The dramatic date of his dialogue, set in 91 BCE, prevents him citing any of the mimewriters of his own day, but he retails some traditional jokes like the Roman equivalent of “that was no lady, that was my wife”, *quid est tibi ista mulier?: uxor :: similis me dius fidius!* The decorum of Cicero’s own genre prevented him from reproducing the real earthy character of mime, and we can only guess what kind of salacious *double entendres* underlay the *Guardian*, an early mime which according to Cicero consisted entirely of misunderstandings and cross purposes.¹⁴

It is not the literary mime of Laberius and Syrus that I propose as the missing link of my title, but let me take a little longer to characterize it.

5.327 f. and Pliny *N.H.* 18.284, who do not indicate when mimes were first officially part of these *Ludi scaenici*.

11 On the composition of mimes by men of the equestrian class see Wiseman 1985, 187.

12 *De Orat.* 2.251: *quid enim potest esse tam ridiculum quam sannio est? sed ore uultu uoce denique corpore ridetur ipso.*

13 *De Orat.* 2.251: *genus hic, quod risum uel maxime mouet, non est nostrum: morosum, superstitiosum, suspiciosum, gloriosum, stultum: naturae ridentur ipsae, quas personas agitare solemus.*

14 *De Orat.* 2.259: *ex eo, cum ad uerbum, non ad sententiam rem accipere uideare; ex quo uno genere totus est tutor, mimus uetus, oppido ridiculus.* I imagine something on the lines of the confusion between the stolen moneychest and the seduced daughter in Plaut. *Aul.* 731–760.

Although only miserable fragments remain, we can guess something from the titles;¹⁵ many are called after professions: *The Augur*, *The Fuller*, *The Dyer*, *The Patchwork Tailor*, *The Fisherman* or *The Salt Seller*; one, *The Weaving Girls*, is an exception in being female and plural. Perhaps weaving girls had the reputation of Swedish Masseuses in modern pornography. In these plays either the trickster hero disguised himself as one of these professionals (like the trickster god Vertumnus described by Propertius and Ovid¹⁶), or else, like the mimes of Herondas about shoemakers and schoolmasters, the story really centred on the tradesman and his lore. Other mimes are called after feastdays, like the *Compitalia* or *Saturnalia* or social occasions: *Nuptiae* ("The Wedding") or *Nekuomantia* ("The Seance"). Others bore the names of Greek comedies: *Colax*, *Ephebus*, *Hetaera*, *Phormio*, *Phasma*,¹⁷ and may well have reused the actions of New Comedy. More mysteriously, five plays of Laberius take their names from the Zodiac: *Aries*, *Taurus*, *Cancer*, *Virgo*, *Gemelli*. But the last two could be a play about a real or fake maiden (a favourite is the false bride story, in which the lecher is presented with a bride more virile than himself) and a confusion of identity play about twins like Plautus' *Menaechmi*.¹⁸ The longest fragment from a script of Laberius is an old miser's entry monologue lifted straight from New Comedy: "They say Democritus set a shield to flash in the sun to burn out his eyes so that he wouldn't have to see the success of wicked men; I want to blind myself with the gleam of money so I don't have to see my rotten son flourish."¹⁹

15 Note that almost every type of title found in literary mime is also represented in the titlature of the Atellane. The classic study is Woelfflin, "Atellanen und Mimentitel," *Rh. Mus.* 43 (1888) 308 f.

16 Both Prop. 4.2.22–40 and Ov. *Met.* 14.643 stresses Vertumnus' disguises, both transvestite and professional; cf. from Ovid: *messor*, *frondator*, *putator*, *miles*, *piscator*, and finally *anus*. We should probably derive this from the many impersonations of Maccus, the trickster hero of the Atellane, since this tradition of plot and title goes back before any of the extant mime texts.

17 The first three are plays of Laberius cited by Nonius or Macrobius, Bonaria 1.29, 39, 44; the *Phormio* is attributed to Valerius, Bonaria 1.108–09, the *Phasma* to a certain Catullus (see below), Bonaria 1.111.

18 These are also titles of literary Atellanes; compare *Macci Gemini* and *Maccus Virgo* by Pomponius, and Novius' *Gemini* and *Virgo Praegnans*. Pomponius' title makes it clear that the virgin was not what she seemed!

19 Laberius *Restio* 89–95; Bonaria 1.62. The form of monologue is the standard Greek-style transition from a mythical or heroic figure to the speaker's own experience; the diction could be from Plautus. Aulus Gellius, the source for this

There is little here to explain the extraordinary popularity of mime or the violence of its denunciation by Christian fathers like Lactantius. We must go underground and look for the common focus of the street-mimes in recurring scenes to be found in other genres. The so-called “adultery mime,”²⁰ explicitly attested in many ancient writers, has been a starting point for a number of recent scholars, mostly, for some odd reason, my British compatriots, who have managed to avoid circularity in arguing for the contribution of mime to more conventional Roman genres. The most wide-ranging paper is perhaps that of J. C. McKeown,²¹ who goes beyond the Augustan elegy of his title, with evidence—to which I will return—mime-inspired material in Horace and Petronius.²² About the same time Nicholas Horsfall noted in a vivid study of Ovid’s Calydonian boarhunt²³ thematic elements from mime in Ovid’s narrative poetry, and argued for a tradition of Roman mime burlesquing mythology, a category McKeown had doubted. I myself²⁴ was led by McKeown’s article to claim the influence of mime in three similar episodes of frustrated rape in the *Fasti*: one of these is the trick by which in *Fasti* 3.675–696 *Anna Perenna tegens uoltus, ut noua nupta, suos* foiled Mars’ lustful interest in Minerva.²⁵ Most recently Peter Wiseman, always aware of the influence of mime on literary genres, has argued that Catullus—many of whose hendecasyllables show a lively sense of the lowlife scene—went on to a new ca-

passage, notes (10.17.3): *est enim persona, quae hoc apud Laberium dicit, diuitis auari et parci, sumptum plurimum asotiamque adolescentis uiri deprecantis.*

20 See R.W. Reynolds 1946.

21 “Augustan Elegy and Mime,” *PCPS* 205 (1979) 71–84.

22 For mime in Petronius see Sandy 1973, 329–46. Note *Sat.* 117, in which Eumolpus plans to deceive the legacy hunters of Croton: he enrolls the other travellers as his troupe, and bind them to act the role of his slaves; they agree upon the scenario, that he is a wealthy man who has lost his only son, and some traits of his role (the constant cough, the affectation of poor digestion, the display of wealth, and *ne quid scaenae deesset* that he should call his “slaves” by other names, to show how many he possessed). Such a deception (the essential plot of Jonson’s *Volpone*) could be the nucleus of a mime, as could the scheme of agreed plot and central figure with improvised dialogue.

23 “Epic and Burlesque in Ovid, *Met.* Viii 260 ff.,” *CJ* 74 (1979) 319–32.

24 See “Sexual Comedy in Ovid’s *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation”, n. 18 in this volume.

25 For the derivation of this tale from Laberius’ *Anna Perenna* see Giancotti 1967, 16 f.

reer as a composer of mimes.²⁶ Writers of the first century AD attribute two mimes *Phasma* and *Laureolus*,²⁷ to an iambographer Catullus. On rather less cogent evidence Wiseman would add to these a *Priapus* and a *Pharmakeutria*. We know nothing of Catullus after 54 BCE; but there are few surviving speeches or letters between 54 and the Civil War, which must have destroyed Roman social life along with the young bloods of Catullus' set. If he changed career after 54 to become a writer of mime-scripts we could not expect contemporary records.

Wiseman's skill in speculation is infectious, but even those who stop short of making Catullus into a *mimographus* should admit the repercussions of McKeown's article for the understanding of elegy and satire. Let us return to the notorious adultery mime, the *scaenica ... adulteria* which Ovid ironically credited Augustus with watching unmoved.²⁸ The adultery mime probably stopped short of stage consummation, since it dwelt as often on the lover's frustrations as on his success. Certainly the scenes noted by McKeown (73–74) from Propertius (2.23), Horace (*Sat.* 1.2) and Ovid (*Am.* 3.4) all exploit the hue and cry of the husband's return and the lover's panic escape through the window or into closets. This is the background to Juvenal's allusion to the mime actor Latinus hiding in the cedar chest *perituri cista Latini* (*Sat.* 6.44), and the ancestor of Falstaff's misadventures in the laundry basket of the *Merry Wives*.²⁹ Another variant of the *retour imprévu* is Propertius' splendid comedy in 4.8, when Cynthia returned early from her trip to Lanuvium to throw his drinking party into chaos—certainly an echo of the return of Odysseus,³⁰ but with so many details from mime³¹ that we must surely imagine the

26 Wiseman 1985, 187 f., 192–194. It seems clear that the mime writer Catullus belonged to the late Republic. The ancient *testimonia* for the mime-writer Catullus are assembled under *Scaenica* in Wiseman's appendix, pp. 258–89.

27 *Testimonia* in Bonaria 1.112ff.; the earliest datable reference is to a performance of *Laureolus* before Caligula (Suet. *Gaius* 57). It was apparently based on the adventures, capture and crucifixion of a brigand, but it is not clear whether he was fact or fiction.

28 Ov. *Tr.* 2.513–514: *luminibusque tuis, totus quibus utitur orbis/scaenica uidisti lentus adulteria*.

29 See Wiseman 1985, 29, who comments the notorious bathtub of *Pro Caelio* 67 with the chest of the adultery mime.

30 Cf. S. Evans "Odyssean Echoes in Propertius 4.8," *G&R* 18 (1971) 51–53; A. Dalzell, "Homeric Themes in Propertius", *Hermathena* 1980, 29–36. I owe this and other Propertian material to the discussion of McKeown.

31 Note the lowlife women, the slaves, the dwarf musician and dancer, favourite personnel of the mime.

Odysseus episode first underwent its sexual inversion in a context of mime or comedy.

The *kômos*, or lover's drunken serenade, is another scene found in a Hellenistic mime on papyrus,³² just as it features in Theocritus' 6th and 11th *Idylls*; hence McKeown draws analogies with Propertius' elegies 1.3 and 2.29. In the latter Propertius is seized as a runaway and dragged before his mistress for punishment. But escape and pursuit are standard mimic motifs: compare Cicero's allusions to the typical mime-plot with the pursuit and last-minute escape of the villain³³ and Seneca's description of Maecenas as muffled up in scarves like the runaway slaves of mime *non aliter quam in mimo fugitui diuitis solent* (*Ep.* 114.6). The motif of last-minute escape reappears in two early satires of Horace: his own escape from the bore, when he is finally swept off to the law courts at the end of 1.9; and 1.8, in which the murderous schemes of the sorceress Canidia and her assistant are brought to a sudden end when Priapus makes his presence heard and smelt. Like Propertius' hired ladies, Canidia and her assistant flee *at illae currere in urbem* (1.9.47). Hellenistic idyll and mime favoured sorceresses: compare Theocritus' Simaetha (*Id.* 2) and Sophron's mime of the sorceress and her accomplice;³⁴ did Horace draw his inspiration for this episode from the mime tradition?³⁵

We have Ovid's own statement that his earlier elegies were staged³⁶ as mime or pantomime, and Suetonius and Macrobius both report mimed versions of Virgil:³⁷ according to Suetonius (*Nero* 54) the emperor wanted to dance the role of Turnus; Macrobius reports a mime

32 See D. L. Page, *Select Papyri III, Literary Papyri, Poetry*, Loeb edition (1970), 332.

33 Cic. *Cael.* 65: *mimi ergo exitus non fabulae: in quo cum clausula non inuenitur, fugit aliquis e manibus, dein scabilla concrepant, aulaeum tollitur*, an important passage for the detection of mime-themes underlying more formal contexts.

34 Page, *Select Papyri* 328 with supporting notes.

35 The escape motif is used to end the second book of *Satires* with the desperate flight from the dinner of Nasidienus, 2.8.93–95; the device is used similarly by Petronius to put an end to the narrative of Trimalchio's feast (*Sat.* 78). Scholars have seen this as evidence for dependence of the *Cena* on Horace 2.8, but in this respect it is more likely that both borrowed an obvious motif from mime.

36 *Tr.* 2.519–520: *et mea sunt populo saltata poemata saepe*.

37 Wiseman 1985, 128, n. 121, gives full testimonia. The most striking is Servius' report (*Ed.* 6.11) that Cytheris performed *Eclogue* 6 in the theatre; this must have been in Virgil's lifetime.

or perhaps pantomime version of Dido's tragic love;³⁸ but although mime itself must have absorbed material from the serious narrative and dramatic genres, I am concerned here to stress the traffic in the other direction. Just as early Roman mime seems to have borrowed from Palliata comedy and Atellane, so it transformed and passed on what it took.

It is often claimed that the Romans had no gift for fiction: that they were not inventive. Certainly their early writers simply adapted Homer and Greek drama, tragic or comic; the material for the early Roman epic of Naevius and Ennius was supplied by Roman history, or something like it. What happened when the Romans first sought to invent? Afranius is absolutely frank that he borrowed the plots of his Italian comedies from Menander, and anyone else he could rework;³⁹ but what about Lucilius and his successor Horace? Horace's raw material goes beyond personal experience and Lucilius, like Russell Baker or any first person humorist, must also have borrowed from fiction. McKeown points to the "Journey to Brundisium", which Horace modelled on Lucilius, and the "Flying Match" of Sarmentus and Messius. He could also have compared the embarkation and canal journey in *Sat.* 1.5.11–23 with the embarkation scene in the Charition mime.⁴⁰ Unlike straight comedy, mimes could handle a voyage and even a shipwreck, according to Seneca (*De Ira* 2.2.5).

It is notable that mime elements are most prominent in the two genres which the Romans claimed as their own—satire and love elegy. Scholars used to debate whether Roman elegy derived its comic elements from Greek comedy through a now lost body of Alexandrian narrative elegy or through Roman comedy, but the disputants have left out the more likely intermediary of Alexandrian mime.⁴¹ Consider as a last example the lover's quarrel, whether she, like Cynthia, is turning on

38 Macrobius 5.17.4; see also Fantham 1986, 54, nn. 30, 31 and more generally Friedländer 2.101 f. Owen, *Ovidius Tristium liber secundus* (repr. Amsterdam 1967) 511, gives further examples of the adaptation of Roman poets and poetry to the pantomime stage.

39 Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.4: *Afranius ... respondens arguentibus quod plura sumpsisset a Menandro "fateor" inquit "sumpsi non ab illo modo/sed ut quisque habuit conueniret quod mihi/quod me non posse melius facere credidi,/etiam a Latino."*

40 Cf. Page, *Select Papyri* 348–49.

41 On Alexandria as the favourite source of mimes, cf. Cic. *Rab. Post.* 35, cited by Wiseman 1985, 35, n. 66.

him, or he on her.⁴² You will not find this staged in Comedy, though it is the starting point of Menander's *Perikeiromene*. But a standard type of Alexandrian mime centred on the *zēlotypos*, the jealous lover or husband;⁴³ both the fifth mime of Herondas and an anonymous papyrus (Page, *Select Papyri*, 350–360) centre on a jealous mistress vindictively beating the slave lover who has slept with a rival. They are unattractive scenes, but they reappear not only in Juvenal's abuse of women (6.278 f.), but in the *rixa* of Propertius 3.8; the comic quarrel of the rustic and his girl briefly evoked by Tibullus (1.10.53–56) is transformed or perhaps reconstituted by Ovid (*Amores* 1.7) into a dramatic monologue of violence, repentance, and cheerful recovery.

Mime will not always be specified as such in our texts, and both the genre and its players are often mentioned under more general names like *histrio* and *ludus*;⁴⁴ thus it is probably the reminiscence of mime in Seneca's Menippean satire, the *Apocolocyntosis*, that provoked its medieval title, *Ludus de morte Claudii*, with its implication of dramatic form. Indeed these reminiscences are so many and the dramatic potential of Seneca's scenario so irresistible that I would like to suggest that Seneca has reworked in the narrative form of Menippean satire his own original libretto, written for intimate staging at Nero's Saturnalia as a mime in four scenes. Imagine that the curtain is lowered (Roman fashion) and the first scene revealed: Claudius is shown on his deathbed as Mercury scolds the fates for prolonging his agony and delaying the coming golden age; they consent to his death and weave a new exciting destiny for Nero. This would serve as prologue. The main drama occurs in Olympus. Enter a shambling figure acting with incongruous authority; when the door-keeper of the gods can get no sense out of him Jupiter sends Hercules (as a third-world linguist and international traveller) to interview him; he boggles at this new kind of monster which speaks in Homeric Greek, until the Goddess Fever identifies the intruder. Claudius makes a speech claiming membership on Olympus and the ensuing disorderly debate culminates in the maiden speech of the deified Augustus. He turns the original motion into an indictment of Claudius for murder of his own kin, and carries his counterproposal that Claudius be deported to the underworld. In the next scene (played before the curtain?)

42 On the *rixa* in elegy and its models see J. C. Yardley, "Lovers' Quarrels: Horace *Odes* 1.13.11 and Prop. 4.5.40", *Hermes* 104 (1976) 124–28.

43 See Fantham 1986, 52 f.

44 Cf. Friedländer 2.109.

Mercury escorts Claudius through Rome to the offstage sound of public rejoicing at his funeral, and drags him before the judgement seat of Aeacus in the underworld. Aeacus is about to assign him the penalty of dicing forever with a leaky dice box when Claudius' nephew, the emperor Gaius, claims him as a runaway slave and drags him away to spend eternity in the slavish office of secretary for petitions.

The satire clamours for performance, but many of the descriptive witticisms that can be reported in this narrative form could not have formed part of a dramatic script. Similarly neither the grandiose hexameter account of the time of day, nor the hexameter sequence in 4.1 passing from narrative to speech in mid-line could have featured in drama; these would be Senecan rewriting to fit the change of genre. In contrast the last two sections 14–15 read more like a stage scenario than artistic narrative; there is little more than a precis of decisions and stage action. Many of the details throughout the *Apocolocyntosis* are borrowed from the mime tradition: the physical deformities of Claudius and the muscle-bound stupidity of Hercules, the knockabout seizure and arrest at the end of 11 and 13.⁴⁵ Finally there is Janus' mysterious allusion in 9.3 to the "Bean Mime": *olim magna res erat deum fieri: iam Fabam mimum fecistis*. This mime is also associated with a travesty of deification by Cicero, lamenting the devaluation of his consulate.⁴⁶ The most likely explanation is that there was such a mime, based on the death of a prominent political figure, and his rough treatment in the afterlife.⁴⁷ Thus Seneca's Janus would be acknowledging a lost forerunner and this comic masterpiece should be seen as having a double ancestry. Behind the Menippean satire, with its recognizable basis in Greek traditions attested from the lost Menippus and from Lucian, would be a par-

45 11.6: *Cyllenius illum collo obtorto trahit*; 13: *In ius eamus ... ducit illum ad tribunal Aeaci*. So also the violent entrance and exit of Caligula, though it must be admitted that Seneca includes such abrupt and violent seizure in his tragedies: cf. Pyrrhus in *Tro*. 999–1008.

46 Cic. *Att.* 1.16.3. See P. T. Eden, *Hermes* 92 (1964) 251 f. and Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*, Cambridge 1984, 109. The text in both passages has been disputed, but their mutual support justifies retaining *Fabam mimum*.

47 There is precedent in the first book of Lucilius' *Satires* (on which see Eden 1984, Intr. 16–17) for a satiric council of the gods to determine the fate of a prominent Roman in the afterlife. Although Lucilius did not compose mime, and his butt Lentulus Lupus was not deified, his satiric treatment of Lupus could have generated the theme of divine councils and punishment of the unpopular dead in mime.

allel tradition of burlesque in mime, known to Seneca and exploited by him.

However difficult or speculative it may seem, we may reach a better understanding of popular Latin literature by remembering the existence of mime at Rome from the beginning of its literary history. For Rome was already in contact with Sicily and Alexandria in the third century BCE, and scenarios were more easily transferred from one linguistic culture to another than dramatic libretti could be translated. There is enough evidence for its themes and techniques scattered allusively in other genres to give clues to the origin of these themes, especially in Rome's innovative personal elegy and satire, in this subterranean tradition and its invisible continuity.⁴⁸

I append a chronologically ordered and annotated bibliography.

- H. Reich, *Der Mimus*, Vols. I and II, Berlin 1903.
The first great synthesis, too wide ranging, however, for a clearly defined picture of mime in any specific century.
- L. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners Under the Early Empire* (7th ed.), tr. Freese and Magnus, Vol. 2, London, New York 1909, 90–97 (mime); 98–107 (tragedy and pantomime).
Full of marvellous information, but without citation of primary references.
- R. W. Reynolds, "The Adultery Mime," *CQ* 40 (1946) 77–84.
Still definitive.
- M. Bonaria, *Mimorum Romanorum Fragmenta* I and II, Genoa 1955.
Vol. I contains all known fragments and testimonia; Vol. II the evidence for performers, productions and events related to mime.
- F. Giancotti, *Mimo e Gnome: Studio su Decimo Laberio e Publilio Siro*, *Bibl. di Cult. Cont.* 98, Florence 1967.
Literary mime only.
- G. Sandy, "Scaenica Petroniana," *TAPA* 104 (1973) 329–46.
- J.C. McKeown, "Augustan Elegy and Mime," *PCPS* 205 (1979) 71–84.
Important for Propertius, Horace, Ovid.
- N. Horsfall, "Epic and Burlesque in Ovid *Met.* Viii 260 ff.," *CJ* 74 (1979) 319–32. "The Literary Mime," *Camb. Hist. Class. Literature* II, Cambridge 1982, 293–94.
- E. Fantham, "Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*," n. 18 in this volume. "Zelotypia: a brief excursion into sex and violence in Classical Literature," *Phoenix* 40 (1986) 45–57 (only 52 f. on mime).

48 A slightly different version of this paper was presented at the meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States held at Princeton, NJ on Sept. 26, 1987.

Both pieces trace sexual motifs (frustrated rape and jealous violence) in mime and other genres.

J. Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life*, London 1985.

T.P. Wiseman, *Catullus and His World*, Cambridge 1985.

Although mime is most often mentioned incidentally in this rich study of Catullus' social world, this book is the single richest source for every aspect of mime in the late Republic.

F. Dupont, *L'Acteur roi*, Paris 1985.

Excellent study of theatricality in Roman life and art, with stress on the show business aspects of Roman *ludi scaenici*. On mime see 396–406.

J. J. Winkler, *Auctor and Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius' Golden Ass*, Berkeley 1985.

On mime see 160–65, 287–91 (fine observations on mime at a later period than my focus).

II

Rhetoric and Literary culture

11. Imitation and Evolution: The Discussion of Rhetorical Imitation in Cicero *De oratore* 2.87–97 and Some Related Problems in Ciceronian Theory

Nearly forty years ago, Richard McKeon, in a brilliant paper, “Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity,”¹ gave English-speaking critics the definitive basis for discussion of the different senses of *mimesis/imitation* in Greek and Roman usage; thus most recently George Kennedy² introduces his account of Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ fragmentary *Peri mimeseos* with a description of the two predominant usages of *mimesis* based on McKeon’s distinctions.

The first sense, denoting the relationship between literary representation and “reality,” belongs to the criticism of creative literature, not rhetoric. But the second sense, that of “imitation of artists,” is central to rhetorical practice, which advocated direct imitation of the teacher or his models by the pupil in training. Theory, slowly following practice, developed an interest in the working of imitation at two levels: (1) the imitation of teacher by pupil, just mentioned; and (2) the more diffused imitation of finished works of art or established artists, by the adult artists of a new generation.³

This paper is concerned with Cicero’s attitude toward rhetorical imitation and takes its point of departure from his first discussion of imitation in a theatrical work—the passage *De oratore* 2.87–97. The precepts, terminology, and imagery of Cicero’s opening comments all throw light on his conception of the practice of imitation. The historical account of Greek oratory which follows in 2.93–95 serves to illustrate the long-term effect of imitation on the history of art. But understanding of this passage requires some preliminary comment on Cicero’s po-

1 *Modern Philology* 34 (1936–37) 1–35, reprinted in *Critics and Criticism*, ed. R. S. Crane, Chicago 1952, 117–45. I cite the article with Crane’s pagination.

2 G. A. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*, Princeton 1972, 347 and n. 69.

3 The locus classicus on ancient rhetorical imitation is still W. Kroll, s.v. “Rhetorik (35),” *RE*, Suppl. 7 (1940) 1113–15. See also Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart 1924, 146 f.

sition in the history of rhetorical theory, and on the special function of these chapters within the dramatic world of Cicero's dialogue.

Cicero inherited a double tradition in the teaching of rhetorical theory, no less double because the later, Latin, tradition itself derived from Greek theory. On imitation at least, his approach was to undergo a change between the composition of *De oratore* and his later works, *Brutus* and *Orator*, because of changes in the critical world around him.

Where Greek pupils of rhetoricians had the choice between modelling themselves on a contemporary tradition or an earlier, classical one, Roman students originally learned rhetoric in Greek from Greeks, and trained by imitating the masterpieces of an alien language.⁴ This is the training which Crassus described in *De oratore* and which Cicero himself experienced.⁵

But Crassus and his generation grew up to be teachers (in the informal Roman sense) and models⁶ of oratory for Cicero's youth: for Cicero there were now two competing forms of imitation. He might advocate imitation of the Athenian orators. This was the ideal of the classicising Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who urged his Greek readers to imitate classical speakers and writers separated from them by some three centuries. It was also the principle of Cicero's younger contemporaries, the Roman Atticists, who advocated that young Roman orators

4 On Cicero's knowledge of the Greek orators, see A. E. Douglas, "The Intellectual Background of Cicero's Rhetorica," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. H. Temporini, Vol. 1.3, Berlin 1973, 102–6. (This discussion will be cited as Douglas, "Intellectual Background.") On imitation of the Greek orators in Cicero's speeches, see A. Weische, *Cicero's Nachahmung der attischen Redner*, Heidelberg 1972. A. Reiff's dissertation, *Interpretatio, Imitatio, Aemulatio*, Bonn 1961, disclaims any concern with rhetorical imitation but offers a careful analysis of Cicero's use of the three terms to denote various degrees of independence in the literary adaptation of Greek models by Roman writers.

5 Cf. *De or.* 1.155: *ut summorum Graecorum orationes explicarem quibus lectis hoc adsequeretur ut cum ea quae legeram Graece Latine redderem ... etiam exprimerem quaedam uerba imitando . . . Brut.* 310–11 attests Cicero's own experience of working in Greek.

6 Crassus seems to have studied Ennius and Gracchus but found imitation of them through paraphrase an unsatisfactory exercise (*De or.* 1.154). Cicero in *Brut.* 164 reports his own private imitation of Crassus' *oratio pro lege Servilia*, probably not with a teacher; it was the speech, *mihi a puero quasi magistra*, which taught him. We may compare his comment on Cotta and Hortensius in *Brut.* 317: *duo ... oratores qui me imitandi cupiditate incitarent.*

should imitate the *Atticum genus*;⁷ and Cicero in his later rhetorical works, *Brutus* and *Orator*, accepted and argued from their premises. In *De oratore*, however, he assumed that the Roman pupils would imitate their teachers, or other senior contemporaries—Latin, not Greek, models.

Cicero's purpose in *De oratore* 2.87–97 is complex. Through Antonius he is trying to cover more than the immediate problem of fostering the growth of an orator; he is also arguing from a highly sophisticated assumption about the importance of imitation on the larger scale, in the growth of oratory as an art from generation to generation.⁸ This larger significance of imitation in rhetorical technique is raised at 2.92, where Cicero asks: *quid enim causae censeatis esse, cur aetates extulerint singulae singula prope genera dicendi*? He sees imitation as a prime cause of the evolution of oratory and as the determinant of each generation's characteristic idiom or *genus dicendi*. The history of Athenian oratory which he recapitulates in 2.93–95 is offered, not in order to advocate imitation of these *Attici* themselves, but to illustrate the evolution of the art through imitation to its acme. As Greek oratory grew in artistic merit because of imitation, so Romans will develop their native oratory by imitation of their Roman predecessors.

These two aspects of the argument in *De oratore*—the belief in a common idiom for any given age group based on imitation, and the illustrative account of Greek rhetorical history—require the reader to compare two other passages of Ciceronian theory. The first of these is the discussion of personal *genera dicendi* in *De oratore* 3.26–37, which is designed to explain the stylistic individuality of orators who could be contemporaries and even pupils of the same teacher. Whereas 2.87–97 seeks out the *genus* of an age, 3.26–37 has the conflicting goal of distinguishing what we would call the species, the stylistic identity of the individual. The sec-

7 For the *Atticum genus dicendi* cf. *Brut.* 68 and 285. The issue of imitating the classical Athenian orators is discussed in order to show that Cicero can answer his young critics on their own terms, but his reply reduces their criteria to a degree of generality in *Brut.* 291 which would hardly have satisfied Calvus. On Cicero and the Atticists there is too much literature to cite here, but see Douglas, *Cicero's "Brutus"*, Oxford 1967, pp. xii–xvii; idem, "Intellectual Background," 119–30.

8 On Cicero's evolutionary approach to the art of rhetoric and its application to the plastic arts in imitation of Greek theory, see the important paper of E. H. Gombrich, "The Debate on Primitivism in Ancient Rhetoric," *JWI* 29 (1966) 24–38; Douglas, *Cicero's "Brutus"*, xxxix–xli.

ond passage is the summary of Greek oratorical history offered in the *Brutus*, again evolutionary in interpretation, but this time treating Greek eloquence as a pattern and precedent for the main subject of the book, the evolution of eloquence at Rome. In discussing the historical account which begins at *De oratore* 2.93, I will first set out in tabular form the *aetates* of the several Greek orators as implied in *De oratore* and the chronology of the fuller version given in *Brutus* 27–37, and then consider the modifications caused by Cicero's change of emphasis and increased historical knowledge. Some of the latent ambiguities in Cicero's presentation of the relationship between pupil and teacher will lead us to a closer examination of the Isocratean approach to training through imitation, and we will find evidence in *De oratore* 3.34–36 for a more flexible attitude in both Isocrates and Cicero.

Finally I will take the evolutionary argument a stage beyond Cicero's portrait of Roman oratory at its acme. As growth in organisms leads to decay, so oratory after its acme will begin to decline; and the critic who both advocates imitation and recognizes this decline will be forced to acknowledge either a failure to imitate or a failure in imitation. So the basically evolutionist accounts of Velleius Paterculus and Messala in Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus* will serve as an epilogue, illustrating some of the adjustments in the evolutionary theory entailed by the recognition of decline.

When Antonius begins his discussion of *imitatio* in *De oratore*, the dialogue has reached a point where he can assume a pupil of natural aptitude, good character, and broad general education (2.85). Speaking as a teacher, he claims that his role is to transmit what he has learned from experience; he should be a guide (*dux*) toward the stage of success which he himself has reached in performance, "since we cannot teach anything more advanced" (87). The technique of imitation is introduced and presented in three ways: most clearly in the *exemplum* of Sulpicius,⁹ a participant in the dialogue who is used at the beginning and end of this section as a illustration of well-directed imitation; more briefly in the counter-example of Fufius, who chose the wrong

9 On Sulpicius' position in the society of *De oratore* and his role in the show-trial of Norbanus, see *De or.* 1.25; 2.89, 107, 109, 124, 183, and 197–204. For his career after the dramatic date of *De oratore*, see *De or.* 3.11; and E. Badian, "Caepio and Norbanus," in *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, Oxford 1954, 50 f.

model, and imitated the worst feature of it; and at the most generalized level in the brief history of Greek oratory.

To begin with Sulpicius, Antonius' former pupil: we are told that he had every physical gift of voice, bearing, and gesture; he had the other natural talents required; but his temperament led to rapid, overexcited speech, and his youth showed itself in a flood of superfluous language.¹⁰ In a metaphor and variation on it, Antonius describes him as a young plant, a vine in need of pruning for controlled growth (88), or a grain field in need of early cropping (96–97). The remedy Antonius proposed was a change of teacher, and he recommended Crassus because he saw that “Sulpicius’ natural gifts were leading him toward the imposing and splendid style of Crassus, but could not succeed unless he directed himself to it by application and imitation, and habituated himself to speaking with his attention and aim focussed entirely on Crassus” (89). This sentence is all that Cicero offers here to describe a proper method of imitation.¹¹ The reason for choosing Crassus as a model is the affinity between Sulpicius’ temperament and Crassus’ developed style.

In book 3 Cicero throws further light on the relationship between natural talent and choice of model, with the much-quoted story of Isocrates’ two pupils, Ephorus and Theopompus.¹² As told in 3.36 it illustrates the need to accommodate the direction of training to the character of different pupils. Isocrates used the spurs to urge on Ephorus, because of his hesitation and modesty, but the bridle to hold back Theopompus’ ver-

10 His oratory is described and analysed at *De or.* 3.31 and *Brut.* 203; in the latter passage, the concluding words (*nec ea redundans tamen nec circumfluens oratio. Crassum hic uolebat imitari, Cotta malebat Antonium, sed ab hoc uia aberat Antoni, Crassi ab illo lepos*) confirm the report in *De oratore*. Apparently, Sulpicius’ imitation of Crassus cured the fault of redundancy mentioned in *De or.* 2.88, but did not enable him to acquire Crassus’ own special merit of charm in diction.

11 Cicero nowhere gives explicit instructions on methods of imitation. Dionysius may have given detailed practical advice in book 3 of the *Peri mimeseos*, but we have only his statement in the letter to Pompeius Geminus of its contents as *peri tou pôs dei mimeisthai*. It is only in Quintilian *Inst.* 10.2 that we have a systematic account of techniques; and D. L. Clark’s helpful article, “Imitation: Theory and Practice in Roman Republic,” *QJS* 37 (1951) 10–22 is based almost entirely on Quintilian. (I reserve comment on his theory and precepts for the sequel to this article, “Imitation and Decline,” in which Quintilian is central. It will appear in the April number of *CP* 73 (1978).)

12 Significantly, the anecdote is told in a direct comparison of Sulpicius and Cotta with Theopompus and Ephorus at *Brut.* 203–4. It is also found at *Att.* 6.1.2; Quint. 2.8.11, and (allusively) 10.1.74 (*Ephorus, ut Isocrati uisum, calcaribus eget*).

bal exuberance: *neque eos similis effecit inter se, sed tantum alteri adfinxit, de altero limauit*,¹³ *ut id confirmaret in utroque, quod utriusque natura pateretur*. The metaphors from sculptural modelling represent the pupil's nature as the medium (the particular variety of stone or clay) predisposed to a certain type of form. A good teacher works both *with* the medium, in choosing the form (*genus dicendi*) to be aimed at, and *against* it, in the sense that he eliminates the excesses that disfigure it, modifying it toward the best version of the form. But, whereas in 3.36 Isocrates is seen as able to foster a variety of styles, in 2.89–90 the teacher is presented, not as versatile, but as the model in himself of a single form, so that the choice of form follows from the choice of teacher. Sulpicius became more successful because he chose to imitate the right man—one whose idiom was suited to his own nature.

Thus Antonius in 2.90 infers from Sulpicius' experience the general precept: we must imitate the right model for us and, he adds, imitate only its best features. The trainee who has chosen his model represents or portrays (Cicero's words are *exprimere, effingere*)¹⁴ the model by prac-

13 *Limare* probably belongs to the language of bronze-casting and represents the final filing away of irregularities. Cicero's Atticist opponents seem to have used *limatus* as a commendatory word. Cicero himself diverts it in *Brut.* 35 to his own ideal Demosthenes. He uses the verb as a rhetorical term at *De or.* 1.115, *De opt. gen.* 9 (of Lysias' plain style for minor cases), *Brut.* 236, and—with similar associations in a dialectical context—*De off.* 2.35 (*illa, cum ueritas ipsa limatur in disputatione, subtilitas*). *Adfiningere*, probably formed to translate Greek *prosplattein* or *prosmattein*, occurs of shaping rough buildings by adding clay at Varro *RR* 3.9.7. It would seem to be the proper word for adding bulk to figurines of clay; hence Cicero applies it to the shaping of human bodies by nature at *Nat. D.* 1.92 and *De or.* 3.179. In contrast, *De or.* 2.325 criticizes an introduction poorly attached to the speech as *adfectum*, "patched onto its main body".

14 *Effingere*, Greek *ekplattein*, is the classic word for representation, originally by hand-moulding in clay or wax. Cicero uses it for the orator's portrayal of his client's character in *De or.* 2.184, but it is more common in relating the imitation, or imitating artist, to the model. With *effingat* in *De or.* 2.90, cf. Quint. 10.1.108 (*nam mihi uidetur M. Tullius cum se totum as imitationem Graecorum contulisset, effinxisse uim Demosthenis*), 10.1.127 (*ad ea se quisque dirigeat effingenda quae poterat*), 10.2.15. See also 5.12.21, *effingere* of the moulding of the pupil by the teacher. In Pliny *Ep.* 7.9, a letter on imitation, the whole metaphor of wax, and its moulding (*effingere*), is revived in a little epigram on artistic creation.

Exprimere, here a mere synonym of *effingere*, is rather shaping by means of a mould, stamp, or die, equivalent of *ektoupoun* (*ekmattein*); see n. 34. For its use in this context, cf. *Orat.* 19 (*quem si imitari atque exprimere non possumus*);

tice, *exercitatio*. He must, however, avoid imitating external features and mannerisms. What is conspicuous (*insignia*) is considered almost as a fault (*paene uitiosa*). There is the implication borne out by the comments of other critics, that what is distinctive in an expert may, by the exaggeration of the amateur, be distorted to a fault. Poor Fufius in 2.91 violated the general rule in two ways: his lack of natural energy prevented him from successful imitation of Fimbria's vigour (*nerui*); and he wrongly chose to copy Fimbria's ugly pronunciation, succeeding where he would have been well advised to fail.

Cicero moves from practical precepts to the highest level of literacy theory in 2.91, without formal transition. The abrupt rhetorical question, "What [else but imitation] has determined the special styles of oratory which characterise each successive generation?" marks the beginning of the historical summary, after which Cicero will return in 2.96 to the pupils of the present day.

The question presupposes that in a society each generation has a common style, a nucleus of characteristics shared by all the orators of that day. These characteristics are distinct from those of the previous generation, yet, we are simultaneously told, causally related to them through imitation. Cicero explains that he is arguing from Greek rhetoric, because the orators have left written work as documentary evidence of the *dicendi ratio uoluntasque cuiusque aetatis*: these five words define the *genera* as a combination of the method and choice; the latter, *uoluntas*¹⁵ (Greek *prohairesis*),¹⁶ represented the style aimed at, and imitation is the means to that end.

Quint. 2.7.3. (*formam orationis ... experiment*), 10.2.18, 10.2.26 (*totum exprimere quem elegeris*); Tac. *Dial.* 23.1.

15 For *uoluntas*, cf. *Brut.* 83, where *uariae uoluntates* describes the stylistic ideals adopted; *Brut.* 285 (*natura quaedam aut uoluntas ita dicendi fuit*), *Orat.* 52 (*et naturae uariae et uoluntates multum inter se distantia effecerunt genera dicendi* (a significant analysis)); and Quint. 10.1.89 (*admirabilem ... nacti generis uoluntatem*). The verb *uelle* is used repeatedly in this section of *De oratore* (cf. 89 *magistrum quem uellet eligeret*; 91 *imitari etiam uitia uoluit*; 94 *partim in acie inlustres esse uoluerunt*; 95 *sic semper fuisse aliquem cuius se similis esse uellent*; 98 *qui imitatione adsequi uolet*; 98 *suapte natura quod uelint sine cuiusquam similitudine consequantur*) and in the discussion of Atticist imitation at *Brut.* 285 f. (*similis esse uelle* denotes *imitari* in 286, *Charisi uult Hegesias esse similis*, and 287, *Atticorum similes esse uolumus*). The phrase is in fact the main element in the definition of imitation as given by *Rhet. Her.* 1.3: *qua impellimur cum diligenti ratione ut aliquorum similes in dicendo uelimus esse*. More generally, *uelle* covers stylistic intent in Quint. 10.1.119, *quam uelle optima credens*, and in the famous verdict on Seneces, 10.1.131,

In 2.93–95 Cicero traces the sequence of Athenian orators from Pericles to Demetrius of Phaleron, linked wherever possible by relationships of pupilhood and imitation. I present in table 1 the generations of this account in parallel with the fuller account given in *Brutus* 27–37. The passages have been compared before by a great historian,¹⁷ and most recently by A. E. Douglas, from the point of view of rhetorical history,¹⁸ but both scholars have been primarily concerned with *Brutus*. Our investigation will focus on *De oratore*, using *Brutus* as a control. The question is: how far is Cicero straining the known facts of chronology and relations between successive orators to reinforce his theory of evolution through imitation?

In the historical sequence of *De oratore*, Pericles (b. 495?), Alcibiades (b. 455?), and Thucydides (b. 460?) are seen as contemporaries, the earliest generation (*antiquissimi*) whose writings are recorded as evidence. The characterization appropriate to Thucydides is applied to them all, and Cicero argues a priori that their common *genus* presupposes imitation of a common model. There are obvious objections to treating these men as belonging to one generation and to the assumptions about their style(s), which in Pericles' case may have been based on forged speeches.¹⁹ By the

digna natura quae meliora uellet, quod uoluit, effecit. The recurring antithesis of *natura* and *uoluntas* treats them as complementary ingredients in each man's idiom.

- 16 For *prohairesis* of stylistic aims, compare Dionysius *Peri mimeseos* 6.31 Usener-Radermacher, where *dynamis* and *prohairesis* are opposed. The orator's *dynamis* is described as limited by his nature, but he had control over his *prohairesis*: style is seen as choice or will.
- 17 F. Münzer, "Atticus als Geschichtsschreiber," *Hermes* 11 (1905) 50–100, discusses and analyses this section of *Brutus* on pp. 78–80. Cicero's chronological modifications are largely to be explained in terms of increased historical knowledge. *Brutus* was written under the stimulus of Atticus' *Liber annalis* and repeatedly acknowledges Cicero's debt. Thus 28 should certainly read *ex Attici monumentis* ("from Atticus' records"), with Malcovati and all modern scholars, against Wilkins' OCT *Atticis*.
- 18 Douglas, "Intellectual Background," 102–6.
- 19 Douglas, "Intellectual Background," 104, suggests that in *Brut.* 27 (*Periclem cuius scripta quaedam feruntur*), *feruntur* could mean either "are in circulation" or "are attributed..." The latter sense is favoured by the similar language of *Brut.* 205, where Cicero mentions and rejects as spurious *Sulpici orationes quae feruntur*. Quintilian, who quotes *Brut.* 27 in 3.1.12, belittles the attributed speeches and supports those who believe that Pericles left no written oratory. According to H. Ll. Hudson-Williams ("Political Speeches in Athens," CQ, n.s 1 (1951) 68–73), it was exceptional for Athenian politicians of the fifth century to prepare speeches, which were expected to be impromptu and accordingly unlikely

time of the *Brutus* Cicero has modified his chronology: starting from Pericles and Thucydides (because of his writings, *Brut.* 27), he renounces a serious attempt to date the earlier statesmen before returning to Pericles, to whom he loosely opposes Cleon. He distinguishes from these two a half-generation, grouping Alcibiades with Critias and Theramenes (orators active from 420 to, at the latest, 403 BCE); and he infers the general style of the *aetas* from the writings of Thucydides (*Brut.* 29). But in *De oratore* Critias and Theramenes are grouped with Lysias, so that the speeches of the *Corpus Lysiacum*, and what survived then of Critias, are used to infer qualities distinct from those of Pericles. These orators have “his vitality, but with a fuller texture” (93).

Table: Cicero’s Chronology by Generation of the Athenian Orators

<i>De oratore</i> 2.93–95		<i>Brutus</i> 27–37
Pericles, Alcibiades, Thucydides		Pericles with Thucydides, with Cleon
Critias, Theramenes, Lysias		Alcibiades, Critias, Theramenes (<i>huic aetati suppare</i> , a half-generation)
		(Sophists)
Isocrates		Isocrates
ORATORS	HISTORIANS	Lysias
Demosthenes, Hyperides, Lycurgus, Aeschines, Dinarchus	Ephorus, Theopompus, Philistus	Demosthenes, Hyperides, Aeschines, Lycurgus, Demades, Dinarchus
Demochares (nephew of Demosthenes)		
Demetrius of Phaleron		Demetrius of Phaleron

In setting down Lysias and Critias as coeval, Cicero suggests a historical scheme which he subsequently changes in the *Brutus*; the ambiguity of

to be written up for publication. Cicero’s assumption that Thucydides’ style was typical of his age has the support of J. H. Finley (“The Origin of Thucydides’ Style,” *HSCP* 50 (1939) 35–84; reprinted in *Three Essays on Thucydides*, Cambridge, Mass. 1967, 55–117). Finley sees Thucydides’ antitheses, abstractions and grammatical variation as characteristic of Greek prose writing ca. 440–425 BCE.

Lysias' historical position stems from his relatively late oratorical activity. His speeches belong to the period between the restored democracy after 403 and 380 or later, although he was born in 459/458, according to Dionysius *Isocrates* 1 and pseudo-Plutarch *Vita X Oratorum* 835C (repeated 836A).²⁰ Lysias' career, delayed by his political exclusion from Attica, began after the careers of Critias, Alcibiades, and Theramenes had been terminated; his activity would be thus nearly contemporary with Isocrates' first speeches. But neither a chronology based on birth nor one based on career would seem to justify Lysias' postponement to a position after Isocrates in the *Brutus* sequence. Rather the arrangement serves to bring Isocrates closer to Gorgias, his teacher, and the other Sophists, while reserving Lysias, as the *prope perfectus* of the immediately preclassical generation, to play foil to Demosthenes, the *plane perfectus* ... *quod nihil admodum desit* (*Brut.* 35).

In *De oratore* 2.94 Isocrates is introduced as a comet newly arisen (*ecce tibi est exortus Isocrates*), and the exclamatory technique and vivid metaphor break the connection of succession and influence from the previous group. In *Brutus* also, Cicero suggests a break, inserting the rival tra-

20 F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit* 1.345, argues for a later date of birth: Lysias' visit to Thurii at age fifteen, he says, need not have been at the time of its foundation; and the fact that Lysias' career began in 403 suggests a later birthdate; so also K. L. Dover, *Lysias and the "Corpus Lysiaceum"*, Berkeley 1970, 42–45. On the other hand, the political crises of the period, beginning with Athens' attack on his native Syracuse in 415, amply explain Lysias' absence from politics; and many scholars still accept the higher dating. Münzer, "Atticus als Geschichtsschreiber," 80, argues that Lysias owes his position in *Brutus* "weniger der Berücksichtigung seiner Zeit, als der seiner Bedeutung ... wobei natürlich für Cicero die Rücksicht auf den Attizisten Brutus, den Verehrer des Lysias, massgebend ist." I would suggest that Cicero is not concerned to please Brutus by his treatment of Lysias (he makes no bones of attacking Lysias in *Brut.* 63–69): rather he reduces Lysias' importance, by postponing him to follow the full appraisal of Isocrates and by making his comment brief. Thus he enhances the prominence of Isocrates, whose characterization balances that of Demosthenes. Douglas, "Intellectual Background," 105, interprets the postponement of late fifth and early fourth centuries. The difficulty is caused by Cicero's switch in *Brut.* 35 from chronological connection to connection by degrees of artistic development. Since Cicero later (*Brut.* 68 f., 293) matches Lysias with Cato as a kind of inspired forerunner of classicism, consistency requires him to keep Lysias distinct from Demosthenes and the group associated with Demosthenes in 36; this Cicero does implicitly through the contrast of *prope perfectus* and *plane perfectus*—as in his contrast between Myron and Polyclitus, the latter called *plane perfectus* in *Brut.* 70.

ditions of Sophistic eloquence, headed by Gorgias, and Socratic dialectic, before he marks a return from the digression to the orators proper with the phrase, *exstitit iam senibus illis quos paulo ante diximus Isocrates* (*Brut.* 32). In fact, in both *De oratore* and *Brutus* Isocrates is recognized as an artist from outside the political tradition. Cicero cannot honestly proclaim him as a pupil or imitator of anyone except Gorgias.²¹ But Isocrates was himself the strongest argument for the importance of evolution through imitation, because of his many and famous pupils²² and because of his professed method of teaching by imitation.²³ It is in his treatment of Isocrates that Cicero sets out his most explicit statement that *imitatio* is the prime cause of stylistic growth (*De or.* 2.94–95).

Isocrates ... cuius e ludo tamquam ex equo Troiano meri principes exierunt; sed eorum partim in pompa, partim in acie inlustres esse uoluerunt. Atque et illi, Theopompi, Ephori, Philisti, Naucratae, multique

-
- 21 Cicero is aware by the time of *Orator* (176) that Isocrates studied with Gorgias in Thessaly, but he may have learned this, along with his corrected attribution of rhythmical periods (*Orat.* 175), from recent reading. (J. E. Sandys' edition of *Orator* (Cambridge 1885), *ad. loc.*, suggests Theophrastus' *Peri lexeos* as the source.) Since Gorgias himself was not in the political tradition of orator-statesmen, we cannot infer from Cicero's omission of the relationship at *De or.* 2.93 that he did not know of Isocrates' association with Gorgias when he wrote *De oratore*.
- 22 From the third century when Hermippus of Smyrna, pupil of Callimachus and Peripatetic biographer, wrote his *Peri tôn tou Isokratous mathêtôn* (*FHG*, Vol. 3, fr. 35–54), Isocrates' many pupils had been multiplied by critical tradition. Cicero elsewhere names Timotheus (*De or.* 3.139, a passage introducing praise of Isocrates' other pupils), Ephorus and Theopompus (see n. 12), and Naucrates (*De or.* 3.173; *Orat.* 172). [Plut.] *X orat.* 837C (Vol. 10 of *Plutarch's "Moralia"*, trans. H. N. Fowler, Cambridge, Mass. 1960) credits Isocrates with a hundred pupils, including Timotheus, Ephorus, Theopompus, and—"some say"—Hyperides and Isaeus; and he quotes a story that Isocrates rejected Demosthenes because he could not pay the full fee. In other lives [Plut.] also quotes Isocrates as teacher of Isaeus (839E has a lacuna, supplemented from 844B), Aeschines (840B, "as some say"), Lycurgus (841B), Demosthenes (844B, inconsistently with his own earlier version), and Hyperides (848E). Among the canonical ten orators only Dinarchus, notorious as an emulator of Demosthenes, escapes inclusion. According to Plut. *Demosth.* 5, Hermippus reported a story of Ctesibius that Demosthenes learned Isocrates' *technê* by borrowing notes from Isocrates' pupils. This kind of myth reflects the eagerness of later generations to exalt Isocrates' teaching.
- 23 *Against the Sophists* 18 and *Antidosis* 205–6, quoted on p. 259. See also Douglas, "Intellectual Background," 106, for Cicero's concern with Isocrates as a teacher in both *De oratore* and *Brutus*.

alii naturis different, uoluntate autem similes sunt et inter sese et magistri; et hi, qui se ad causas contulerunt, *ut* Demosthenes, Hyperides, Lysurgus, Aeschines, Dinarchus alique complures, etsi inter se pares non fuerunt, tamen sunt omnes in eodem ueritatis imitandae genere uersati, quorum quam diu mansit imitatio, tam diu genus illud dicendi studiumque uixit; postea quam extinctis eis omnis eorum memoria sensim obscurata est et euanuit, alia quaedam dicendi molliora ac remissiora genera uiguerunt.

The pupils of Isocrates are divided into what we might call academics and statesmen. The former include the historians Theopompus, Ephorus and Philistus of Syracuse (at *De or.* 2.57 cited as an imitator of Thucydides), and the literary theorist Naucrates (known chiefly from *De or.* 3.173, which reports him as crediting Isocrates with the invention of prose rhythm): these were men who had chosen epideictic writing, removed from the battlefield.²⁴ Set against them are the orators. The linking *ut* of line 5 mitigates the inclusion with Isocrates' pupils, Hyperides and Lysurgus, of others who had no direct relationship with him: Demosthenes, Aeschines, and the last in the canon of Attic orators, Dinarchus, whose first known speech occurred two years after Isocrates' death. For both groups Cicero emphasizes the differing natural aptitudes of the individual, modified by their shared artistic intentions. The epideictic writers, despite different temperaments, became similar to their teacher, and so incidentally to each other, because of their choice of model. The orators, although not all equally gifted, all practiced the same style of representing real life.

Cicero's argument has become less exact and more generalized: just as the concept of pupil has been extended to cover the whole range of orators from the next generation, so perhaps awareness of the radical differences between Demosthenes and Aeschines, or between each of

24 The image of the public world of law and politics as a battlefield lends itself to contrast with the lesser worlds of epideictic, on the one hand, and the training school, on the other. Thus *pompa* denotes the display or parade of epideictic oratory, in which the orator's equipment is shown, not used. Compare *De or.* 1. 157, where the boy is to be brought *in agmen, in puluerem, in clamorem, in castra atque in aciem forenssem ... illa commentatio in ueritatis lucem proferenda est*; or *Brut.* 37, describing the philosopher Demetrius of Phaleron as *non tam armis institutus quam palaestra*. In *Orator* Isocratean epideictic is deprecated at 42: *uerum haec ludorum atque pompae; nos autem in aciem dimicationemque ueniamus*. Quintilian uses the same distinction to contrast oratory and poetry in 10.1.29 (*nos uero armatos stare in acie*) and to distinguish oratory from history in 10.1.31 (*totumque opus non ad actum rei pugnamque praesentem, sed ad memoriam posteritatis et ingenii famam componitur*).

them and Isocrates,²⁵ has led to the vaguer formulation, *in eodem ueritatis imitandae genere uersati* (line 7). Here the specification *in eodem genere* would seem to be parallel to *uoluntate autem similes*, and to indicate their choice of the one Isocratic *genus* for their depiction of real life; while *ueritatis imitandae*, rightly interpreted by the commentaries of Piderit-Harnecker and Wilkins as “representation of real life,”²⁶ is contrasted not with fiction, but with the remote but factual world of epideictic.²⁷ The orator deals with actuality, with immediate, current events; and *ueritas* here merely resumes the distinction of the previous sentence between the *acies* of public life and the *pompa* of the academic

25 Cicero affirms these differences in *De or.* 3.28 f. and *Brut.* 289: *nam quid est tam dissimile quam Demosthenes et Lysias? quam idem et Hyperides, quam horum omnium Aeschines?* The inconsistency between *De or.* 2.94 and 3.28 is more apparent than real.

26 W. Piderit/O. Harnecker (eds.), *Cicero: “De oratore”*, Vol. 2 (Leipzig 1889; repr. Amsterdam 1965), *ad loc.*: “in ihrer Darstellung des wirklichen Lebens, wie es ist ... im Gegensatz zu den Prunk-rednern des *genos epideiktikon* und deren rhetorischer Ausschmücking.” A. S. Wilkins (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis “De oratore” libri tres* (Oxford 1892; repr. Hildesheim 1965), *ad loc.*: “style of representation of real life.”

27 There are problems in interpreting both elements of this phrase. *Genus* could distinguish the genre(s) of public oratory from the genre(s) of epideictic writing along the lines of Cicero’s *tria genera causorum* (*De or.* 1.141; cf. 2.43 f.). But this would be merely to declare that all the men named were orators. Rather we need emphasis on their common idiom, *genus dicendi*. The attachment of the explanatory gerundive is awkward, but it is paralleled by *Brut.* 146, *orator in hoc interpretandi explanandi edisserendi genere mirabilis* (identified by Douglas as the expository style, Cicero’s “*Brutus*,” xxxiv). The difficulty in *ueritatem imitari* arises from the ambiguity of *ueritas*. Two other passages in *De oratore* (2.34 and 3.214) describe orators as maintaining or enacting reality (*ueritatem suscipere, actor ueritatis*) and contrast them with theatrical players who merely imitate it. This contrast of factual with fictional material has no relevance in discriminating between oratory and history. The superior “reality” of oratory can only derive from its actuality or immediacy, as in Suet. *Rhet.* 1.33: *ueteres controuersiae aut ex histories trahebantur ... aut ex ueritate ac re, si qua forte recens accidisset*.

Douglas (“Intellectual Background,” 114) has suggested a transference of critical terminology from the visual arts, “in which the achievement of *ueritatis imitatio* marks the high peak.” It carries an implication of classical perfection to be contrasted with the *molliora ac remissiora genera* which followed the fifth-century acme. A translation along these lines might be “in the same style of perfect realism,” but Douglas himself sees the difficulty when he comments, “True *ueritas* (whatever that could conceivably be in oratory)” The antithesis of idealism and realism is not transferable to different stylistic levels in a purely verbal art.

world: the pattern is the same as in *De oratore* 1.157 (quoted n. 24). The orator-pupils of Isocrates employed the same method of representing reality because they copied the same model. The phrase confuses because Cicero has introduced something like the Aristotelian *mimesis* into a context concerned with the rhetorical type of imitation. But he surely has a motive: to affirm the validity and fidelity of imitation from artist to artist by describing the relationship between speech and life in the same terms. Imitation is reproduction, not pretence. As the sentence continues, Cicero returns to rhetorical *imitatio* and asserts its power to shape styles (*genera dicendi*). But he has moved on a generation, and Isocrates' pupils have become models; the objective genitive *eorum memoria* following (line 9) shows that *quorum imitatio* (line 7) is also objective: "as long as imitation of these speakers persisted, that style of oratory flourished; only with their death and the fading and blurring of their memory did slacker and more indulgent styles come into fashion." *Imitatio* depends on direct experience, or memory; when memory is damaged, *imitatio* becomes impossible and continuity ceases.

This sentence seems to set the break in continuity between Demosthenes and Dinarchus, on the one hand, and Demochares and Demetrius of Phaleron, regent of Athens from 317–307, on the other. These two are hardly more distant in time from Demosthenes than Dinarchus, but their success belongs to the era of Macedonian domination, so that politics reinforce the generation gap.²⁸ However there are signs of a *petitio principii*: the decline in quality is apparent to Cicero, so it is convenient to imply a break in the tradition. Cicero's interest in *imitatio* as a source of continuity and development centres on Isocrates; and the successive generations are more slackly connected, until he can stand on more familiar ground with the state of oratory in Antonius' heyday—the time of Cicero's youth—in which all Asia is bent on imitating Menecles and Hierocles of Alabanda.

28 By the dating of OCD, Aeschines (397–322?), Lycurgus (390?–325/4), Hyperides (389–322), and Demosthenes (384–322) represent one generation; Dinarchus (360?–290), Demochares (360–275), and Demetrius of Phaleron (350?, but began political life in 325/4) the generation of their sons. But Dinarchus made his first speech in 336 and actually accused Demosthenes in 324; whereas Demetrius' career depended on his elevation by Cassander in 317, and Demochares did not become powerful until he was over fifty, in 307. If Cicero is dating the orator-statesmen by their earliest known oratory, his chronology is consistent.

In some ways this historical sequence is better handled in *Brutus*, where Lysias is postponed and set in direct comparison with Demosthenes. Indeed Cicero has made Demosthenes central, by describing his style fully before associating with him, not only Hyperides and the lesser contemporaries, but also the younger group represented by Dinarchus and the new figure of Demades (not in *De or.* 2.95). The break in tradition and beginning of decay with Demetrius is extenuated by exaggerating the time interval (*successit his senibus adulescens*, *Brut.* 37) and by emphasizing the impractical nature of his philosophical training (*non tam armis institutus quam palaestra ... processerat ... e Theophrasti doctissimi hominis umbraculis*, *ibid.*). The further decline after Demetrius is conveniently postponed to the second version²⁹ of oratorical history, which emphasizes outside cultural influences and blames Asianism squarely on geographical and anthropological factors.

Cicero was less self-conscious about Asianism in 55 BCE, and he ends the account of *De oratore* without reservations about the merits of contemporary tradition, urging Sulpicius, or whoever wishes to achieve a resemblance to the traditional form, to seek it by intensive practice and above all by written composition. Although Antonius adds as a courtesy to his present company that some speakers, such as Caesar Strabo and Cotta, or the absent Curio, have succeeded in forming their chosen style without imitating any model (“*suapte natura quod uelint consequantur*,” 98), Cicero’s verdicts on these orators in *Brutus*³⁰ show that he considers them only modified successes, falling short of the power and versatility of the *plane perfectus*. But in the earlier work, tradition, and consequently imitation, has met with no serious challenge: the modifications in *Brutus* bespeak Cicero’s urgent reaction to the challenges that arose with Calvus and continued after his death.

We leave this discussion in *De oratore* 2 with the impression that, for Cicero, imitation succeeds in proportion to its closeness to the model. Is this what Cicero intends? Is this what we normally understand by imitation? If so, what will be the artistic consequences?

29 *Brut.* 39–48 (or perhaps 51).

30 Caesar Strabo, see *Brut.* 177; Cotta, *Brut.* 200, especially the reservation, *etsi id melius est quod splendidius ac magnificentius tamen in bonis omnia quae summa sunt iure laudantur*. The verdict on Curio (the consul of 76) is more extensive and severe in condemning his lack of technique: cf. 213, *neminem ... cognoui ... tam indoctum, tam rudem*.

Dictionaries reflecting modern usage generally define the act of imitation in terms of the verb “imitate”: to try to be the same as, to follow the example of, to reproduce (in form, colour, etc.), to make a duplicate of, to copy.³¹ These definitions imply the aim of being as like as possible to the original, so that any modification of the original, even if it is bigger or better, is a failure, qua imitation. With this connotation, imitation will only produce growth and evolution in a technique by accident, and successful imitation will obstruct development. Did the ancient rhetorical theory, then, understand something different by *mimesis* / *imitatio*?

We have seen that Isocrates was Cicero’s paradigm for the value of *imitatio*, and he himself reports of *De oratore* that it combines all the rhetorical teaching of both Aristotle and Isocrates.³² How did Isocrates understand *mimesis* as an element in rhetorical training? Two passages can be used to throw light on his approach to *mimesis*. In the speech *Against the Sophists*, he argues that “the teacher should provide in himself so good a model that the pupils who take on his imprint and are able to imitate him³³ instantly show in their speaking more grace and charm than is found in the others.” The key metaphor here, *ektypoun*,³⁴ is

31 I quote from Webster’s *Twentieth Century Dictionary* (Cleveland 1956), whose entry seems to be based on the three main headings of the OED.

32 *Fam.* 1.9.23: *abhorrent enim a communibus praeceptis, atque omnem antiquorum et Aristoteliam et Isocratiam rationem oratoriam complectuntur.*

33 *Isoc.* 13.18: τοὺς ἐκτυπωθέντας καὶ μιμήσασθαι δυναμένους.

34 On the *typos* image in Platonic *mimesis*, see McKeon, “Concept of Imitation,” 124, 126–27. His examples show that *ektypoun* is one of a group of words from the plastic arts used extensively by Plato, both for imitation and for memory. The use of *apomattein* as a metaphor of copying by Aeschylus in *Ar. Frogs* 1040 shows that the image was already associated with literary representation before Plato, and should perhaps be credited to the Sophists. The soul of man is a matrix of clay or wax (*ekmageion*, *Tht.* 191C) receiving the impression of its experiences (cf. *Tht.* 194D–E, 195). Plato’s imagery of memory survives in Dionysius, both in his formal definition (*Peri mimeseos* fr. 3.28 U–R: μίμησις ἐστὶν ἐνέργεια διὰ τῶν θεωρημάτων ἐκματτομένη τὸ παράδειγμα) and in his metaphorical praises of the successful eclectic imitator whose achievement will be οὐκ ἐξίτηλον χρόνω γενησομένην εἰκόνα τυποῦν (fr. 6.31.417 fin. U–R). As for Cicero, he makes explicit the metaphor of wax for memory in *De or.* 2.354, but the analogy there is between the artificial organisation of memory landscapes and the wax tablets of formal notetaking. More significant is the link between memory and imitation made in our passage, *De or.* 2.95, where the fading metaphors of *obscurare* and *euanescere* show that Cicero conceived imitation as a memory-cased process in the same Platonic tradition. The metaphor of

properly used of reproduction of a die or seal in wax or some other mould—a medium in which a faithful likeness is to be expected and can be mass-produced. That this is no aberration is shown by his statement in *Antidosis* 205–6:

We think those men the most skilled experts in all arts and crafts who produce pupils as like each other in workmanship as possible. It will be obvious that the same thing applies in the case of philosophy. Whoever enjoy a real guide³⁵ with good judgement will be found to have such similar oratorical talent that it would be apparent to everyone that they had enjoyed the same rhetorical training. Yet if they has not undergone the same conditioning, or been offered the same technical training, they could not have achieved this likeness.

Isocrates then attributes this close resemblance (which he presents as a desirable effect and proof of the teacher's success) to the pupils' practice in copying, just as his teacher Gorgias had trained his pupils by giving them model speeches to learn by heart.³⁶ In this tradition the teacher creating the new orator aims to reproduce his own excellences. But there is a difference between Isocrates and his predecessors, because he is stressing the responsibility of the teacher to offer the highest standards (in much the same way the *Auctor ad Herennium* (4. 10) insists that the teacher should be able to compose all his own examples, or at least provide examples from a single model.) Although such an attitude may seem to resist development and assume that all deviations from the master's own style must be a falling away, we should recognize Isocrates' own liberalization in practice of the tradition he inherited. For he goes on to describe the teacher in *Antidosis* 208 as possessing both knowledge he has taken over and what he has independently discovered,³⁷ so improving, we may infer, on his own instructors; again he al-

the wax imprint echoes literary theory and is applied, not only to imitation, but to style, the product of imitation, in *De. or.* 3.177; Quint. 10.5. 7; and Pliny *Ep.* 7.9.11.

35 Isocrates' word is *hegemōn*; we may compare Antonius' claim in *De or.* 2.87 to be a guide (*dux*) and his frequent use of imagery based on *uias* (*itineraria, locos*) *monstrare* in the section 2.152–74.

36 Arist. *Soph. El.* 34.183 b 38–184 a 1: ὁμοία τις ἦν ἡ παιδείσις τῇ Γοργίου πραγματείᾳ· λόγους γὰρ οἱ μὲν ῥητορικοὺς οἱ δὲ ἐρωτητικοὺς ἐδίδοσαν ἔκμαν-θάνειν, εἰς οὓς πλείστακις ἐμπίπτειν ᾧ ἤθνησαν ἑκάτεροι τοὺς ἀλλήλων λόγους.

37 *ta men pareilêphonta ta d' auton heourêkonta*. I have been convinced by Dr. Erika Rummel of this important difference between Isocrates' own practice and the traditional methods which he recalls to his readers. Dr. Rummel's work in progress on Isocrates' educational principles shows that, while it was in Iso-

lows for variation in the teacher's handling of different pupils—within the generation. The famous anecdote contrasting Isocrates' methods of training Ephorus and Theopompus shows that he was not so rigid, and Cicero himself has deliberately presented this story as the climax of his account of individual styles in *De oratore* 3. It is time to analyse his argument in these chapters (3.26–37).

He lets Crassus begin with the variety of sensations, of sounds, or of sights, equal in beauty but different (he might even have added incommensurate) in kind. The argument leads through diversity of sights to diversity in the visual arts (the personal idioms of painters and sculptors), then to diversity in voice and language, such that men of acknowledged excellence are praised for different styles: *in dispari tamen genere laudentur*. Here *genus* marks not the literary genre nor the idiom of a generation, but personal style. It is repeatedly applied in this way, to the *dissimile scribendi genus* (27) of the three Greek tragedians and their Latin counterparts, then to the idiom (*suo genere* 28) of the Roman orators of the past and of the rising orators, Cotta and Sulpicius (*quid tam inter se dissimile, quid tam suo in genere praestans* 31). The *genera dicendi* of Caesar Strabo (30), of Antonius (32 and 33), and by implication of Crassus himself, are described and distinguished, leading to the summation in 34: the difference of merit between one and another of those present is a matter of *facultas*, not *genus*, since everything is praiseworthy which is *in suo genere perfectum*.³⁸

Concentrating on oratorical identities, Cicero here brings his argument to the extreme conclusion: there must be as many *genera dicendi* as there are speakers. Then he faces an objection: how can men of different personal idioms be the product of the same *praecepta* and training? This might be called a different approach to the problem of imitation and change, and his answer lies in the recognition and exploitation of a speaker's nature. The theme has already been prepared by Cicero's reference in 28 to *oratorum studia atque naturae*.³⁹ The two elements of per-

crates' interest to appear conservative in method, his class techniques were both calculated and flexible.

38 The argument is that, since it is possible to be perfect of one's kind in any *genus*, any actual speaker who is less than perfect falls short of the potential of his own *genus*. A similar distinction is made less successfully in *De opt. gen.* 4 (*ut alius melius quam alius concedendum est; uerum id fit non genere, sed gradu*) and again in 6 (*appellabuntur omnes oratores, ut pictores appellantur etiam mali, nec generibus inter se, sed facultatibus different*).

39 The equivalent of *natura* and *uoluntas* in *Brut.* 285, *Orat.* 52, etc. See n. 15.

sonality (or personal talent) and stylistic choice combine to create the personal idiom, and the supreme teacher will direct the pupil where his natural bent leads him (35). We are back to Isocrates, whose pupils can emerge from the school of the same artist and teacher, supreme in his own personal style, yet show themselves both different from each other and deserving praise—like Ephorus and Theopompus. As the details of the anecdote show, Isocrates is not rigid: he acknowledges the existence of more than one “good” style and recognizing that a speaker’s idiom is formed from the blending of his own nature and teacher (2.89) implies the same point. To realise the maximum potential of the young orator, a fusion of his natural tendencies (*natura, ingenium, indoles*) with the right kind of imitation is needed. Sulpicius’ temperament suits him to the imitation of a particular *genus dicendi*, that of Crassus rather than of Antonius. By blending imitation of Crassus’ *genus* with his own talents, Sulpicius produces a new compound, his mature *genus*.

Yet it should be noticed that this formulation has reconciled the ideal of imitation with the fact of change only at the risk of denying the *singula prope genera dicendi* of each *aetas*, an intrinsic part of Cicero’s theory. He has acknowledged a substantive difference between the *genera* of Antonius and Crassus, although they are men of the same generation and social group. This inconsistency can be solved by a refinement of terminology; and in 3.34, faced with the *reductio ad absurdum*, *quot oratores totidem paene reperiuntur genera dicendi*, Cicero quickly presents the reformulation, *innumerabiles quasi formae figuraeque dicendi, specie dispares, genere laudabiles*. By introducing *forma* to convey the individual *charakter*, and the additional term *species*,⁴⁰ Cicero can avoid the potential contradiction, leaving himself the option of describ-

40 Cicero identifies *forma* with *charakter* at *Orat.* 36 and 134. In *Orator*, *species* is a synonym of *forma*, but both concepts are more important to Cicero’s argument, because he is viewing oratory statically in its present, evolved sophistication. Hence, *species* in *Orator* is the full equivalent of the Greek *eidos* or *idea*, and the *perfectae eloquentiae species* of *Orat.* 9 (cf. 18) corresponds to the Platonic ideal or form. Cicero does not yet employ *species* as the technical equivalent of *eidos* in classification (this terminology is first adopted in *Top.* 30). The non-technical nature of *species* is confirmed by three instances of classification in *De oratore* (1.189–90, 2.166–68 and 3.111 f.), which analyse in terms of *genera* and *partes*. But 1.189 (*genus autem id est quod sui similis communione quadam, specie autem differentis ... complectitur partes*) shows how *species* (“appearance” or “shape”), as the respect in which the *partes* were distinct, would come to be used in classification. In 3.34 *species* is merely a synonym of *forma* or *nota*, as in 3.115; it is adopted for the sake of variation.

ing the difference between Antonius and Crassus as one of *species*. Yet he stops short of making this point explicit, and, as I will show, it was left to his successors in the tradition to present a satisfactory formulation of the relationship between individuals, generations, and their inheritors.

As for the immediate issue of differentiating Antonius' idiom from Crassus', Cicero might have explained their idioms in another way reconcilable with the practice of *imitatio*, if he had attributed the differences to imitation of rival models from the Roman forum of their youth. But he does not associate either Crassus or Antonius with any teacher or model.⁴¹ He may have lacked historical evidence, or have thought the details irrelevant to the dialogue situation. More important is the fact that such an attribution would merely have transferred the problem of Sulpicius' *genus* to an earlier stage and would have weakened the emphasis he is seeking on the unified, single-stream progression of rhetorical Latin toward its full scope and versatility. There is still some inconsistency in Cicero's use of the term *genus dicendi*, which has varying degrees of generality even within the single section 2.87–97 under discussion, but the value of the evolutionary sense, "idiom of a generation," to literary theory may be seen as a compensation for the difficulties of terminology which he leaves unresolved.

The most important element of this evolutionary theory, the assumption of a characteristic oratory for each generation, based largely on imitation of existing models, recurs in the literary chapters of Velleius Paterculus (1.16–18), and in the arguments of Messalla, the representative of classicism in Tacitus' *Dialogus*.

Velleius is a particularly interesting case. Nothing is known of his actual teachers,⁴² but his interpretation of rhetorical history is clearly in the tradition of *De oratore*. He opens his discussion with the proposition that the best talents (*ingenia*) of any art have coincided in time

41 In *Off.* 2.47, speaking of Crassus' early debut as an orator, Cicero comments, *non aliunde mutuatus est, sed sibi ipse peperit maximam laudem*; this need not be a literary judgement, but in fact so precocious an orator cannot have undergone the usual extent of training by imitation in either political or rhetorical arts.

42 On Velleius' discussion, see Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*, 456–59. F. Della Corte, "I Giudizi Letterari di Velleio Paterculo," *RFIC* 15 (1937) 154–59, reports that scholars have seen a conflict between Velleius' approval of Isocrates and his Ciceronian content; but it is the choice of Isocrates, rather than Demosthenes, as the Greek ideal which brings Velleius closest to *De oratore*.

and in type: *in eandem formam et in idem artati temporis congruere spatium* (16.2). He has added a new element to the Ciceronian theory: where Cicero assumes the art of oratory and is concerned only with those adhering to it, Velleius argues that men of talent have chosen their art form according to their circumstances and the condition of the genre. He limits excellence in Attic oratory to the age of Isocrates (16.5): *quid ante Isocratem, quid post eius auditores eorumque discipulos clarum in oratoribus fuit?* Like Cicero (*De or.* 2.94–5) he extends this acme to two generations, covering the pupils of Isocrates and those who learned from them. As in *De oratore*, but not in *Brutus* or *Orator*, Isocrates is prominent, Demosthenes not yet the model and counterpart of Cicero. Velleius' account of Roman oratory limits its full achievement to the time of Cicero (17.3) and explains this narrow period of success in terms of imitation. Talent is fed by competition, and, whether it be jealousy or admiration that fosters imitation, the desire of individuals to succeed raises the achievement of an art as far as its natural peak. Only then, since it is difficult to remain still at the level of perfection, what can no longer advance, naturally recedes (17.6). The last sentence, predicating decay of the fully evolved organism, is a feature without precedent in Cicero's rhetorical writings, which could however have been inspired by his words or regret in *Tusculans* 2.6: *atque oratorum quidem laus ita ducta ab humili uenit ad summum*,⁴³ *ut iam quod natura fert in omnibus fere rebus, senescat, breuique tempore ad nihilum uentura uideatur*. Decline is a first-century issue with implications that demand a separate study.⁴⁴ In other respects, however, Velleius can be said to conform to the pattern of *De oratore*.

But Velleius' theme does not call for an account of the relationship between contemporaries; such an account is provided by Messalla, in what may be the last version of the theory to be composed.⁴⁵ Messalla argues in terms of *aetates*: just as the height of Attic oratory was achieved by Demosthenes, and those who came closest to him were orators of his

43 Cicero's language merely continues his expression of the concept of growth and acme as it is found at the focal point of *Brutus*: *ut dicendi latine prima maturitas in qua aetate exstisset posset notari et intelligeretur iam ad summum paene esse perductam* (161).

44 A sequel to this article (cf. n. 2 in this volume) will consider Quintilian's attitude to imitation, in the light of the apparent decline of eloquence in his day, and will relate his attitude to the comments of the Elder and Younger Seneca and the later generation of Pliny and Tacitus.

45 Tac. *Dial.* 25–26.

aetas (Aeschines, Hyperides, Lysias, whose seniority is here disregarded, and Lycurgus), so Cicero surpassed all his contemporaries, but they in turn were superior to all earlier or subsequent speakers. The contemporaries are extended from Caesar to Asinius Pollio, their radical differences identifies and reconciled by the *species / genus* distinction:

Nec refert quod inter se *specie* differunt, cum *genere* consentiant ... omnes ... eandem sanitatem eloquentiae ferunt, ut si omnium pariter libros in manum sumpseris scias, quamvis in *diuersis ingeniis*, esse quandam *iudicii ac uoluntatis similitudinem et cognationem*. (*Dial.* 25)

Their individual *species* can be attributed to their *diuersa ingenia*; their common *genus* is seen as a product of choice. *Consentiant* anticipates the more specific words *iudicium* (taste) and *uoluntas*, which we have seen are associated with the choice of model for imitation and the pursuit of a given style.⁴⁶ In these sentences Tacitus presents through Messalla a consistent account of the theory of evolution through imitation; it would be dangerous to assume that he was himself committed to this interpretation of rhetorical history, but it is noteworthy that the theory goes without contradiction in the ensuing chapters.

46 On this chapter of the *Dialogus*, see A. Michel, *Le "Dialogue des orateurs" de Tacite et la philosophie de Cicéron*, Paris 1962, 104 and n. 5. Oddly Michel, 106, sees not ch. 25 but the arguments of Aper in ch. 18 as growing from the *genus/species* distinction of *De or.* 3.34. The conflict arises because Aper had substituted a relativistic for an evolutionary approach, appraising oratory by its capacity to satisfy the tastes of its own generation.

12. Imitation and Decline: Rhetorical Theory and Practice in the First Century AD

In an earlier paper¹ I attempted to outline Cicero's views on the role of imitation in the training of the orator and in the evolution of oratory itself from generation to generation. We saw that Cicero in *De oratore* used the development of Athenian oratory as an illustration of evolution; and made Isocrates, whose principle of training by imitation Cicero advocated, into the central figure in the process of artistic growth. In *Brutus*, where the history of oratory at Athens served chiefly as a model for the growth of Roman eloquence, evolution was Cicero's main concern and the technique of imitation was allowed to recede. But his rhetorical works dealt too briefly with one question: exactly how did a mature student imitate another man's style? And they left aside another: if imitation promoted evolution of an art toward its highest form, what was imitation's role when decline set in?

The first question is very much Quintilian's business. The *Institutio* is concerned with education from the nursery to the *rostra* (or centumviral court), and in book 10 Quintilian can make the same general assumptions about a student's general education and technical expertise as Antonius did in *De oratore* 2.87 f. The reader expects to hear how an orator is educated. But instead of passing immediately to his practical advice on imitation, Quintilian recognizes the logical conflict between the fact of change (here progress) and the intention of reproduction. As a result, his chapter on imitation begins by trying to reconcile the method with the evolution of oratory before it deals with individual precepts. Thus, when we follow his argument in Part I, we shall have to consider imitation first as a cumulative factor in technical evolution before we can focus on the individual student and his technique of imitative composition. Only then can we compare Quintilian's approach with the interpretations of other first-century writers. In Part II I shall consider the

1 "Imitation and Evolution: The Discussion of Rhetorical Imitation in Cicero *De oratore* 2.87–97 and Some Related Problems of Ciceronian Theory," *CP* 73 (1978) 1–16, = n. 11 in this volume.

belief that Roman oratory was in decline, and illustrate from Quintilian and others the relationship between this belief and their attitude toward rhetorical imitation.²

I: *Artis pars magna*

The extensive survey of Greek and Roman literature which opens book 10 of the *Institutio* has a limited purpose: Quintilian is directing his students to the classical authors as models of oratory, and so he emphasizes in particular the genres, the authors, and the aspects of those authors which are suited for imitation. Although his reading list is on an unprecedented scale, his grounds are traditional enough. Theory (*praecepta*) needs the reinforcement of practice in writing if the student is to achieve fluency, but his writing will be aimless and inconsistent in style *citra lectionis exemplum* (10.1.2).³ Thus book 10 first enumerates the *lectionis exempla* in 1.46–135, then discusses active imitation, justifying and analysing it in chapter 2, before proceeding to the chapters on how, what, and even when the student himself should write.

Chapter 2 opens with three simple arguments⁴ for the usefulness of imitation. The first is particular to rhetoric, and the verb *inuenire* is chosen to suggest rhetorical *inuentio*. Although the greatest achievement is innovation, it is also advantageous to follow the direction suggested by successful innovation, *ea quae bene inventa sunt* (10.2.1). The second argument is more general, and shows Quintilian's understanding of psychology. It is, he argues, part of human behaviour (*omnis uitae ratio*)

2 In general, see now Gordon Williams, *Change and Decline*, Berkeley 1978, ch. 1 and 5. Ch. 1, "Contemporary Analyses of Decline," discusses briefly the views of Seneca the Elder, Velleius, and others, and ends with a detailed analysis of the argument in Tac. *Dial.* Ch. 5, "Thought and Expression," considers *imitatio* and *aemulatio* in poetry, and as forms of rhetorical training, but is not concerned with imitation of particular prose styles.

3 Throughout this paper I shall be quoting Quintilian from Michael Winterbottom's text (Oxford 1970). For the analysis of training into *ars*, *imitatio*, and *exercitatio* in the Latin tradition, see H. L. Caplan (ed.), *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cambridge, Mass. 1953, 1.2.3 and p. 7, n. c. It seems to be Isocrates who added imitation to the earlier trinity of *physis* (*ingenium*), *episteme* (*doctrina*), and *melete* (*exercitatio*).

4 Too little has been written on Quintilian's argumentation (see J. Cousin's bibliography, "Quintilien 1935–1959," *Lustrum* 7 (1962) 289 f.). On 10.2, see the discussion by Cousin, *Études sur Quintilien*, Vol. 1, Paris 1936, 584–88; and G. Kennedy, "An Estimate of Quintilian," *AJP* 83 (1962) 144–45.

to copy what we admire in others: this is the way in which children learn handwriting, and men learn to sing or paint or farm. It has been part of Quintilian's approach to education from the beginning of *Institutio*⁵ that he sees the pupil's imitative faculty as an asset to be exploited (1.3.1). When he describes the ideal teacher in book 2, he assumes that the teacher will use this faculty to instill moral precepts: he should give short speeches for his pupils to remember, *because* boys imitate living models more easily than they do the material of books; he should be a man who calls forth love and respect, *because* we are much more eager to imitate those we are fond of (2.2.8). Later in book 2 Quintilian follows the Isocratean pattern in advising the teacher to dictate from time to time complete themes for the pupil to imitate—*materias quas et imitetur puer et interim tamquam suas amet* (2.4.12). There is even a short list in 2.5.18–20 of literary models suitable for beginners, a foretaste of the full catalogue in book 10. Although he has borrowed the Isocratean analogy from physical crafts,⁶ Quintilian has doubtless had personal experience of the value of imitation in children, and is arguing from conviction in 10.2 as in book 2.

The third argument is more artificial, based on the dilemma that we must be either like or unlike what is good; but resemblance seldom arises by nature (in the sense of undirected chance), whereas it frequently results from imitation. We might note that this claim is to some extent contradicted by the criticism advanced against imitation in 10.2.10 (below and p. 269). Both arguments are too categorical to allow for the nuances of stylistic imitation, which much be appraised by delicate aesthetic criteria.

Quintilian might have been content to argue from these favourable premises, but instead he presents some serious criticisms of systematic imitation, starting from its apparent advantage—the ease of repetition rather than innovation. The arguments of 10.2.4–9 are evolutionary. Since progress depends on innovation, if men in the past had felt no need to create or think beyond what was familiar, there would have been no discoveries. In fact, primitive men innovated without models to copy (10.2.4) or teachers (10.2.6), and not only invention but devel-

5 See Kennedy, *Quintilian*, New York 1969, 43, on child psychology; 49, for the references to imitation in book 2.

6 For Isocrates' recommendation of set-pieces composed by the master, cf. *Against the Sophists* 18; for the analogy from training by observation in crafts, cf. *Antidosis* 205 f.

opment requires something more than imitation. Here Quintilian makes two useful distinctions: the early stage of learning by copying models (as in the case of the child or the craft-apprentice, 10.2.2) is marked off from the later formalization of theory by teachers; and discovery (10.2.5) is distinguished from development (10.2.7). Development in other arts returns the argument in section 8 to the central problem of artistic progress—*nihil autem crescit sola imitatione*—and to the specific art of oratory. The perfect orator can come into being only if it is possible to surpass all previous performers, since not even the greatest orators have possessed every positive quality or been free from fault.

From this “Platonic”⁷ idealism Quintilian falls back to the more realistic goal of matching past achievements, and the next two sections (10.2.10–11) are based on the argument from human frailty.⁸ The first derives from imagery marching or walking. The man who tries only to keep up will inevitably fall behind, but he who tries to overtake will at least keep level with his predecessor. The second, which is apparently contradictory, is based on the replication of a craftsman’s product: absolute resemblance is unattainable even in nature, so that it will be easier to surpass another’s achievement than to duplicate it.

Despite the inherent contradiction, both arguments depend on the discrepancy between intention and performance; yet this same discrepancy must be assumed, if we are to reconcile the pupil’s imitation of his model with progress beyond it. As Cicero saw in his comments on Sulpicius, or on Isocrates’ contrasted pupils Ephorus and Theopompus,⁹ the individuality of the imitator ensures that his product will be different from, and, if he is talented, perhaps better than, what he is imitating.

But Quintilian’s argument in 10.2.11 assumes the inferiority of the imitation, raising the new issue of originality. To modern eyes, judging by post-Romantic criteria, it is this argument which seems most damning against the policy of imitation. As Quintilian expresses it, imitation, like a shadow, or an actor simulating emotion, is always weaker than the original. So in composition, *iis quae in exemplum adsumimus subest natura*

7 The concept of the perfect orator derives directly from Cicero’s *Orator*, where it is called Platonic. Cicero extrapolates from an idea or form of eloquence the ideal *eloquens* “cui nihil deerat” (*Orat.* 18), “qui omnino nullus umquam fuit” (*Orat.* 19). The ostensible goal of the treatise is to define him, and Cicero declares at *Orat.* 100 that he has done so.

8 For the argument from human frailty, cf. 10.1.25 *summi enim sunt, hominess tamen*; and the comments on 10.2.25 (107–8).

9 See “Imitation and Evolution,” 4–5.

ac uera uis, contra omnis imitatio ficta est et ad alienum propositum commodatur. Conscious imitation of another man's work has to be compromise: the words of the model have the vigour of spontaneity, but the imitator who copies them will have to subordinate the identity to the model's.

In an aside Quintilian draws the analogy between this relationship and the imitation of real-life cases offered by the fictitious contexts of declamation; inevitably they lack vitality compared with factual cases. This aspect of imitation—fiction seen as an imitation of life—is a leit-motif of Quintilian's criticism of the declamations, and it helps to shape his views on the factors which promote the decline of eloquence. At this point, in 10.2, the question of fiction is marginal to his argument, but it serves to conceal from the reader that the objection to imitation is left unanswered.

Quintilian might have tried to counter the argument based on the superiority of the original (10.2.11) with a disclaimer. He could have said that he is not advocating imitation of content, but merely of form; but he does not. To the rhetorician, form was as significant as content, since the latter was to some extent dictated by circumstances. The criticism made in section 11 is left aside. Instead, by introducing the concept of *imitabilia*—what can, rather than what should, be imitated—Quintilian moves in 10.2.12 and 13 from justifying imitation to assuming its validity and examining its methods: the theme of the second half of the chapter, sections 14 to 28, is that of Dionysius' lost third book *Peri mimeoseos*, not *ara dei* ... but *pōs dei mimeisthai* (*Ep. ad Pomp.* 3.776 Usener-Radermacher).

There is little Latin precedent for Quintilian's account of rhetorical imitation; but, although Cicero said virtually nothing in his major account (*De or.* 2.87–97) about the details of method, there are two passages from his later works which throw light on what he meant by imitation. In *Brutus* 68 Cicero encourages Brutus to imitate the Elder Cato, but at the same time urges him (a) to change Cato's unattractive diction (*horridiora uerba*);¹⁰ (b) to add rhythmic structure (*numeri*); and (c) to arrange and reconstruct (*compone et quasi coagmenta*) the phrases so that the language may be more shapely (*aptior*). If stylistic imitation allowed for

10 The parallel allusion to *orationes ipsae horridulae Catonis* in *Orat.* 152 confirms that Cicero is criticizing defects of euphony in Cato's *compositio* (hiatus and consonant clashes) rather than individually archaic words. Quintilian uses *horridae atque incomposite* in 10.2.17, where he discusses students who try to imitate archaic oratory.

all these changes, what was left? A quite different procedure is suggested in *De optimo genere oratorum* 14, where Cicero describes how he adapted Demosthenes and Aeschines in translation,

conuerti ... ut orator, sententiis iisdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, uerbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. in quibus non uerbum pro uerbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omne uerborum uimque seruaui."¹¹

Imitation, then, could cover either the rephrasing of a primitive Latin author so as to impose sophisticated *compositio*, or the translation of a Greek work. But the artistic translator aimed to copy the thought (*sententiae*) and figures in order to preserve stylistic form and tone. In translating a Greek model, the same content had to be transferred to the equivalent form in another language; in imitating a model written in the same language, forms had to be adapted to a new content.

Quintilian is concerned with the second kind of imitation, and his examples of poor imitators in 10.2.13, who show their lack of original talent in superficiality and pastiche, bear out the warnings of 10.2.11. They echo phrases and rhythms (2.13), or mannerisms like the Ciceronian *esse uideatur* (2.18; cf. Tac. *Dial.* 23.2). They reproduce localised tricks of diction without achieving the impact of independent thought (*uim dicendi atque inuentionis*, 2.16) because, as Quintilian warned, natural ability (*ingenium*), fertility of argument (*inuentio*), emotive power (*uis*), and fluency (*facilitas*) cannot be acquired by imitation or training.

Between the good original and the unsuccessful copy two types of distortion have intervened. The first can be described in general terms as incongruity: words current in the original have become obsolete, or sentence structures are transferred to inappropriate material. The other type is distortion by exaggeration: because of the students' lack of independent *uis* and *inuentio*, they exaggerate the stylistic form of the model into *proxima uirtutibus uitia*,¹² the deviations associated by tra-

11 On this passage, see A. Reiff, *Interpretatio Imitatio Aemulatio* (Ph.D. diss., Cologne 1959; Bonn 1961), 40–44. Reiff distinguishes in the preface (8 and n. 12) between literary imitation and rhetorical “mimesis,” but paradoxically Cicero’s translations of Aeschines and Demosthenes, in which he set out to achieve more than *interpretatio* (translation) by matching the style and form of the originals, will have come very near to imitation in the rhetorical sense, lacking only the normal feature of independent material.

12 Compare *Rhet. Her.* 4.10.15, on the *finitima et propinqua uitia*, with Caplan’s note, p. 263, n. c. Quintilian’s list, *pro grandibus tumidi, pressis exiles, fortibus temerarii, laetis corrupti, compositis exultantes, simplicibus neglegentes*, coincides at two points with the *Auctor*’s deviations, the *figura* ... *sufflata*, and the *genus exile*.

ditional rhetoric with each of the recognized styles. Quintilian's account of these deviations reflects the Peripatetic preoccupation with the mean between two extremes, just as his criticism of incongruity derive from the Peripatetic concept of *to prepon*,¹³ propriety. Propriety also underlines two further cautions. The first forbids imitating a style for which one is unsuited by deficiency or discrepancy of temperament (*infirmitas, diuersitas, naturae*, 10.2.19); this is the principle we have seen illustrated in Cicero's comments on Sulpicius and the pupils of Isocrates.¹⁴ The second caution bars adopting the diction of other genres: Quintilian insists that *sua cuique proposito lex, suus decor est* (22).¹⁵ In this conservatism he is at variance with the new school of orators, who plundered poetic diction to give *nitor, cultus, pulchritudo* to their eloquence, but he is true to the tradition of Cicero, Varro, and Horace. Although his negative precepts are more explicit than those of Cicero in *De oratore* 2.87–97, there is nothing in them to conflict with Cicero's account.

However, Quintilian introduces an issue not raised in *De oratore*—the number of models. Just as he advises against imitating characteristics peculiar to one genre, and prefers the common features of all genres, so he deprecates attachment to a single model. Like the Greek professional rivals of the *Auctor ad Herennium*, like Dionysius of Halicarnassus or Seneca the Elder, Quintilian argues in 10.2.24 for the eclectic approach. The hallmark of the eclectics was the anecdote of Zeuxis the painter, who derived his composite portrait of Helen from imitating in paint

13 For this Theophrastan principle, cf. *De or.* 1.55, 3.38, and 3.53 (*qui idem ita moderantur ut rerum, it personarum dignitates ferunt, ei sunt in eo genere laudandi laudis, quod ego aptum et congruens nomino*). See also J. Stroux, *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi*, Leipzig 1912; M. Pohlenz, "To prepon," *NGG* 1933, 53–92, on the many aspects of propriety in ethics and aesthetics. Pohlenz (*ibid.*, 85) traces the tradition of literary propriety in the styles and genres, from Aristotle, through Panaetius and Cicero, to Horace *Ars poetica* (cf. Cousin, *Études*, 587) and Quintilian.

14 In 10.2.19–21 Quintilian is largely recapitulating his discussion at 2.8.1–15 of the effect of training upon natural gifts. (It is in 2.8.11 that Theopompus and Ephorus put in their inevitable appearance, echoing *De or.* 3.34.) But Quintilian refines Cicero's principle of modifying temperamental deviations toward the related norm: weak talents are to be developed where their limitations will permit; stronger abilities must be trained in every essential aspect of the trade (*nulla dicendi uirtus omittenda est*, 2.8.13). Above all, the pupil must not be made to attempt what he cannot achieve, nor diverted from some lesser field where he has more prospect of success (2.8.14).

15 Cousin, *Études*, 587, compares the *descriptas uices ... operumque colores* of Hor. *AP* 86–116.

the separate features of many local beauties. The anecdote appears in Cicero's *De Inventione* as the introduction to book 2 (1–3), but would naturally conflict with the principles of the *Auctor ad Herennium*.¹⁶ Dionysius relates the story as a preface to his critical selection of classical authors (*archaiōn krisis*), the largest surviving fragment of his lost *Peri mimeseos*. Using the *tupos* metaphor, he twice recommends the anthologising approach: “You will be able to scrutinize the appearance of classic physiques, like a spectator in a theatre, and select the best blooms of their intellect: assembling this feast of erudition, you will be able to stamp out (*tupoun*), not a likeness that fades with time, but the undying beauty of a work of art” (fr. 6.417.13–16 U.-R.). He renews this advice at the end of the catalogue: “If things which by their own nature give pleasure are blended artistically into the form (*tupos*) of one body of speech, then the diction will be enriched by the admixture” (436.7–9 U.-R.).

Quintilian has different reasons for advising the imitation of many models. He does not question the supremacy of one great orator (Cicero). Instead, renewing his argument from human frailty, he concludes that, since we cannot hope to imitate any man perfectly and completely (10. 2. 25, repeated in 26), it is better to imitate the special merits of several orators. We may hope thereby to acquire some of the excellences of each, provided we always take care to adopt each feature in the appropriate place.

Which approach to imitation—the monotheist or the pluralist—was more conducive to the growth of the individual and to the furtherance of the art? Logically, a man who imitates only one model is more likely to produce an identifiable copy of outdated techniques, while a man who instead selectively copies aspects of many artists will at least produce work distinguishable from each of his predecessors’ by the presence of features adopted from the others. Mastery of all their techniques (in so far as they were compatible) would raise the speaker to a new level of versatility; and versatility was the goal of Dionysius and Seneca the Elder—and even to some extent of Cicero in his last phase, when he

16 See *Rhet. Her.* 4.5.7 with Caplan's note, 242, n. c. Caplan argues that the advocacy of a plurality of models was Peripatetic in origin, whereas the earlier *rhetores*, from Korax onward, had provided their own examples. Seneca the Elder comments, *quo plura exempla inspecta sunt, plus in eloquentia proficitur; non est unus, quamvis praecipuus, imitandus, quia numquam par fit imitator auctori* (*Contr.* 1.1.6).

argued in the *Orator* for the greater stylistic range of the grand speaker, as opposed to the restraint and limitations of Atticism. But are versatility and integrity compatible? Can an orator hope to play Caesar in the *prooemium*, copy Pollio in the *narratio*, imitate Caelius in the *refutatio*, write a *confirmatio* in the style of Calvus, and top off the whole with a Ciceronian *peroratio*?¹⁷ Will such a speech stand as any kind of unified whole? A letter of Quintilian's pupil Pliny (1.2) shows that this sort of thing was attempted. In a speech not identified, Pliny tells his friend Arrianus, he tried to imitate Demosthenes and Calvus (*nuper meum*, a new taste), but did not omit the paint-pots of Cicero whenever he could embark on a pleasing digression. Perhaps this speech was less eclectic than it sounds: the imitation of Demosthenes would imply some deliberate *deinotes*, no doubt involving figures of thought also found in Calvus.¹⁸ Pliny probably recognized the affinity between Calvus and his model Demosthenes, but the fact remains that he thought he was imitating not two artists, but three. Yet these post-classical writers were no fools, nor were their audiences; and we should not imagine the orator presenting either a carbon copy or a patchwork quilt. The whole process of imitation clearly could not be superficial, and depended on a broad general understanding of the classical artist taken as a model.

Only in 10.2.27 does Quintilian reach the prerequisite of good imitation, the close study (the technical verb is *intueri*¹⁹ as in 26) of the

17 With apologies to Quint. 10.2.25, *quid tamen noceret uim Caesaris, asperitatem Caeli, diligentiam Pollionis, iudicium Calui, quibusdam in locis adsumere*? Quintilian attaches this suggestion to the discussion in 2.23 of the different stylistic requirements of separate parts of the speech: *cum sit diuersa non causarum modo inter ipsas condicio sed in singulis etiam causis partium, sintque alia leniter alia aspere, alia concitate alia remisse, alia docendi alia movendi gratia dicenda*.

18 W. D. Lebek, *Verba Prisca*, Göttingen 1970, 90, and Winterbottom, in his review of Kennedy's *Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* in *CR* 25 (1975) 66, have pointed out that Calvus imitated Demosthenes, especially his figures of thought. A. N. Sherwin-White (ed.), *The Letters of Pliny*, Oxford 1966, 86–90, discusses this letter as evidence of Pliny's approach to style; relevant is p. 87: "Pliny owed much to Quintilian's advice that the best orators used the various styles as appropriate to each particular case" (12.10.69, *nec pro causa modo sed pro partibus causae*).

19 *Intueri* appears in *De or.* 2.89 *ut tota mente Crassum atque omni animo intueretur*. Cf. *De or.* 1.156 *intuendi sunt nobis non solum oratores sed etiam actores*; *Orat.* 9 *ipsius in mente insidebat species pulchritudinis eximia quaedam quam intuens in eaque defixus as illius similitudinem artem et manum dirigebat. ut igitur in formis et figuris est aliquid perfectum et excellens, cuius ad cogitatum speciem imitando referuntur eaque sub oculis*

model, not as verbal surface but as instrument of the author's purpose. Assuming that the model is forensic oratory, Quintilian asks the student to assess the orator's success in presenting action and character; to consider his aims, method and arrangement; to see the intentions behind each successive part of the speech; and to measure the achievement of each of the three "functions," proving the case, arousing emotional reaction, and winning popular acceptance.²⁰ This procedure is perhaps too formalistic, but it is more helpful than the mere selection of meritorious aspects of the recommended classical authors, as in Dionysius' *archaiōn krisis*,²¹ or Quintilian's own reading list in 10.1.46 f. It is not enough that this kind of dissection should be performed for younger students by the teacher's *praelectio*: if the maturing orator is to control his material effectively he must be able to perform his own analysis, *sine adminiculo*. Only such analysis will give him the understanding for real imitation. *Haec si peruiderimus, tum uere imitabimur*.

Even so, Quintilian is not content. Concern for the growth of the art leads him to hope for a bonus—the *propria bona* of the ideal student. This tension between his advocacy of imitation and his desire for progress also comes out in 10.5, where he discusses the imitative exercises of translation and paraphrase.²² Cicero in *De oratore* 1.154–55 had preferred translation from Greek to paraphrase of Latin authors, because he felt inhibited from using a Latin phrase if it occurred already in his model.²³ Paraphrase, even self-variation, was a talent valued in the ora-

ipsa non cadit, sic perfectae eloquentiae speciem animo uidemus, effigiem auribus quaerimus. Quintilian applies the verb to the imitative attention of pupil to teacher in 2.2.11, and to imitation of a model at 10.2.2 and 26. It corresponds to the technical use of *paratêrêsis* at, e.g., Dion. Hal. *Peri mimeseos* 416.1; the Greek terms ultimately seem to derive from the practice of empirical medicine. *Intueri* is not entirely an adequate equivalent, since it implies intense immediate attention rather than continued observation.

20 This is virtually the procedure of the *praelectio*, which he describes at 2.4.6–9.

21 My comment intends no criticism of Dionysius, since the text of *Peri mimeseos* survives only in fragments. Dionysius may have supplied such recommendations in his lost book 3.

22 For an analysis of methods of training in ancient imitation, see D. L. Clark, "Imitation: Theory and Practice in Roman Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 37 (1951) esp. 15–18.

23 In *Brut.* 310 he adds as justification the greater wealth of rhetorical ornament in Greek which fostered the development of such features in Latin, and the need to communicate with Greek rhetoricians (who probably knew no Latin). The point is repeated and expanded by Quintilian in 10.5.3. See also Pliny *Ep.* 7.9.1

tor or poet (we may recall Cicero's praise of Archias for composing multiple versions of a theme on demand);²⁴ and Quintilian himself prefers paraphrase, openly disagreeing with Cicero, because of its challenge to achieve expression independent of the original. *Neque ego paraphrasim esse interpretationem tantum uolo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen atque aemulationem* (10.5.5). This competitive imitation (as in 10.2.10 and 27) satisfies his desire for both imitation and development. Paradoxically, while paraphrase supports the ability to compose (*facultas*, 10.5.10), it also fosters innovation of form, and operates against the continuity of style which had been Cicero's original reason for encouraging imitation.

Since Quintilian is concerned in 10.5 with writing, he passes over²⁵ Cicero's other recommendation (*De or.* 1.157) of learning by heart, although it would lodge phrases and rhythms in the memory patterns of the student, and memorized material, properly assimilated, would help him to form an idiom of his own.

Assimilation is the hidden element which memorization and analysis of classical models would contribute to the student, in different degrees. Assimilation requires both concentration and a lapse of time. The thorough analysis of the model prescribed in 10.2.27 is a preliminary which should be kept distinct from reproduction of the model's qualities in the student's own work. Quintilian shows in chapter 2 that he appreciates the requirement, but he has expressed the idea more vividly in his introduction of the reading list, at 10.1.19, where he explains the need for digestion of what is read:

repetamus autem et tractemus et, ut cibos mansos as prope liquefactos demittimus quo facilius digerantur, ita lectio non cruda, sed multa iteratione mollita et uelut confecta memoriae imitationique tradatur.

on the merits of translation as an exercise: *praeterea imitatione optimorum similia inueniendi facultas paratur.*

- 24 Compare *Arch.* 18 (*quotiens ego hunc uidi, cum litteram scripsisset nullam, magnum numerum optimorum uersuum de eis ipsis rebus ... dicere ex tempore, quotiens reuocatum eandem rem dicere commutatis uerbis atque sententiis*) with *Quint.* 10.5.7 (*an uero ipsi non bis ac saepius de eadem re dicimus et quidem continuas nonnumquam sententias?*).
- 25 See, however, 2.7.2–3 where he argues that the pupil should memorize not his own juvenile material, but *electos ex orationibus uel historias alioque quo genere dignorum ea cura uoluminum locos ... nam ... adsuescent optimis, semperque habebunt intra se quod imitentur et iam non sentientes formam orationis illam quam mente penitus acceperint experirent*. Cicero at *De or.* 1.157 sees memorizing only as a training for the memory, and does not distinguish between learning one's own compositions and the more valuable experience of memorizing a work of art.

This image is also fundamental to the more positive conception of imitation outlined by Seneca the Younger in a letter (84) in which he discusses the proper relationship between a writer's studies and his literary output. He starts from the famous image of the bees blending the nectar of different flowers into the new flavour of honey (84.3 and 5), and then explores the analogy of digestion.

The foods we take in are a burden as long as they retain their own nature and remain solid in the digestive tract; only when they have been changed from their former nature do they turn into vitality and blood. We should ensure the same effect on the nourishment of our intellects, not letting what we take in remain unchanged, or it will be foreign to us. We must digest it, or else it will merely enter our [receptive] memory, and not the [active] intellect. (84.7).

Seneca argues in eclectic terms but claims that, whether a man imitates many writers or one single model, the alien sources of his style, arguments and thoughts will be imperceptible, if he impresses his own contours on the raw material from his chosen models, so that they are fused into one entity (*si ... omnibus quae ex quo uoluit exemplari traxit formam suam impressit ut in unitatem illa competent*, 84.8).²⁶

The image and the emphasis have changed. Now the *tupos* or *forma*²⁷ belongs to the imitator and is imposed by him on the blended raw materials of his predecessors – as though they provided the wax, and he the die or stamp; the inversion is perhaps to be expected from so confident a stylist as Seneca. While one might welcome his approach as much closer to modern concepts of literary identity, its importance to the present discussion lies in the theme of transformation. Both the image of the bees and the analogy from digestion imply a period of subconscious or automatic change between the collection of the raw materials and the final product. The self-conscious aspect of imitation—analysis, memorizing, paraphrasing—has to be followed for a time by the less self-conscious activities of the brain before models will begin to act upon the literary personality of the new artist. When he comes to write, there must be no deliberate²⁸ continuing process of imitation. While his words appear to be spontaneous in form and content, they

26 The text is disputed here; see L. D. Reynolds' apparatus criticus in the 1965 OCT.

27 For the *tupos* image in Greek mimetic theory see "Imitation and Evolution," n. 34.

28 As in Quint. 2.7.3 (quoted more fully in n. 25): *iam non sentientes formam ... experiment*.

will actually have absorbed the merits of his chosen models—the models' rhythms and dictions, as well as their methods of reasoning, will contribute to the new identity.

Seneca seems to have in mind the mature writer and a wider range of writing: the whole genre of epideictic, including popular writing on ethics and natural science. It would be unfair to accuse Quintilian of narrowness because his precepts for the student in the rhetorical school allow less scope for what we call originality. In the orator's world, subject matter is imposed by practical relevance and governed by non-aesthetic limitations such as political expediency, or the definition of guilt under a given legal heading. There is little use for the originality of imagination which we praise so highly in works of poetry or fiction. It is a discriminating teacher who can recommend, as Quintilian does, the analysis of the aims and methods of a literary model; only understanding of these aims, rather than familiarity with their outcome²⁹ in the finished work, will help the student to assimilate the techniques of the model and adapt them to his own needs. Yet we have seen that Quintilian goes beyond mere assimilation in the last, forward-looking section of his discussion. If the new orator contributes his *propria bona* (10.2.27), it is still possible for a theorist to combine Quintilian's faith in imitation with an evolutionary approach to his art. Cicero had added his own skills to those mastered by Antonius and Crassus, the models of his youth. A hundred years later Quintilian argues for the prospect of continued development in his own post-classical period, on the grounds that the sheer abundance of great models should favour, not hinder, the creation of the perfect orator: *nam erit haec quoque laus eorum, ut priores superasse, posteros docuisse dicantur* (10.2.28).

II: *Brevique tempore ad nihilum ventura*

In book 10 we find Quintilian in an optimistic vein. At the end of his critical account of Roman orators, he pauses to praise contemporary oratory. The forum, he claims, is still adorned by major talents, and mature orators continue to emulate the traditional great models, while students of energy and high ideals are in turn imitating the mature orators (10.1.122).

29 Compare the distinction of Arist. *Soph. El.* 184 a 3, criticizing the method of teaching from models used by Gorgias and his successors.

But there was another side to the story. Quintilian finds it necessary to follow his reassuring account of the contemporary scene with severe condemnations of Seneca's *corruptum et omnibus vitiis fractum dicendi genus* (10.1.125), the more so because the young men, showing more partisanship than accuracy in their imitation of Seneca's style, have degenerated as much from Seneca as Seneca himself had from the *antiqui* (126). Whatever optimism Quintilian may parade as a teacher, in an effort to encourage the next generation, he was sufficiently alarmed to write a work, *De causis corruptae eloquentiae*,³⁰ on the dangers of current trends in oratory; and the *Institutio* itself is full of protests against fashionable ostentation. Indeed the final chapter is haunted by the acknowledgment that the best of oratory is past (*uerum ut transeundi spes non sit, magna tamen est dignitas subsequendi*) and by the fear that, when arts have reached their acme, *quod optimum sit idem ultimum esset* (12.11.28). The decline of eloquence had long been a hackneyed complaint.³¹ Sixty years earlier the Elder Seneca had accepted decline as a fact, and associated it, as did Velleius,³² with the law of organic decay. Although the theme was so overdone that it earned a parody in the opening chapters of Petronius' *Satiricon*, it continued to be discussed in earnest by Quintilian and after him³³ by Tacitus' conversationalists

30 Attested at Quint. 6. Praef. 3 *eum quoque librum quem de causis corruptae eloquentiae emisi*, and 5.12.23 *sed haec et in alio nobis tractata sunt opere et in hoc saepe repetenda*. Kennedy, *Quintilian*, 23, points out that the title of the work need not imply a belief that all eloquence had been corrupted; it may also have been written only to analyse the particular trends in oratory which Quintilian saw as corrupt, and which he describes specifically at 12.10.73. (Other references to corrupt style occur at 4.2.122, 127; 8.3.6–8, 23, 58, 76; 8.6.52, 73.)

31 For ancient treatment of this theme, see Caplan, "The Decline of Eloquence at Rome in the First Century A.D.," in A. King and H. North (eds.), *Of Eloquence: Studies in Ancient and Medieval Rhetoric*, Ithaca, N.Y. 1970, 160–95; and Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*, Princeton 1973, 446–64 (on Longinus, Josephus, Velleius, Seneca the Elder, Petronius, Persius), 494–96 (on the *De Causis*), and 515–26 (on Tacitus' *Dialogus*). Kennedy believes that the earliest treatment of decline is Longinus' (*On the Sublime* 44), in Greek and concerned with Greek oratory; discussions, then, originated not from the changed political climate of imperial Rome, but from the self-conscious nostalgia of Greek classicism.

32 See "Imitation and Evolution," 262–4.

33 For the chronology of Tacitus' *Dialogus* and its relation to Quintilian's *Institutio*, see R. Güngerich, "Der *Dialogus* des Tacitus und Quintilians *Institutio Oratoria*," *CP* 46 (1951) 159–64; and the bibliography cited in Kennedy, *Art of Rhetoric*, 522 n. 37.

in the *Dialogus de oratoribus*. If he admitted contemporary decline, Quintilian would have to explain the relationship between imitation and the new corrupted style. He could attribute the decline to neglect of imitation, or to incompetent and misdirected imitation of models that were either intrinsically faulty or inappropriate to the context. Some of these ideas are suggested in Seneca the Elder's comments; others by the traditionalist Messalla in Tacitus' discussion, while the modernist Aper naturally takes a radically opposed approach in interpreting both facts and theory. Part II of this paper is concerned to illustrate, from these mutually independent writers, how they reconciled the practice, or neglect, of imitation with the prevailing belief in the decay of eloquence.

Writing in the time of Tiberius, Seneca had praised his sons in the preface to his first book of *Controversiae* because they sought out models not only from contemporary orators, but from the previous age. Like Quintilian, he recommended imitation of more than one model, since the imitator could never match his exemplar: *numquam par fit imitator auctori. haec rei natura est, semper citra ueritatem est similitudo* (Contr. 1.1.6). The old Platonic antithesis of truth and imitation is revived, and, while the reader is urged to reproduce his model, it is recognized that any reproduction is inherently inferior to the original. Seneca compares eloquence to an evolving species, which has lived through its prime (the Ciceronian age) to a period of decay. Through his strictures against contemporary oratory are expressed less in literary than in moral, and specifically in sexual, terms, he returns, via the theme of "le style c'est l'homme même," to diction and imitation in 1.1.10. The corrupt new orators are blamed for choosing models as corrupt as themselves (also, despite the inconsistency, for plagiarizing the *sententiae* of the great), thereby compounding the defects of their own *ingenia* with the defects of the models they have chosen to copy. Their compositions are a product of two ingredients, natural temperament (*ingenia*) and choice of model (*uoluntas*), and both are at fault.

Quintilian finds the same mannered effeminacy in production of the time of Domitian, but divides responsibility for the decay between the artificiality of training in declamation and the affectation of over-ornamented style. In both criticisms, the concept of imitation plays an important role.

It is the declamations which provoke Quintilian's first reference to his now lost *De causis* at 5.12.17. He recalls the original function of declamation: to train for the battles of the courts young men who were to

experience frequent exposure to these conflicts.³⁴ The present emasculation of style results from a new concern with mere pleasure and display, when men deviate from the faithful representation of real pleading (*olim ab illa uera imagine orandi recesserunt*, 17): the cure lies in restoring training conditions to the closest possible simulation of real life (*quam maxime potest componat se ad imitationem ueritatis*, 22). Quintilian is condemning failure to imitate “reality,” but the Ciceronian battle imagery shows that he is not measuring oratory against the Platonic ideal of Cicero’s *Orator* (*perfectae eloquentiae spes*, *Orat.* 9; cf. 18) but against the real life of the Roman forum. Quintilian’s phrase, *imitatio ueritatis*, echoes the use in *De oratore* 2.94,³⁵ where oratory is distinguished as a genre by its concern with representing real life.³⁶

Earlier Quintilian had alluded to the original form of declamation practiced by Demetrius of Phalerum (*fictas ad imitationem fori consiliorumque materias*, 2.4.41–42) as a proper kind of imitation, referring to another (unnamed) work, almost certainly the *De causis*, for his account of its origin. Quintilian postpones comment on the evil of corrupt declamatory practice until 2.10, where he again casts his criticism in terms of imitation. Repudiating the extravagant and fantastic themes of present-day declamations, he calls for material *quam simillimae ueritati*³⁷ (2.10.4), argues that the declamation should copy the real situation for which it is intended as training, and reformulates his demands at the end of the section in 2. 10. 12: *quare declamatio, quoniam est iudiciorum consiliorumque imago, similis esse debet ueritati*. These passages, 2.10.1–12 and 5.12.17–22, are two versions of the same protest, to which the concept *ueritatem imitari*, simulation of real public life, is central.

In style too orators are becoming corrupt, and Quintilian sees misdirected imitation as one cause of affected style. He discusses in 2.5, as later in 10.1, the choice of models for stylistic imitation, and follows his list of those recommended (2.5.18–20) with a caution against copying either the archaic roughness of Cato Censorius and the Gracchi, or the

34 For the battle metaphor, compare *ad pugnam forensem* (5.12.17) and *initurus ... frequenter forensium certaminum pugnam* (5.12.22).

35 See “Imitation and Evolution,” 252 ff. and n. 26

36 Quintilian uses the criterion of realism in recommending history to the student of rhetoric in 2.4.2: *grammaticis autem poeticas [sc. narrationes] dedimus; apud rhetoricum initium sit historica, tanto robustior quia uerior*.

37 Compare 2.10.2 *ueritati proximam imaginem reddit*; 2.10.3 *culpa doctentium recidit ut inter praecipuas quae corrumpent eloquentiam causas licentia atque inscitia declamantium fuerit*. (Cf. Messalla at *Dial.* 28.2.)

new, wanton, florid style (*recens lasciui*). His language here (2.5.22–24) is echoed in his condemnation of Seneca the Younger in 10.1.125–31: Seneca's style is a dangerous influence because of the very unattractiveness of its faults, which invite imitation and so lead to worse extravagances (129). Detailed analysis of contemporary mannerisms would not be relevant to the argument of this paper, but Quintilian's attitude toward them may be summed in his recognition of a change for the worse at 2.5.24: *dicendi mutauimus genus, et ultra nobis quam oportebat indulsumus*.

This mannerism and distortion make it necessary for Quintilian to urge criteria of propriety and restraint in his own discussion of imitation, which we considered earlier (10.2, see pp. 266 ff.). To him the change in style is a wilful deviation, the product of a deliberate choice of the wrong models (in this opinion he echoes Seneca the Elder's *talia habent exempla qualia ingenia*) and a training increasingly remote from the realities of public life.

Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus* appears to offer us something different in presenting both sides of the question. His classicist Messalla explains the decline in eloquence on the basis of sins of omission: *desidia parentum et neglegentia iuuenum et inscientia praecipientium et obliuione moris antiqui* (28.2). For him oratory is suffering from a failure to know and imitate the tradition.³⁸ The modernist Aper had earlier disputed this decline, criticizing the traditional manner and forms, and deriding those who are still imitating them, with their ubiquitous *esse uideatur*, and the other tricks *quae tamen sola mirantur atque exprimunt ii, qui se antiquos oratores uocitant* (23.1). Unfortunately Aper's legitimate mockery of the *seruum pecus* is undermined by the positive criteria of merit which he sets up in 20: there he accepts the audience as a yardstick; and it is a frivolous audience, impatient, wandering to and fro, demanding glamour and appeal (*laetitia, pulchritudo*, 20.3), even *poeticus decor*. The new

38 Speaking of the old and new training, Messalla shows himself a mere echo of Quintilian. Compare the military metaphor *pugnare in proelio disceret* (34.3), the *uera et incorrupta eloquentia* of the good old days (34.4), and the standard condemnation of the contemporary audience (34.5) and of unrealistic declamations (35.5). One point of language reverses the terminology of Cicero and Quintilian, the praise of the good instructor as providing *faciem eloquentiae non imaginem*. Here *imago* is not the true likeness, but the hollow shadow contrasted with the embodied features; but this is purely a *uerbi controuersia*. Messalla continues with the traditional reference to the material of declamations as *abhorrens a ueritate* (35.4) and the contrast with the courts (*cum ad uerso iudices uentum*, 35.5 just before *lacuna*).

style brings delight to the ears.³⁹ The brilliant, concealed art of Tacitus allows the meretricious debasement of the *dolce stil nuovo* to be conveyed by its own advocate, and we are convinced more effectively than we could have been by the strictures of a Quintilian or a Messalla. Rejection of the tradition, then, is not a cause but a symptom of the cultural malaise.

If we synthesize our evidence, we find that contemporary orators were failing in part because they imitated clumsily and superficially what was good in the original: we may instance the Ciceroniasts. Others failed because they imitated models that were intrinsically bad (*talia habent exempla qualia ingenia*, *Sen. Contr.* 1.1.11), or because public taste and their own inclinations led them to admire, emulate, and extend the *dulcia uitia* of their favourites. The Roman critics did not take the line which has been forcibly put in George Kennedy's recent history of rhetoric in the Roman world. Criticizing the Greek Atticists of the last century BCE for their concern with imitation, he argues that Roman imitation of classical Greek literature was creative and successful, but "when Latin literature is itself classic enough to be imitated, the process had equally dreary results"⁴⁰—as if it were the fact of imitating predecessors in the same language that hastened the degeneration of Roman eloquence. In an earlier paper specifically on Quintilian Kennedy had been more just.

The doctrine of imitation had taken hold of the Greek critical world in the Hellenistic period shortly after creativity had failed ... in Latin there was less reason for it until the literary achievements of the first century B.C. began to fade into the past.⁴¹

This sequence would make imitation a symptom, not a cause, of decline. But was it either? Eloquence declined from Cicero's time to Quintilian's, yet thanks to Roman study of Greek theory, imitation was advocated for the student as vigorously in *De oratore* as in the *Institutio*. Certainly it would seem that imitation was never absent from the

39 This is not to deny that Cicero, too, saw public approval as the yardstick of oratory at, e.g., *De or.* 1.12.223, 228–33. Cf. *Brut.* 185 *quod enim probat multitudo, hoc idem doctis probandum est* (followed by a subtle distinction between the judgement of the connoisseur and the crowd at 193) and 283 *a multitudine et a foro, cui nata eloquentia est, devorabatur*. The difference lies in the public itself, which was more dilettante, less principled, and less committed to political life in Tacitus' day than it had been in Cicero's prime.

40 *The Art of Rhetoric*, 243.

41 "An Estimate of Quintilian," 144.

theory of rhetorical training at Rome. Mistrust of *imitatio* is natural to modern critics in the light of the Romantic antithesis between imitation and originality, but they do little justice to the insight, subtlety, and flexibility with which imitation was encouraged by the best ancient teachers. I hope this paper and its companion piece, "Imitation and Evolution," have done something to bring out the sanity and the fundamental usefulness of the ancient approach.

I do not believe it is possible to present a satisfactory analysis of the decline of eloquence, but I would like to end, like Tacitus, with a reminder of oratory's changed circumstances. We have seen that, where Roman orators of the first century after Christ turned their backs on the past, as Aper did, their product was geared to an idle and pretentious public. Oratory was always an applied art, chosen in the first place by the man who would use it for success in his relations with men, whether senate, people, or emperor; if a man loved the creative use of language in description or narrative, or philosophical argument, for its own sake, he would divert his talent into another genre. Given the applied nature of the art, how was the orator to use it for the civilian heroism of defence or attack which Cicero's Crassus had idealised in *De oratore*?⁴² Successful attack was possible only against guaranteed victims: the delatatory oratory of Aper might sparkle, but the certainty of his destructive success inspired disgust. Successful defence had little scope, but the related art of *encomium* was always welcome when lavished on the *sapientissimus et unus*. Again the tone and content were foreordained, and only in ornament could men innovate. With a capable imperial administration there was no need for the *suasio* of deliberative oratory; with a perverted or despotic administration there was no possibility of a *dissuasio*. In short, for any man of action and principle, oratory finally became irrelevant or futile.⁴³

Of the orators, some used their skill to impress the audience, applying the display of epideictic to the "real world" of public life; others doggedly persevered in the study of the rhetorical classics, hoping to maintain the constructive relationship between the past and their own

42 *De or.* 1.32; cf. Antonius' eulogy in 2.35.

43 This point is made by Kennedy, "Estimate," 146, but I am not convinced that there was any real scope for oratory in the "new type of orator" whom Kennedy proposes, "a civil servant with technical training, rather than a swayer of senate and people." We have many of these today and derive little inspiration from their words.

generation which had been taught by the theorist under the rubric of *imitatio*. But neither choice could rescue their performance from the mediocrity to which a changed society had doomed them.

13. Orator and/et Actor

My title is bilingual, because both stage and courtroom professionals were described in classical Latin by the same familiar terms that have survived in English. Although my focus is to be the evidence of Roman writers on rhetoric about actors and acting, it is, I think, important to open with a brief discussion of these key terms. Romans were very conscious of the common element of performance that bound the orator to his theatrical counterpart, but Latin *orator* and *actor*, like their root verbs *orare* and *agere*, were found in the earliest theatrical texts with other senses besides those that survived into the classical period. In the texts of Plautus and Terence both the actor and the director could be said to *agere*: while the director put on the play, *agit* (*fabulam*), the actor played or performed the role, *agit* (*partes*). Hence Plautus' jest in *Bacchides*: "it isn't the action but the performer (*actor*) who strikes my heart with loathing: even the *Epidicus*, a play I love like my own self, I am loath to watch when Pellio is performing (*agit*)".¹ *Orator*, on the other hand, originally stressed the speaker's role as pleader or intercessor, a sense found in both Plautus and Terence. Both terms converge in a significant passage from the prologue of Terence's *Heautontimoroumenos*:

Terence wanted me to be a pleader (*oratorem*) not a prologue speaker. He made the verdict yours, and provided me as advocate (*actorem*), in hope that

1 This chapter of *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an ancient profession* (Easterling/Hall, CUP 2003) refers to the chapters of Brown (10, n. 1) and Lada-Richards (19, n. 25). Plaut. *Bach.* 213–15 *non res sed actor mihi cor odio sauciat. / etiam Epidicum, quam ego fabulam aequae ac me ipsum amo, / numquam aequae invitatus specto si agit Pellio*. See Brown, 'Actors and actor-managers at Rome in the time of Plautus and Terence' 228–9 and n. 17. As Brown argues (232), the director Pellio was almost certainly the leading actor, and it is his interpretation as performer which is meant here. See also Brown 228–9 and n. 20 for the use of *actor* for the *dominus gregis* in *Phorm.* 10 and 33, alongside *partes agere* (*Phorm.* 27, 835–6) of playing a part.

this advocate can achieve as much by his eloquence as the poet could devise successfully when he wrote the speech that I am about to give.²

Beyond the stage, the form of public performance most likely to be required, of Roman public men, was the delivery of a forensic or political speech. In this respect the speaker was an *actor* no less than the stage performer of comedy and tragedy to whom the word was more often applied. Yet it is sometimes difficult to determine which sense of *actor* or *agere* is intended. The orator is an *actor* both because he pleads his case (*causam agit*), and because he enacts the speech he has (normally) himself composed.³

Actio, a word not found in early comedy, brings in another complication. The earliest and dominant use of *actio* was a legal term, to denote the formal and formulaic procedure of the civil courts. In the developed and freer form of public advocacy the speech itself, as a brief or plea, was also called *actio* (like Cicero's *actio prima* against Verres), and so again was its manner of performance. Thus *actio* came to include both visible gesture and oral delivery, *pronuntiatio*. In contrast with the more complex Greek concept *hypokrisis*, this basic noun became the word for acting/performance in courtroom, senate, assembly and theatre.⁴

Our own experience tells us that public speakers often distort the facts. The court defender often has to disguise the truth on behalf of his client, and the politician just as often makes statements he (or she) does not believe to a political gathering. But when the rhetorical theorists who are our main source for Roman methods of acting invoke theatrical practices they are eager to distinguish the reality and veracity of the public speech from the fiction of theatre, and the decorum of the gentleman from the licence of the artist.

For Cicero the stage actor merely imitated reality, whereas the orator engaged with it:⁵ the actor was only the performer of a role created

2 *Heaut.* 11–15 *Oratorem esse uoluit, non prologum; / uostrum iudicium fecit; me actorem dedit, / si hic actor tantum poterit a facundia, / quantum ille potuit cogitare commode, / qui orationem hanc scripsit quam dicturus sum.* Terence clearly usurps courtroom language to strengthen the advocacy of his prologues.

3 Cf. Cic. *De or.* 3.214 *actore mutato ... quae sic ab illo esse acto constabat oculis, uoce, gestu, inimici ut lacrimas tenere non possent.*

4 I am most grateful to the Directors of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* for permission to consult the original Zettel for both *actio* and *actor*.

5 Typical are *De or.* 2.34 *quis actor imitanda quam orator suscipienda ueritate iucundior?*, 2.193 *quid potest esse tam fictum quam versus, quam scaena, quam fabulae?*,

by another (the poet) outside himself, but the orator was both originator of his own role and responsible for it.⁶ Yet the mature statesman turned repeatedly to the parallel of the actor in the full treatment of *De oratore*, his first great theoretical treatise, using both generic illustrations from the stage and examples of the leading actors of his day to demonstrate the requirements of *actio*, delivery or performance. In his eagerness to press demands on the orator for excellence in performance, Cicero uses examples from the theatre to illustrate the need for natural beauty of voice, body and gesture: he returns to tragedy (rather than comedy) in giving precepts for conveying and arousing emotion, in demonstrating the need for contrast in tone, and above all in the systematic treatment of delivery which ends the treatise.⁷

Cicero's youth, when the writing of Roman drama was already in decline, seems to have been the great period of star actors in both comedy and tragedy. He formed a close friendship with the leading *comoedus*, Q. Roscius Gallus, and knew the slightly younger tragic actor Clodius Aesopus. His intimacy with Roscius is borne out by the speech *Pro Roscio Comoedo*, defending him on a charge of business fraud in 66 BCE, by his many allusions to personal conversations with Roscius and his reports of performances by both men. Indeed, Macrobius, writing four hundred years later, and probably drawing on lost works of Suetonius, cites Cicero's letters as his source for their friendship.⁸ The actor and the orator used to compete by taking an idea or statement and testing whether Roscius could represent it in a greater variety of gesture or Cicero in a variety of language. Yet the influence of the two arts was reciprocal, if it is true, as Valerius Maximus claims, that Roscius and Ae-

3.214 *oratores qui sunt ueritatis ipsius actores reliquerunt, imitatores autem ueritatis histriones occupauerunt.*

6 These double aspects of the actor's dependency and speaker's autonomy are reflected in *De or.* 2.194 *neque actor sum alienae personae sed auctor meae.*

7 See *De or.* 3.213–27 for the systematic discussion of *actio*. Not *actio*, but *pronuntiatio* is the rubric used by the *Rhetoric for Herennius* for its recommendations on delivery (3.19–27), which deal only briefly with gesture (*corporis motus, gestus*). This passage will not be discussed here because like Cicero's *Orator ad M. Brutum* (54–60) it offers no incidental comments on theatrical performance.

8 Macrobius, *Sat.* 3.14.10. He or his source seem, however, to have confused Roscius with the tribune Roscius Otho—probably a kinsman—whose theatrical seating law Cicero defended in a consular *contio* of 63 BCE

sopus used to attend court cases in order to adapt forensic gesture for the stage.⁹

These actors were famous in and after their lifetimes, so I include a brief summary of their lives and performances. Although Roscius' name Gallus might suggest he was of freedman origin, his circumstances were too prosperous for him to have been born a slave. He came from the territory of Lanuvium, and circulated the story that as a baby he had once been embraced by a snake, but was found by his nurse unharmed—a symbol of future greatness.¹⁰ He must have been born in the 120's BCE to be already a star when Lutatius Catulus, the future victor of Vercellae and consul of 102 BCE, composed his flattering epigram comparing Roscius to the dawn: *mortalis uisus pulchrior esse deo*.¹¹

Certainly Cicero, careful to avoid anachronism, makes his former teacher L. Licinius Crassus speak in *De oratore*, set in 91 BCE, of seeing Roscius on stage and sharing discussions of his art. Cicero undoubtedly has transferred to his teacher elements of his own experience, but in keeping with the generic tradition of the dialogue, he will also have represented as Roscius' oral teaching maxims like *caput esse artis decere* ('the essence of art is grace'), which could be found in Roscius' treatise comparing oratory and acting, the *librum quo eloquentiam cum histrionia compareret*, cited by Macrobius.¹² But the actor must have begun to perform considerably earlier than the nineties, since Crassus reports the adverse reactions of an older generation (*nostri illi senes*) to Roscius' performance

9 On the contest *utrum ille saepius eandem sententiam uariis gestibus efficeret an ipse per eloquentiae copiam sermone diuerso pronuntiaret* see Macrobius *Sat.* 3.13.12.

On the reverse flow of influence from forensic *actio* to the stage Val. Max. 8.10.2 claims that Hortensius' gesture was so elegant that both Roscius and Aesopus used to attend regularly when he was pleading, in order to transfer to the stage gestures they had found in the judicial forum: *constat Aesopum Rosciumque ludicrae artis peritissimos illo causas agente in corona frequenter adstitisse, ut foro petitos gestus in scaenam referrent*. Since Valerius' other illustrations of the importance of gesture in 8.10 all come from Cicero, this tradition too is probably Ciceronian, but is not found in his extant work.

10 Cic. *Div.* 1.79, criticized at 2.66. We might compare Horace's childhood miracle in *Odes* 3.4.17–20, with Fraenkel's note in *Horace*, Oxford (1957, 275), which cites as model the miracle of the infant Iamos described by Pindar *Ol.* 6.45 ff.

11 'The mortal seemed more handsome than the god', quoted by Cic. *De nat. deorum* 1.79. But Cicero adds a revealing comment, discussed below.

12 *Sat.* 3.14.12. But the book may go unmentioned in Cicero's dialogue because it was not composed until after the dramatic date of 91 BCE

when he wore a mask. This one sentence, *nostri illi senes personatum ne Roscium quidem magnopere laudabant* (*De or.* 3.222), has implications both for the star actor and for the history of the theatre: Cicero acknowledges in *De natura deorum* 1.79 that Roscius had a pronounced squint, but clearly older audiences were used to seeing both Roscius and other performers without masks. While anecdotal versions of theatrical history claim that Roscius introduced the wearing of masks to conceal his squint, a more reliable inference is simply that masks were introduced¹³ in the generation before the dramatic date of *De oratore*.

In this period, around 90 BCE, Roscius was already taking pupils, so it is not unlikely that some of Cicero's knowledge comes from private study of elocution with him as a boy. We only know that Roscius was usually discontented with his pupils (*De or.* 1.129) but made a success of at least one pupil, Panurgus, whose value he increased 150 fold by his training.¹⁴ Besides his admission to the aristocratic circle of Catulus, Roscius was also an intimate of Sulla,¹⁵ who as Dictator and absolute ruler of Rome gave the actor the gold ring of a Roman *eques* in 81 BCE. From this time forward either as a result of his new status or as an affirmation of his own dignity, Roscius seems to have performed without accepting a fee.

But what roles did he perform? And what was distinctive about his acting? Roscius would become a byword for artistry in any field,¹⁶ but his own artistry was something perfected by careful rehearsal, for according to Valerius Maximus (8.7.7) he never adopted a gesture on stage that he had not practiced at home. He was chiefly known for his *uenustas*, which we might translate as 'grace', and this directed him towards comedy rather than tragedy, which made more demands on the actor's voice and less on his action.¹⁷

Another factor in his preference was that comedy usually exploited nimbler movements, and Quintilian follows his comment on Roscius'

13 Or re-introduced: I share Brown's belief (Easterling/Hall 2003, 233, n. 34) that Plautus' and Terence's comedies were performed in masks, as I have argued in an earlier paper: Fantham 1973.

14 On Roscius' dispute with his former partner Fannius over the profits from Panurgus, see Lebek 1996, 37.

15 See Plut. *Sulla* 36, 1–2 (grouping Roscius with the mime Sorex and the Ly-siode Metrobios), also Macr. 3.14.13.

16 Cf. Cic. *De or.* 1.130, 258, Festus 288–9M.

17 Cf. Cicero's distinction in *De or.* 1.128, *uox tragoedorum, gestus paene summorum actorum est requirendus*, and 1.251 *gestu histrionum ... tragoedorum uoci*.

preference (11.3.111) for comedy with a list of the comic roles such as slaves, parasites, maidservants and fishermen (!) who move more rapidly than the solid citizens. He does not mention pimps, but Charles Garton has used his vast range of knowledge of Roman theatrical life to create a wonderfully imaginative account of 'How Roscius acted Ballio', largely based on Cicero's statement in his brief for Roscius that this was a favourite role.¹⁸

If Roscius preferred the role of the pimp in *Pseudolus* to the much longer title role, this may have been for its scope in innuendo¹⁹ as Garton suggests, or perhaps it was a choice of his later years. There are two clues to this in *De oratore*: Roscius is on record as saying that with advancing age he adopted a slower tempo on the accompanying pipe and more leisured singing (1.254), and his mimicry of a tedious old man is cited as famous.²⁰ And while *Pseudolus* has an exhausting singing role, the role of Ballio only has the one great *scena ed aria*, a boastful and threatening song with recurring stanzas in many metres (the canticum of 133–228). His part is considerably shorter than that of *Pseudolus*. But it would be misleading to neglect Roscius as a performer of tragedy; thus to illustrate the art of contrast in oral delivery Cicero comments in *De or.* 3.102 on two passages from tragedy which Roscius regularly performed. First citing from an unknown play, he notes that 'Roscius never acts this verse with that gesture which he is master of,

The wise man seeks honour, not plunder, as reward of valour,
without immediately dropping his voice, as in the next line,

But what do I see? A man girt with the sword occupies the sacred place ...
He cuts himself off, gazes, expresses wonder and amazement.'

Then citing the famous passage from Ennius' *Andromacha* which begins

What aid am I to seek?

18 Garton 1972a, 170–88, starting from Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 20. See also Brown, 234.

19 In a letter to Paetus (*Fam.* 9.22) Cicero fondly recalls Roscius' intonation on a phrase from an unidentified comedy 'and so she left me—stripped'.

20 *De or.* 2.242. To judge by the quotation *tibi ego Antipho, has sero, inquit, senium est cum audio*, what was celebrated was the actor's quick change from the young speaker's own voice to his mimicry of the old man. But note Quintilian's warning to the orator against adopting this theatrical trick.

Cicero comments: 'how mildly, how casually and without gesticulation (*non actuose*) he speaks! For there follows immediately

O father, O my country, O house of Priam!

where such passionate delivery would be impossible if it had been used up and exhausted by the previous gesture.'

In many ways oratory is closer to tragedy, especially in the pathos of the peroration,²¹ and Cicero usually appeals to the art of Clodius Aesopus, whose career began perhaps ten years later than that of Roscius, and ended rather sadly when he disappointed with the huskiness of his voice in his recall to the stage at Pompey's inaugural games of 55 BCE. It is probably this episode that has triggered the single reference to Aesopus found in *De oratore*, where Antonius claims that audiences are more critical of actors than orators, hissing Aesopus off the stage *si paulum inrauserit* ('if he grew a little hoarse').²² Only two years earlier, in 57, Aesopus had moved audiences with his own real tears on Cicero's behalf in his tragic performance in the *Eurysaces* of Accius and subsequently in the Praetexta *Brutus*. It is a reflection on the artist's lack of respect for his text that Aesopus not only gave special emphasis to a reference to king Tullius that could be applied to Cicero, but inserted into Accius' script lines of his own invention and a whole tragic aria from Ennius' *Andromacha*.²³ He was famed for the passion of his *uultus* and *motus* ('expressions and gestures, *Div.* 1.80),²⁴ and is said to have been so carried away with violent anger when he was playing the role of Atreus that he killed a slave who ran across the stage (*Plut. Cic.* 5.5).²⁵

21 Often ironically called *tragoediae* e.g. *De or.* 1.219, 228; 2.205, 225. Public oratory often came close to tragedy during the late Republic, since it so frequently involved the risk of a noble citizen's *caput*—his life or citizen status—and was played out before a large audience of jurors and onlookers. In this respect the situation of the Roman Republic comes closer than the world of the early imperial courts to the courtroom dramas of democratic Athens, as described by Hall 1995, esp. 54 ff.

22 *De or.* 1.259, with which cf. *Fam.* 7.1.2. *is iurare cum coepisset uox eum deficit in illo loco; si sciens fallo.*

23 *Cic. Sest.* 120–3. To fit Cicero's case, Aesopus added the phrase *summo ingenio praeditum* (121) and recited the lines quoted above (*O pater, O patria* ... down to *haec omnia uidi inflammar*) with such tears that he even made Cicero's enemies and rivals weep.

24 This surely implies no use of the mask.

25 For this excess of subjectivity, cf. Lada-Richards (Easterling/Hall 2003), 'the Subjectivity of Greek Performance', 402 and n. 25.

This is a story which Cicero chose to ignore when he was arguing in *Tusculan Disputations* 4.55 that neither the poet nor the actor Aesopus were actually angry when they wrote or performed angry lines such as

Will no one punish this deed! Bind him, I say!

Drawing the moral that we should play the roles in life best suited to our natures, Cicero praises the judgement of actors who choose to perform not in the best plays, but those which best suit their skills (*sibi accommodatissimas fabulas*, *Off.* 1.114): thus actors who rely on a fine voice choose Accius' *Epigoni* or Pacuvius' *Medus*, whereas experts in gesture play Ennius' *Melanippe* or Accius' *Clytemnestra*—both plays with strong female protagonists: no doubt gesture would dominate in such roles because men could more successfully impersonate women's gait and gesture than their voices. Thus according to Cicero the actor Rupilius (otherwise unknown), constantly revived Pacuvius' highly pathetic *Antiope*, whereas Aesopus avoided the *Ajax*, perhaps because he was reluctant to spoil his beautiful delivery by playing the madman.²⁶

Although Accius, the last great Republican author of tragedies, had died before 80 BCE, the revival of old tragedies was still favoured in Cicero's time, and colours his comments on emotion and delivery. At *De or.* 2.193 Antonius notes that he often saw the eyes of the unnamed actor burning through his mask as he spoke these verses from Pacuvius' *Teucer*:

How did you dare to let him leave your side
and then come back to Salamis without him?
Did you not dread to see his father's face?

He adds 'the actor never uttered the word "face" without it seeming to me that Telamon in his anger was maddened with grief; and (in the next few lines) with his voice rising and falling²⁷ to create a pathetic note ... he seemed to speak weeping and grieving.'²⁸

26 The *Ajax* is probably Ennius' play; we can only assume that the dignified and beautiful speaker Aesopus disliked playing Ajax's mad scenes. On Ajax as typically *attonitus* (frenzied), probably corresponding to his traditional mask, cf. Quint. 11.3.73 cited below. All these plays, revivals in Cicero's time, are now lost. With the exception of the *Antiope*, praised for its pathos, we do not know why they appealed to the actors.

27 *inflexa ... uoce*.

28 It is a topos of rhetorical treatment of the emotions to speak of actors moved to tears. Thus Quintilian discussing pathos in 6.2.35 praises *histriones atque comoedi*

This stress on the rising and falling pitch of the voice in grief returns in the discussion of *actio* proper at 3.216. Each emotion, Cicero insists, has its own expression, sound and gesture; body, face and voice all sound like the strings of a lyre, as they are struck by the heart's emotion, sharp (rising) or dull (falling), quick or slow, loud or quiet. Within these categories he lists a greater range of modulations, such as legato, staccato, broken and suspended, or protracted with the pitch rising and falling on each phrase. All these vocal nuances Cicero describes by another synaesthetic comparison as colours in the actor's palette. Thus he associates with anger a sharp excited tone, constantly cutting itself off or broken up, citing Telamon again and the entire role of Atreus. For evoking pity and mourning he suggests the rising and falling full-throated and tearful voice, again with broken effects. Here Medea provides the model:

where should I turn, what path begin to tread?
home to my father? or to Pelias' daughters?

Other tragic lines illustrate the humble choking downcast voice of demented Alcmaeon's terror, the strained passionate threatening tone of Atreus' violence, the gay and tender relaxed outpouring of pleasure, and the heavy 'covered over' monotony of bitterness.²⁹

On gesture Cicero implicitly defines the actor's practice by his prohibitions; the orator should not represent each phrase but indicate the general theme with restrained gestures of the fingers, extending the arm as if casting a spear, reserving stamping the foot to mark the opening or end of an argument.³⁰ We will meet the same definition by negatives in Quintilian's discussions.

Between the time of Cicero and Quintilian comedy and tragedy gave way to mime—first the literary mimes of Laberius, who felt disgraced when Caesar forced him to act in his own play, then the more

for still weeping when they have put aside their masks (or perhaps simply their roles).

29 It is difficult to render these descriptive terms, only some of which reflect audible effect; if agner is *crebro incidens* (217) but lamentation *interruptum* how do they differ? *Demissum* and *abiectionum* both convey letting the voice fall in despair, *contentum* urgency, but how to translate the relaxation of *effusum*, or the sense of covering and suppression in *unio pressu ac sono obductum*?

30 *De or.* 3.220 *manus autem minus arguta, digitis subsequens uerba non exprimens. brachium proceris proiectum ... suppositio pedis in contentionibus aut incipiendis aut finiendis.* Maier Eichorn 1989 compares *Rhet. Her.* 3.27 *perfectione perceleri brachii, inambulatione, pedis dexteri rara sub plausione*, and *Quint.* 11.3.125 below.

improvisational and physical comic mime. Tragedy in its turn gave way to the art of the pantomime,³¹ and the word *histrion*, formerly used of comic actors, came to denote star dancers such as Pylades and Bathyllus, who relied on gesture without speech. To a great extent the *comoedus* was relegated to become an ornament of élite private life: few were wealthy enough to own a troupe like Ummidia Quadratilla (Pliny *Ep.* 7.24), but many like Pliny himself had a *comoedus* to provide solo dinner entertainment. His *comoedus* Zosimus, according to *Ep.* 5.19, not only performed speeches from comedy but recited prose history and other forms.

The other private function of the *comoedus* was as a teacher of elocution to younger boys. In his chapter on the use of the actor-trainer (1.11) Quintilian starts by rejecting theatrical tricks: he does not want the boy to learn how to speak falsetto like a woman or quaver like an old man, still less to fake drunkenness or the cheeky speech of a slave, or to learn the imitation of lovesickness, greed or fear. All these, like the more extravagant use of voice, arms and pacing around (*uultus, manus, excursio*) would certainly be standard features in the traditional comedy. Instead Quintilian wants four things from the actor as trainer: he should teach clear pronunciation, correct voice production, synchronisation or at least harmonizing of speech and gesture, and the avoidance of mannerisms. The immediate goal of such training is to prepare the boy for appropriate delivery of each part of a speech, and to teach his memorization and recitation.

But when he comes to discussing delivery as practiced by the mature student Quintilian is more informative. The more than thirty pages of his long chapter 11.3 can be divided into prefatory material (1–13), followed by discussion of the voice (14–71), with a transition through comments on facial expression and eyes and neck to the discussion of gesture proper (88–149). Here, the discussion at 125–49 moves from the speaker's use of the feet to consider the varying circumstances of the courtroom, and the control and maintenance of the toga, before leading to a sequential survey of delivery through the phases of a courtroom speech (150–77). Only with the last few sections (178–85) does Quintilian return to wider aspects of delivery associated with the world of the actor.

31 This is the name of the performer, not the genre.

I shall pass on the positive precepts appropriate to the orator which have been discussed previously both by Fritz Graf and myself.³² Starting from Cicero's description of gesture as 'body language' or 'bodily eloquence',³³ Quintilian distinguishes between *pronuntiatio* of the voice, which appeals to the ears, and *actio* of face and body, which appeals to the eyes. The stage provides his example of the power of this art, since actors by their interpretive skill and emotional power can both guarantee the survival of plays with inferior texts and overwhelm an audience over pure fiction *rebus quas fictas esse scimus et inanes* ('stories we know to be hollow fiction', 11.3.5). It must have been the case in early imperial Rome as in the modern theatre and opera house, that a 'vehicle', a text or libretto offering a star role or even one exceptionally powerful speech, would be performed beyond its actual literary merit.

Training is all important, but must stop short of anything theatrical: the modern tendency to chant observed in schools and courtrooms angers Quintilian because of its resemblance to theatrical intonation 'like the licence of drunks and partygoers' (we are back with his cautions for the younger pupil in 1.11). When the court needs grief and anger, the indignation of the *conquestio* and pity of the *commiseratio*, he sees it as an insult to the dignity of the forum to indulge in the licence of a cabaret (*ludus talarius* 58). But in suggesting that such speakers might as well perform to lyre, pipes and cymbals Quintilian is only echoing Cicero's complaint of a century earlier. It is perhaps easier to understand than to express the rhetorician's distinction between good and bad vocal effects: his indignant repudiation of 'Asiatic' singsong (*cantare* 58, 59) and his admiration for a special tone 'suggesting stage lament, with a dying fall' (*iam cantici quiddam habent sensimque resupina sunt* 11.3.167) in Cicero's famous appeal to the power of poetry at *Pro Archia* 19. In keeping with Quintilian's relish for sheer vocal colour and power are other references such as 11.3.41 *vox ... toto ut aiunt organo instructa* ('the voice equipped with its full diapason').³⁴

The stage naturally provides comparative material for the visual aspects of the orator's delivery. Here Quintilian takes his argument from the art of the pantomime (*saltatio*), which makes itself understood and

32 Cf. Fantham 1982 and Graf 1991.

33 *Quasi sermo corporis* (*De or.* 3.222), *eloquentia quaedam corporis* (*Or.* 59).

34 Cf. also 167 *pleniore canali* 'with a fuller throttle', 169, *paene extra organum* 'almost beyond its range', and perhaps 50, *apertis, ut aiunt tibiis* 'with the pipes uncovered'.

stirs the emotions without speech (66), showing states of mind (*habitus animorum*) simply by expression and gait. Of the many kinds of decorum which he goes on to invoke, Quintilian's first requirements are congruence of emotion and tone, and congruence of gesture and gaze. Thus the gaze should always turn towards the direction of the gesture, except when we want to condemn or reject something, so that we seem to turn our face away from the thing we push away with our hands. Later he will describe this gesture, explaining the contradiction; 'to express aversion we thrust our hand/arm out to the left; the left shoulder should be brought forward in unison with the head which will incline to the right' (113). Such gestures of rejection seem very frequent in comedy.³⁵ Yet in commenting on nodding or shaking the head, Quintilian warns that even stage trainers (*scaenici doctores* 71) think it a fault to gesture only with the head.

We should expect facial expression to be dominant, and Quintilian gives this as the reason why acting coaches (*artifices pronuntiandi* 73) borrow their emotions from the mask associated with each role; thus 'Aerope is sad, Medea savage, Ajax crazed, and Hercules defiant'.³⁶ In comedy, he notes that this is how the different roles, slaves, pimps, parasites, yokels, soldiers, courtesans, maids, severe and indulgent old men, strict and debauched young men, married women and girls can be told apart at sight. To illustrate the dominance of the mask Quintilian cites the role of the leading father,³⁷ who ranges between anger and mildness, for whom there is a mask with one eyebrow raised and the other calm; actors, he claims, normally contrive to show the audience whatever side is appropriate to the old man's lines.³⁸

35 Typically marked by *nolo*, *aufer*, *apage*, *mitte* etc.: cf. Plaut. *Truc.* 358, 751, 861 *non uoluptas, aufer nugas, nil ego nunc de istac re ago*, 912 *mitte me, inquam*. Unfortunately it is difficult to match these descriptions with surviving visual representations.

36 Quint. 11.3.73. Cf. Horace *Ars poetica* 125–6 'let Medea be proud and unquerable, Ino pathetic, Ixion treacherous, Io wandering and Orestes gloomy'.

37 *Pater ille, cuius praecipuae partes sunt*; such fathers typically pass from anger with their sons to forgiveness during the play.

38 (11.3.74) *pater ille cuius praecipuae partes sunt, quia interim concitatus interim lenis est, altero erecto altero composito est supercilio, atque id ostendere maxime latus actoribus moris est, quod cum iis quas agunt partibus congruat*. The editors remind me that Pollux (4.141) reports a special mask for the minstrel Thamyras who was blinded during the tragedy, with one eye *glaukos* (to represent his blindness) and one black.

In several places Quintilian warns the would-be orator against procedures that are theatrical or appropriate to the pantomime: at 89 he rejects imitation of a doctor taking his patient's pulse or a lyre player's hands as he plucks the strings: even gesturing to oneself as one speaks about oneself or pointing to the person referred to are too theatrical.³⁹ It is noteworthy that after repeating the Ciceronian precepts that gesture should echo meaning, not individual words, he claims that this was formerly the practice of more serious actors. But he is essentially conservative: he even criticizes *comoedi* who are playing young men but adopt a quavering voice to report an old man's words, as in the prologue to Menander's *Hydria*, or a falsetto for a woman as in the *Georgos*.⁴⁰ In contrast with Cicero's praise of this Roscian trick, Quintilian finds such mimicry offensive even in the imitative art of theatre. Later, while reviewing and accepting the more violent gestures of striking the thigh or smiting the brow, Quintilian will claim that it is theatrical to clap the hands or beat the breast (124).⁴¹ Again, raising the hollowed out hand above the shoulder and moving it back and forwards to exhort (103), which he sees as now virtually routine in foreign schools, is seen as wavering and theatrical.⁴²

39 Compare Suetonius' report (*Nero* 39) of the Atellane actor who mocked Nero by accompanying the text 'farewell father, farewell mother' with gestures of drinking (poison) and swimming, to recall how the emperor had disposed of each of his parents: the actor also pointed (*senatum gestu notarati*) to the senators' rows in the theatre as he pronounced the play's envoi (*novissima clausula*) 'Hades is dragging you off by the feet'.

40 11.3.91. On the use of Menander in training orators see 10.2.69–72 and Fantham 1984.

41 Maier Eichhorn 1989, 133–4 has a valuable note tracing the gesture of distress in striking the thigh back to Homer (*Il.* 16.125); she notes that Plut. *Ti. Gracchus* 2.2 attributes it to Tiberius Gracchus (he had Greek teachers and is cited by Cicero for theatrical turns of rhetoric). Quintilian is influenced by the criticism which he quotes from Cicero that Calidius could not have been distressed in his pleading, since he did not express it with these gestures: *non frons percussa, non femur* (*Brut.* 278). Despite her many illustrations of *pectus caedere* Maier Eichhorn does not note that it was not simply a spontaneous gesture, but the ritual gesture of mourning.

42 11.3.103 *est et illa cava et rara et supra umeri altitudinem elata cum quodam motu uelut hortatrix manus, a peregrinus scholis tamen prope recepta, tremula, scaenica*. As Maier Eichhorn 1989 96–9 notes, however, editors disagree radically on this. The descriptive phrases seem overcrowded. Should this text be punctuated as two sentences, distinguishing the waving of the hand accepted by foreign schools from

How 'busy' was theatrical gesture? To counter all Quintilian's strictures let us consider some samples from comedy as described by the other actors on stage: Graf has illustrated this from the famous dumb show of deliberation when Palaestrio excogitates his plan in *Miles Gloriosus* (200–10), so I will add a simpler piece of dumb show, when the soldier Stratophanes in *Truculentus* is shut out by the courtesan to whom he has just given extravagant gifts. The rival's cook exultantly describes Stratophanes' look of pain as he seems to eat himself up in envy, his sighs, his gnashing of teeth and slapping of his thigh.⁴³ This is the gesture which even Quintilian would approve as now accepted (*usitatum*) in the courtroom, fitting the speaker's indignation and effective in rousing the spectators. But descriptions of gesture are seldom written into the text of comedy and excluded from actual dialogue. Plautus offers description when the audience might otherwise fail to notice e.g. new characters entering and looking stealthily around,⁴⁴ or in another passage a piece of dumb show as two young men enter quarrelling.⁴⁵ For the most part it was left to the actor to follow his own instinct or more likely a received tradition in choosing his gestures.⁴⁶ We can gain some idea of the traditional choreography of gesture from the illustrations that survive in different manuscripts of Terence.⁴⁷

Throughout this chapter Quintilian has chosen his illustrative texts not from comedy and tragedy but from Ciceronian oratory or from the *Aeneid*. He will offer only one demonstration from a stage text (see below), but he does provide some descriptions of individual actors'

a more violent tremulous movement that is theatrical? Or is the text damaged; is *tremula* corrupt, or should it be preceded by a lacuna?

43 *Truc.* 593–4 *sed quisnam illic homost qui ipse sese comest, tristis, oculis malis? ... auscultat observat quam rem agam / ... me intuentur gemens / traxit ex intimo uentre suspirium / hoc uide dentibus frendit, icit femur.*

44 *Mil.* 990 *viden tu illam oculis uenaturam facere atque aucupium auribus.* Cf. *Trin.* 851–2.

45 *Trin.* 622–4 *celeri gradu / eunt uterque, ille reprehendit hunc priorem pallio, / haud ineuscheme astiterunt huc aliquantum.*

46 My thinking here is influenced by the long-standing tradition of the D'Oyly Carte Opera company in performing the operettas of Gilbert and Sullivan. Until the expiration of their copyright we could be confident of seeing these operettas with the gestures of the 1870s. More significant examples would be the traditional staging and gestures imposed in the genres of Chinese opera or the Japanese Noh play, but of these I have no experience.

47 For samples of these, see Duckworth 1952, illustrations between 96–7, 240–1, 256–7: for the corpus see Jones and Morey 1930–31.

skills: reversing cause and effect, he adapts Cicero's account of his two great peers: 'the slower the delivery, the greater its emotional power; thus Roscius was rapid and Aesopus weighty in his delivery *because* the former was a comic and the latter a tragic actor'. He allows that within comedy imitation of movement too follows the same dichotomy, as the young men, old men, soldiers and matrons of citizen rank walk more slowly, while slaves and other low characters move more quickly (111–12).⁴⁸ Corresponding to these inherited Roman examples, Quintilian turns in his closing section (178–80) to the contemporary Greek *comoedi* Demetrius and Stratocles. We do not know whether these men were known to Quintilian first hand, or another borrowed example, but as comic actors they demonstrate a point: the charm and appeal of even mannerisms (*uitia* 178). Demetrius, who had a sweeter voice, went in for waving his hands and uttering charming cries for the audience and fanning himself with his garment and gesturing with his right side. Stratocles, on the other hand, had a sharper technique and preferred running around and skipping nimbly (is this what is meant by *agilitas*?) and laughing, even when it did not suit his part (180).⁴⁹ He was playing to the gallery (*id populo dabat*), even to hunching his neck. Stratocles' trademark mannerisms suited him as they would have done no one else, because of his physique and good looks. But if either man had tried on any of the other's tricks it would have been very ugly. The lesson is drawn that we must know ourselves and base our performance not on common rules but on our own nature. In this at least Quintilian is true to Roscius and his maxim *caput esse artis decere* (see above). But he is not happy to leave his pupils with a dangerous example. So, as a last illustration he notes how an actor will treat the famous opening of Terence's *Eunuchus*, and then rejects the model.

What am I to do, then? Can't I even go
now when I'm summoned? or should I steel my self
not to endure the arrogance of whores?

'The actor will use pauses of hesitation, sliding pitch of voice, a range of hand gestures, and various head movements. But speech has a different

48 See for similar character implications of fast or uneven gait in Greek drama, Hall 1995, 53.

49 This recalls Petronius' description in *Sat.* 7 (7) of *mimicus risus*. It was obviously a popular feature.

flavour, and doesn't want much seasoning: for it depends on enactment, not on pretence (182).⁵⁰

To judge by Quintilian's incidental comments and his final faint protest, in his time just as poetic diction had become popular in prose oratory, so the delivery of the courtroom was coming closer to that of the stage: *iam recepta est actio paulo agitatior et exigitur—et quibusdam partibus conuenit* (184). But the stage itself may have adopted more exaggerated gesture, if we are to go by the claims of Tacitus' modernist orator Aper:

The crowd of bystanders too ... has grown used to demanding extravagance and beauty of speech, and no more puts up with drab and unkempt old fashioned speech in the courts than it would do if a stage player wanted to imitate the gestures of Roscius or Ambivius Turpio.⁵¹

The stage player in question was probably performing in a salacious mime rather than a decorous comedy, but it is a pity that Quintilian's educational purposes, focused on models of the gentleman's authority, leave in silence the actor's more elegant or provocative gestures. Unfortunately our other informants, the moralizing Persius and Juvenal,⁵² are more interested in denouncing the sexual responses of the audience, than indicating the actual bumps and grinds of the performers. Coarseness and refinement are after all largely in the eyes of the beholder.

No doubt ancient *actio* also underwent some changes in response to changes in social behaviour: for as fashions in gesture and spoken idiom undergo a gradual transformation in life off-stage, so on-stage too, conventions will gradually be modified to provide a more contemporary style of performance. Even in reconstructing the gestures and techniques of the near-modern stage two generations back we find that still photographs cannot revive the nature of action and achieve the immediacy of the moving camera. So when we attempt to reconstruct the *actio* of the ancient stage by juxtaposing dramatic texts, verbal descriptions and surviving illustrations, we cannot really hope for more than a limited understanding of their living theatre.

50 This passage must surely have been a school exercise, since both Horace (*Sat.* 2.3.258–70) and Persius (*Sat.* 5.172–4) cite the same portrayal of amatory indecision.

51 Tacitus *Dialogus de oratoribus* 20.3. We should certainly not assume this represents Tacitus' own preference.

52 Cf. Juvenal 6.61–70 on sexual arousal in response to actors, with Persius 1.80–7 on similar erotic response to oratory.

Suggestions for further reading

For the background: Csapo and Slater 1995, esp. 275–85; Fantham 1984. On acting styles: Garton 1972b, esp. ‘How Roscius acted Ballio’ (170–88). Other chapters of Garton’s book are informative on acting styles, and he provides a list of Republican actors in straight theatre and mime. On gestures see in particular Graf 1991. On Quintilian: Fantham 1982; Maier Eichhorn 1989.

Bibliography

- Duckworth, G. E., *The Nature of Roman Comedy*, Princeton 1952.
- Fantham, E., “Towards a dramatic reconstruction of the fourth Act of Plautus’ *Amphitruo*”, *Philologus* 117 (1973) 197–214.
- Fantham, E., “Quintilian on performance: traditional and personal elements in *Institutio* 11.3”, *Phoenix* 36 (1982) 243–271.
- Fantham, E., “Roman experience of Menander in the late republic and early empire”, *TAPhA* 114 (1984) 299–310.
- Garton (1972a), C., “How Roscius acted Ballio”, in C. Garton, *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre*, Toronto 1972.
- Garton (1972b), C., *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre*, Toronto 1972.
- Graf, F., “Gestures and conventions: the gestures of Roman actors and orators”, in J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg (eds.), *A Cultural History of Gesture from Antiquity to the Present Day*, Oxford 1991, 36–58.
- Hall, E., “Lawcourt dramas: the power of performance in Greek forensic oratory”, *BICS* 40 (1995) 39–58.
- Jones, L. W., and C. R. Morey, *The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence prior to the Thirteenth Century*, 2 vols., Princeton 1930–31.
- Lada-Richards, I., “Emphatic understanding: emotion and cognition in classical dramatic audience response”, *PCPhS* 39 (1993) 94–140.
- Lebek, W. D., “Moneymaking on the Roman stage”, in W. J. Slater (ed.), *Roman Theater and Society*, Ann Arbor 1996.
- Maier Eichhorn, U., *Die Gestikulation in Quintilians Rhetorik*, Frankfurt and New York 1989.
- Slater, W., “The pantomime Tiberius Julius Apolautus”, *GRBS* 36 (1995) 263–92.

14. Disowning and Dysfunction in the Declamatory Family

How much can we learn from the imaginary case histories of the Roman controversia? To what extent do these exaggerated *domesticae disputationes* (Quint. 7.4.9) reflect real patterns of behaviour in the upper-class family? Do they come from life, or from the soap operas of Graeco-Roman comedy? Or are they merely puzzles devised as vehicles for the teenager's ingenuity? And, as a corollary, what would the psychological effect of these family ordeals be on the budding teenager whose school exercises they constituted?

This is a world of arbitrary *patria potestas*,¹ exercised in outrageous demands on the fictitious son, and drop of a hat adoption and disowning to add or subtract an heir to the family. Each declamatory scenario is preceded by an outline with some defining statements and often so-called laws.² Experts on both declamation and Roman law have acknowledged that the 'laws' set out before each scenario were not necessarily current Roman law, but could represent custom, or obsolete laws, or even laws originating in Athens or Hellenistic city states.³ It might, then, be better to treat them as arbitrary axioms, chosen as rules for each particular scenario, not invariable like the rules of chess,

This paper was originally presented at Stanford University for a Symposium in honour of Susan Treggiari. I would like to take this opportunity to express in print my admiration and gratitude for Professor Treggiari's pioneer work on the Roman family as well as on many other important social issues.

- 1 On the legal and psychological aspects of *patria potestas* see Richard Saller, "*Patria potestas* and the stereotype of the Roman family," *Continuity and Change* 1 (1986), 7–22.
- 2 Compare on this Quint. 7.1.4 *in schola certa sunt et pauca et ante declamationem exponuntur, quae themata Graeci uocant, Cicero proposita*; cf. Cic. *Topica* 79.
- 3 The negative verdict of H. Bornecque, *Déclamations et Déclamateurs d'Après Sénèque le Père*, Paris 1902, 59–75 has been carefully reconsidered for each law cited by S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire*, Liverpool 1947, 84–132, who concludes "the majority (of the laws cited) are, if not demonstrably Roman as they stand, far closer to Roman law than has been generally supposed".

but more like contemporary teenage fantasy *Dungeons and dragons*, a code to control and restrict the argumentative options of the player in this rhetorical challenge.

So let us take our starting point from the beginning of the elder Seneca's reminiscences, the *Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae, divisiones colores*. The first scenario of *Controversiae* book 1 is called PATRUUS ABDICANS; "the uncle who disowns". A certain son, when his uncle (father's brother) became impoverished, gave the uncle support, although his father forbade it. When his father disowned him for this he did not protest, and he was adopted by his uncle. But when his uncle became rich and his father in turn became a poor man, he supported his father, although his uncle forbade this; so he is disowned by his uncle.⁴ As Arellius Fuscus protests, speaking for the son: "What am I to do, banished about between two fathers, the son of both, but always disinherited by the more fortunate, placed between two perils?"⁵ You might wonder what case could possibly be put up against this dutiful son; so here is a sample, "am I not justified in fearing to write an ungrateful youth into my will, to leave an enemy my heir?"⁶

There are three key terms involved in this minimal scenario; first the notion of supporting (*alere*): we will leave aside the legal question of how a son not yet *sui iuris* could find the support of either father or adoptive father: maybe he did manual work and used his wages? In any case before the days of pension schemes it was accepted that parents expected their sons to support them in their helpless old age, hence for example the splendid adjectives *gerokomos* (Hes. *Theog.* 605) and *gerotrophos* and *geroboskos*, describing the role expected of children in Greek tragedy. Indeed Seneca's contemporary Valerius Maximus offers an interesting corollary, extending the son's obligation of reciprocal support to include a further commitment to provide his father with grandchildren. Apparently an early pair of censors engaged in the eternal task of reconciling spoiled Roman bachelors to marriage and the production of sons argued that "Nature wrote a law for you; as you were born so must you give birth, and your parents by supporting you imposed on you the obligation, if you have any shame, of rearing

4 Sen. *Contr.* 1.1 (abridged) *patre uetante adolescens illum aluit; ob hoc abdicatus tacuit. Adoptatus a patruo est ... egere coepit pater: uetante patruo alit illum. Abdicatur.*

5 *Contr.* 1.1.6 *iactatus inter duos patres, utriusque filius semper tamen felicioris abdicatus, positus inter duo pericula quid faciam?*

6 1.1.6 *equid iustus meus metus est, ne heredem ingratum scribam, inimicum relinquam?*

up grandchildren for them”.⁷ But without the costs and effort entailed by a second generation, there was an even more obvious obligation on the children to support in old age the parents who had supported them in childhood. The issue of adoption was a little more complex, but normally originated when a middle-aged man who had not been able to father a son initiated a request to a kinsman or political ally to adopt his (usually teenage or young adult) son; it was then a positive parental step, which might also serve to diminish the economic responsibilities of a kinsman with more sons than he could comfortably support.⁸ We will return later to examples from both literature and life. The most negative of these father-son relationships was obviously *abdicatio*, a term found in Latin as early as the mid-second-century tragedy *Teucer* by Pacuvius when Telamon, father of the legitimate son Ajax and grandfather of Eurysaces, denounces his illegitimate son Teucer for returning to Salamis after failing to save the lives of his half-brother and nephew: *te repudio nec recipio; natum abdicō: facesse*. “I reject you and refuse to take you in; I disown you as a son: be off with you”.⁹

Apart from this passage, *abdicare* is uncommon outside the declamations and Quintilian: contrast the formal legal terms *exheres*, *exheredare* used from Cicero onwards for cutting a son (or other legal heir) out of one’s will. Both Bonner and Winterbottom¹⁰ point out that this

7 Val. Max. 2.9.1 *Natura uobis quemadmodem nascendi ita gignendi legem scribit, parentesque uos alendo nepotum nutriendorum debito, si quis est pudor alligant.*

8 Cicero brings this out clearly in his mockery of the adoption of convenience of P. Clodius by the young plebeian Fonteius: *De domo 34: quod est, pontifices, ius adoptionis? Nempe ut is adoptet qui neque procreare iam liberos possit, et cum potuerit, sit expertus ... adoptat annos uiginti natus, etiam minor, senatorem. Liberiorumne causa? At procreare potest; habet uxorem, suscipiet ex ea liberos*. The patrician Clodius was older than his new ‘father’. But note that Cicero is talking about custom (*ius*) rather than an actual law or laws. The adoption was perverse but legal.

9 Pacuvius *Trag.* 343 R. = Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin* 2.342: *te repudio nec recipio: natum abdicō: facesse*. The MSS read *naturam dico*, but while editors do not all adopt Mercier’s *natum*, they agree in printing Hermann’s *abdicō*. The context of Telamon’s rejection of Teucer is confirmed by fr. 345–349, 350–351 Warmington.

10 See S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation*, Liverpool 1949, 32, and 101–103; M. Winterbottom (ed.), *Seneca Rhetor* (LCL, Cambr., Mass. 1974) 26 n. 3, on this declamation. This is confirmed by E. J. Champlin, *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion In Roman Wills, 200 BC-AD 250*, Berkeley 1991, 108 “Declamatory works overflow with scenes of fathers repudiating their sons for every conceivable offence. But this repudiation in lifetime is something quite different from disinheritance after death ... not a legal act in itself [*abdicatio*] is rarely met

was not a legal procedure, and therefore not actionable in the courts, as was formal disinheritance. Instead “the son was ordered to leave the house but remained *in patria potestate*,” presumably in the hope of later atonement and/or forgiveness. It was not however a purely fictional process, and the verb and noun *abdicatio* are applied by Suetonius (*Aug.* 65.1) and the Elder Pliny (*NH* 7.150) to Augustus’ repudiation of Agrippa Postumus.¹¹ Now Postumus was not Augustus’ natural son but his grandson, and so apparently an example of one of the phenomena of the declamation schools, the son first adopted then disowned, a prominent example which must have radically affected the unnatural frequency of these disowning in the *controuersiae* of the schools.

It is not peculiarly Roman or unusual in any society to be distressed and angered by the behaviour of one’s son as he obtains a measure of independence and takes more than his expected share. This seems to have been characteristic of the Ephebe in Athens, and Menander’s comedies offer some illuminating examples. Let us start with case histories from the complete adaptations by Terence (the theme seems to have been too serious for Plautus): the prologue to *Andria* shows a father growing more vigilant as his son graduates from the ephebate, and imposing his authority to force upon the son (already in love with an unidentified citizen girl) a marriage he desperately resists; but *Heautontimoroumenos* comes closer to our theme. The good father Menedemus is afflicted with remorse that his reproaches of his son for falling in love drove the young man to leave home and serve as a mercenary; he now sees his own behaviour as a kind of *abdicatio*: *hinc eieci miserum* “I threw him out through my unfairness” (134). The foolish father Chremes at first shows tolerance to the point of indulgence, even bringing a greedy and vulgar professional courtesan into his own home as long as he believes she belongs to his neighbour’s son. But once he discovers that it is his own son who is living wastefully and lavishing money on her—that his son is what the declaimers identified as *luxuriosus*—he turns against him (945–946) and in a harangue tells him to go to his future brother-in-law, the good boy now about to

outside of the classroom.” P. Veyne, *La Famille et l’amour sous le haut-empire romain*, *Annales* 33 (1978), 35–63 uses the emotional conflict implied in these declamations as evidence for actual family life.

11 B. M. Levick, *Abdicatio and Agrippa Postumus*, *Historia* 21 (1972), 675–697, provides a detailed discussion of *abdicatio* and its implications for the law of succession, 675–690.

marry Chremes' newly identified daughter, if he needs money in future: "with him there will always be a protection for your folly, food and clothing and a roof to shelter in. Anything is better than Bacchis taking possession of all this, if you are left as heir".¹² Since this is a comedy, of course, the son is finally forgiven and the implied disinheritance never takes place.

Most classicists know best the action of Menander's *Adelphoe* as represented in Terence's highly successful study of contrasted upbringing, and will be thinking of its opening situation. This play pivots around two contrasted brothers: one, Demea, lives like a poor man (he may or may not be poor) in the country: after his wife's death his bachelor brother, the man about town Micio, has adopted the elder of Demea's two sons, who has just acted like a rake, abducting a courtesan from her place of business, while the younger son remains on the family farm, under the severe thumb of his father. In the opening monologue the bachelor Micio is distressed by his adoptive son's behaviour because he has relied on upbringing by trust and indulgence, and he will be more distressed still when he finds out that his adopted son has got an honest girl pregnant. The severe father cannot of course disown a son once he has been adopted, but he begins to scold the brother fiercely for spoiling the boy. In reply the bachelor brother recalls their agreement. This won't do, he declares; to keep scolding me is virtually to "demand back (*repscere*) the boy you gave to me." This argument helps us to understand the action of a classic but lost Menander comedy, the *Hypobolimaeus*, or "supposititious son". What do we know about this play and its Roman version by Caecilius? Cicero twice invoked it to win sympathy from his jurors for a son he was defending. In the *Pro Roscio Amerino* the prosecution had represented Roscius as a boor whom his father kept in the country because he was unfit for town life. Just as the old father in Caecilius had sent one son away to the family farm as a punishment, so they alleged, Roscius' father had sent him away and was planning to disinherit him.¹³ In the later *Pro Caelio*, when Cicero was probably defending a real *luxuriosus*—hadn't Caelius had a

12 966–968 *Ibi tuae stultitiae semper erit praesidium, Clitipho, uictus, uestitus quo in tectum te receptes. Satius est quam te ipso herede haec possidere Bacchidem.* Compare Syrus' later references to *alienare* (979) and *expellere* (989).

13 *Cic. Rosc. Am.* 42–53 *hunc in praedia rustica relegarat ... an amandarat hunc sis ut esset in agro ac tantum modo aleretur ad villam ... senex ille Caecilianus ... alterum rus supplicii causa relegasse ... exheredare pater filium cogitabat.*

prolonged relationship with the merry widow Clodia?—he again cites the father from Caecilius, knowing that the Roman jurors would find the old countryman totally unsympathetic—good ammunition for a tricky defence.¹⁴

But this play has more in common with both Terence's *Adelphoe* and Seneca's first *controversia*, as a further illusion in Quintilian shows. In discussing Greek musical and mathematical education at 1.10.18, Quintilian cites as proof "the old man in Menander's *Hypobolimaecos* who, when the father demands his son back (*repositi filium patri*), says as if accounting for what he has disbursed on the boy's education that he has given large sums to lyre players and geometers". So once again we have a situation in which one son has been adopted and brought up indulgently in town, but the other confined to the family farm. Indeed Quintilian's last reference to the *Hypobolimaecos*, citing the *meditatio* of Menander's play as a speech to be memorized (10.1.70) suggests a father's soliloquy such as Demea's reversal of policy in treating the now semi-adult sons in Terence's *Adelphoe* 855–881.

In comedy, of course, there must be a happy ending, and the scape-grace son traditionally begs for forgiveness: "forgive me, I blundered, I backslided, I didn't even think. If ever again..." to put into the dramatic first person Cicero's ironic third person citation of the advocate's or mediator's standard *deprecatio*.¹⁵ In the comic tradition fathers sometimes come to the brink of disowning misbehaving sons, but this could, after all, be simply 'the sort of thing people do in Athens'. Was it really Roman? And just how commonly did a son find himself changing households either honorifically through adoption or in disgrace when disowned? Can we find evidence outside the imaginary world of declamation?

Yes, Roman evidence for repudiation is available at the highest level, and from as early in the middle Republic as the fourth century. Both Cicero and Valerius Maximus report that Manlius Torquatus Imperiosus was prosecuted by a tribune in 362 both for overreaching his military command and for relegating his son to the country and burden-

14 Thus Quintilian's main allusion to the severe father in his contrast at 11.1.39 is not between the plays, but between the uses made of this figure and of the indulgent Micio in Cicero's *Pro Caelio*.

15 Cic. *Pro Lig.* 30 "ignoscite iudices; erravit, lapsus est, non putavit, si umquam posthac..." *Ad parentem sic agi solet. Ad iudices:* "non fecit, non cogitavit: falsi testes, fictum crimen. For mediators in comedy, compare Callidamates in Plautus' *Moscellaria*, or the wronged wife Nausistrata: In Terence's *Phormio*.

ing this fine young fellow with farm labour that prevented him from serving the public need.¹⁶

The story attracted attention because the young man was so loyal to his father that he went and threatened the prosecuting tribune with a sword and forced him to withdraw the charge. If we move to the second century, there are a number of historical reports as well as moral anecdotes, about both elite adoptions and forms of elite paternal severity. The most famous case is probably that of Aemilius Paullus, father of two sons by his first, divorced wife and two younger ones by his second wife. He gave the two elder sons in adoption, one to Publius Cornelius Scipio, the sickly son of Africanus; this man became Aemilianus. His brother was given to the son of Fabius Maximus to adopt, and became Fabius Maximus Caecilianus (*RE* 109). Fabius Aemilianus was consul in 145 and died in 130 just before his natural brother. But these adoptions gained fame because Aemilianus lost his two younger sons after his triumph, supposedly because he had wished that any evil that might be incurred as penalty for his triumph would fall on him and not his country. And the same Fabius who adopted Fabius Aemilianus also adopted the son of his friend Servilius Caepio, who thus became Fabius Maximus Servilianus (*RE* 115). These would be typical adoptions between political allies, if they were not unusual in the double adoption by Fabius Maximus. More typically we hear of older men, bachelors or widowers like Atticus' uncle Caecilius and the uncle of the Younger Pliny, adopting their sister's son: or again the Servilius Caepio who adopted the son of his sister Servilia by her first husband, who retained his natal name of M. Iunius Brutus.

The historian Sallust and Julius Caesar both adopted great-nephews, presumably because they had no nephews: again where a marriage produced no sons, only a daughter, it would be natural to adopt one or more of her sons as one's heir.

But the same Fabii who adopted in order to obtain heirs, produced two notorious examples of problem relationships with actual sons. Fabius Allobrogicus (*RE* 110) the son of Aemilianus, either died intestate or left his fortune to his son, but the young man was so debauched (*luxuriosus* again) that he was denied his inheritance.¹⁷ And in the next generation Fabius Maximus Eburnus (*RE* 111) was brought to trial

16 Cic. *Off.* 3.111; Val. Max. 5.4.3 *quodque filium optima indolis iuuenem rustico opere grauatum publicis usibus subtraheret.*

17 Val. Max. 3.5.2.

for having the son he had relegated to the country estate murdered by two household slaves whom he subsequently freed. Valerius Maximus classifies this under-cases of paternal severity towards unchastity, so the youth was probably gay.¹⁸ A reversal of the usual power relationship is reported by Valerius Maximus in this chapter on disallowed wills; apparently in 70 BCE Calpurnius Piso as *praetor urbanus* overthrew the will of a son given in adoption because he had disinherited his natural father. However Valerius noted that this adopted son had also disinherited his seven natural brothers, so the issue was probably one of leaving his estate away from the family (perhaps to a mistress or even a wife?) rather than a bad relationship between the son and his former father.

In real life there were probably many more occasions when a contrite son obtained forgiveness with a well-calculated *deprecatio* than actual cases of repudiation. Yet more declamatory scenarios are based on paternal disowning than on any other single issue; four out of Seneca's first book of *Controversiae* and fourteen more, of which 7.5 involves a double *abdicatio*: twenty-six out of the surviving hundred and fifty minor declamations of Quintilian deal with abdication of a son, and two (357 and 368) of a daughter, something found only once in Seneca the Elder at *Contr.* 2.2. Although adoption was clearly far more common in real life than the extreme measures of *abdicatio*, there are plenty of scenarios involving multiple *abdicationes*. Consider *Contr.* 11.1 ADOPTANDUS POST TRES ABDICATOS; *Diues tres filios abdicauit. Petit a paupere unicum filium in adoptionem. Pauper dare uult; nolentem ire abdicat*, or *Contr.* 3.3, of which the title ABDICANDUS QUI ABDICATUM FRATREM ADOPTAVIT is enough to make my point.

It is not as though this was the only serious issue between father and son significant enough to generate a *controuersia*. But it may have been the closest to an actual court case. Quintilian noted that the same approach is needed for these schoolroom cases of disowning as in the real-life cases of men disinherited by their father's will when they seek the father's estate from the Centumviral court—a court in which Quintilian himself had pleaded cases of inheritance.¹⁹ In his full scale

18 Our sources are Val. Max. 6.15 (*de pudicitia*), Pseudo-Quintilian *Decl. Maj.* 111.17 and Orosius 5.16.8 (probably based on Livy). Prosecuted by Cn. Pompeius, he was found guilty of *parricidium*, and went into voluntary exile.

19 7.4.10 *nam quae in scholis abdicatorum, haec in foro exheredatorum a parentibus et bona apud centumuiros repetentium ratio est*. He goes on to cite (7.4.20) a centumviral case where a father specifies in his will that he has disinherited his son for an affair with a courtesan; the issue will then be whether he should be pardoned

discussion of argumentation Quintilian cites two *controversiae* based on the conflicting inheritance rights of sons. In the first, a father has three sons; an orator, a philosopher and a doctor, and divides his estate into four on his death, willing the remaining quarter to whichever son can prove he is most useful to the community.²⁰ The inclusion of the philosopher, like the reference to *ciuitas* rather than *res publica* clearly marks this controversy as Greek in origin, and Quintilian wastes little time on it. But there is more than one scenario in which a son uses his skill as a doctor to save his father, before or after being disowned.

More complex by far is the three-son scenario analysed in Quintilian 3.6.96–103: here Quintilian provides us with five ‘laws’ as basis for the argument. Three would seem to be automatic; that wills made according to the laws should be valid: that children (*liberi*) should be the heirs of parents who die intestate, and that a man is entitled to give a child in adoption. Then come three more precise rules by which the young speakers must declaim their case:

1. No *abdicatus* should receive anything from his father’s estate.
2. A bastard is a son according to the law if he is born before any legitimate son, but if he is born after, he has only the status of a citizen.
3. A child given in adoption may return to the family if his natural father dies without *liberi* (sons, yes, and citizens; but probably only *legitimi*).

So what is the family history? The father who has two legitimate sons, but gives one in adoption and disowns the other. This of course leaves him childless, so he acknowledges a son outside marriage (*nothos*) and in due course dies, having set up his disowned son as heir: *instituto herede abdicato decessit*. The three sons now contest to claim the estate.

This too is probably a Greek problem, to judge by Quintilian’s painstaking explanation of what the Greek term *nothos* means, though I do not see why a Roman could not acknowledge as his son a child by a citizen concubine. The appeal of this situation, as Quintilian demonstrates, is that it offers the student speaker scope to use all three of the statuses associated with the law as well as all three associated with the circumstances. The bastard has to deal with two problems; whether

by the court. For Quintilian’s own experience in a centumviral case, cf. 9.2.73–75.

20 Quint. 7.1.38; cf. *Ded. Min.* 268 which samples the arguments. Medicine claims priority because oratory harms as many citizens as it benefits; the philosopher is seen as easily eliminated from the reckoning.

he was born *after* the two legitimate sons, and whether he was *not* in fact born before a legitimate son. The first depends on a syllogism arguing that sons alienated from the household are like not-sons (or unborn): *an pro non natis sint habendi qui a familia sunt alienati* (99); the second on conflict between the wording of the law and its intent; it is clear he was not born first, but he will protect himself on the intents of the law, that a bastard would be a son in the law if there was no legitimate son in the household at his birth. Or he could challenge the meaning of the wording (100) saying that it did not affect the bastard if a legitimate son was not born afterwards: in his case he was neither born after nor born before a legitimate son, so the wording of the law is inapplicable and one must stand by its intent.²¹

The disowned son will be told by his brother “*You may be restored to the family but I am the heir*”. He and the disowned son will each have to investigate whether a disowned son can be heir. Both the other sons can tell him “you have no right of return because our father did not die childless”—*sine liberis* (102). But each will have his own line of argument: the disowned one will say that disowned sons can also be included among children and base his claim on the law; obviously it would have been superfluous to exclude him from his father’s estate if he was counted among outsiders—*alieni*.

As it is, since he would rightly have been the heir of the man who died intestate, the law has been cited against him, but it does not make him a not-son, only a not-heir. This invokes the status of definition; what *is* a son? (102 end). In return the bastard will infer from the same arguments that his father did not die without children, but he too will propose a definition: is it the case that even not-legitimate sons are *liberi*? So in this one *controuersia* we have two statuses dealing with the law, the syllogistic and the issue of wording and intent, but also the status of definition. And it can also generate the only three statuses that are found in Nature; that of *coniectura*, interpreting conflict of wording and intent; that of quality, based on the syllogism. And obviously that of definition (103).

This mare’s nest was clearly devised to test the analytical powers of the student orators, and run them through the whole gamut of available statuses. Equally obviously it is unlikely to represent any situation in real life. Would any man go to the trouble of recognizing a bastard in order to get himself a replacement for his natural sons—and then go and in-

21 3.6.100 *si uerbis legis stari non potest, uoluntate standum est*.

stitute the disowned son as heir in his will? The nearest I can come to this pattern is the action of the orator Hortensius, whose son acquired a terrible reputation for debauchery. This was perhaps the reason for Hortensius' extraordinary demarche in asking his friend Cato to divorce his daughter Porcia from her husband and give her as wife to Hortensius. Certainly when Cato instead offered up his own wife Marcia, it was to provide Hortensius with an heir—although he had a living son. The purpose is confirmed by Plutarch (*Cato Minor* 25) and Lucan: and Lucan at least seems to confirm that Marcia bore him sons;²² but if so, they did not survive to rectify the situation.

But the majority of these scenarios were clearly aimed to give the student a number of moral arguments he could use to defend his position as a virtuous but disowned son, so that instead of a lame *deprecatio* he can make a strong rhetorical case. It is these which we will consider now, using Quintilian's own criteria. The first issue was to determine when or whether the young man had a right to disobey his father; compare Sen. *Contr.* 2.10 *an in omnia patri parendum sit*. And, as Quintilian explains in his systematic discussion at 7.4, the answer was to show that what he had done was *honestum*, or *iustum*, either by nature or convention (7.4.4–6). If he could not do that and his action was normally subject to disapproval he must defend it on the basis of external considerations. Quintilian suggests as reasons for abdication that the son was offended by either doing military service, or seeking office (here *honores petierit* may perhaps have a wider meaning) or marrying against his father's will (7.4.4), but it is just as common for the son to be disowned not for acting against his father's will but for refusing to act: controversies often present as the final situation "when he refuses, the father disowns him": *nolentem abdicat*.

In fact Quintilian's selection of causes is too sober and close to real life—quite unrepresentative of our scenarios even in the *Minor Declamations* which he may himself have assembled. Take the choice of military service. It is difficult to imagine a Roman *controversia* in which military service itself was contrary to a father's will. (For a Greek son to go and serve as a mercenary for one of the Diadochi was another matter; profit, not patriotism would be the motive). We have one example of this in Seneca's *Controversiae* (1.8) "A man has three times earned credit for val-

22 Lucan 2. 338–341 *dum sanguis inerat, dum uis materna, peregi / iussa, Cato, et geminos excepi feta maritos; uicarius lassus partuque exhausta reuertor / iam nulli tradenda uiro.*

our; when he wishes to return to active combat a fourth time his father keeps him back; when he refuses (to stay), his father disowns him.” Here we have the declamatory figure known as the *Vir fortis*, who according to the rules of the game can claim a reward, and may by definition be immune to disowning. In many declamations he offends not by going on campaign but by claiming his reward; in *Decl. Min.* 258, he refuses to yield his prize for valour to his father; in 285 as victor he does not use his prerogative to recall his father from exile, so when the father returns at the end of his period of exile he disowns his son; in 371 his father is on trial and the son does not use his reward for valour to ask for his father’s discharge but defends him successfully in court; his father disinherits; in 375 he uses his prerogative as a war hero to free his brother who is a deserter, instead of his father who is guilty of treachery, as asked; his father is acquitted and then disowns him. Conversely in 387 it is the father who has earned the hero’s reward, and the son who has deserted, so the father disowns him. In this case we suppose the student would choose to speak on behalf of the father; in the other four, the case has been framed so as to make the son appear justified in his past behaviour and present demand to be restored.

Next, Quintilian mentions the seeking of office (or honours) as grounds for disowning, but I have found no scenario using this; the final motive is marrying against his father’s will—or perhaps just without his permission. Here the *Controversiae* go to town. Most people remember the pirate’s daughter scenario: Sen. *Contr.* 1.6. Our son is captured by pirates and his father refuses to ransom him, but the pirate king’s daughter frees him, on condition he marries her. Back home his father orders him to divorce her so as to marry an orphan (and this is surely a Greek *epikleros*?): then comes the inevitable *nolentem abdicat*. The *Minor Declamations* offer a slightly more realistic version of this scenario at 257. Here the son marries the daughter of his father’s rich enemy so as to raise money to ransom his father. On return his father orders the boy to divorce her: *nolentem abdicat*. Seneca (book 5 exc.) has a similar story; the son of a poor man marries a rich man’s daughter, believing his father dead. His father returns and tries to force his son to divorce, disowning him when he refuses. We clearly cannot infer probabilities of father-son conflict from the exceptional contingency of fathers or sons being lost at sea or held to ransom.

What is perhaps more significant is that the same kind of scenario arises once in Seneca’s collection, and in the three cases among the *Minor Declamations* where a father disowns his daughter. The daughter

of Seneca *Contr.* 2.2 suffers from an equally perverse husband and father. The husband binds her to a suicide compact if either of them should perish, then sends a message from abroad reporting that he has died. She loyally throws herself from a height, but survives. She is then told by her father to leave the man, but refuses; so, of course, she is disowned by her father.²³ In *Decl. Min.* 259 a rich man's daughter is rescued by a poor man. Because she has been found alone with him, her father forces her to marry him, but discovering she has not been raped, orders her to divorce; she refuses to leave her husband and her father disowns her. This too is a well-known comic scenario, as in Menander's *Epitrepontes* or the original of Plautus' *Stichus*. Another father, in *Decl. Min.* 357, also disowns his daughter for refusing to leave her husband, but as a variant in 368 the father disowns her for marrying against his will. Although disowned she does not protest, (another common manoeuvre in these scenarios) but when her father is impoverished she supports him and is then repudiated by her husband. In other words daughters are only brought into these scenarios over a conflict between natal and marital loyalties. I presume that our declaimer's pupils would speak on behalf of, rather than in the person of, the wronged daughter.

But if we are concerned for the effect on the student orator of living in an imaginary world of family disloyalty, we must surely be concerned at the number of these affairs in which the father involves his son in punishing an adulterous mother. Early in Seneca's memoirs (1.4) an amputated father catches his wife with an adulterer; he orders his young son to kill her, but when the son fails to do so the adulterer escapes. He then disowns the boy. Quintilian only cites one adultery-based scenario, at 4.2.98–99. The situation is comparable to the action of Euripides' *Hippolytus Stephanephoros*, with mutual accusation of attempted seduction by wife and stepson. The father found the wife waiting for a rendezvous where the stepson had said she would be, and the stepson likewise; he therefore repudiates the wife and disowns the son. How does Quintilian propose to handle this? He notes that any arguments against one will be equally valid against the other; instead he recommends arguing from a comparison of their characters, the order in which they informed on each other, and the silence of the repudiated wife.

But the *Minor Declamations* include other kinds of intra-familial adultery, where the student must play the role of a son tested by his loyalty

23 2.2 *recreata iubetur a patre relinquere uirum; non uult. Abdicatur.*

to an offending brother: in 276 a man catches his younger brother in adultery with his wife, but the father intercedes to prevent him killing the adulterer, and promises to disinherit the offender. However, on the father's death the adulterer is found to be named as heir. In 286 the man kills his adulterous brother, although his father pleads for mercy, and is then disowned for his pains; there are variations on this in 275 and 291. Will not this kind of scenario disturb the student? Is that why Quintilian avoids introducing them?

He does, however, speak about the bad son, the *luxuriosus*, as in the real court case we mentioned, where the father disinherited his son for keeping a courtesan. The *Minor Declamations* show how declaimers can play variations on the comic theme of the man with a mistress. In 356 in a scenario close to that of Plautus' *Mercator* a father gives his dissolute son money to buy the mistress his father loves, but the son buys his own mistress instead and is disowned. The situation is more serious in 330, where the son of a mother divorced for adultery asks his father for money to keep his own mistress and uses it to support his mother; here too the son is disowned. Mothers are seldom involved in these family sagas, but when they are, it is most often as offending by adultery. How will our student plead such cases, and how will it affect his trust in his real-life parents? This kind of scenario is surely more disturbing than one which merely pits the father's and mother's claims against each other: this is another fantastic scenario clearly designed to exercise the student in handling legal issues. In *Sen. Contr.* 7.5 the father has got himself captured and his son wants to go and ransom him, but his mother, who has blinded herself with weeping over her lost husband, asks the young man to stay and support her; indeed she actually demands that the young man be imprisoned for not staying as she requested. Albucius Silus invoked the duty of support to reproach the son: "will you then, young man, not repay your mother the food you owe her even for ten months? If you don't want to feed your mother you might at least wait to bury her!"²⁴

Here there are interesting legal issues; the captive father has forfeited his citizenship, so surely he has lost his *patria potestas*, and the mother has

24 7.4.1 *ergo tu, adolescens, matri tuae ne decem mensum quidem alimenta reddes? Si pascere non uis matrem, expecta saltem ut efferas.* The ten months allude to the supposed time she had carried and nourished him in her womb. In 7.4.3–4 two declaimers raise questions about the *lex de alendis parentibus*: did it only apply to fathers? Did it apply to mothers if the father were still alive?

complete legal power over her son?²⁵ But this issue, although of great potential interest to a feminist, is only recalled in a very cursory form by Seneca.

Quintilian ends his discussion of *abdicatio* by claiming that it has two forms; one for an offence committed, such as when an adulterous rapist is disowned, the other is of an offence still open to reversal,²⁶ like the cases where a son is disowned for not obeying his father. His comments on the potential of the first type show that he envisaged our young student playing not the boy's role, but the father's; first he is to speak as the angry *pater abdicans*: then Quintilian acknowledges that the father in the second case would speak gently as if in persuasion, since he would prefer to correct the boy rather than disown him. But the plea on behalf of the son should be humble and ready to atone; elsewhere Quintilian reminds the student of the tone of respect due to a father.

We have seen that the reasons for these acts of disowning are usually far-fetched, but designed to give the son justification for a plea to be restored. What is more extraordinary is the number of declamatory scenarios where disowning has no context, and may even be repeated. Often too these are combined with adoption, as if the basis for every declamation was a mathematical addition or subtraction of sons between families. We have had more than enough examples, but let me cite three variations; in Sen. *Contr.* 2.1 a rich man disowns three sons and asks a poor man to let him have his son in adoption; the poor father is ready to give him for adoption, but when his son refuses he is disowned, in 3.3 the disowned son adopts his own disowned brother, and in 7.3 a son three times disowned and then restored (*absolutus*) is caught mixing poison by his father.

What is behind this crowd of fathers disposing of unwanted sons? Could it have been an actual social phenomenon? Quintilian offers one exceptional case of a father who wants to reclaim his son; the father is a professional parasite, and he wants to claim as his child the son three times disinherited by a rich man and the acquitted (*absolutus*); his story is that he exposed the child because of his poverty and became a parasite in order to be able to see his son in the rich man's house. The son was

25 Cf. 7.4.4. Pompeius Silo's argument ... *iura cuius non habet qui liberi hominis non habet <ita qui cuius non habet nec> patris habet; ille nullam in te potestatem habet, mater in totius legis possessione est; iam non commune illi ius in te sed proprium est.*

26 Quint. 7.4.27: the opposition is between a *crimen perfectum* and a *crimen uelut pendens et adhuc in condicione positum*.

innocent and his disowning proved that the rich man was not his real father. In such a plea, says Quintilian, he must show devotion to his son and fear for the boy at risk in an alien home, or he will be written off as an impostor.

We do know, however, of an adopted son disowned—Agrippa Postumus, adopted simultaneously with Tiberius after the death of young Gaius Caesar in 4 AD, and disowned by Augustus some two years later²⁷—and historians naturally suspect a complex of political motives behind this dynastic affair. It is time we considered first the historical context of declamation, then the chronological range of Seneca's memoirs. There had been almost twenty years of Civil War between 50 and 31 BCE. Civil War had seen Cicero and his brother on opposite sides, and his nephew Quintus apparently working to blacken both his father's and uncle's reputation with Caesar. Was he not a prime case for disowning? Only one declamation raises this issue: Sen. *Contr.* 10.3. In this only too likely scenario, a woman followed her husband in the Civil War, although her father and brother were on the opposite side. When her side was defeated and her husband conquered she came to her father and was not allowed back into the household (*non recepta in domum*). She asked her father "how do you want me to make amends to you?" and he said "just die!" She hanged herself and her son accused his father of madness (*dementia*). We have Quintilian's assurance that these accusations of madness, like cases of *abdication* and *mala tractatio*, were not the basis of court cases, but a kind of domestic parallel favoured by the declamatory schools. Each of the declaimers recalled by Seneca uses the clemency of the victor to contrast the merciless treatment of this woman by her father; "there was no proscription of any poor woman," "women were the only ones exempt from the victor's anger," "even the victor did not want this kind of amends: he excused the defeated and restored them," "now the nation realizes, commander, what it owes to you, that you have accepted satisfaction without bloodshed." But from Valerius Maximus comes rather a different insight into the effect of Civil War on families. When the tribune Caesetius cast

27 See on his adoption and abdication B. M. Levick, *Historia* 21 (1972), 675 f., and *Tiberius the Politician*, London 1976, 49–50 and 58: "As an *adoptatus abdicatus* Agrippa was in a worse position than most boys who suffered this extreme penalty; it reduced him to the status of an emancipated member of the *gens Vipsania*, in other words he lost his all-important adoptive name of Agrippa Iulius Caesar."

down the garlands from Caesar's statues at the Lupercalia, Caesar spoke to his father, and ordered him to disown his son because he had sought to bring Caesar into odium by suggesting that he had aimed at becoming king. The father bravely replied "You will rob me of all my sons, Caesar, before I drive one of them away by my censure": *celerius tu mihi Caesar, omnes filios meos eripies quam ex iis ego unum nota mea pellam* (5.7.2).

This seems to be the only instance of *abdicare* in Valerius Maximus. And there was probably good reason for our rhetorical sources to make little reference to this kind of situation, whether fathers chose to disown their sons to curry favour with the new regime, or were pressured into it. After all it was only twenty odd years since a father, Fulvius, had executed his son for joining the Catilinarian conspiracy.

Seneca the Elder's memoirs are perhaps strongest in events of the ten to fifteen years after Actium, but book 7 includes as if personal experience what must be second-hand memories of Licinius Calvus' defences of Vatinius and C. Cato in the 50's (*Contr.* 7.4.6) and reports from Cassius Severus Caesar's humiliation of the mime-writer Laberius after his return in 47 BCE (*Contr.* 7.3.9). The second book includes one topical anecdote highly relevant to adoption: Maecena, Agrippa and Augustus were among the audience of Porcius Latro, at the time that Augustus was planning to adopt his grandsons, Gaius (born 20 BCE) and Lucius (born 17 BCE) the sons of Julia and Agrippa, who was regarded by aristocrats as a man of humble birth. Declaiming an imaginary case of adoption Latro included the comment *iam iste ex imo per adoptionem nobilitati inseritur* (*Contr.* 2.4.13) at which Maecenas pointedly told Latro that Augustus was in a hurry; he should finish his declamation now.²⁸ Another of Seneca's anecdotes (*Contr.* 4, *Pr.* 5) refers to an occasion twenty years later, when Pollio challenged Augustus's grief at the death of his adopted heir Gaius Caesar, so in or after 4 AD. But we need not expect that there were any declamations about *abdicatio* in the years after Postumus Agrippa's disgrace. What I would suggest, then, is that there had been sufficient instances of family conflict and disinheriting or disowning during the years leading up to Actium for declaimers before the events of autumn 6 AD to see *abdicatio* as a living and fruitful topic, but also to avoid allusion to political motives: the father's

28 Seneca's own remark (2.4.13) that Latro deserved pity, since he could not excuse his faux pas without making it worse, shows that the audience of declamations took such incidental judgements as politically as late-Republican audiences had taken the actors' scripts at the theatrical games.

act could be left unmotivated, or, as men grew used to peace without opposition, the schoolmasters could devise actual offences against the family or the father's will to occasion a father's anger and provide the student with a speech of self-justification with which he could identify. Even docile sons must have many occasions when they resented and would have wished to flout their father's absolute authority. Perhaps the many declamations based on *abdicatio* served to remind the boys of their filial duty, or at least their continued social and financial dependence.

15. Quintilian on the Uses and Methods of Declamation

Quintilian of Calagurris may have been Spain's greatest contributor to Roman rhetoric, but he was not the first. His father was a professional speaker,¹ and the *Quintilianus senior* mentioned by Seneca Rhetor in *Contr.* Pr. was surely a great-grandfather or similar relation. Seneca and his schoolfriend, the most admired Porcius Latro, were taught by a certain Marullus, who seems also to have declaimed at Rome. Junius Gallio, who adopted Seneca's son Novatus was probably Spanish, and Gavius Silo practiced advocacy at Tarragona (*Contr.* 10. Pr. 14) like Clodius Turrinus (10. Pr. 14–16), who owed his wealth and authority in the province to his eloquence (*pecuniam ... et dignitatem, quam primam in provincia Hispania habuit, eloquentiae debuit*)². However, there is no doubt that Porcius Latro was the most distinguished declaimer of his day, at least in part, as Seneca puts it, because of *illum fortem et agrestem et Hispanae consuetudinis morem* (*Contr.* 1. Pr. 16), his hardy Spanish vigour and passion for work—or whatever else he was engaged in. The Spanish connection may be why Quintilian, who quotes Seneca's *Controversiae* only once, in his chapter on *figurae (schemata)*,³ cites both Latro and Junius Gallio approvingly later in the same discussion (9.2.91–2). But we must remember the lapse of time between our surviving sources. The great names of the Elder Seneca's reminiscences were dead before Quintilian was born, around 40 AD, and we do not know whether he studied declamation with Domitius Afer, who was his teacher in the late 50's, or with other instructors. (Regrettably we cannot claim Afer, who came from Gaul, for Roman Spain.) When Quintilian returned to Spain about 59 AD, he must have served, like Gavius Silo and Turrinus,

-
- 1 We cannot be sure that his father was a professional advocate, since the retort to an ineffectual envoy cited by Quintilian at 9.3.73 could arise either in a prosecution or a political dispute in the local senate.
 - 2 On these men of Spanish origin see L. Bornecque, *Déclamation et Déclamateurs*, Lille 1902, part 3, and L. Sussman, *The elder Seneca*, Leiden 1978, 21, 56, 91.
 - 3 *Institutio oratoria* 9.2.42. See below.

as an advocate in the Roman communities of his region.⁴ He may also have started to build his reputation as a teacher, but the practice of advocacy is more likely to have attracted the attention of Galba, who brought him to Rome in 68.

The pity of it is that we know nothing about the teaching of rhetoric at Rome between around 35 AD and Quintilian's own time, apart from the manuals of Celsus and Verginius Flavus mentioned by Quintilian. Yet although there are almost 60 years between Seneca Rhetor's reminiscences and the criticisms of Quintilian himself, the picture of other teachers' approach to declamation conveyed in the *Institutio* is little different from that reflected in Seneca. And we know that Quintilian himself declaimed, not just as a teaching tool but for the benefit of visitors, since he mentions it incidentally in his discussion of memory at 11.2.39

Etiam quae ex tempore uidebantur effuse ad uerbum repetita reddantur. Quod meae quoque memoriae mediocritatem sequebatur, si quando interuentus aliquorum qui hunc honorem mererentur iterare declamationis partem coegisset.

The traditional picture of hostility and even contempt on Quintilian's part arises from two well-known passages, 2.10.4–15 and 5.12.17–23, in which he deplores the divergence of declamation from forensic practice. In his second book, on instructing adolescents, he protests that the *controuersiae* have fled into a fantasy world of wizards and pirates, plagues and oracles (2.10). Again, writing on the techniques of argumentation in book 5 he despairs that declamations, which should arm young men for the forum, have long since lost touch with real pleading: *olim iam ab illa uera imagine orandi recesserunt*: now they are composed purely to please and titillate *ad solam compositae uoluptatem* (5.12) and the audiences enjoy their wantonness with passive lust: *licet hanc libidinosa resupina uoluptate auditoria probent*.

We should, however, keep in mind two things: first, that Quintilian sees the training offered by *controuersiae* as the most modern method (*nouissima*) and also by far the best (*utilissima*), perhaps sufficient in itself and certainly requiring for its practice all the necessary virtues of serious oratory (*perpetuae orationis* 2.10.2). He asks only that declamation, created as the imitation of *iudicia* and *consilia* (5.12.12) be closer to real law-

4 J. A. Crook, *Legal Advocacy in the Roman World*, London 1995, shows the importance of advocacy in the disputes between local communities, and their suits for favourable consideration from Rome.

suits and cases: it should use names and circumstantial details like age and occupation, instead of stereotyped “fathers” and “sons” and accepting more complexity of legal situations, relying on normal everyday language (*uerba in usu cotidiano posita* 2.10.9).⁵ After all, these young men will be using their training in judicial oratory as advocates, and their study of deliberative oratory as members of a personal council, to give a senatorial opinion, or to urge a policy on the Princeps if he consults them (3.8.70 *aduocari in consilio amicorum, dicere sententiam in senatu ... suadere si quid consulit princeps*). Why, then, do they so seldom enact the role of advocate in *controuersiae*, but play sons and fathers, rich men, old men severe or indulgent, and other roles which belong to New Comedy? (3.8.51) Oddly Quintilian does not develop this practical argument, preferring to complain about students’ carelessness of speaking “in character.”

My second, and more significant, theme is Quintilian’s constant use of declamatory situations in his own teaching, above all in the area of argumentation (*inuentio*) to which he attaches the greatest importance. He most often cites examples of declamation, including extensive demonstration of how to organize a declamatory speech, in the three main discussions of *inuentio*. These are the outline of *status*-theory in 3.6; the discussions of argumentation in the *confirmatio* in 5.10; and finally chapters 1–4 of book 7, ostensibly on *dispositio*, but in fact about using *status*-theory to determine the issue, and choice and sequence of arguments in a given case.⁶ With the Spanish tradition in mind we should also consider his few references to declamation under *elocutio* in 9.2, since this is the chapter which reveals his verbatim knowledge of Seneca and the two Spanish declaimers, Seneca’s friends, Latro and Gallio.

Quintilian quotes so many types of scenario for the *controuersiae* that I shall deliberately limit myself to the family problems (*domesticae disceptationes*, 7.2.31) which focus on fathers and sons, with the least possible complications from adulteresses, pirates and tyrants.⁷ He will allow such

5 Compare M. Winterbottom, in *Empire and Aftermath*, ed. T. A. Dorey, London 1975, 82–3.

6 Here for once Winterbottom’s summary “the methods of treating cases of different *status*” (*op.cit.* 85) does less than justice to Quintilian’s concerns. For a full list of declamatory scenarios cited by Quintilian see J. Cousin, *Études sur Quintilien*, 2.617–22.

7 Cf. 3.6.80 *quod ipsa nobis etiam natura praescribit*, cf. 84 and 103. Quintilian associates nature with reasoning; whatever follows logically is “natural.” See E.

romantic contrivances to his pupils as an occasional indulgence, but sees the nucleus of the *controuersiae* in these family disputes because they resemble common types of court case.

Quintilian's discussion in 3.6 is important because he is our only rhetorical authority to combine *status*-theory with declamatory themes in his instruction. In introducing the *status* he first reviews the earlier schemes from Hermagoras onwards, then puts forward his own view at 3.6.66 f., dividing the general issues into three *rationales* (*coniectura*, determining the facts, *qualitas*, dealing with the moral nature of the deed, and definition) and one *legalis* (covering five subgroups of issues of law). These he sees as natural in origin, that is, determined by logical analysis. One of his earliest examples is the *controuersia* of the disgraced father who wishes to disown his son (3.6.77), a scenario so familiar that Quintilian starts, not with summary narrative, nor even the declamatory "law," but with the son's response: "you don't have the right to disown me, because a disgraced man cannot launch an *actio*" (lawsuit): this is quoted to illustrate the legal status of rejecting the case (*tralatia*). The father retorts "I have the right, because disowning is not an *action*." This, says Quintilian, will require us to use the status of definition to define an *actio*, or argue by *syllogismos* to extend the restriction against proper actions to disowning.⁸

The conduct of declamatory exercises would normally be determined by a bare narrative synopsis and a set of "laws," like the rules controlling a chess game. Thus Quintilian cites an extreme-case scenario of an inheritance dispute involving both *abdicatio* and adoption, and adding an utterly un-Roman complication (3.6.96 f.):

A certain father has two legitimate sons: he has one of them adopted and disowns the other. Having then no sons he fathers an illegitimate child and acknowledges paternity. He then makes the disowned son his heir and dies.

The laws operating are

- 1) Legally made wills should be valid.
- 2) When parents die intestate *liberi* should be their heirs.

Fantham, "The concept of Nature and Human Nature in Quintilian's Psychology and Theory of Instruction," *Rhetorica* 13.2 (1995) 125–37.

8 On disowning (*abdicatio*), which stopped short of being a legal process, see S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation*, Liverpool 1947, 102–7, and J. Adamietz, *M. F. Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber III*, Munich 1966, 152. Useful is L. Sussman, "Sons and Fathers in the *Major Declamations* ascribed to Quintilian," *Rhetorica* 13.2 (1995) 179–192.

- 3) No disowned son should receive any of his father's property.
- 4) An illegitimate child is deemed legitimate if born before *legitimi*, but if born after them he only has the status of citizen.
- 5) It should be lawful to give a son in adoption.
- 6) An adopted son may return to the family if his father dies without *liberi*.

As usual in declamatory contexts these are not actual Roman laws, but the rules limiting how each of the sons must plead his claim to be heir. In this case 1, 2 and 5 are normal Roman practice, but 3 and 4 are not valid in Roman law, as Quintilian shows, by using and explaining the Greek word *nothos* for an illegitimate son. But the nightmare scenario has been designed to maximize the trainee's use of different issues (*status*). Thus the law forbidding a disowned son from receiving property obstructs the son recorded as heir in the will; he will have to argue the issue between letter and intent (*scripti et voluntatis*) opposing the law with his father's intent to make him heir. The illegitimate son has two tasks; to prove he was not born after legitimate sons, and that he was not born before them. He deals with the first by syllogism, arguing that sons alienated from the household are to be considered *non nati*⁹ and the second by the intent of the law, that an illegitimate son should count as legitimate, if born when there were no sons in the family. He will exclude the letter of the law by using a *fictio* (invented situation). Suppose he had been the only child, what would his status be? Just a citizen? But he was not born after a legitimate son, so does that make him a son? Nor (in another sense) was he born before a legitimate son. So if it is impossible to observe the letter of the law, we must reach its intent by deduction. The disowned son will tell his brother who wants to be restored to the family "yes, you may be restored, but I am still the heir." And both the disowned son and the illegitimate boy will tell the adopted son "you cannot be restored to our family because our father did not die without *liberi*." And—to ignore further argument sketched by Quintilian—this returns the pupils to an issue of definition, this time *quid sit filius*?

Quintilian has used this scenario to involve two issues of the law and one of definition, or in his other terms, every one of the three "natu-

9 This can be understood as both "not-born" and "not sons."

ral”¹⁰ issues: *coniectura* about the letter of the law, quality in constructing the syllogism, and the issue based on definition. The scenario is a sharp test of the students’ command of logic and of the tension between the general written law and the specific written will. Whether or not this is Quintilian’s own invention, it forms the climax of his demonstration of how to apply *status*-theory.

Book 7, giving precepts for argumentation, begins with a chapter on determining the best *status* for handling the case and the best organisation of arguments. The pupil will find the *quaestio* at the point where the two sides disagree (7.1.6) and construct his arguments by working out the most general category to which his case belongs, and then arguing back from the general to the particular instance—a process similar to dialectic, which Quintilian follows in recommending *naturam sequi ducem* (7.1.40).¹¹ Throughout book 7, he is concentrating on teaching logical argument, and countering the tendencies of the declamatory schools by forcing his pupils to think of the contrary arguments which their opponent will produce, again somewhat in the manner of chess where it is necessary to think out play several moves ahead.

Family disputes with a given scenario and set of “laws” again provide the best testing ground for this kind of logical exercise. For this purpose Quintilian cites several generally assumed laws at different points in his introductory chapter on argumentation

- 1) MINUS DICTO AUDIENTEM FILIUM LICEAT ABDICARE: let it be permitted to disown a disobedient son: 7.1.14
- 2) NON ABDICABIS ADOPTATUM: you may not disown a son you have adopted: 7.1.21
- 3) LIBERI PARENTES ALANT AUT VINCIANTUR: sons must support their parents or be imprisoned: 7.1.55 (cf. Sen. *Contr.* 1.1.7; 7.4)
- 4) VIR FORTIS OPTET QUOD VOLET: the war hero may choose his own reward: 7.1.21–22 (cf. Sen. *Contr.* 10.2, *Minor Declamations* 293, 304, 371)

These “laws” were so common as declamatory rules that Seneca reports Latro arguing a century before that one should take as already agreed (*res iudicatae*) the right of a war hero or tyrannicide to choose his reward

10 On Quintilian’s use of *natura*, *naturalis*, see Fantham, *op. cit.*, 135–6. Here and in the other books on *inuentio* Quintilian uses “nature” to designate logical as opposed to legal thinking.

11 Cf 7.1.26 *quid naturale sit primum responderi*, 7.1.46 *at qui naturam sequetur*, 7.1.49 *natura permittit* ...

(=4), a son's obligation to do everything his father commanded (=1), and the restriction that only a son could charge his father with *dementia* (*Contr.* 2.3.12).

Given the crucial impact of disowning on the adolescent son expelled from his home, and the extraordinary frequency of this paternal act in declamations, Quintilian explores the assumptions about this punishment in more detail in 7.4 on the *status qualitatis*. There are (7.4.4) three common reasons for disowning: because the son did military service—, or sought office (*honores petierit*), or married—against his father's will. Quintilian explains the importance of these scenarios of protest against *abdicatio* as one of the three categories of domestic dispute closely resembling actual lawsuits which might come into court in adult life: *abdicatio* is parallel to suits before the Centumviral court protesting disinheritance (*exhereditatio*) by a son excluded from the will after his father's death: so also the declamation on behalf of a wife accusing her husband of *mala tractatio* corresponds to the *actio rei uxoriae*, suing for restoration of a dowry on divorce. The third type, where a son accuses his father of *dementia*, is seen as parallel to the petition for a *curator furiosi*, an administrator to represent a crazy father of householder (7.4.11; repeated in 29).

Two examples in this book based on a family of more than one son illustrate how Quintilian used these hypothetical situations, and what he was trying to teach through them. Twice in book 7 (7.1.38; 7.4.39) he recalls the *controuersia* based on the competition of the three sons, an orator, a philosopher and a doctor, each claiming to be most useful to society and so deserving an additional share of their father's inheritance. Here is no challenge to logic, but a fertile field for praise and blame. The essentially epideictic issue could be tackled by a less advanced student indeed it features with little variation in *Minor Declamation* 268, produced in conformity with Quintilian's principles.¹²

One last case, which Quintilian tells us comes from the school syllabus, but regards as neither difficult nor new, he explains and develops in detail, to show how to construct a plea. Here I shall not go through his recommended argumentation, but try to isolate the principles which he is advancing.¹³

A father has two sons, one a trained orator (*disertus*), the other a farmer (*rusticus*). When he is accused of treason, his lawyer son defends him, but he is

12 Cf. M. Winterbottom, *Minor Declamations*, Berlin/New York 1984, *ad loc.*

13 On this as on other cases the reader should consult the *notes complémentaires* of Cousin's edition, here 216.

condemned. His farmer son is absent from the trial, and the father goes with his lawyer into exile. However the farmer becomes a military hero and asks as his reward the restoration of his father and brother. When the father dies intestate, the farmer asks for his share of the inheritance, but the lawyer claims it all (7.1.42 f).

The situation is controlled by only two laws:

- 1) Any man who does not support (*adesse*) his father when tried for treason shall be disinherited.
- 2) Any man convicted of treason shall go into exile with his lawyer.

Quintilian mocks the declaimers for preferring the emotionally attractive option: to defend the farmer and war hero and restorer against the unwarlike and ungrateful lawyer. He imagines them blustering their way through the material to search out extreme and obscure aphorisms (as is now fashionable—*nam ea nunc uirtus est*) and make a fine melodramatic display. Instead Quintilian suggests the farmer should follow the lead of nature. Here this means citing the basic claim to inheritance of sons in a normal Roman family, ignoring the exceptional, unnatural situation: “Our father left us two sons and I am asking for my share in common law.” Inevitably the lawyer will answer by citing the declamatory law excluding anyone absent from the defence, and use it to condemn the absentee.

The farmer’s best hope is to show the letter of the law cannot hold good (49). Supposing the son who was absent from the trial was an infant or on military service? He must focus on the legislator’s intent, to punish disloyalty. But since each son can accuse the other with equal justice of failing his father, Quintilian turns to other approaches to interpreting the application of the law, such as the moral and legal standing of the father himself. To argue in most general terms, should the law punish the absentee, no matter what kind of father is in question? (7.1.55) He reminds his readers of two stock bad parents, well-known from declamation, the mother who bears witness against her son charged with non-citizenship, and the man who sells his son to a pimp. Are sons obliged by the law to support this kind of parent? Again and again Quintilian prods the student to envisage the most general situation: in 58, does the law bind whoever is advocate, and to whatever defendant? The student should simply imagine in the most general terms that the father has been restored, then treat this restoration by the farmer son

as a special case.¹⁴ Can he not claim that his act of restoration was equivalent to acting as advocate, since it achieved the same effect as successful advocacy (61)?

We need not follow this outline step by step to the bitter end. In this preliminary *sermo*, “talking through”¹⁵ the sequence of claims of the declamatory scenario, Quintilian uses the declamatory scenario to lead the student through the mental processes which generate each argument by reducing each element of this situation to the most general categories, because he believes that abstract argumentation, and the manipulation of the *status*, play an essential part in the success of his brief.

The last passage which bears on Quintilian’s experience of declamation and declamatory literature comes in his account of figures in 9.2. He approaches figures and figured speech critically, stressing the deviation of figures of thought from direct significance.¹⁶ Quintilian brings up the declaimers to illustrate the extravagance of *schemata* (cf. 9.2.27, 55, 65, 79, 92), which he rejects as unnatural¹⁷ because he is both impressed and repelled by their passion for bold figures. At 9.2.42 (and here only in the whole *Institutio*) he cites the Elder Seneca, for his use of *evidentia* in the *controuersia* in which a (blind) father is guided by one son to catch his other son in adultery with his stepmother: “lead me, I will follow you. Take this aged hand and press it where you choose” ... and again “see what you long refused to believe; for I cannot see, night and thick darkness come before my eyes.” He seems both shocked and impressed by this powerfully vivid *figura* ... One reason for his hostility may be moral fastidiousness. In the rest of his work Quintilian avoids adulterous scenarios.¹⁸ While it was the extravagance of *elocutio* which offended Quintilian in the contemporary declamation, he may also have felt a proper embarrassment at these family scandals, serving up adulterous mothers and brothers to impressionable pupils.

When he returns to the *scholae* for his material later in the same discussion (9.2.67–68, 70 and 81–92) he protests at the *schemata* or innu-

14 7.1.59–60 *qui subtiliter quaeret aliquid, spectabit ultra, nam ut genus species sequitur, ita genus speciem praecedat. Fingamus ergo ab alio restitutu, ... quaestio orietur: an ... valeat ac si iudicium non fuisset?*

15 I have not seen this term used by Quintilian in the *Institutio*, but it is the heading supplied for the teacher’s outline in the *Minor Declamations*.

16 *Sententiarum figurae quae ab illo simplici modo indicandi recedunt* 9.2.1.

17 9.2.32 *in iis quae natura non permittit, mollior fit figura*, and the comment *audacius genus*, repeated in criticism of Seneca at 42.

18 Apart from the scenario derived from Euripides’ *Hippolytus* at 4.2.98.

endos as an outdated fashion in declamation, at its worst when he was first training.¹⁹ The examples include a scenario based on an adulterous, indeed an incestuous, mother and a violent father accused of *mala tractatio*. What could be more offensive and impure than if he defended himself by hurling innuendos against his wife? (9.2.80)

It is the last of the family conflicts mentioned in this context (9.2.91), which returns, or seems to return, to Seneca the Elder. The scenario of the third *controuersia* of Seneca's second book assumes a law that a rapist must die unless he persuades his victim's father and his own (to forgive him) within 30 days. One young man has won over his victim's father but cannot persuade his own father; so he launches a suit for *dementia* against him. Here, Quintilian twice quotes what look like excerpts from the Senecan collection. First he praises Latro for this wording: "then will you kill me?" "If I can bring myself to" (9.2.91). Gallio's contribution he criticizes as slacker and more in keeping with his talent: "be firm my heart, be firm! Yesterday you were brave." So does this mean Quintilian knew parts of Seneca's work which are now lost? The blinded father of 9.2.42 is not found in the continuous declamations but was appended by Mueller's edition as a fragment. The quotation from Gallio has a slightly different form in Sen. *Contr.* 2.3.6 (*fortiori fuisti*, instead of *eras*) and the comment of Latro is not among the many preserved in Seneca's record of this declamation. Could Quintilian have found these sayings, not in Seneca, but in an intermediate source? Gallio certainly published on rhetoric; there may have been other, rival, collections by declaimers, for him to consult. Even so, why does he quote from and name the actual declaimers only in this chapter? Has he turned, for this chapter only, to a source-book on figures which drew only on declamation?

We have no answer. Instead let me end by adding to Quintilian's use of declamation as training in logical thinking, the moral and psychological motives that would lead him to select the typical father-son scenarios we have been examining. Quintilian knew that adolescent sons had mixed feelings towards their powerful fathers; and he speaks of the *personae reuerentia* (9.2.76) which led other speakers to veil their criticisms of those with power. But he also recognized that many pupils

19 9.2.77 *praecipue prima quibus praecipere coeperam tempora hoc uitio laborarunt: dicebant enim libenter tales controuersias*. Although this would not take us quite as far into the past as the declamatory youth of Seneca the Elder, it suggests that the mannerisms of his youth persisted into the second half of the century.

were glad to attack the father obliquely (*qui libenter patres figura laedunt* 7.4.28) even if they showed tact in actions for *dementia* by deploring the insanity but pitying the father for his condition, and praising his past goodness to emphasize the present change for the worse. One way in which the son could feel released from oppressive control is by contriving a scenario in which the father needs his help, or is abandoned by all but his son: hence the fathers captured by pirates, or convicted of desertion or treason. In most of the *controuersiae* considered by Quintilian, the son has to deal with conflicting obligations—to stay married to the generous pirate's daughter against his father's will—while others deal more with matters of equity than law, and stress *officium* (duty) and good intent (*uoluntas*) rather than the unbending written law. While Quintilian gave absolute priority to preparing his students for arguing real-life lawsuits, we can also see that he kept in mind the principles of morality on which they would both argue these fictional cases, and—we may hope—determine their own adult behaviour.

16. The Concept of Nature and Human Nature in Quintilian's Psychology and Theory of Instruction

Abstract: Nature is a highly tendentious word and was already so in the time of Quintilian. Since the Stoic ideal was “to live according to Nature,” the concept can be invoked persuasively in every phase of education. But Nature had other regular functions in rhetoric: to demarcate innate talent from acquired skill (*Natura* vs *Ars*); to distinguish reality, the outside world, from verbal imitation; and to privilege preferred patterns of augmentation. These competing uses lead to inconsistencies, especially in presenting the relationship between Nature and imitation. The purpose of this paper is to detect these contradictions and illustrate the assumptions that underlie them in Quintilian's treatment of invention, organisation, and expression.

What is the natural and peculiar property of human beings? The Platonic philosophical tradition made it the *logos* of reason—Latin *ratio*—while the rival discipline of rhetoric counterclaimed it to be the *logos* of speech—Latin *oratio*. Like Cicero before him, Quintilian realized the discrepancy but argued for the interdependency of reason and the eloquence that expressed it. Thus he can begin his *Institutio oratoria* with the production of the future orator as his goal, and *ratio*, the power of learning and thinking, as the natural, defining quality of a human being: *homini naturale*. This inborn gift is a guarantee that pupils can use their human and natural talent to achieve their goals.

Later, when Quintilian passes from elementary instruction to the doxography and definitions of the secondary, adult training in rhetoric, we find him reversing the direction of his argument. Since instruction in rhetoric is his given task, he proceeds in 2.16.12 from the Isocratean claim that Nature's *alter ego*, the divine parent and creator of the earth,¹ distinguished men from beasts by their power of speech (*dicendi facultate*). While beasts had speed and strength but were unable to speak (*muti*²),

1 The word “Nature” will be capitalized whenever it is personified by Quintilian or treated as an active force; otherwise it will be left in lower case. Here Quintilian uses Nature's alias Divine Providence, *Deus ille parens ... fabricator mundi*.

2 *Mutus* in Latin regularly represents Greek *alogos*, whether it means “without reason” or “without speech.” (Cf. Cicero, *Fin.* 1.71.)

men were given the compensation of reason to put them on a par with the gods, but reason itself only found fulfilment in speech. Despite Quintilian's omission of the name of Nature in this protreptic passage, the providential deity is clearly Nature's other face; first reason, then speech, are established as natural and peculiar to human beings. It will remain Quintilian's task not only in the next chapter but throughout the *Institutio* to establish that human nature needs the rhetorical art to reach its fullest and most perfect realisation.

Quintilian is less certain whether either eloquence or moral virtue is natural in a more exclusive sense—that is, imparted by nature *unaided* by education. At the end of book 1 he has found comfort in stressing that human nature³ is capable of many skills. At the same time it is a gift of providence (Nature) that honourable pursuits give the greatest pleasure: thus (as Aristotle also argued in his *Rhetoric*) the pleasure of mental activity provided by Nature will lead the young person on towards fully developed eloquence and towards virtue.⁴

However, at the beginning of his second and major cycle (2.17.1) and in his final book on the formation of the orator (12.2.1–2), Quintilian sets it out as an axiom that both natural eloquence and natural virtue need professional support (the recurrent verb, found also in Cicero's treatment, is *adiuvant*). Though nature provides some *stimuli* to virtue (12.2.1), people need both *doctrina*, theory, and discipline to develop their character, and *doctrina* for their intellectual development.

Much of this can be traced, with some gain in intellectualism, to the introduction to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, which moves from the superiority of truth (1355 a 21) to its advantage with human beings. One of Aristotle's first statements about people is that they are born (*pephukasin*, 1355 a 15) inclined towards truth.⁵ From Aristotle, too, Quintilian derived the no-

3 In emphatic formulation: *natura humani ingenii* 1.12.2.

4 Compare the Stoic version of Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* 108.8: *Facile est auditorem concitare ad cupidinem recti; omnibus enim natura fundamenta dedit semenque uirtutum.* ("It is easy to stir the student to the desire for what is right, for Nature has given all men the foundations and seeds of the virtues.")

5 ἅμα δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς τὸ ἀληθὲς πεφύκασιν ἱκανῶς καὶ τὰ πλείω τυγχάνουσι τῆς ἀληθείας. ... αἰεὶ τὰληθῆ καὶ τὰ βελτίω τῇ φύσει εὐσυλλογιστότερα καὶ πιθανώτερα ὥς ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν. ("It may also be noted that men have a sufficient natural instinct for what is true, and usually do arrive at the truth ... Things that are true and things that are better are, by their nature, practically always easier to prove and easier to believe in"; 1355 a 15–17, 37–38; emphasis mine; trans. Rhys Roberts, *The Works of Aristotle*, Oxford: Clarendon

tion that people are naturally inclined to pleasure (1362 b 7) and naturally take pleasure in learning (1410 b 10). However, the use of Nature in persuasive definitions and generally in protreptic seems to have developed much more intensely under post-Aristotelian, especially Stoic, influence, and so we find behind Quintilian's use of Nature not only a practical psychology, invoked to encourage people to expect success, but also a normative, teleological principle.

In rhetoric the *locus de natura* was already a cliché in Cicero's time (cf. *Part. orat.* 111), and it was customary to invoke the authority of nature (Cicero, *Top.* 73) as a moral imperative. All this has been well illustrated for Quintilian himself by Freyr Roland Varwig,⁶ but Varwig shows little or no interest in Aristotle or Isocrates and severely restricts his consideration of earlier Latin rhetorical texts.

From here on I would like to build on Varwig's analysis by discussing four themes in Quintilian's treatment of nature: 1) the relative contributions of nature and art (both theory and training) to the orator's excellence; 2) the apparent opposition between nature and imitation (also part of training); 3) the natural origin of artistic expression in society and the individual; and 4) the varying roles of externalized Nature in prescribing the thought (*inuentio*) and empowering the expression (*elocutio*) of artistic eloquence.

The relationship posited by Quintilian between nature and art is analysed in the most useful part of Varwig's study. He rightly traces the distinction between nature and art back to the triple division of education into nature, practice, and art, used by Cicero in *De oratore* and derived from its most influential formulation in the *Phaedrus* (269c-d).⁷ In Quintilian's text "*ars*" generally designates every aspect of training: theory and precepts, method and exercise, including systematic imitation.

Unlike Varwig I see no real difference between Quintilian's views and the comments of Cicero's spokesman in *De oratore* that nature (whether called *natura* or *ingenium*) is a necessary condition for oratory but not a sufficient condition for excellence in oratory. Both Cicero and Quintilian argue three points: that nature unaided by *ars* is not

Press 1924, Vol. 11). William Grimaldi, *Aristotle Rhetoric I: A Commentary*, New York: Fordham University Press 1980, compares 1361 b 11.

6 *Der rhetorische Begriff Natur bei Quintilian*, Heidelberg: Winter, 1977.

7 On this, the canonical study is Paul Shorey's "*Phusis, Melete, Episteme*," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 40 (1909) 185–201.

enough for success; that *ars* unaided by nature is a non-starter; and that the relative contribution of raw talent and informing theory—of matter and form—shifts with the progress of the orator, so that art, which can benefit the ordinary and even the moderately weak pupil, becomes the determining factor in raising the talented to excellence.

But Quintilian is offering two levels of educational theory for two stages in human development, and he stresses different factors in the two treatments of the issue within a short span of his study. It is useful to trace the reasons for his reformulation of the issues from 2.8, on the teaching of children, to the higher level of instruction introduced in 2.17 and 19. In the first part of book 2, when Quintilian is still thinking of the formation of children, the model for his precepts is fundamentally Isocratean, for it is Isocrates who most of all stresses the responsibilities of the teacher, the care or nurture (*epimeleia*) which Quintilian translates as *cura*.⁸ From the very opening of book 1 Quintilian has emphasized that failure in the pupil is more often due to a lack of this nurture than to a defect of nature. In 2.8 he enjoins the teacher to foster the natural gifts (*propria naturae bona*) of the pupils in the direction of their natural bent (2.8.3), since nature aided by nurture more successfully reaches its full strength.⁹ Here there is no mention of art, only of nurturing or extending care and of following the pupil's nature, which is still dominant. With a warning to respect a child's individuality (2.8.12), Quintilian urges that the child be led where nature calls.

A very different approach is adopted in the theory of adult training which begins in 2.15. Nature is still stressed (2.17.9), but rhetoric as a skill is aided by the third component, practice (*exercitatio*). Quintilian gives his answer in 2.19 to the traditional debate on the relative role of nature and culture: natural talent can achieve much unaided, whereas theory is useless without talent. But although his first comparison with agriculture illustrates the importance of natural talent, Quintilian overrides it by a second analogy, from sculpture: the product of theory is as far superior to the finest raw talent as stone sculpted by a great artist excels unworked marble (2.19.2–3).

8 See Erika Rummel, "The Effective Teacher and the Successful Student," *EMC/Classical Views* 21 (1977) 62–66.

9 *Adiuta cura natura magis eualescat*. *Eualescere*, a word of increasing popularity in Silver Latin, is used specifically for full realisation of natural power by Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* 94.31, and Quintilian, 10.2.10. (It is also used by Quintilian for the development of language at 1.5.57, 8.6.33, and 9.3.13. See *TLL*, s.v.)

I come now to the major problem arising from Quintilian's stress on nature, that of reconciling the primacy of nature with his advocacy of imitation. In ascribing the origin of the formal art of rhetoric to observation (3.2.3), Quintilian or his tradition took a step towards reincorporating imitation into the history of rhetorical theory. The rules of rhetoric were deduced by observation of orators in practice, just as the rules of medicine were deduced from observation of patients. But the orator's purpose in observing was to imitate. Individual imitation of rhetorical models had been stressed by Isocrates, but ignored by Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and restricted in importance in Cicero's fullest treatise, *De oratore*.¹⁰ Cicero, however, had not dismissed it, for in *Orator*, his last and most sophisticated work, he reintroduced *imitatio* in a form less vulnerable to criticism, not as imitation of one or even of several oratorical models, but as a Platonic imitation of the ideal form of eloquence.

Certainly it is difficult to reconcile any theory of imitation with the complementary but competitive roles of nature and art. Quintilian makes a first attempt in 3.2.3: there, although the origin of art is derived from imitation of practice, the origin of speaking itself—that is, practice—is derived from nature. We might add as a gloss that nature provided the beginning of oratory, but observation and imitation the beginning of rhetoric. Later Quintilian discriminates between the degree to which different components in traditional rhetoric required artifice: at 5.10.120, on the formal theory of invention,¹¹ and in the preface to the four books on style (8. Pr. 13) he credits nature with the principles of invention and disposition, but distinguishes *elocutio* (style) as the product of care and effort—of art rather than natural reasoning. Because human nature is the power of reasoning, Quintilian can contrast the dominant role of native good sense in *inuentio* with the increased need for trained technique in *eloquentia*, the art of expression. He is less convincing when he tries to reconcile respect for nature with the

10 On Cicero's treatment of imitation in *De orat.* 2.88–98 and the later rhetorical works, see Elaine Fantham, "Imitation and Evolution," *Classical Philology* 73 (1978) 1–16 (= 11 in this volume).

11 *Neque enim artibus editis factum est ut argumenta inueniremus, sed dicta sunt omnia antequam praeciperentur, mox ea scriptores obseruata et collecta ediderunt.* ("For we did not find arguments as a result of the publication of formal *artes*, but everything occurred in speech before it was formalized as rules, and subsequently the writers collected and published what they had observed.")

need for art and imitation by appealing to Cicero, along with Nature, in an impassioned but disingenuous denunciation of affectation.¹²

Two arguments are advanced. First, Quintilian depicts the modern orator as stirred by pride and affectation into rejecting the simple and appropriate speech of his skilled predecessors—that is, avoiding what could be said straightforwardly (*recte*, 8. Pr. 24) out of love of words. Thus Quintilian can present refusal to imitate as contrary to nature. Second, Quintilian argues from the criterion of accepted usage (*consuetudo communis*), which he equates with “what Nature has dictated to us?” First, words consistent with the subject matter; second, plain, correct language (*propria uerba*, a term often associated with nature); third, clarity; and finally, *ornatus* and appropriateness. These are the four virtues of Theophrastus, of which all except *ornatus* seem necessary, or basic: there was even an *ornatus* inherent in good speech, as Cicero had shown in *De oratore*, and not to be confused with added embellishment (8. Pr. 26–27).

It is much harder for Quintilian to merge imitation with nature when he deals in book 10 (chapters 1 and 2) with the models for stylistic imitation and the factors governing the process. First he had to set right the archaizers who denied natural eloquence to any but the earliest orators (10.1.43): this enabled him quite consistently to single out the contribution of natural talent to the success of his two heroes, Virgil and Cicero, and to note its paradoxical failure in the case of his *pessimum exemplum*, Seneca. Thus he builds on his own doctrine of the complementarity of nature and care at 10.1.86, praising Virgil for his heavenly and immortal nature *and* his exceptional care.¹³ The same antithesis of nature and care is used more subtly at 10.1.107 to contrast Demosthenes and Cicero. The difference between the rival Greek and Roman heroes lies in the proportion of natural talent to effort (*natura/cura*). While Demosthenes is awarded the prize for effort, Cicero excels him because his achievement reflects greater gifts of nature: by a trope Quintilian present him as born¹⁴ by the gift of Providence (another of Nature’s aliases) so that eloquence might exercise its full power in this single man (10.1.110).

12 He has earlier quoted Cicero (*De orat.* 1.94 and *Or.* 18) for this distinction between the requirements of invention and expression.

13 *Ut illi naturae caelesti atque immortalis cesserimus, ita curae et diligentiae in hoc plus est.*

14 There is wordplay here, since Latin *natura* derives from the root *natus*, “born.”

By attributing to Cicero a superhuman (but not supernatural) talent, Quintilian can give Nature full credit for his artistry. In contrast, Nature is exonerated of responsibility for Seneca, the model of bad eloquence from Quintilian's youth: it was not Seneca's talent but taste that was betrayed.¹⁵

We saw an inherent inconsistency in the claim in the preface to books 8–11 that it was a violation of nature to refuse to imitate the great artists, because their simple and direct language was itself nature: Quintilian confronts this inconsistency in the theoretical preamble of his chapter on imitation. This starts from the recognition of imitation as the method by which writing and all physical crafts are developed—the method which also shapes the first steps in every intellectual discipline. If imitation is opposed to nature, it is clear that it is imitation, and not nature, that enables men to resemble good models. At the same time Quintilian admits (in direct contradiction to the preface of book 8) that if the model itself has nature and the force of authenticity (*uera uis*), all imitation in contrast is put on (*ficta*), but if they refuse to imitate and seek out their own words, they will be rejecting Nature—the simple, direct, authentic voice of reality—for affectation.

The answer to this impasse can be derived from Quintilian's advice at 10.2.18: to imitate well, the students must understand the principles behind what their model has written—that is, the reasoning behind their model's choice of thought and phrase. One could then argue that by adopting the reasoning of their model, the students made it part of their own nature, just as the schoolteacher of book 2 moulded the nature of the young pupils described there by habituation, turning *consuetudo* into a second nature.

Nevertheless, this is the most problematic part of Quintilian's theory, and for all his caution and respect for the natural limitations of individual older students (10.2.21), he has not fully worked out the binary system of *natura* and *uoluntas*, nature and taste, talent and tendency, that enables Cicero to endorse imitation for the individual and for the history of the art.

Outside these chapters Quintilian maintains his persuasive use of Nature consistently through the books on *elocutio* and the late chapter on individual style, *genus dicendi* (12.10). This leads to my third point, the natural genesis of expressive artistry. Book 8 notes repeatedly that art is

15 *Digna enim fuit illa natura quae meliora uellet: quod uoluit effecit* (10.1.131).

rooted in nature and resembles it: *emphasis* or “loaded language” occurs in the natural speech of the uneducated, and tropes such as metaphor (8.6.4) and hyperbole (8.6.76) arise spontaneously in the speech of simple people. For Quintilian these rhetorical features are grounded in human nature and have a natural origin. Exaggeration is innate in everyone (8.6.75), and we are led by nature to adopt rhythm (9.4.10).

This argument for the natural sanction of rhetoric is reinforced by playing on the two scales of macro- and micro-development of the art: in society and in the individual. The origin of rhythm can be ascribed to a period before the recognition and formulation of its theory in society: it will then be “natural.” An individual, too, may adopt rhythm without recognizing or considering the principles that make it effective. Both in the easy case of rhythm and the more complex case of *ornatus*, Quintilian cites Cicero as authority for their natural origin.¹⁶

In all the passages we have considered, Quintilian is extending the scope of nature as the basis on which art builds and using the approved status of nature to warrant the activities of his art. In books 8–11 (and 12.10), while presenting his theories of *elocutio*, Quintilian is most vehement in affirming the necessity for training against the advocates of “natural”—i. e., artless—eloquence when he follows the Isocratean or Ciceronian model of aesthetic oratory.

As he approaches a technical analysis, Quintilian stops four times to combat those who reject as mannered and artificial the effects of training—the advocates of “simple manly speech.”¹⁷ He does this as a pre-

16 Cf. *De orat.* 3.195 *uis incredibilisque naturae* (“the incredible power of nature”); 197 *Ars enim cum a natura profecta sit, nisi natura moueat ac delectet, nihil sane egisse uideatur; nihil est autem tam cognatum mentibus nostris quam numeri atque uoces* (“since art originated with nature, unless it naturally moves and gives pleasure it will seem to have achieved nothing: for nothing is so naturally related to our minds as rhythm and sounds”); and 125 *si est honestas in rebus ipsis, de quibus dicitur, existit ex re naturalis quidam splendor in uerbis. Sit modo is qui dicit aut scribet, institutus liberaliter educatione doctrinaque puerili et flagret studio et a natura adiunetur. ... ita facile in rerum abundantia ad orationis ornamenta sine duce natura ipsa, si modo est exercitata, delabitur.* (“If there is nobility in the subject matter, then a natural brilliance will appear in the words of the speaker or writer, provided that he has received a cultured upbringing and education and is aflame with enthusiasm and support by natural talent. ... He will slip so effortlessly into the ornament of speech without guidance, led by his own nature, provided it is practiced;” my emphasis.)

17 To answer these opponents Quintilian tries to redefine “*uirile*” (9.4.3, 10.1.43) and delimits art as controlled *cultus*, contrasting cultivation with affectation. But

liminary to his account of rhythm (9.4.3–5), early in the enumeration of writers to be imitated (10.1.43), before his precepts on delivery (11.3.10–11), and in the long, synthesizing chapter on personal stylistic identity (12.10.40–45).

His is a difficult position, since he is trying to defend a middle ground between the untutored *sermo uulgaris* and affectation. Thus Quintilian calls most insistently on the range of nature-based language in the last excursus on “natural style,” arguing that in persuasive oratory the speaker must use these auxiliary techniques allowed to us by nature. By resorting to the analogy of physical exercise, Quintilian can argue more cogently that exercise and development of power is itself natural: the more effectively a man speaks, the more he is speaking according to nature. It becomes clear in reading the *Institutio* that “according to nature,” once the catchword of Stoic moralists, had already been taken over by all the teachers of rhetoric, both those in agreement with Quintilian and those who opposed him.

This leads to my last point: the distinctions, implicit in Varwig’s survey but never clearly expressed, among the roles played by externalized Nature in different sections of Quintilian’s manual—in the formal rhetoric that stretches from 2.15 to the end of book 11, and in the framing proreptic of books 1 and 12.

Externalized Nature, the Nature that is represented as governing human behaviour is in many ways only a syntactical rewording of what has been said by Quintilian about internalized nature, the inborn qualities of the individual which seem to have been the first reference of the substantive in Latin.¹⁸ Studies of the history of *Natura* in Latin have shown how much this externalized Nature was influenced to become a cliché or traditional trope, first by the wider semantic range of Greek *Physis*, and later by the Stoic doctrine which set up Nature as Provi-

Virilitas is an even more compulsive slogan than *Natura*, and Quintilian himself adopts it to denounce the affectation taught in the declamatory schools; here he compares the delicate complexion of such oratory to the effects of castration, something that would be monstrous if it occurred in nature (5.12.17–19).

- 18 See André Pellicer, *Natura: étude sémantique et historique du mot latin*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France 1966. For internalized nature, compare Plautus, *Trin.* 812; and Terence, *Andr.* 795, *Ht.* 24 and 503, and *Ad.* 885. Nature is externalized in Plautus, *Poen.* 300, where *ingenium bonum* (“a good character”) is a gift of *Natura*; cf. Terence, *Eun.* 316.

dence, the parent of the universe (*Parens rerum*), creator and guide of human moral behaviour.

Thus there recur throughout Quintilian's argument phrases in which a weakly or strongly personified Nature is agent, subject of a psychological verb of willing, allowing, requiring, or prescribing. Variation from the passive to the prescriptive is itself determined by which aspect of oratory is under discussion, the intellectual or the aesthetic.

A whole group of allusions to Nature as leader or to following Nature's lead presents a strongly prescriptive image of Nature as the controller of argument. This is prominent in the analysis of invention for each part of the speech: for the *prooemium*, where Quintilian declares that Nature will tell the speaker what should be said first; for the transition from *prooemium* to narration, where Nature will suggest the connection (4.2.1) and be the judge of plausibility (4.2.52) and consequentiality (4.2.53); and in narrative, as Quintilian introduces the idea of natural order and coherence, warning that a digression should not interrupt things naturally associated (*natura iuncta* 4.3.4). It is logic that is represented by Nature in Quintilian's rules for the *partitio* or analysis of the case: the *ratio rectae partitionis* (4.5.3) follows nature as its guide, just as Quintilian relies on nature as his authority in the *dispositio* or ordering of his arguments. Once the *propositio* has been determined, the speaker must answer what is "naturally" (*naturale* 7.1.26) first and must "follow nature's lead" (*naturam sequi ducem* 7.1.40).

Quintilian invokes Nature again as he imagines counter-arguments based on the *intent* of the law: indeed, even as he suggests what nature authorizes (*permittere*), he shows himself conscious of his own reliance on this device ("as I said," *ut dixi* 7.1.40; "let me repeat," *saepius dicam* 7.1.49). The same appeal to nature justifies sequential treatment of the *constitutio coniecturalis*¹⁹ and the natural order of proof (7.2.15) and determines whether to begin argument from the issue (*causa*) or the defendant (7.2.39).

The last and most sharply defined application of personified Nature to *inuentio* comes when Quintilian returns to the practice of composition and the art of writing. Twice the chapter on composition appeals to nature, first to encourage students if they do not find easy and instant success, and then to represent the process of invention. The argument that Nature herself, *rerum ipsa natura*, "has not willed that anything great should be quickly achieved" (*nihil ... uoluit magnum effici cito*) is

19 *Quia natura prima quaestio est.*

supported by a comparison of intellectual and physical gestation: the law of coming to birth (*lex nascendi*, 10.3.4) requires larger animals to remain longer in the womb.²⁰ As for composition, Nature does the work for us. "Nature herself prescribes"—literally writes down for us to copy—"both our beginnings and what follows them." (*Sic nobis et initia et quae secuntur natura ipsa praescribit* 10.3.15). This is nature as *ratio*, the source of invention.

In contrast, the benevolence of a permissive Nature to man is the basis on which Quintilian must build his exhortations to training and guarantees of success. Thus Nature's generosity supports the argument that the good orator can and must be moral, since Nature does not forbid anyone to be both a good man and an expert speaker (12.1.30). The ostensibly mild double negative should recall the opening claim in the preface to the first book: there is such a thing as perfect eloquence and the nature of the human mind does not prevent us from reaching it (1. Pr. 20).²¹ But Nature's *Nihil obstat*, with which Quintilian opened his book of eloquence, receives its most emphatic form in 12.1, when Nature is invoked for the last time as the great enabler that created us to achieve *mens optima* through our gift for learning (12.1.13). The Aristotelian faith in the teleology of man, born for truth and virtue (*Rhet.* 1.1), is still clearly audible as the ground bass of Quintilian's parting assurance that not just human nature, but the nature of our universe (*rerum natura*, emphasized) offers the possibility of perfection (12.11.25).

Given Nature's status as the highest sanction invoked by contemporary moral and intellectual thought, Quintilian must use its authority to guarantee training in his art as both possible and necessary: thus he has to go beyond the traditional antitheses between nature and nurture, nature and imitation, or nature and artistic design.²² Each of these distinctions in turn must be merged until finally Quintilian has vindicated the idea of human nature as the full potential of humanity, and externalized Nature as our ally in developing art. Thus Nature is revealed

20 This analogy from animal life is consistent with the argument at 12.11.13 that the intellect is the human element as water is to fish and air to birds. Both arguments are probably Posidonian in origin.

21 Cf. 1.10.8: *Natura* does not forbid a man to become a perfect orator.

22 I use "design" designedly to cover both mental planning (*inuentio*) and giving material form (*elocutio*).

as the efficient cause of artistic eloquence and the patroness of the *Institutio*.

17. The Synchronistic Chapter of Gellius (*N.A.* 17.21) and Some Aspects of Roman Chronology and Cultural History Between 60 and 50 BCE

Part I.

Synchronizing Roman and Hellenistic Times

In reading Gellius' synchronised summary of Greek and Roman history up to the 2nd century BCE, I was struck by its value as evidence, not for actual chronology, but for the way in which the Romans related Greek cultural and political history to their own. For the chronology of Gellius gives us no new information on real dating, but has been successfully mined, in combination with conventional dating, to trace his material back to the standard Roman chronographies of Nepos and Varro, and to reconstruct their lost works from his patchwork. The definitive source analysis offered by Oscar Leuze, "Das synchronistische Kapitel des Gellius," *Rh. Mus.* 66 (1911) 237–74, provided an insight into the contents of Nepos' *Chronica* which has since been deepened by H. Malcovati, *Corneli Nepotis quae exstant, in aedibus Paraviae* 1945, and by scattered papers of Luigi Alfonsi, listed in the bibliography of Edna Jenkinson, *ANRW* 1.3 (1973) 718.

The recent progress tempted me, as an enquirer into the culture of Nepos' period, to try to see for myself the panorama of Greek history against which Cicero's generation measured the growth of their own society. Essentially this entails consideration of the work of four scholars: of Nepos, already engaged on his three books of *Chronica* when Catullus dedicated his *libellus*: of Varro, whose omniscience put his predecessors into the shade for all posterity: of Atticus, whose *Liber annalis*, based on Varronian material, was in Cicero's hands by 46 BCE and served as a stimulus to the composition of his *Brutus*: and of Cicero himself. As F. Münzer showed seventy-five years ago ("Atticus als Geschichtsschreiber", *Hermes* 40 (1905) 50–100), Cicero's works, with their established dating and sequence, are the best evidence for Atticus' contribution to the knowledge of Roman literary history. But one purpose of this paper is to react against Münzer's emphasis, with its corre-

sponding depreciation of Roman knowledge, on the preceding decades, of the political and cultural history of the two societies.

We cannot know all the sources tapped by Nepos when he set out to compose the *Chronica*, but Solinus reports his endorsement of the *Chronica* of Apollodorus of Athens, which would be the direct or indirect basis of Greek notices in any Roman work of this century. The three books of Apollodorus continued events through to 144/3 BCE, but for events up to the death of Alexander they were faithful to Eratosthenes' chronology (see Jacoby, *FGH* 244 2 D, introduction, 718–20). Nepos may also have consulted Polybius directly, as did Cicero, but his purpose was probably closer to that of Apollodorus, to compose a chart of famous men—what Gellius calls *excellentium in utraque gente hominum* (17.21.2)—rather than to cover the gamut of military and political history.

It will then perhaps be helpful to include in my recapitulation of Gellius' synopsis the evidence we have for treatment of important individuals (rather than events) by Apollodorus. For each item I will indicate Gellius' form of dating (Olympiad, *a.u.c.* based on Nepos, or on Varroian dating, and other temporal adverbs and phrases), and the source suggested by Leuze (most easily checked against his schematic analysis, *Rh.Mus.* 66 (1911) 269). In square brackets I will note how this differs from conventional dating, adding any references from fragments of Apollodorus about the same personality, and some comment on discrepancies which can be explained.

In the first sections, from 3–8, Gellius disregards chronological order, while setting the scene and giving some details on his sources. As background for his starting-point, Solon, he offers:

3. Homer and Hesiod, both assigned to the period of the Alban kings; on Cassius Hemina's authority both are given a *floruit* 160 years after the Trojan War [far too early], while he quotes *Nepos in primo chronicorum* for dating Homer 160 years before the foundation of Rome [751/0 + 160 = 911 BCE; see Part II of this paper, on Cicero *De re publica* 2.18, for Apollodorus as a source for this dating].

4. Solon's legislation: in the 33rd year of Tarquinius Priscus [?583; by any reckoning of Tarquinius' reign this is around 10 years too late for the traditional date of the Seisachtheia, 594/3 BCE]

5. Pisistratus' tyranny: during the reign of Servius [578–535 according to Varro, from whom Leuze derives this notice, and all material from 4–7; this is a free estimate, but would cover Pisistratus' first period of domination in Athens and most of his established tyranny].

6. Pythagoras' arrival in Italy; *filio Tarquinio regnum obtinente* [Tarquin became king in 533 according to Varro: Pythagoras is conventionally said to have come in 530; see Part II on Cicero, *De re publica* 2.28, for the pre-Varronian dating].

7. *isdem temporibus* Hipparchus' murder [514/3].

8. Archilochus' *akme*: during the reign of Tullus Hostilius [673–42; cf. Herodotus 1.12 for synchronism with Gyges of Lydia; this is more accurate than the Varronian estimate in Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.3, *regnante Romulo*]. Expressly quoted from Nepos.

9. Marathon: in the 260th year *a.u.c. aut non longe amplius* [490, and therefore based on Nepos' foundation-date]. Death of Miltiades. From Nepos.

10. *Tum* ('then'? 'thereafter?') Aeschylus *floruit* [too early, but according to *Marmor Parium*, FGH 239 A 48, he fought at Marathon]. From Nepos.

11. *isdem temporibus* the plebeians created tribunes and aediles [traditionally dated at the First Secession, 494].

non diu post Coriolanus was driven into exile and joined the Volsci in waging war on Rome [491]. From Nepos.

12. *post deinde paucis annis*: Xerxes defeated by Themistocles at Salamis [480].

13. *atque inde anno fere quarto*: battle at the Cremera, in the consulship of Menenius Agrippa and Horatius Pulvillus [477]. From Varro.

14. *iuxta ea tempora* Empedocles *floruit* [FGH 244 F 32; Neanthus gives his *floruit* as Olympiad 83 (444–1), nearly contemporary with 15.

15. *per eas tempestates* the decemvirs were created at Rome, and issued the XII Tables in two instalments [451–0].

16. *deinde* the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, *a.u.c.* 323 [432 BCE on Varronian reckoning].

17. *qua tempestate* Olus Postumius Tubertus was dictator and executed his son [431].

18. *inter haec tempora* Sophocles, and later Euripides [FGH 244 F 34 and 35] were famous, and Hippocrates [FGH 244 F 73] and Democritus [FGH 244 F 36]; Socrates was younger than them, but lived simultaneously for some time [cf. FGH 244 F 36]. Leuze, *Rh. Mus.* 66 (1911) 269, gives this as Varronian, but there is no dating that forces this conclusion.

19. *tum deinde* 347 years *a.u.c.* the Thirty Tyrants were imposed upon Athens by the Spartans [this is conventional 404 by Nepos' dating] and Dionysius the Elder seized power in Sicily [?405], *paucisque annis post* Socrates was condemned to death [399].

20. *ea fere tempestate* Furius Camillus was dictator and captured Veii [396].

21. *post non longo tempore* there was war with the Senones,

22. when the Gauls captured Rome [390 by Varronian reckoning].

23. *neque multo post* Eudoxus became famous in Greece [FGH 244 F 76, *floruit* Olympiad 103 (388–5)], and the Spartans were defeated by

the Athenians under Phormio [an error of Gellius for Iphicrates' victory of 390; cf. Nepos, *Iphicrates* 3], and

24. M. Manlius was condemned for attempting tyranny, and thrown from the Tarpeian rock (Varro) or beaten to death (Nepos) [conventional date 384].

25. *eoque ipso anno*, the 7th after the recovery of the city, Aristotle was born [384; *FGH* 244 F 38]. The dating of 24–5 is Varronian.

26. *aliquot deinde annis post bellum Senonicum* the Theban victory at Leuctra [371].

27. *breui post tempore* plebeian consuls were elected as a result of the *lex Licinia Stolonis* [366].

28. About the 400th year of the City Philip took power in Macedonia [359] *inque eo tempore* Alexander was born [356].

29. *paucisque inde annis post* Plato set out to visit Dionysius [too late, since his last visit is dated by the eclipse of Plutarch, *Dion.* 19, to 361; but note that Cicero, *Cato* 41, based on Atticus' chronology, similarly dates this visit to 349 BCE, naming the consuls].

30. *post deinde aliquanto tempore* Philip defeated the Athenians at Chaeronea [338].

31. *tum* Demosthenes fled.

32. *postea* Philip was assassinated, and Alexander as king crossed to Asia to conquer the Persians and Indians [336].

33. Alexander Molossus crossed to Italy to wage war on Rome, but died in the attempt [330].

34. *postea* the Macedonian Alexander died after reigning 11 years [323; really 13 full years].

35. *neque ita longe post* Aristotle and *post aliquanto* Demosthenes died [both in 322; cf. *FGH* 244 F 38 for Aristotle].

36. *isdem fere tempestatibus*, in the Samnite war, T. Veturius and Sp. Postumius were forced to go under the yoke at the Caudine gorge [321].

[Sections 28–36 hang from one approximate dating; neither on Varronian chronology nor on that of Nepos is *a.u.c.* 400 within five years of Philip's accession, but since the figure is rounded off to the hundred, it would be unreasonable to contest Leuze's suggestion (*Rh. Mus.* 66 (1911) 269] that these sections are Varronian in chronology].

37. In the 470th year *a.u.c.* war was declared against Pyrrhus [280; therefore closer to Nepos].

38. *ea tempestate* Epicurus [*FGH* 244 F 41 and 42] and Zeno were famous.

39. *eodemque tempore* the censors Fabricius and Aemilius Papus expelled Cornelius Rufinus from the Senate [275; also reported by Varro, Livy, *Periocha* 14, etc.].

40. In the 490th year *a.u.c.* Appius Claudius Caudex and M. Fulvius Flaccus opened hostilities in the first Punic War [264, by Varronian reckoning].

41. *neque diu post* Callimachus of Cyrene was famous.

42. *annis deinde postea paulo pluribus quam uiginti*, peace having been made, in the consulship of Claudius Centho and Sempronius Tuditanus [240]. L. Andronicus produced the first play at Rome, more than 160 years after the death of Sophocles and Euripides [both in 406; *FGH* 244 F 35], and 52 years after the death of Menander [292/1; *FGH* 244 F 43 does not give a date]. 42–46 are Varronian as stated.

43. In the next consulship, of Q. Valerius and C. Mamilius, Varro reports the birth of Ennius *in primo de poetis libro*, and gives Ennius' own statement that he wrote his 18th book in his 67th year [173].

44. *deinde* in the 519th year *a.u.c.* Sp. Carvilius Ruga was the first to divorce his wife, for sterility [231, according to Dionysius 2.25, and by Nepos' chronology; but contrast the conflicting *a.u.c.* and consular years in Gellius 4.3.2, quoting Servius Sulpicius].

45. *eodemque anno* Naevius produced his first play [undateable except by this reference], and Varro *in libro de poetis primo* reports that Naevius himself speaks of his service in the first Punic War. However, Porcius Licinus asserts that poetry came to Rome later, in the second Punic War [quotation].

46. *ac deinde*, 15 years later, war was declared against the Carthaginians [218; ? = 231–14 years].

47. *non nimium longe post* Cato, as orator, and Plautus, as comic dramatist, were in their prime [? from 204–184 BCE; Cicero, *Brutus* 60, for Atticus' chronology].

48. *isdemque temporibus* Diogenes, Carneades and Critolaus were sent by the Athenians as envoys to Rome [dated to 155 by consular year by Cicero in *Acad. pr.* 2.137].

49. *neque magno interuallo post* Ennius, Caecilius, Terence *et postea* Pacuvius, and in Pacuvius' old age Accius, flourished, and Lucilius became even more famous for his criticisms of their writings [this dating is only correct if it follows 47, since the first three poets named were dead before the embassy; Leuze thinks this has been added from memory, but the coincidence of the same grouping in Velleius, 1.17 and 2.9, may suggest that both authors found these writers listed with their *akmai* in Nepos].

Gellius himself explains that this survey was compiled from previously mutually independent excerpts from *libri qui chronici appellantur*. If he began annotating with the intention of constructing an historical grid, these excerpts will have been fairly comprehensive, and we might expect him to have noted down datings, at least for some events, both from Nepos and from his Varronian sources. Leuze, *Rh. Mus.* 66 (1911) 237–274, and others believe that Varro substantially confined himself to *res Romanae*, and that Atticus restricted his Greek material to the more salient Athenian political history (cf. Cicero, *Orator* 120: *cognoscat [orator] etiam rerum gestarum et memoriae ueteris ordinem, maxime scilicet nostrae ciuitatis, sed etiam imperiosorum populorum et regum inlustrium*;

quem laborem nobis Attici nostri leuauit labor, qui conseruatis notatisque temporibus, nihil cum inlustre praetermitteret, annorum septingentorum memoriam uno libro conligauit), whereas Nepos was interested in all *uiri illustres*, whether, to quote Gellius, *ingenio* or *imperio nobiles*. Partly on this basis, and partly from the chronology, Leuze ascribed to Nepos not only the attributed datings of Homer and of Archilochus, but also the notes on the Persian wars, on Miltiades and Themistocles (whose lives he later composed), on Coriolanus, Pyrrhus, Epicurus and Zeno, and on the censorial action against Rufinus and the divorce of Carvilius.

Since there is confirmation that most of the Greek personalities featured in Apollodorus, Nepos' most likely source, it seems likely that the loosely dated allusions to Aeschylus (11), Empedocles (14), Sophocles, Euripides, Hippocrates and Democritus (18), Socrates (18 and 19), Eudoxus (23), Aristotle and Demosthenes (31 and 35, if not also 25), and Epicurus, Zeno and Callimachus (41), will have been found in Nepos. Leuze argued that since the late dating of Plato's Sicilian journey occurs elsewhere in a context influenced by Atticus (Cicero, *Cato* 41), it must be a Varronian notice; he also sees the birth of Aristotle as derived from Varro, because it is anchored to the Varronian chronology of Manlius' trial. Without disputing his general assessment, we do know that biographical material concerning the heads of the philosophical schools was particularly popular, so that it is highly probable that Nepos too included a reference to Plato's Sicilian voyage; but perhaps unlikely that he dated correctly what the successors were to date several years too late.

Given Gellius' double process of excerpting and later compiling a further sub-group, it is all the more remarkable that this miniature chronicle still preserves the major Greek stages (*Epochemjahre*) of Eratosthenes and Apollodorus, in so far as they relate to the period it covers. We know from Clement (*Strom.* 1.138) and Eusebius (*Chron.* 1.190) that Apollodorus took over from Eratosthenes the following framework (*FGH* 241 F 1):

	From	To	Years
1	Fall of Troy	1184/3	Return of Heraclids 1104/3 80
2	Return of Heraclids	1104/3	Ionian migrations 1044/3 60
3	Ionian migrations	1044/3	Lycurgus' legislation 885/4 159
4	Lycurgus' legislation	885/4	First Olympiad 777/6 108
5	First Olympiad	777/6	Xerxes' expedition 480/79 297
6	Xerxes' expedition	480/79	Peloponnesian War start 432/1 48

	From		To		Years
7	Peloponnesian War start	432/1	Peloponnesian War end	405/4	27
8	Peloponnesian War end	405/4	Battle of Leuctra	371/0	34
9	Battle of Leuctra	371/0	Death of Philip	336/5	35
10	Death of Philip	336/5	Death of Alexander	324/3	12
	Fall of Troy	1184/3	Death of Alexander	324/3	860

The last six stages fall within Gellius' scope; for 5, 6 and 7 he offers dates accurately related to the *Chronicle's* foundation dating (5 and 6 are anchored by Varronian consular dating and *a.u.c.* [5 by an *a.u.c.* date for Marathon (9) and a consular date for the Cremera (13), 6 by an *a.u.c.* date (16) and a dictator (17)]; 7 is linked to Nepos' foundation date of 751 (19); for 8, 9 and 10 the dating is looser, and related only to adjacent events (see 26, 32 and 33).

Prior to the First Olympiad the two most-cited time-markers were the legislation of Lycurgus and the prime of Homer. Gellius indicates the latter to provide a point of chronological perspective; we will see that Cicero and others use the Lycurgan year as their backstop. Whereas Jacoby made brilliant use of Gellius, Cicero, and other Romans as quarries for the reconstruction of Apollodorus' *Chronica* (in *Phil. Untersuchungen* XVI, Berlin 1902), and Münzer (*Hermes* 40 (1905) 50–100) used the evolution of Cicero's historical comment on matters Greek and Roman from his first to his second period to gauge Atticus' and Varro's contribution to Roman chronology, there is also value in reconsidering Cicero's earlier work as evidence for his own awareness of cultural and historical sequence, and for the responsible use of synchronisms by Roman authors prior to Atticus' researches.

First a rapid survey of attempts at systematic dating in the early Roman historians. From Dionysius 1.74, and Solinus 1.27, we know the foundation dates for Rome put forward by Fabius Pictor (Olympiad 8.1 = 747 BCE) and Cincius (Olympiad 12.1 = 729 BCE); Solinus states expressly that Catulus and Nepos followed the dating of Eratosthenes and Apollodorus (Olympiad 7.2 = 751/0 BCE). The fragments of Cassius Hemina show concern for chronology; besides the evidence of Gellius (3), note fr. 20 P = Macrobius 1.16.21), dating the ritual prohibition of public business on that date of the Allia and Cremera defeats to 365 *a.u.c.* (probably 389 BCE from fr. 26 P., next cited), fr. 26 P. (Pliny, *NH* 29.12), dating the first doctor in Rome

by the consulships of Aemilius Paullus and Livius Salinator in 535 *a.u.c.* (219 BCE), and fr. 37 P. (Pliny, *NH* 13.84) and 39 P. (Censorinus 17.1), which date events of his own time both by consulships and the first (the discovery of Numa's tomb) also by the death of Numa, the second (the fourth Secular Games) also by an *a.u.c.* date. The fourth Secular Games were also used as a time-marker by all contemporary historians, including Cn. Gellius and Piso Censorius.

The evidence for Cato's *Origines* confirms only foundation dates for Ameria (fr. 49 P.), Capua (fr. 69 P.) and perhaps Antenna (fr. 21 P.). As far as we can judge from fragmentary evidence, interest in either relative or absolute chronology had not yet evolved at Rome, and these odd notices contrast with Polybius' systematic establishment of his starting-date in 1.6.1, where the capture of Rome by the Gauls is given as the same year as the peace of Antalcidas in mainland Greece and Dionysius' capture of Rhegium in Sicily, falling 19 years after Aegospotami and 16 before Leuctra. But this firm dating to 387 BCE was superseded by Varro's claims for 390 BCE, and seems to agree neither with Diodorus nor with the system used by Nepos, which would have give 388 BCE.

In contrast with this lack of chronological material Cicero's work of the 50's shows a keen concern for chronology, recognizing its contribution to the understanding of cultural and political evolution in each society, and of the relative development of Greece (really Athens) and Rome. When Cicero wanted information from Apollodorus' *Chronica* in 45 BCE he sought it from Atticus (*Att.* 12.23.2), who seems to have possessed his own copy; we might note that Gellius himself had access at least once to a copy, and quotes from his own reading three lines of Apollodorus on Menander (17.4 = *FGH* 244 F 43). It is, however, unlikely that either writer had access to the *Chronica* on many occasions, and both Jacoby (*Phil. Untersuchungen* XVI, Berlin 1902) and Münzer (*Hermes* 40 (1905) 50–100) assume Nepos as an intermediary source between Apollodorus and Cicero or Gellius, using the statements of both authors as evidence for the content of Nepos as well as for that of the Greek *Chronica*.

Part II.

Chronology and cultural history in the theoretical works
of Cicero's first period (56–51 BCE)

Of Cicero's two great theoretical works of the 50's, *De re publica* is partly historical in genre, and achieves what is for the Romans a new control of chronology, while *De oratore*, of which the organisation is not historical, rises to a new command of the whole spectrum of Greek cultural life over and beyond the narrow rhetorical tradition. If it is momentarily surprising to find Empedocles or Eudoxus listed among Gellius' *ingenio* ... *nobiles*, we should note that Empedocles is mentioned in both *De re publica* and *De oratore*, and Eudoxus' invention of the celestial sphere is described with admiration in the *De re publica*. I would like to list and annotate all the synchronisations from the surviving parts of *De re publica*, adding the references to those figures of Greek culture who are represented in Gellius' listing. The order given is for that reason chronological, like that of Gellius.

1 *De re publica* 2.18 (cf. 2.20, below). Homer, Lycurgus and the foundation dating. Cicero prefaces his foundation date for Rome, Olympiad 7.2 (751/0) with the phrase *id quod Graecorum inuestigatur annalibus*: this suggests that, while he certainly used Polybius, *quo nemo fuit in exquirendis temporibus diligentior* (2.27), as his primary source for Roman chronology, he has also consulted Apollodorus, or another source based on Eratosthenes—perhaps Nepos himself. Here, as in 2.20, Cicero is concerned to show how Greece had preceded Rome in evolution, being “already full of poets and musicians” when Rome was founded: for, on the Eratosthenic base-date of 776 BCE for the First Olympiad, the first Games are dated 108 years after Lycurgus' legislation, while Homer lived about 30 years before Lycurgus. In his *Historical Commentary on Polybius*, Vol. 1, Oxford 1957, 670, F. W. Walbank has shown the sophistication of Cicero's treatment here, which takes in unobtrusively Timaeus' solution to the discrepancy between the date of the legislator and of the Games which he was said by some to have founded. It is very probable that the hypothesis of a second Lycurgus was in Polybius also, but in view of Cicero's judgement in *De oratore* (2.59) on the erudition and style of Timaeus we should not rule out the possibility that he read Timaeus for himself. Jacoby, *FGH* 244 2 B, F63b and 64 (cf. 241 F 1) shows that this is Apollodorus' dating for Lycurgus, and notes (pp. 747–8) that the post-dating of Homer by 30 years (from 944 to 914) in Cicero, in Velleius (1.8), in Pliny (*NH* 7.74), in Gellius (17.21.4) and in Solinus (40.14) must depend on Nepos' *Chronica*, though it originates in the confusion of Nepos' source, Apollodorus, between the poet's *akme* and his related date of death.

2 *De re publica* 2.42. Between the chronological marker of Lycurgus' legislation and the foundation of Rome there is also preserved Cicero's Olympic and relative dating for the foundation of Carthage, ... *sexaginta annis antiquior, quod erat xxxviii anti primam Olympiadem condita*. Timaeus gave this foundation date, 814/3 BCE, for both Carthage and Rome, and the form of this fragmentary sentence suggests that Cicero was both reporting Timaeus and asserting the Polybian date for Rome (751/0 BCE) as a correction.

3 *De re publica* 2.20. The damaged text apparently reports that [...]us, the maternal grandson of an unidentified figure, died in the year in which Simonides was born. As Mommsen established, the lost figure must be Stesichorus, whose death is reported by the *Suda* as coinciding with the birth of Simonides in 556/5 BCE. Since the time interval between the death of Hesiod (attributed to the first Olympiad year, 777/6 BCE) and the possible birth-date of Stesichorus was so great, Apollodorus had rejected the two-generation link made by his sources between Hesiod and Stesichorus. Cicero, then, must be denying the relationship (cf. *FGH* 244 F 337, p. 805), and will be arguing another correction in chronology, breaking the chain of poetic succession.

4 *De re publica* 2.2 and 59. Solon, mentioned in a sequence of Athenian legislators between Draco and Cleisthenes at 2.2, is dated very loosely at 2.59, where his relief of debt is described as *non longis temporibus ante* the late 5th century abolition of *nexus* at Rome.

5 *De re publica* 1.68. The allusion to Pisistratus' bodyguard is undated.

6 *De re publica* 2.28. Pythagoras is said to have come to Italy in the 4th year of Tarquinius Superbus: Cicero adds that the 62nd Olympiad (532–529 BCE) covered both the inception of the reign and the arrival of Pythagoras, and notes that, by counting up the regnal years, it can be shown that Numa died 140 years before Pythagoras came to Italy. The false connection between Numa and Pythagoras was a *cause célèbre*, and Hemina (fr. 39 P., above) had shown an equal care in dating Numa's accession to 535 years before the digging up of his alleged tomb, full of Pythagorean works, in 181 BCE, that is, to 715 BCE. Cicero himself repudiates the connection at *De or.* 2.154 and *Tusc.* 4.2–3, as does Livy, 1.18, but nowhere with such careful chronology. However, as Walbank shows (*Historical Commentary on Polybius*, Vol. 1, Oxford 1957, 665–9), by Cicero's own foundation date of 751 BCE and the total of regnal years for Romulus and Numa, even allowing for the 18-month *interregnum* reported at Livy 1.17, Numa's death in 673/2 BCE must have been more than 140 years before the arrival of Pythagoras in Olympiad 62.4 (= 529/8 BCE). Since Cicero has provided a precise Olympiad dating, it is not unreasonable that his relative dating should approximate to the nearest decade, as in 2.42 above, where Carthage was founded in 751 BCE (note that *quinque et* may have stood before *sexaginta* in the damaged sentence); compare also his rounding-off of the years of the monarchy from 244 to 240 (see Walbank's discussion, *loc. cit.*), and his approximation, in *Tusc.* 1.3, of the known interval from 753 BCE to 240 BCE as 510 years.

7 *De re publica* 1.5. Miltiades. With Themistocles, Miltiades was already a precedent for Cicero as benefactor of his ungrateful country in *Pro Sest.* 141: *Miltiadi calamitas, qui illam ciuitatem paulo ante seruarat*. But no chronological references occur here, and the assimilation and synchronism of the careers of Themistocles and Coriolanus first appear in *Brutus* 42 where it is expressly introduced as a reaction to Atticus' criticism of rhetorical parallelism in history. In his reuse of the parallel at *Laelius* 42 (see Münzer, *Hermes* 40 (1905) 83–4) Cicero adopted Atticus' chronology, but sacrificed truth to rhetoric.

8 *De re publica* 3.19. Empedocles is mentioned with Pythagoras for their prohibition of the killing and eating of animals.

9 *De re publica* 1.16, 2.22 and 51. Socrates is naturally the subject of several allusions, but they are literary and philosophical, without chronological relevance.

10 *De re publica* 1.17. Dionysius of Syracuse illustrates tyranny.

11 *De re publica* 1.22. The sphere of Eudoxus.

12 *De re publica* 1.18. Plato's voyage. Cicero reports that after Socrates died Plato went first to Egypt, then to Italy and Sicily to learn Pythagorean teachings, and stayed with Archytas and Timaeus at Locri. This suggests no specific date, but avoids putting the visit to Archytas as absurdly late he does (on Varro's authority) in *Cato* 41, where he gives the consular year of 349 BCE.

Other figures are not mentioned in the surviving parts of *De re publica*. But if we move back to *De oratore*, composed between 56 and 54 BCE, what Cicero is lacking in chronological concern is balanced by the wide panorama of cultural figures who appear in the work, particularly in the sections which allude to recognized canons—for instance the choice of Epaminondas and Hannibal as model generals (*De or.* 1.210; cf. *Inv.* 1.55–60 for rhetorical exercises based on Epaminondas' career), or the pitting of Rome's three tragedians, Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius, again Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides (here as always in chronological order) in 3.27. Other passages on cultural, as opposed to rhetorical, history feature virtually all the intellectuals named in Gellius' list, and one of two whom he omits. Thus the triple embassy which is the starting-point of Gellius' exercise is first mentioned in an extant Latin author at *De or.* 2.155; but Cicero does not date it, and was still unsure of the date when he asked Atticus ten years later (*Att.* 12.23) to give him the context from Apollodorus; yet it had been described, no doubt as autopsy, by Polybius and then Rutilius (Polybius 33.2 = Gellius 6.14). Cicero is, however, able to give the date correctly in *Acad. pr.* 2.137.

In *De oratore* 3.56 a similar attempt to create cultural parallels matches earlier Roman worthies against Lycurgus, Pittacus and Solon,

and leads to the enumeration of Cicero's canon of natural philosophers, Pythagoras, Democritus and Anaxagoras (Democritus appears again with Anaxagoras in *Tusc.* 5.115, and with Anaxagoras and Empedocles at *Acad.* 1.44). If Anaxagoras, whose chronology was certainly discussed by Apollodorus (see *FGH* 244 F 31 and 34 and Mansfeld in *Mnemosyne* 32 (1979) 39–65) is omitted by Gellius, this could show his ignorance of Apollodorus, or simply desire for economy in an already crowded generation. In *De oratore*, the longest sequence dealing with cultural history is from 3.127–143; among a large array of personalities it includes the following leaders and intellectuals found in Gellius' selection: Socrates and Plato (129: Gellius 17, 19 and 20), Hippocrates (132: Gellius 18), Callimachus (132 as critic, not poet: Gellius 41), Pisistratus (137 as Homeric editor: Gellius 5), Epaminondas (139: Gellius 26), Pythagoras (139: Gellius 6), and Philip employing Aristotle to teach Alexander (142: Gellius 28, 30 and 32). Of all the *docti* listed by Gellius only Menander and Archilochus go unmentioned in *De oratore*, and also in all of Cicero's work before 46 BCE, although Archilochus may have occupied a niche in the lacuna which interrupts the succession of poets at *De re publica* 2.20.

Another feature to note is that neither Cicero nor Gellius include the great Greek historians in their survey, although earlier in *De oratore* (2.53–9) Cicero gives a chronologically ordered account of all Greek historians from Pherecydes, Hellanicus and Acusilaus to *minimus natu horum omnium* Timaeus. Apollodorus surely gave dating for all the historians: cf. *FGH* 244 F7, on Thucydides, and Gellius' own citation from the chronicles of Pamphila (Egyptian, 1st century AD) for the exact ages of Hellanicus, Herodotus and Thucydides when the Peloponnesian War broke out (Gellius 15.23 = *FGH* 244 F 7b). I would deduce that even before Atticus and Varro initiated their research into Roman history not only Nepos, but also Cicero and no doubt also other contemporary writers, including Atticus and Varro themselves, had a firm grasp of the cultural history of Athens and other Greek states.

The panorama of Roman events offered by Gellius' summary is rather different. From Varro and Nepos together he offers eight precise datings based on consular years; but whereas both the Varronian source and Nepos relate *Greek* events to their separate Roman foundation dates (the *akme* of Homer, 3; Marathon, 9; the Thirty Tyrants, 14; the war with Pyrrhus, 37 [derived from Nepos according to Leuze, *Rh. Mus.* 66 (1911) 269]; the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, 16; the accession of Philip and/or the birth of Alexander, 28), *Roman* events

are related, predominantly in passages assigned to the Varronian source(s), to consular years (the Cremera, 13; the Caudine Forks, 36; the outbreak of the first Punic War, 40; the debut of Andronicus and the birth of Ennius, 44 and 45). Only two Roman events, the outbreak of the first Punic War (40) and the divorce of Carvilius (45) receive foundation datings, and the latter is perhaps wrong. A third event can be dated by the named censors (39). Other Roman events are only loosely dated, which could be due to Gellius' own form of notes. However, it would seem that the precisely dated Roman material is chiefly Varronian, while Gellius has gone to Nepos for the synchronisms between Greek and Roman items.

By Leuze's assessment (*Rh. Mus.* 66 (1911) 269) the following material is, or could be, from Nepos: the correlation of Archilochus and Solon with Roman kings; the secession of the plebs and the exile of Coriolanus; the condemnation of Manlius; the war with Pyrrhus; the expulsion of Rufinus from the Senate; and finally the affair of Spurius Carvilius. This list includes several obvious pieces of political history, but also some less predictable items of social and moral history. It suggests that Nepos' chronicle, though it might offer nothing more than the prime of Roman literary figures, contained a good representation of Roman foreign and domestic political history.

In Cicero's later works, *Brutus*, *De finibus*, *Tusculans*, *Cato* and *Laelius*, there is ample proof of his more detailed knowledge of Roman literary history even if, as Münzer has shown (*Hermes* 40 (1905) 50–100), 2nd century political history has been slightly bent to avoid evidence of un-Roman activities by Cicero's exemplary Cato and Aemilianus. There is still nothing to add to Münzer's magisterial demonstration, except to return to Gellius in order to juxtapose his report on Livius Andronicus and Cicero's two notices of the same event. In *Brutus* 72 Cicero's report takes a form almost identical to that of Gellius 42–3: information found only in Gellius is bracketed:

- a) *Livius [Andronicus] primum fabulam ... docuit.*
- b) *C. Claudio [Centhone Appi] Caeci filio et M. [Sempronio] Tuditano consulibus.*
- c) *anno ipso ante quam natus est Ennius [consules sequuntur Q. Valerius et C. Mamilius, quibus natum esse Q. Ennium poetam M. Varro in primo de poetis scripsit].*
- d) *post Romam conditam quarto decimo et quingentesimo, ut hic ait quem nos sequimur.*

Whatever Cicero's debt to Atticus, it was surely less that Atticus owed to the researches of Varro. But Cicero's second use of this material, at *Tusc.* 1.3, illustrates his subordination of the newly precise datings to the same overriding purpose evident in *De oratore*; he looks back to the past, when Greece used to surpass Rome *doctrina et omni litterarum genere*: for among the poets, the oldest type of *docti* in Greece, Homer and Hesiod lived before Rome was founded, and Archilochus while Romulus still reigned (Nepos knew better). But Rome received the art of poetry late—and at this point the first production of Livius is given its full dating, *annis enim fere LCCCX post Romam conditam Liuius fabulam docuit C. Claudio, Caeci filio, M. Tuditano consulibus, anno ante natum Ennium*. As he always had, Cicero argues from Rome's late start, and her natural *ingenia*, to the future when Roman cultural history will match that of Greece. The message is patriotic and tendentious, but the historical background is fully realized and honestly presented.

III

Ovid's Narrative Poem, the *Fasti*

18. Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti* : Sources and Motivation

Returning recently to Ovid's *Fasti*¹ I was struck for the first time by an oddly recurring motif. The national legends and ancient cults of the Roman ceremonial year do not offer an obvious context for comedy, let alone the comedy (perhaps "farce" would be more apposite) of frustrated seduction, but Ovid has composed no less than four episodes on this theme within the compass of six books; the attempt of Priapus on the nymph Lotis in 1.393–40, that of Faunus on Omphale in 2.303–356, Anna Perenna's ruse to seduce Mars, forestalled in 3.677–96,² and Priapus' attempt to rape Vesta in 6.321–44. Three of these narratives have since been the object of special scholarly interest in recent years, since they have no known Hellenistic or Roman source:³ indeed that tale of Faunus, Hercules, and Omphale seems to conflate incompatible religious elements while the two Priapus narratives are notorious doublets, relying on the same device of comic denouement. Thus I

1 The text of *Fasti* quoted is *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum libri sex*, ed. Alton, Wormell, and Courtney, Leipzig 1978. Other works frequently cited are F. P. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten*, Heidelberg 1957; Hans Herter, *De Priapo* (*Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten* 23), Gießen 1932; Walther Kraus, s.v. *Ovidius* in *RE* XVIII.1 (1907–86), repr. in *Wege der Forschung* XCII: *Ovid*, ed. M. von Albrecht and E. Zinn, Darmstadt 1968; Eckard Lefèvre, "Die Lehre von der Entstehung der Tieropfer in Ovids Fasten 1.355–456," *Rh. Mus.* 123 (1976) 39–64 = Lefèvre I, and "Die Schlacht an der Cremera in Ovids Fasten," *Rh. Mus.* 127 (1980) 152–162 = Lefèvre II; G. E. Rizzo, *La Pittura Ellenistico-Romana*, Milan 1929; Karl Schefold, *Die Wände Pompejis*, Berlin 1957; Stith Thompson, *A Motif Index of Folk Literature* I–V, Indiana 1933–36; and Karl Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, Berlin 1912. These will be cited by the name of their authors only.

2 This narrative need not be treated here, since the derivation of the tale from a mime *Anna Perenna* by Decimus Laberius has been established by F. Giancotti, *Mimo e Gnome: Studio su Decimo Laberio e Publilio Siro*, Biblioteca di Cult. Cont. 98, Florence 1967 16 f.; see also Bömer 2.179.

3 Compare Walther Kraus, *RE* (1957) = *WdF* 132 on the stories of Anna Perenna and Faunus, Omphale, and Hercules, and Herter, *De Priapo* 81 f. and Lefèvre I.51 on the Priapus narratives.

was prompted to investigate Ovid's motives and possible sources for the composition of these episodes. They have an importance beyond their own content, since Ovid has deliberately introduced them into his more serious context, whether or not he actually created the fictions for the occasion.

To understand the effect of these passages we must first consider Ovid's scope for humour in the patriotic context of the *Fasti* and take into account the differing roles played by Faunus and Priapus in Roman public and private religious practice. Again the assessment of Ovid's possible models for these scenes depends on interpretation of the tone and structure of each episode and will be further affected by our assumptions about Ovid's composition of the *Fasti* and the nature of his reworking of the poem in exile. Thus the specific inquiries lead in my final section to general reconsideration of some recent scholarly criticism of the *Fasti* in the light of Ovid's poetic raw material and the selective use he has made of it.

In general terms what were his motives for introducing these episodes of sexual frustration? A psychoanalyst might toy with theories attributing this obsessive motif to sexual difficulties in Ovid's middle age: Walther Kraus⁴ has more aptly related the stress on failed seduction to the poet's late concern with appeasing the moral indignation of his emperor. The master of love had now to show that lust does not pay.

But the treatment in *Fasti* has no parallel in the near-contemporary *Metamorphoses*. Not that the *Metamorphoses* were without episodes of unsuccessful seduction: the extended story of Apollo and Daphne comes early (1.466–567) and another of Apollo's failures is reported more briefly at 14.132–143 by the Sibyl who resisted his advances. But there is generally a different tone, exemplified by Ovid's sympathetic analysis of Daphne's chastity (1.474–489) and terror (1.524–545) and by his respectful portrayal of Apollo. The note of farce characteristic of the frustrated seductions in *Fasti* is found in a quite different but traditional context in *Metamorphoses*, when the sun god enables the deceived Vulcan to trap Venus and Mars, and the sight of their guilty embrace provokes appreciative divine laughter (4.171–189): here satisfaction exposed, not frustration, is the theme.⁵

4 See Kraus' *RE* (1961) = *WdF* 137.

5 I am most grateful to Professor Richard Tarrant for pointing out to me the significant contrast between the use of this theme in *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. The tale of Apollo and Daphne is probably used as the basis for the incomplete saga

Can we believe that Ovid's motive in *Fasti* was moral deterrence—*cauebunt qui audierint faciant*, to quote Plautus' comment on a similar narrative in the *Casina* (901)? The moral outcome of these tales is somewhat undermined by the old Ovidian relish in their telling, with, as I shall argue, one exception. A more likely motive would be the desire for a change of tone, for sheer comic relief. What were the opportunities for comedy in *Fasti*? I use the term comedy here in an unsophisticated sense, to cover popular humour based on amicable trickery, on the frustration of villains, on feasting, drinking and sexual fulfillment—ideas linked in Aristophanic comedy with the cult of fertility and offering a counterpart to its sacred marriage.

Of the Olympian gods taken over by Rome, Hermes/Mercury was associated with trickery because of his theft of Apollo's cattle reported in the hymn to Hermes and was considered as a patron of sharp business dealings. It colours his performance as prologue speaker of Plautus' *Amphitruo*, where you will find allusions very similar to the prayer of Ovid's merchant at *Fasti* 5.675–692 for success in his deceitful dealings.⁶ But almost all humour in the *Fasti* is related to the god most associated with comedy, Dionysus/Liber, or to his entourage of Silenus and the satyrs.⁷ It is as though Ovid had balanced his scenes from the *pre-text* of Roman legend and prehistory with substantial elements of the satyr play, a genre which despite Horace's encouragement had probably lapsed for good in Augustan Rome.

We might start, then, with the Dionysiac *komos* depicted on Greek vases and in the satyr plays, generally including Silenus on his donkey, a group of satyrs whom he leads, and Maenads or accompanying nymphs. The sexuality of the satyrs and even of the donkey⁸ is often rampant on vases, but it seems unlikely that it was allowed much display in the ac-

of Jupiter and Juturna in *Fasti* 2.585–616. The comic relish of Ovid's narrative of Venus and Mars reflects that of the original at *Odyssey* 8.280–343. (See also n. 21.)

6 See Norman E. Brown, *Hermes the Thief*, New York 1947, and compare Plautus, *Amphitruo* 1–14.

7 For a representative range of illustrations of Dionysus and his entourage, see *Dionysus and His Circle, Ancient through Modern*, catalogue of the Fogg Museum exhibition of the same title, Cambridge, Mass. 1980, with an essay by Albert Henrichs surveying popular aspects of the cult of Dionysus (1–12), and Caroline Hauser's introduction to the exhibit.

8 Compare *Dionysus and His Circle*, 4b, a red-figure vase by the Kleophrades painter, and for ancient reference to the licentiousness of the donkey, Suzanne Mills, "Ovid's Donkey Act," *CJ* 73 (1978–79) 303–306, esp. 304 n. 6.

tion of satyr drama, or that the dramatic texts were coloured with actual obscenity.

In Hellenistic society the *komos* became an increasing favourite as a theme of visual art as well as the lighter genres of literature and developed a fantasy social world of its own. Much of the artistic evidence has been gathered in *Dionysus and His Circle*, to which I will refer again, but the exhibition it represents could not include all the wall paintings of Herculaneum and Pompeii, and it is sufficient to consult the list of subjects in Schefold's catalogue to realize the ubiquitous nature of these Dionysiac scenes. In Hellenistic poetry Moschus' lament for Bion represents a scene of pastoral mourning: the satyrs and sable-cloaked Priapi grieve, while the Pans groan and the nymphs of the springs lament as their fountains weep tears.⁹ Lucretius reports the countrymen's faith in these creatures (4.580–589) and in *Georgics* 1.7–20 Virgil invokes a similar Latin group to foster agricultural fertility, listing Liber and Ceres, the Faun, *agrestum praesentia numina* (10) the dryads, Pan, guardian of sheep, and Silvanus. Ovid inherited this society of woodland spirits, and at *Met.* 1.192–195, when Jupiter plans to destroy mankind in a flood of vengeance upon Lycaon and Arcadia, he anticipated leaving the earth to be enjoyed by nymphs and satyrs, Fauni and Silvani. A common feature is the easy multiplication of singular deities. Did Ovid cherish a distinct concept of these different groups in his mind? Artists had found it useful to display pluralized Cupids on friezes, engaged in collective activity such as chariot racing or the vintage;¹⁰ the plural Panes and Priapi probably owe their existence to the ancient equivalent of repeating wallpaper. But once plural, they lost the status of the single deity, and their identity was subordinated to their animal natures. As such they were seen as lecherous, but because they were less than human, their lust was normally frustrated. Jupiter, Mercury, or Neptune had a claim to successful rape, because they were divine and ultimately benefited their victims by begetting some future hero to do his mother honour, but the sexual code of Arcadia normally frustrated the more animal spirits of enjoying even the nymphs, their usual companions. Thus Syrinx becomes a reed bed to escape Pan in *Met.* 1.689–712, and Lotis

9 Moschus 3.27–29 *Kai Satouroi mouronto melaghlainoi te Priēpoi / kai Panes stonacheounto to son melos, hai te kath houlan / Kranides ôdouranto, kai houdata dakma geouto.*

10 As in the Atrium (Schefold 146) and Orcus (147) of the Casa dei Vettii and the Atrium of the Casa di Sirico (Schefold 164) at Pompeii.

at *Met.* 9.347–348 is turned into the lotus flower to save her from Priapus.¹¹ In *Met.* 14.637–641 Vertumnus finally succeeds in courting Pomona, but she has already stirred futile lust in the satyrs, Panes, Silenus, and finally Priapus.¹² It is in this rustic milieu that Ovid finds his licentious comedy.

Naturally Roman cult, the proper theme of *Fasti*, paid no attention to satyrs or anonymous nymphs. Of those associated with Bacchus Pan was recognized as the equivalent of Faunus,¹³ a genuine recipient of Roman cult, but Priapus, son of Dionysus and Aphrodite, was chiefly the object of private worship. Herter¹⁴ suggests that his cult was imported along with the Bacchanalia at the beginning of the second century before Christ, but even in the first century of our era it was not Priapus but Liber who replaced the archaic Mutinus Titinus as embodiment of phallic fertility. According to Palmer (*op. cit.*, 198), after Domitius Calvinus eliminated the shrine of Mutinus to make his new baths, Mutinus' function was transferred to a new tholos of Liber on the Velia. But though Palmer himself equates Mutinus and Liber with Priapus on the basis of their common function, there is no evidence that Varro or his contemporaries gave this status to Priapus. Instead he was affectionately reproduced as a scarecrow in cottage gardens and celebrated by poets in the collection of *Priapea* believed to date from Ovid's generation¹⁵ but still had no official role at Rome, where he was treated as either *ruber hortorum custos*, or as the exotic god of Hellespontine Lamp-sacus.¹⁶

11 *Met.* 9.347–348 *Lotis in hanc nymphe, fugiens obscena Priapi / contulerat uersos ser-uato nomine uultus.*

12 *Met.* 14.637–641 *quid non et Satyri, saltatibus apta iuuentus / fecere et pinu praeincti cornua Panes / Silenusque suis semper iuuenalior annis / quique deus fures uel falce uel inguine terret / ut poterentur ea?*

13 See W. F. Otto, s.v. *Faunus*, *RE* VI, 2054–73, Wissowa 208–212.

14 Herter 25–28, esp. 28 *sane publico honore non aequae fruebatur atque fructus erat Alexandriae neque fere vera religione homines politiores eum coluisse quisquam sibi persuadebit.* See also Jessen, s.v. *Priapus*, in Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, 3.2.2967–90 and on Mutinus Titinus, R. E. A. Palmer, *Roman Religion and Roman Empire*, Philadelphia 1974, 187–206.

15 They are Ovidian in technique, and a phrase from *Priapea* 3.8, *inepta loci*, is attributed to Ovid himself by Seneca Rhetor, *Contr.* 1.2.23.

16 *Fasti* 6.33, cf. 1.415 *ruber, hortorum decus ac tutela, Priapus*; *Fasti* 1.440 *Hellespontico ... deo*. The adjective seems to have been brought into Latin poetry by Virgil, *Geor.* 4.111.

Liber himself was worshipped at several festivals in the Roman year, and one of Ovid's most innocent comic episodes is introduced in connection with the Liberalia of March 17. What starts as a conventional celebration of Dionysus' miraculous birth, his triumph over the East and against his Mediterranean enemies Lycurgus, Pentheus, and the Etruscan pirates¹⁷ becomes an account of the sacrifices offered at the Liberalia and the discovery of honey to sweeten the sacrificial honey cakes. The story of Liber's capture of the wild bees is introduced with the promise of laughter; *non habet ingratos fabula nostra iocos* (*F.* 3.738) and soon leads to a simple folktale, "he who gets stung," as Silenus, searching greedily for honey, stands on his donkey to reach the honeycomb in the tree stump and provokes the whole swarm, to tumble under his donkey's hooves riddled with stings,¹⁸ while the satyrs and Liber enjoy the scene: *concurrunt satyri, turgentiaque ora parentis / rident ... ridet et ipse deus* (*F.* 3.757–759). These comments are almost formulaic, as we will see; at such fundamental humour even the gods must laugh. The two motifs—a promise of a good jest (cf. *F.* 2.304; 3.738; 6.319) and the divine laughter as seal of approval (cf. *F.* 1.438; 2.355, 377; 3.343, 693, 5.691) recur in almost every story with an element of trickery.

I might mention here the three brief episodes which lack full narrative treatment; in book 2 two explanations are given, one Greek, one Roman for Faunus' requirement that his worshippers run naked; the second, simpler tale is of Romulus and Remus, whose sacrifice of a goat is interrupted by the alarm of a cattle raid before they can share the feast. Remus and his men are first to return, having recovered the cattle, and eat up Romulus' share also; Romulus' rueful laughter is at his own slowness without resentment at the trick, which he takes in good part.¹⁹ Book 3 presents another folktale, in which Numa first overcomes Picus and Faunus with wine, in order to make them reveal

17 The sequence is the same as in Propertius' hymn to Bacchus, 3.17.21–26.

18 Compare *Dionysus and His Circle*, n. 42, p. 62 for the panel by Piero di Cosimo illustrating this story; this panel, dubbed "The Misfortunes of Silenus" with another "The Discovery of Honey" in the Worcester Art Museum, were part of a set painted by Piero for the Vespucci palace in Florence.

19 *Fasti* 2.359–380, esp. 377–378 *risit et indoluit Fabios potuisse Remumque / uincere, Quintilios non potuisse suos*. Although the possibility is not considered by Lefèvre II (see n. 109 below) the delayed position of this Roman *aition* and its stress on the Fabii make it likely that this section was inserted by Ovid in exile, and should be counted as a fourth "Fabian" addition.

how he can entice Jupiter Elicius,²⁰ and then bandies word games with Jupiter so as to implement his demand for a sacrifice without cost of human life. Again the trick is sanctioned by the god's laughter (3.343). The third example is sexual comedy in its simplest form, the last of Ovid's aetiologies for Anna Perenna, a story like many in *Fasti* in having no antecedent in formal mythology. When Mars approaches the elderly Anna Perenna, newly promoted among the gods, to act as go-between and win him access to Minerva, she promises to bring Minerva to his bed but instead has herself escorted to his chamber covered with the bridal veil, like the classic false bride of folktale. Mars quickly realizes the deception and is covered with shame and anger, but the new goddess laughs, and Venus gives her approval.²¹

Faunus is the only one of the *numina* associated with Dionysus who qualifies in his own right for inclusion in the *Fasti*, since he is the acknowledged patron of the Luperalia. Accounts of his origin are usually blurred and contradictory; thus he is presented by Virgil²² as king of the Laurentes, father of Latinus, himself child of Picus and descended from Saturn, while Dionysus of Halicarnassus makes him a descendant of Mars and king of the aborigines on the site of Rome before Evander the Arcadian colonized the Palatine.²³ In Dionysus' account the Arcadians construct a shrine not to Faunus but to Lycaean Pan, the most ancient and most honoured of all gods. He adds that the Romans call this shrine Lupercal but that it should be called Lykaion in Greek. As Michael Grant has shown, Evander was identified with Pan, or Faunus, Pan's Italian counterpart, by some antiquarians; Evander's speaking name "Goodman" suggests to Grant associations with one familiar derivation of Faunus from *fauere*, to be kind or supporting. Certainly Faunus, patron of forests and agriculture, had two major etymological

20 *Fasti* 3.289–324, based on Valerius Antias (Plut. *Numa* 15) : the trick of capturing the deities by making them drunk is surely borrowed from Dionysus' circle again; compare the trick played on Silenus by the nymph Aegle and the two shepherds in *Eclogue* 6.13–26.

21 *Fasti* 3.676–695, esp. 693 : *ridet amatorem carae noua diua Mineruae / nec res hac Veneri gratior ulla fuit*. We find the same laughter in *Met.* 4.187–189, where, however, the god's open envy of Mars (*optat sic fieri turpis*) is modeled on *Od.* 8.335–343.

22 *Aen.* 7.47–48 and 81 : *oracula Fauni, fatidici genitoris*.

23 D. H. 1.31–32. The conflict is discussed by Michael Grant, *Roman Myths*. London 1971, 52–55.

associations; the root *faure*, according to Wissowa²⁴ associated him with the fertile spring breeze Favonius, Lucretius' *genitabilis aura Fauoni* (Lucr. 1.11); the wind arises in February about the time of the Lupercalia and his concern with fertility matches the fertility magic of the festival. A rival derivation from *fari* given by Varro,²⁵ treated Faunus or the Fauni as prophetic deities perceived only as voices in remote woodland places, in which Faunus and Picus were intermediaries for Numa in his access to Jupiter Elicius.

Around the fertilizing Faunus who presides over the Lupercalia Ovid has constructed a great panel of stories occupying the centre of *Fasti* 2 from 266–445. He makes it clear that he is identifying Faunus with Pan through the conventional Graeco-Roman etymology relating *lupus* to *lycos*, seen as the root of *Lykaïos*, the title of Arcadian Pan. He also knows his other name, Inuus (*ab ineundo passim omnibus animalibus*²⁶) and the baffling oracle of Juno, *Italidas matres ... sacer hircus inito* (F. 2.441) which led to the ritual flogging of married women with strips of hide from the sacrificial goat. This trades on a less civilized aspect of the god, and Holleman,²⁷ though he is extravagant in his conclusions about Ovid's motivation in constructing the Lupercalia panel, is right to recognize that Ovid knew Faunus' dangerous side. Thus Lucretius and Pliny depict him (or the Fauni) as *incubi* responsible for nightmares, which presumably often took the form of rape dreams.²⁸

The antiquity of the Lupercalia and its recent restoration to favour by Augustus fully justify the attention given by Ovid to these rituals. The reader may be surprised by the introduction of a Greek *aition* for the practice of nudity at the festival, since Ovid also offers a full Roman *aition* in the ensuing tale of Romulus and Remus and the stolen

24 Wissowa 212.

25 *Fauni dei Latinorum ita ut et Faunus et Fauna sit : hos uersibus quos uocant Saturnios in siluestribus locis traditum est solitos fari <futura, a> quo fando Faunos dictos*; cf. Virgil *Aen.* 7.81 (n. 22 above) and Lucr. 4.580–583 : *haec loca capripedes satyros nymphasque tenere / finitimi fingunt, et faunus esse loquuntur / quorum noctiuago strepitu ludoque iocanti / adfirmant uulgo taciturna silentia rumpi*, also D.H. 5.16 which also conflates Faunus with Pan.

26 Quoted from Servius on *Aen.* 6.775.

27 It is not clear how the Lupercalia, apparently flourishing in 44 BCE, could have lapsed to the point of needing revival in Augustus' time. See A. W. J. Holleman, "Ovid and the Lupercalia," *Historia* 22 (1973) 260–268, and J. H. G. W. Liebeschuetz, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*, Oxford 1979, 62 and n. 9.

28 Cf. Lucr. 4.582–583 above and Pliny *NH* 8.151, 25.29, 27.107, and 30.84.

goat-flesh. I have suggested above (n. 19) that Ovid may not have included this Romulean *aition* in his original version of book 2, since it seems to be a "Fabian" passage. But if he did not use the story, which had been known in outline since the earliest Roman historiography, we have merely to ask a different question : not, why did he add the Greek *aition*, but why did he prefer it to the Roman tale? In view of the Roman distaste for nudity²⁹ he may have preferred to give the custom a Greek origin: otherwise the only obvious incentive is the undoubted appeal of the Greek tale as burlesque comedy. But it is time to consider Ovid's treatment in detail.

Fasti 2.303–356: Faunus, Hercules and Omphale

The story of Faunus' encounter with Hercules and Omphale blends three narrative elements, for which we should probably seek separate origins.

1. (*F.* 2.305–316) Hercules as consort of Omphale, their travels and picnic before the convenient grotto.
2. (*F.* 2.317–330) The traditional exchange of garments between male and female, here associated with the preliminary period of chastity before initiation to Bacchus : the physical description of the transfer of clothing occupies eight lines.
3. (*F.* 2.331–356) The misdirected assault and humiliation of Faunus.

For the first two ingredients we can provide a context of sorts within Latin poetry. Hercules' year of enslavement to Omphale, originally a penalty imposed by Apollo for the slaughter of Iphitus, is always seen by Roman literature as the extreme case of *seruitium amoris*: this does not begin with elegy, for the *Miles gloriosus* of Terence's *Eunuchus* justifies his surrender to Thais with the precedent *qui minus quam Hercules seruiuit Omphalae?*³⁰ So Propertius ignores the mythical cause of Hercules' bondage and treats his submission to Omphale's beauty³¹ as an exemplum for Propertius' own servitude in 3.11: *quid mirare meam si uersat femina uitam?* Ironically his Hercules, shut out from the shrine of Bona

29 Cf. now Crowther, "Nudity and Morality : Athletics in Italy," *CJ* 76 (1980–81) 119–123.

30 Ter. *Eun.* 1026.

31 Prop. 3.11.17, 19–20 : *Omphale in tantum formae processit honorem / ... ut qui pacato stetisset in orbe columnas / tam dura traheret mollia pensa manu.*

Dea, pleads to the women in 4.9.47–50 that he too has dressed and worked as a woman. Without itemizing all Ovid's uses of this tradition we might note that in *A.A.* 2.215 if Hercules again serves as a precedent in advising the lover on *obsequium*; the lover can make himself useful by holding a mirror (2.216) or a parasol (*A.A.* 2.209, the only parallel to Omphale's parasol in *Fasti* 2). It is clearly a *topos*, and Galinsky rightly contrasts the burlesque and epic parody of the *Fasti* passage with the elegiac sentimentalism of *Ars Amatoria* or the more extended passage of Deianeira's reproaches in *Heroides* 9.³² Deianeira may have drawn some inspiration from Sophocles' heroine in *Trach.* 252 f., but there is a great difference in the tone of the allusions. The full treatment of *Heroides* combines all the *topoi* inherent in the relationship of Hercules with Omphale which are scattered in Propertius, Ovid, and later Seneca and his imitator in the *Oetaeus*. This material can be used to show what is unconventional in the passage of *Fasti* 2. There are three main sections in Deianeira's reproaches: first, she describes Hercules' female dress, with necklace, bracelets, Lydian *mitra* and girdle (*Her.* 9.57–66), and embroidered Sidonian gown; like other poets Ovid contrasts the arms or shoulders which supported the heavens (58) with their effeminate covering.³³ Next Deianeira introduces (with a line repeated by Ovid in *A.A.* 2.219) the servile women's work of spinning, again stressing, as do most poets, the clumsiness of Hercules' hands which snap the thread and even break the distaff (*Her.* 9.73–80). Finally she evokes Omphale, clad in the lion skin and wearing the quiver of arrows, as she brandishes the famous club (103, 111–119).³⁴ Common to all the passages except *Fasti* is the contrast of Hercules' present humiliation and former heroic activities, especially the description of his work, spinning. The scene in *Fasti* is stripped of dignity, however, by Ovid's de-

32 "Hercules Ovidianus," W. St. 85 (1972) 93–116, here 114–115. It should be noted, however, that since Lachmann (*Kleinere Schriften*, Berlin 1876, 2.60 the authenticity of this "letter" has been doubted: See Courtney, *BICS* 12 (1965) 63–66 and Vessey, *CQ* 19 (1969) 349–361 and the counterarguments of H. Jacobson, *Ovid's Heroides*, Princeton 1974, 228 f., who sees *A.A.* 2.215–222 as a reworking of *Heroides* 9.

33 Jewels and oriental female clothing: Prop. 4.9.49, Sen. *HF* 467–470, *Phae.* 318–322, *Oet.* 374–376. Supporting the heavens, Ovid *A.A.* 2.218, Sen. *Phae.* 327–328. Pacifying the world, Prop. 3.11.19.

34 Woolworking, spinning, Prop. 4.9.47–48, Ovid *A.A.* 2.219–220, Sen. *Phae.* 324, 328–329, *Oet.* 372. Rough hands, Prop. 3.11.20; 4.9.50, *Oet.* 372. The third element, stressing Deianeira's possession of the club and lion skin is less common but cf. *HF* 465–6.

liberate burlesque of the exchange of clothes, as he notes item by item the misfit of Omphale's dress on the muscle-bound hero; her girdle cannot encompass his girth, he must undo the pins of her *stola* to insert his arms, he bursts her sandals and shatters her bracelets. He is absurd and more vividly so than can be achieved by any rhetorical *topos* contrasting virility and perfume.

In contrast, however, his role in the first phase is hardly servile; only the parasol intrudes on the stately picture of queen and escort (*comes* 305) proceeding to a *fête champêtre*. There are servants to prepare the supper, and after a discreet reference to the meal, they retire to sleep on separate couches (real furniture, no doubt carried by the slaves: cf. 328, 345 *sponda*) because they are to participate in the mysteries the next morning. There is no Herculean gluttony, no wanton dalliance and were it not for Hercules' costume, this might be a scene of elegiac courtship.

Ovid has increased this opening tone of decorum by his epic diction and use of Virgilian allusion. It should be possible to depict a queen and her admirer entering a cave at nightfall without recalling that other queen, Dido, and Aeneas, her still chase consort: in the context the golden clothing and Tyrian purple of 310 and 319 are to be expected and need not be related to the hunting apparel described in *Aen.* 4.137–140.³⁵ But if Ovid does not want his readers to recall Dido, why does he apostrophize Faunus with a pentameter ending *quid non amor improbus audet?* (331) designed to echo Virgil's hexameter: *improbe amor, quid non mortalia pectora cogis?* (*Aen.* 4.412)? Even the first half, *noctis erat medium*, finds a near parallel in *Aen.* 4.522 *nox erat*. While the Virgilian colouring only becomes unmistakable in this final section³⁶ Ovid prepares the way at 323, where he deprecates the bracelets of Omphale as *non illa ad brachia factas* (323) evoking Aeneas' sword *non hos quaesitum munus in usus* (*Aen.* 4.647). Two other echoes recall Aeneas at Troy. Faunus, like the Greeks, finds the escort *somno uinoque solutos* (33 cf. *Aen.* 2.265 *somno uinoque sepultos*) and when panicked by the rough lionskin he steps back, like a traveller who sees a snake rear in his path (341–342 cf. Androgeus at *Aen.* 2.378–381). Hercules himself

35 The tag *Gaetulo murice tinctae* is actually drawn not from Virgil but Horace, *Ep.* 2.2.181: *uestes Gaetulo murice tinctae*.

36 I owe this point to Professor Tarrant, who suggests, however, that the colouring is simply mock Virgilian, without any illusions to Dido and Aeneas as such.

is an incongruous blend of *Tiryntius heros* (349) and travesty, his straining female clothes covering shaggy, almost animal, thighs.³⁷

The seduction narrative contrives a brilliant building-up of tension as Faunus enters the cave; we share his false start (*felix prima sorte futurus* 338) as Ovid runs on, from one couplet into the next, Faunus' change of direction. The vigor of the overrun *reppulit* (340–341) followed by his fall, and the raising of the alarm achieves its effect by control of rhythm and language; nothing too much. Is this episode Ovidian reclothing of Greek material, or his own invention? If we are not prepared to credit him with invention of the tale, we should at least consider whether the fusion of ingredients may be his. He may well have overlaid a basic narrative with details and tone colouring from other genres. In fact, over the last century scholarship has variously suggested four or five genres or media on which Ovid might have drawn for his model.

The elaborate physical context of servants, parasol, torches, camp furniture suggests a sophisticated court, that of Arsinoë or Berenice, rather than an archaic Lydian household. The cult explanation of the separate couches also savours of Callimachus' modernized mythology. Herter, using the research of Turcan,³⁸ recognizes the technical force of *pia sacra* representing the *hosiai teletai* of Dionysiac initiation. Turcan has compared the rites of the second-century Bacchanalia for the dinner on the last day of abstinence and quotes evidence for the sacred cave as scene of the rites in memory of the cave on Nysa where Dionysus was suckled. Here a separate thread is woven into the Hercules-Omphale myth. Herter notes that the tradition of a marriage with exchange of clothes between the two develops rather later than the myth of Hercules' bondage, but he believes that both elements attest an original *gamos* between hero and mistress, supporting the Dionysiac associations.

There is a difficulty in relating the transvestism to the ritual sexual abstinence which is a prerequisite for the staging of Faunus' blunder. Males adopt female clothing in many contexts, in the procession of

37 Hercules is called *Tiryntius iuuenis* at *A.A.* 2.221. Note the hairiness is a special characteristic of characters in folktale associated with animal strength. Compare Stith-Thompson, *MI*; F 521.1 and Theodor H. Gaster, *Myth, Legend and Custom in the Old Testament*, incorporating material from Sir James Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament*, New York 1969, 164.

38 Hans Herter, "Lydische Adelskämpfe," *Kleine Schriften*, Munich 1975, 536–563, esp. 543, R. Turcan, "Apropos d'Ovide *Fasti* II 313–330," *R.E.L.* 37 (1959) 195–203.

Ithyphalloi,³⁹ in dances at the Anthesteria,⁴⁰ in Dionysiac reveling⁴¹ and in wedding rituals where an apotropaic exchange of clothing between partners is attested for many societies. Yet the only Greek instance seems to be the practice at Cos, which derives from an episode in Hercules' flight from the Meropes, and is not an exchange but is limited to the bridegroom.⁴² The best attestation of a real exchange of male and female clothing seems to be Philostratus' portrait of Komos (*Imagines* 1.2) in which both sexes are described. In general, however, transvestism seems to be a festive or marriage rite, not a feature of the preparatory abstinence before initiation. The author of this tale has had to fuse the separate elements of transvestism and sexual abstention in order to trigger his comic mechanism.

We might simply assume that this was the idea of some Alexandrian, if not of Callimachus himself, then a minor contemporary. But other hypotheses have been raised, going further back in Greek literary history. Did the episode originate as drama? Franz Skutsch⁴³ long since noted the affinities of this episode with the finale of Plautus' *Casina*, itself based on Diphilus' *Kleroumenoi*. In that play the old husband lusts after a beautiful servant girl, who is really a citizen and must therefore be kept chaste for her recognition and marriage at the end. He schemes to enjoy her through making her the bride of his slave overseer, so that he can claim a sort of *ius primae noctis* for himself. His wife suspects this, and the women of the play mount a series of tricks to frustrate him; in the last of these, the overseer is admitted to the bridal chamber, where his rival, the armor-bearer, is disguised in the wedding veil and repulses the groom's advances with violence and a display of reciprocal virility. Naturally the episode must be kept off-stage, so it is presented as a narrative by the terrified groom acting as *exangelos* to his master. The

39 See Turcan, *op. cit.*, 201. For a recent discussion of transvestism in Greek cult, with details of clothing see W. J. Slater, "Artemon and Anacreon," *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 185–194, citing the basic discussion of J. D. Beasley, *Greek Vases in Boston*, Oxford 1954, 2.55–61. On the Ithyphalloi, see Athenaeus 14.622a.

40 Philostratus *Apollonius* 4.21.

41 Lucian, *Calumniae non temere credendum* (OCT I.131) describes how the Platonist Demetrius was embarrassed into putting on the Tarantinidion to dance in the rites of Dionysus at the court of Ptolemy XIII Dionysus.

42 Plutarch *Quaest. Graecae* 58. The priests of Hercules also wore women's gowns and headgear to sacrifice.

43 F. Skutsch, "Ein Prolog des Diphilus und eine Komödie des Plautus," *Rh. Mus.* 43 (1900) 213–215.

speech has three elements in common with Ovid's narrative of Faunus' disappointment: the pushing-away of the lover by the "bride" (*reppulit*, *Cas.* 888; cf. *Fasti* 2.350); the bride's bristly or hairy impact (*Cas.* 929; cf. *Fasti* 2.348); and the lover's fall from the bed (*Cas.* 931, *decido de lecto praecipies*, cf. *Fasti* 2.350). The similarity led Skutsch to suggest that Diphilus and Ovid were drawing on a common Greek tradition, though not a single source. He acknowledged that Plautus and Ovid might both be using an Atellana (several of which have titles like *Maccus Virgo* or *Sponsa Pappi* suggesting a false bride), and those scholars who believe that Plautus inserted this episode to displace the family reunion in the Greek recognition play would have to assume that Plautus drew on an Italian tradition, but as Skutsch admits, it would be less likely that Ovid had derived his story either from Plautus or from an Atellane farce. As we have seen, the basic situation in *Fasti* depends on Greek cult, or at least Greek literary distortion of cult. Skutsch therefore argued, as Leo had done for so many elements common to Roman comedy and elegy, that the derivation was from Greek comedy into Roman comedy and by a separate Hellenistic channel into Augustan elegiac writing.

Skutsch's argument has recently been revived by MacCary and Willcock,⁴⁴ who endorse the suggestion that *Casina's* finale comes from Diphilus, himself taking over a tradition of earlier Greek comedy. MacCary has developed this argument in a related paper "Comic Tradition and Comic Structure in Diphilus' *Kleroumenoi*,"⁴⁵ claiming that the two chief motifs of Diphilus' comedy, the lot casting and the false bride scenes, probably draw on a number of treatments in satyr play and Middle Comedy.

Should we then recast the Ovidian Faunus episode as an adventure from a satyr play, substituting Silenus or a satyr for the role of Faunus? Satyr plays seem to have shown restraint in action and language, and the so-called seduction scene between Silenus and Danae in Aeschylus' *Diktyoulkoi* is a wooing as coy as that of Theocritus' Polyphemus. Only the baby Perseus seems to be aware of Silenus' excitement. Could the Om-

44 *Plautus, Casina*, Cambridge, Mass. 1976. Following Skutsch's investigation the finale of *Casina* was discussed by G. Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Attisches*, Berlin 1931, 105–127 and W. H. Friedrich, *Euripides und Diphilus*, Munich 1953, 173–182, who argued for its Greek origin.

45 *Hermes* 101 (1973) 194–208. The relationship between Diphilus and satyr play has recently been supported by Dana Ferrin Sutton, *CJ* 73 (1978–79) 21–25, showing that Diphilus' *Epitrope* (original of Plautus' *Rudens*) derives its action partly from that of Aeschylus' *Diktyoulkoi*.

phale story have been an offstage crisis reported by the failed seducer? Brommer⁴⁶ gives a good idea of the role played by Hercules in these plays; he may be robbed while his hands are tied supporting the heavens or have his club and lion skin stolen by satyrs while in a drunken sleep; he may brawl or steal food, but he is not attested sleeping sober and apart, and it is difficult to imagine the failed rape of Ovid's story forming the crisis of a satyr drama. Nor does the suggestive title of an otherwise lost New Comedy, *Herakles Gamoumenos*,⁴⁷ provide a precedent for our kind of narrative. Hercules is not pretending to be a bride: in fact the false bride of *Casina* is a false lead. Hercules and Omphale have not exchanged clothes to deceive the expected rival nor to set up Hercules as a substitute bride in a formal marriage. Faunus' disappointment is self-induced.⁴⁸

To take another approach, was Ovid reflecting a tradition of Hellenistic painting? There are two types of wall painting relevant to this scene: first, Hercules and Omphale themselves feature in two major Pompeian wall paintings. The best known is from the *triclinium* of the Casa Lucreti, the second is found in the Casa di Sirico⁴⁹ and is hardly connected with our theme. Hercules is lying asleep, probably drunk, on the ground in his own clothes; while Cupids play with his club in front of a mirror—two antithetical sex symbols—Omphale looks on with triumphant contempt. The painting from the Casa Lucreti comes closer. It shows Omphale in female dress but with her breasts exposed, wearing the lion skin and holding the club in one hand, while Hercules is leaning on Priapus: he seems drunk or weary and is wearing only a necklace and a silken woman's garment which has slipped below the groin and is barely held in position. Priapus, partly concealed by an outside tripod, has a little Cupid at his feet lifting up his tunic to admire his virility.⁵⁰

46 F. Brommer, *Satyrspiele*, Berlin 1959.

47 "Heracles the Bride," quoted by MacCary, *Hermes* 101 (1973) 197.

48 On the false bride in its various versions, cf. Stith Thompson, K 1911 and the same author's *The Folktale*, New York 1951, 117–120 and Gaster, *Myth, Legend and Custom* 199 on the foisting of Leah on Jacob. Our episode comes closer to the motif K 1210: humiliated and baffled lovers.

49 On the Casa Lucreti painting, Schefold 249 = Rizzo 73 and 43–44, also reproduced by G. K. Galinsky, *The Heracles Theme*, Oxford 1972, plate 11; on the painting of the Casa di Sirico, see Schefold 164 = Rizzo 118 and compare the similar Rizzo 119.

50 This is the interpretation of Herter, *De Priapo III*, E4, p. 22.

The other type of scene relevant to our episode is the classic seduction scene of a satyr approaching a sleeping nymph or maenad, often lifting up her garment. There are many related wall paintings in Pompeii and elsewhere, and a variation of this theme depicts Hermaphroditus, instead of the expected nymph, and the disappointment of Pan, or Silenus⁵¹ when the garment is removed to expose Hermaphroditus' male organs. Their gesture and ensuing disappointment are similar to those of Faunus: *tunicas ora subduxit ab ima : / horrebant densis aspera crura pilis* (347–348). The popularity of this type or erotic art is borne out by the comments of the Roman elegists on provocative paintings in the houses of *meretrices*.⁵²

Thus the seduction itself is a theme that would constantly confront Ovid in visual art,⁵³ and the gesture suggests that he was working from visual inspiration. The depiction of Hercules and Omphale exchanging their dress is less likely to have a visual source. Schauenberg,⁵⁴ in his study of the iconography of Hercules and Omphale comments that the full exchange of clothing is absent from wall paintings. In fact, Hercules is often omitted or less prominent than Omphale, who usually retains her female gown, with the addition of the lion skin and club, even when Hercules is shown wearing female clothes. The theme is Hellenistic and treated with some decorum. Schauenberg notes the absence of any grossly sensual features. In this connection, if we consider the grotesque details of Hercules' dressing scene it is clear that no serious artist would want to depict such a caricature.⁵⁵ Now that it has become cus-

51 From the Casa dei Dioscuri, Schefold 116, reproduced in Rizzo 116, and Grant, *Erotic Art in Pompeii*, London 1975, 147; compare also the two versions of Silenus and Hermaphroditus, Rizzo 117 (Grant 144 misses Silenus) and satyr scenes reproduced in Rizzo 113, 115, and Grant 151, 162, for the gesture of pulling away the garment.

52 Compare Prop. 2.6.9 and 28 (where, however, *obscenae tabellae* are alleged to be in a decent home), Ovid *Tr.* 2.523–524 *sic quae concubitus uarios Venerisque figuras / exprimat, est aliquo parua tabella loco*, also as evidence for Hellenistic practice the scene of Jupiter and Danae which inspired Chaerea in Ter. *Eun* 584 f.

53 The fourth-century Greek artist Nicomachus left a famous painting of Bacchae *obreptantibus satyris* (Pliny *N.H.* 35.109) and a naughty picture (*lasciua*) of three Silenus figures reveling. The contents of the wanton scenes (*libidines*) painted by Timanthes of Samos are not specified (*N.H.* 35.72).

54 See Konrad Schauenberg; "Hercules and Omphale," *Rh. Mus.* 103 (1960) 57–76, esp. 64 and n. 38.

55 There is some evidence for this kind of grotesque painting in Pliny *N.H.* 35.114 *Antiphrilus ... iocoso nomine Gryllum deridiculi habitus pinxit, unde id*

tomary to look for Ovid's inspiration in the visual arts, there is a risk of ignoring alternative literary sources. It is perhaps well to respect Herter's warning:⁵⁶ unless the text includes details of gestures and poses also found in ancient sculpture or painting, it is more likely that Ovid drew his invention from dramatic or narrative poetry.

In a recent paper, "Epic and Burlesque in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 8.260 f.,"⁵⁷ Nicholas Horsfall has considered the sources possible for Ovid's treatment of the Calydonian boar hunt and has argued for the influence of Greek Middle Comedy, transmitted through Roman mime. He points to a fragment of Laberius (fr. 148 *equid praecurris Calydonem*) which seems to confirm that one of his mimes staged the myths of Calydon. The more generally accepted case of mythological mime by Laberius, the *Anna Perenna*, for which Horsfall refers to Giancotti and Bömer,⁵⁸ comes very close to our Faunus narrative. As Bömer has proposed for the story of Mars and Anna Perenna at *Fasti* 3.677–696, so I would like to suggest that Faunus' adventure was known to Ovid from popular drama: this could be Atellane, mime or pantomime.

Episodes of adultery or seduction seem to be a characteristic of mime. Giancotti shows that the phallus was worn, and scenes of phallic humour are implied by some fragments of Laberius.⁵⁹ Seneca the Elder⁶⁰ applies the phrase *mimicae nuptiae* to the kind of triangular sexual comedy in which a clever adulterer, who enjoys the audience's support, takes advantage of a stupid husband, and this coincides with Ovid's loaded description of mime in his defence of the *Ars Amatoria* to Augustus; the poet is able to cite *imitantes turpia mimos* as a precedent for the

genus picturae Grylli uocantur, and 140 : Ctesilochus ... petulant pictur innotuit, Ioue Liberum parturiente depicto mitrato et muliebriter ingemescente inter obstetricia dearum. Compare also the humorous paintings of Ovid's contemporary Spurius Tadius, N.H. 35.117, described as argutiae facetissimi salis.

56 Hans Herter, "Ovid's Verhältnis zur bildenden Kunst," *Kleine Schriften*, Munich 1975, 493–513.

57 *CJ* 74 (1978–79) 319–332, esp. 331.

58 See n. 2 above.

59 Giancotti 25; cf. Arnobius *Adversus nationes* 7.33 *delectantur, ut res est, stupidorum capitibus rasis ... factis et dictis turpibus, fascinatorum ingentium rubore*. See also Laberius 6, 21–22, 66, and app. Gell. 16.7.1.

60 *Contr.* 2.4. (12) 5 *mimicae nuptiae, in quibus ante in cubiculum rualis uenit quam maritus*.

licence of his fictional narrative verse.⁶¹ To be sure, in *Fasti* morality triumphs in the end, but the tone of the episode is provocative.

One reservation should be made. Mime made full use of dialogue, but the first phase of this narrative does not require dialogue (303–316), while the second phase of dressing up (317–330) and the climactic third phase of attempted seduction (331–350) would be more appropriate without speech, danced as pantomime. Ovid tells us that his own poetry was danced (*saltata*⁶²), and one assumes that his narrative would be delivered in speech or song at the same time. But this passage of *Fasti* describes a sequence of events that could be fully understood as pantomime by any onlookers, not because he has composed it *for* pantomime but most probably because he has derived it *from* pantomime. We might note too that in the passage of *Tristia* 2 Ovid cites *saltare* and the genre of wall painting as the two socially accepted media for provocative subject matter.

The panic ending as Faunus makes his escape is certainly characteristic of the popular stage: according to Cicero, weakly constructed mimes often used the escape of the villain⁶³ to bring down (or in Roman times *up*) the curtain. The tale of Faunus' discomfiture could have been invented for such a Roman entertainment, or again it could have been adapted from a Hellenistic burlesque in which Pan or Priapus served as villain instead of Faunus. As for the introduction, Ovid may have borrowed it from a Hellenistic narrative elegy on the union of Hercules and Omphale, thus deriving only the comedy of Faunus' assault from his experience of painting and pantomime. But perhaps the Virgilian echoes point to a slightly different conclusion. While he drew his comedy from his experiences as a spectator, Ovid called on his intimate knowledge of Virgilian epic to supply the more dignified introduction to the affair.

61 *Tr.* 2.514–515 : *scaenica uidisti lentus adulteria. / scribere si fas est imitantes turpia mimos / materiae minor est debita poena meae.*

62 *Tr.* 2.519–520 : *et mea sunt populo saltata poemata saepe, / saepe oculos etiam detinuerunt tuos.*

63 *Pro Caelio* 65 : *mimi ergo ... in quo cum clausula non inuenitur, fugit aliquis e manibus, dein scabilla concrepant, aulaeum tollitur.*

Fasti 1.393–440 and 6.321–344 :
The Frustrations of Priapus

I have suggested that Ovid may have adapted the Faunus story from a tale associated with Priapus: certainly his other scenes of sexual debacle, centered on Priapus, reflect the same malice toward the frustrated lecher. It is a well-known problem of the *Fasti* that Priapus' disappointment is twice told, only with a change of victim. In *Fasti* 1.335f. Ovid's theme is the origin of different types of animal sacrifice. He passes from the pig, offender against Ceres, and the goat who damages Bacchus' vines (349–360) to domestic cattle and sheep and stranger victims, horses, hinds, and even dogs offered to Hecate (389–390). At this point he might have passed on to his last example, the bird sacrifices, for if the story which occupies *Fasti* 1.391–440 had been omitted, the thought would have flowed as easily as the elegiac couplets. If he had, it would have been a loss to his customary readers, for the story of Priapus and Lotis is splendidly told and offers an *aition* for the sacrifice of the donkey which matches the retaliatory motif of 349–360, since the donkey's ill-timed braying cheated Priapus of his prey. Yet witty as it is, the story has no place in the Roman *Fasti*: despite the literary *Priapea* and the devotion of such as Giton in the *Satyricon*,⁶⁴ Priapus is an outsider to Roman public ritual with no place in any official fertility ceremonies.

There is another oddity: this tale of Priapus and Lotis seems to conflict with the version summarized at *Met.* 9.347–348,⁶⁵ in which Lotis is transformed into the lotus flower to escape his attentions. That story's aetiological function guarantees its authenticity. Surely if she had been roused by the donkey, she could have escaped Priapus and saved her face? Herter⁶⁶ has suggested that if the donkey episode preceded the final, fatal pursuit, both tales could have occurred in a single Alexandrian narrative poem. He is surely right that the Lampsacene sacrifice is a note of erudition which Ovid could not have acquired without a learned Greek source. Although Ovid himself visited Lampsacus on his way to exile,⁶⁷ it is unlikely that he had the heart or the leisure to collect

64 *Satyricon* 17, 21, 104, 137, and 139; *Hellespontiaci sequitur grauis ira Priapi*.

65 Quoted n. 11 above.

66 Herter 88.

67 *Tr.* 1.10.25–25 *Dardaniumque petit auctoris nomen habentem, / et te ruricola, Lampsace, tuta deo*.

local *aitia*. Without prejudicing the issue of dating this section of the *Fasti* to his first draft or his later reworking in exile I see no reason to doubt that a Greek aetiological poem supplied Ovid with the donkey's tale, together with Lotis' ultimate fate, perhaps in an epilogue as brief as Ovid's own allusion in *Metamorphoses* 9.

In book 6, the complex of ritual and taboo surrounding the cult of Vesta leads to Ovid's commemoration of the Vestalia on June 9, when the bakers and millers hang the millstone with garlands and their donkeys wear wreaths like revelers. At 319 Ovid breaks off to address Priapus, promising that his tale of the god's disgrace will be both brief and funny. As in his other narrative, the tale is set at a feast, if not perhaps a festival. The hostess is Cybele and this seems to be at a time when the gods still inhabited earth and Vesta is treated as a daughter figure and hence a desirable maiden. Cybele has invited the gods, the satyrs, and nymphs: Silenus, we are told, came uninvited. Priapus, mentioned only later, may also have been a gatecrasher. Ovid describes the carousing through the night followed by dancing, flirtation, and sleep for the tired or innocent. Vesta is one of these, and sleeps apart, until Priapus, who has chased nymphs and goddesses indiscriminately (333) spies her and draws near—but the ultimately braying of Silenus' unattended donkey arouses her and the god takes flight as the other guests come to her aid. So, Ovid concludes, the Lampsacenes sacrifice the donkey as punishment for his betrayal of the god,⁶⁸ but the goddess rewards the donkey with a necklace of loaves.

This time the seduction is introduced without connection but ends with a double *aition* explaining both the donkey's reward (the Roman motivation of the story) and his punishment of Lampsacus. The story is abrupt and discontinuous and the context devised for the incident is singularly odd. Where outside the heroic marriage of Peleus and Thetis, do the gods assemble on earth and mix with the lesser breed of nymphs and satyrs? Scholars have been moved to ask several related questions. Could this have had a Greek model, or did Ovid devise the story? If he invented it, did he do so before or after composing the tale of Priapus and Lotis? Did he intend both versions to be published in the single work?

68 The Teubner reading at 346 is "*apta*" *canens* "*flammi indicis exta damus*," but I would prefer Alton's earlier conjecture *apta putat flammis ... deus* (CR 32 (1918) 61).

It is easiest to answer the last question first. The stories have the same structure, duplicating not only the divine vengeance (1.439–440 = 6.345–346) but every stage of the narrative. Thus the tale is introduced by an illusion to the god's shame (*causa pudenda* 1.392 = *tuum ... dedecus* 6.319–320). There is a special feast attended not only by Silenus and Priapus but also by nymphs and satyrs (1.393–400 = 6.323–324, 333, but 1.397 also adds *Panes*). A description of the feast and wine (1.401–404 = 6.325–326) leads to a *diuisio* of the nymphs or guests present, describing the activities (1.405–413 = 6.327–330, but the latter seems to imply male guests and male activities such as the *tripudium*). Next comes a reference to sleep and the victim is seen at rest (1.421–424 = 6.331–332). Priapus is introduced early in *Fasti* 1 (400, then 415–420) before his pursuit is resumed (425–433) but in *Fasti* 6 he is not mentioned until just before he launches his assault (6.333–338). In both versions his frustration is anticipated by the inceptive verb (1.429, 432 = 6.342 *ibat ut inciperet*) and his dishonourable intentions (1.432–433 *vota ... sua* = 6.337 *spem ... obscenam*) are foiled by the donkey's braying (*intempestiuus ... sonus* in different forms frames the pentameters 1.434, 6.342). In both stories the victim leaps up in terror (*terrata ... nymphe* 1.435 = *terrata ... dea* 6.343), and a crowd gathers around. Not only the action but many features of diction are the same: Ovid could not have published both versions in one work.

However the version of book 1 is not only twice as long, it is also more coherent and consistent in tone.⁶⁹ The atmosphere of play is built up by many touches; Dionysus' associates are described as *iocis non alienus ... in Venerem ... prona iuuentus*: expectation is created of both humour and desire. They are all the ingredients of a symposium as god, guests, and river supply wine, garlands, and water. The nymphs are in provocative undress and their effect on the other guests prepares us for Priapus' undertaking. In the Vesta story Priapus is indiscriminate and Ovid does not commit himself to believing his excuse that he did not recognize Vesta; but he is single-minded in pursuit of Lotis, and her disdain earns him some sympathy for his plight. In the climactic section which echoes the four stages of his approach as he first tiptoes to the spot, then holds his breath and lowers himself to the ground beside her, and even lifts away her skirt, the premature *gaudet* (431) intensifies suspense, whereas the disapproving *spem ... obscenam* of 6.337 is separat-

69 But on the inconsistency of *bruma* 394, with the apparent summer setting see Bömer 2.48 and Lefèvre I.53, discussed below.

ed from the crisis by a reference to the donkey too late to serve as effective foreshadowing. As for the debacle, Vesta cries out before she has been touched, and Priapus makes his getaway *per infesta manus*, the cliché of the badly composed mime. The more vigorous Lotis narrative shares many features with the Omphale episode, or even the messenger speech of *Casina*. The ravisher is laid low while Lotis escapes and Priapus' humiliation proves an *aition* for his everyday image as the moon exposes his desperation.

Why is the Vesta tale so badly told? And which version is derivative? Arguments from taste or skill depend on the critic's assumptions about the effect of imitation and could be used quite arbitrarily to argue either case. But it should be noted that since Peter's edition of 1874⁷⁰ the majority of scholars have favoured the thesis that Ovid composed the Vesta story after, and on the basis of, the Hellenistic tale of Priapus and Lotis:⁷¹ since there is no evidence for any mythological adventures of Vesta in Roman legend, it is natural to see the failed seduction as not only based on the generally assumed Greek Lotis narrative but also composed by Ovid after he had composed the story of Priapus and Lotis.

On the other side Nick⁷² argued rather perversely that Ovid initially composed the Vesta story in connection with the sacrifice of the donkey to Priapus in book 1, but when he came to the *Vestalia* of June, transferred it and substituted the Lotis story, intending, that is, to keep both versions. Most recently Eckard Lefèvre⁷³ has reconsidered the Lotis story in the whole context of the passage on animal sacrifice and has shown in detail that this extended passage (1.335–456) was composed by Ovid later than the similar speech of Pythagoras in *Metamorphoses* 15.111–141 and reveals inconsistencies of motivation which are the mark of secondary or self-imitative writing. He has made a firm case for reversing the order of composition of the Priapus stories by showing that the

70 H. Peter, P. *Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*, Leipzig 1874, 265 on 6.319.

71 Lefèvre I.51 cites B. Ressler, "Quaestionum Ovidianarum capita duo," diss. Halle 1903, 22 f. and Wissowa, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* ..., Munich 1904, neither available to me, Jessen, *Priapus*, Roscher 3.2.2969 f., Herter 81 f., S. D'Elia, *Ovidio*, Naples 1959, 362, and Bömer 2.46, on 1.391. On the evidence of doublets occurring between passages in book 1 and other books, for Ovid's revision of book 1 in exile see Bömer 1.18.

72 Gustav Nick, "Kritisches und Exegetisches zu Ovids Fasten," *Phil.* 36 (1877) 435–444.

73 Lefèvre I.40–49; see his resumptive list of imitations p. 57.

whole section in book 1 belongs to Ovid's reworking in exile: thus the story of Lotis must be Ovid's adaptation of his own previous narrative of Priapus and Vesta. This thesis does not require the truth of his lesser claim, that the Vesta story was based on a Greek model, nor are the incoherencies which he finds in the Lotis story proof that Ovid invented it without a Greek precedent.⁷⁴ He is right to note that the biennial winter festival of Dionysus is incompatible with the summer night's reveling of the Lotis story, for which Ovid gives no geographic setting. But his criticisms are stronger than the arguments he can advance in favour of the supposedly authentic setting of Cybele's family party on Ida in book 6.⁷⁵

I would like to propose an alternative hypothesis in summary form, before returning to an account of the Vesta episode which I believe can explain both Ovid's decision to introduce it and his subsequent change of heart. Let us return to the generally agreed hypothesis that Ovid knew an Alexandrian narrative about Priapus' pursuit of Lotis. When he first composed book 1, he had no extended discussion of animal sacrifice and certainly no cogent reason to introduce a Priapus myth into an already full book. So he passed over the myth, but coming later to the Vestalia in book 6, he remembers Propertius' sentimental account of the donkeys standing garlanded at the old rite of the baker's goddess⁷⁶ and sees a chance to adapt a tale of Priapus to this new context, provided

74 Lefèvre I.53–54.

75 Could the Vesta story have originated in a Greek myth about Hestia? Did she for instance have a cult at Lampsacus which might have fostered the growth of myths linking Hestia with Priapus? Professor C. P. Jones has kindly drawn to my attention an inscription from the early years of Tiberius honouring Livia (called Iulia Sebaste) as both Hestia and the New Demeter. (See P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Lampsacus*, Bonn 1978, 74, n. 11) This is, however, the only inscription related to Hestia, and better evidence for Greek conversion of the known identification of Livia with Vesta (on which see Ollendorf, *RE* XIII.914, and Ovid *Ex P.* 4.13.29 *esse pudicarum te Vestam, Livia, matrum*) than for an independent cult of Hestia. Preuner (Roscher 1.3.2609–10) and Süss (*RE* VIII.1266–71) agree that there are no myths about Hestia other than her birth from Kronos and Rhea, and her refusal of the wooing of Poseidon and Apollo and resolve of perpetual virginity, in return for which Zeus gave her special privileges beyond other goddesses. Thus neither cult nor myth of Hestia can explain the episode.

76 His introductory line 6.311 *Ecce coronatis panis dependet asellis* clearly recalls Prop. 4.1.21 *Vesta coronatis pauper gaudebat asellis*; if Ovid's readers knew Propertius they would anticipate further comments on Vesta's protection over the donkey.

only that he is careful to speak of Vesta with great respect. The result is the circumspect and jejune narrative of 6.319–344. Yet it was not circumspect enough. Certainly Ovid finds himself in exile with the *Fasti* still unpublished when the death of Augustus forces him to rework whole sections of the book addressed to the living emperor. Here I take over part of Lefèvre's thesis—that the Priapus story was to some extent his motive for rewriting of the whole section on animal sacrifice, of which it is almost the half. Whether Ovid realizes that the Vesta story did not “come off” or felt it was offensive or was simply attracted by the positive advantages of retelling the tale with its original victim, he now returned to the original Greek tale: no matter if the connection to the *Fasti* is rather far-fetched, the story is free of offence to the imperial cult and can be told without inhibitions. As for the confused setting, Ovid had few texts in exile;⁷⁷ he had to reconstruct for himself a setting for the old Hellenistic scandal and the inconsistency betrays his lack of learned reading matter.

This cannot be proved, but I believe it can be supported and that we can increase our understanding of Ovid's composition of *Fasti* by examining the Vesta story in the whole context of book 6.

Vesta is herself the focus of book 6, occupying the central panel from 249–460, and the tale of Priapus follows a long introductory section on her cult places in Rome (249–298), and a final derivation from *ui stare* (299–304). Then a brief account of Vacuna leads to the Vestalia of the millers and bakers (305–312, 313–318). The Priapus story is followed by four other topics: the origin of Jupiter Pistor, when a council of the gods, Venus, Vesta, and Romulus, helps Jupiter save Rome from the Gauls (349–394), then an explanation of the Lacus Curtius (395–416). Ovid gives special attention to Vesta's role as guardian of the Palladium (417–436) and ends with the heroic rescue of the Palladium by the high priest Metellus and the ensured safety of Vesta's flame now that Caesar Augustus is high priest.

This is the solemn parade, and Ovid may well have looked for humour to dilute the solemnity. Ovid has taken pains to tell us that Vesta has no *effigies* (6.298) and he has not been able to see her in a poetic vision because she is *uiua flamma* (6.291), incorporeal and unable to conceive. How can he attach such an earthy story to this goddess? There was only one context in which Vesta was regularly represented in womanly form, and this was in the *lararia* of bakers or millers. Here as the

77 Tr. 3.14.37–38 *non hic librorum per quos inuiter alarque / copia.*

remains of Pompeii⁷⁸ show, she was usually portrayed veiled and holding a scepter and *patera* for libation and accompanied by a donkey: of nine *lararia* in Pompeii which show Vesta, only one portrays her without her shaggy companion.

To ignore the extreme modern hypothesis that Ovid was using *Fasti* as a medium for anti-Augustan malice,⁷⁹ could we suppose that he hoped to subject Vesta to associations of this kind without offending the susceptibilities of his emperor?

Augustus has no great love for Hercules and allowed the cult of Antony's model to be upstaged by his own ancestors Mars and Venus and his patron Apollo,⁸⁰ but he had since 12 BCE given special prominence to Vesta.⁸¹ She was already conspicuous among the national gods in the patriotic invocation by Virgil at *Georgics* 1.498–499 *di patria, Indigetes, et Romule Vestaque mater / quae Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia seruas*, or *Aen.* 1.292 *cana Fides et Vesta*, but this is partly caused by Virgil's central concern with the Trojan inheritance. So in the later Ovid of *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* she is supremely *Troici Vesta* (*Met.* 15.730), protectress of Julius Caesar as her priest the Pontifex Maximus on March 6, 12 BCE took her under his wing, building an *aedicula* within his Palatine residence,⁸² so that Ovid could coin the conceit that there

78 See G. K. Boyce, *Corpus of the Lararia of Pompeii*, *MAAR* 14 (1957). Vesta is shown in the *Lararia* of Pistrina, in nn. 185 (plate 21.1), 236, 240, 247, 313, 316 (plate 24.1), 318, 419, and 420. Of these only 236 includes no donkey. Vesta is sometimes clad entirely in white, but elsewhere, e.g. plate 24, wears a violet mantle and yellow chiton, with a white veil and golden wreath. Here instead of the common scepter she carries a cornucopia in her left hand and a *patera* in her right.

79 See, for example, Holleman's interpretation of Ovid's treatment of the Luperalia in *Historia* 22 (1973) 260–268. He interprets Ovid's presentation of Faunus (especially in the episode with Omphale) as deliberate caricature motivated by anti-Augustanism. He concludes, "All the threads of his anti-Augustanism come together in the *Fasti*, often resulting in a pattern which is at best inextricable."

80 See E. Schilling, "L'Hercule romain en face de la réforme religieuse d'Auguste," *Rev. Phil.* 16 (1942).

81 I incorporate here much basic material from Wissowa 156–163, and H. Wagenvoort, "Auguste et Vesta," *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire offerts à Jérôme Carcopino*, 965–979, and from Karl Koch, s.v. *Vesta*, *RE* XXI.1717–76.

82 For the *aedicula* see Koch, *loc. cit.* 1758, Ziegler, s.v. *Palatium*, *RE* XVIII.60–63. The shrine was opened on April 28, 12 BCE, showing that it must have been before Augustus became Pontifex Maximus (cf. Dio 54.27.3). The Sorrento Base (on which see Rizzo, "La Base di Augusto," *Bull. Comm.* 60 (1933)

were three gods (a traditional Etrusco-Roman triad) in the one *aedes*: Apollo, Vesta, and Caesar—*tertius ipse tenet* (*F.* 5.952). Vesta symbolized several things dear to Augustus: his Trojan ancestry, his role as avenger of his father Julius, the chastity of his family, and, as Wagenvoort suggests, the perpetuity of his house. Only one book of *Fasti* is without homage to Vesta; thus in book 1, largely remodeled after Augustus' death, Carmenta is made to prophesy that Vesta shall welcome the Trojan Penates⁸³ and in due course receive a god (Augustus) as her high priest, in whose line the priesthood will remain as his son Tiberius and grandson take up the burden of empire, and Livia becomes divine. In book 3 the anniversary of Augustus' pontificate naturally evokes honours for Vesta and her *cognatus*⁸⁴ while the Ides of March justify her speech calling down vengeance on Caesar's murderers.⁸⁵ April too brings Vesta with Jupiter and father Mars to aid Romulus at the city's founding on the twenty-first (4.828) and ends with the consecration of her shrine on the Palatine (4.949–951). In May the founding of the temple of Mars Ultor again recalls Julius Caesar as Vesta's priest,⁸⁶ and finally, as we have seen, June is Vesta's month for the central panel, entirely concerned with her cult, is extended backwards and forwards by brief allusions of June 6 (6.227–234) and 15 (713–714) to the period of cleansing her temple, whose debris was swept into the Tiber on the fifteenth and carried away to sea. Apart from the Priapus episode every other allusion to Vesta in *Fasti* depicts her in the Augustan inner circle of deities, pure and untouchable. In book 6, as in the earlier books, she is bound almost as closely to the emperor as his *genius* or *numen*.

Perhaps we should consider here the positive evidence that Vesta's cult, despite its apparent antithesis to that of Priapus, was strongly con-

7–109) shows the setting of this shrine. Five Vestals emerge from an Ionian colonnade; behind on a richly decorated throne sits the goddess with scepter and *patera*. Behind, a small round temple with conical roof is raised to suggest perspective. There are traces of the lance and shield of the Palladium within. On the left is shown the entrance to the Domus Augusta, on the right Apollo, Latona, and Diana representing the Palatine temple of Apollo as in *Met.* 15.864. If Rizzo is right, that the broken middle section showed Augustus at the altar as Pontifex Maximus, the base will commemorate the original dedication of 12 BCE.

83 1.528 *Iliacos accipe, Vesta, deos*.

84 *Cognatus* is so used of Augustus at 3.426; 4.949–950.

85 Vesta speaks at 3.698–703.

86 *Fasti* 5.573 : *Si mihi bellandi pater est Vestaeque sacerdos / auctor*.

nected with phallic sexuality. Pliny records that the *fascinus* or symbolic male organ was kept in her temple.⁸⁷ Recent studies of the Vestals by Hommel and Beard⁸⁸ have brought out the mediating role of fire in the cult as a symbol of generation. They point to the language used of both ignition and conception and the analogy between the process by which Vestals had to revive the dead fire (by boring with a stick into a receptive piece of wood) and the act of sexual penetration. From these aspects of the cult scholars have reasonably inferred a peculiar link between the sacred fire and the perpetuation of the race by intercourse. Even so, it is a big leap from Vesta's undoubted patronage of generation to the lecherous Hellenistic immigrant Priapus, and the association is precluded in *Fasti* by Ovid's own denial that fire can generate: 6.293, *nataque de flamma corpora nulla uides*. In devising this account of Priapus' abortive assault on Vesta, Ovid is not making a sophisticated anthropological statement but introducing Priapus' antics because the donkey offers him the formal connection: yet the donkey is an appropriate mediator, to borrow a Lévi-Straussian term, because of his service to Vesta and his incongruous sexuality. Like the magistrate presiding over a Roman festival which has grown too solemn, Ovid feels the need for a change of mood and brings on the clowns. But his own need to treat Vesta with the respect due to imperial cult and the empress' divine counterpart prevented him from handling the episode with his usual relish and the seduction scene contrives to be both sober and tasteless. He had forgotten, or else he dared not observe, Cicero's precept in his letter to Lucceius: *qui semel uerecundiae fines transierit, eum bene et nauiter oportet, esse impudentem*.⁸⁹

87 Pliny *N.H.* 28.39 : *Fascinus qui deus inter sacra Romana a Vestalibus colitur*.

88 Hildegard Hommel, "Vesta und die früh-römische Religion," *ANRW* 1.2 (1972) 402–421; Mary Beard, "The Sexual Status of Vestal Virgins," *JRS* 70 (1980) 12–26, esp. 19.

89 Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.3. Cicero is, of course, speaking of immodesty in a different sense, that of vanity and self-promotion. However, the basic principle applies, that an outrageous tale should be told with panache or not at all.

The Uneven Inspiration of the *Fasti* : The Poet and His Materials

The tale, like Priapus himself, was a failure, defeated by Vesta's aura of respectability, and Ovid must have regretted the greater freedom with which he could handle the original encounter of god and nymph; hence, I believe his return to the original context when he came to re-model book 1. But it would be begging the question to blame his failure only on Vesta. There are many signs that in composing book 6 Ovid was conscious of dwindling material and failing inspiration : we need not go all the way with Johnson's recent paper on "The Desolation of the *Fasti*"⁹⁰ to recognize that the last book, or even the last two books, are lackluster and largely without poetic momentum. I would like to account for this waning of interest without speculation about Ovid's state of mind, but simply by analyzing the content of these books against the background of his chosen range of subject matter.

Johnson's sensitive discussion lays great stress on the problem of faith created for Ovid by the conflict between Augustan archaizing ideology and the contemporary social reality, and on the difficulty—perhaps more sharply felt in our present age of disbelief and shattered personality cults—that Ovid might have felt in endorsing the divinity of Augustus. But Johnson betrays a post-romantic approach to poetics and the tender political conscience of a modern democrat. Ovid could write bitterly on contemporary society, notably in Janus' diatribe against materialism in *Fasti* 1.191–226,⁹¹ but this too was a literary tradition, and I doubt if it cost him any qualms, at least during his years of success at Rome, to write the comparison of Augustus and Romulus (2.133–144, where the irony is latent for those who wish to find it) or the earnest praise of Augustus' piety in avenging Caesar's death (*Fasti* 3.699–710; 5.567–589) : the task of handling his official themes with skill was a challenge to his professional versatility, not a threat to his private integrity.

Instead we should consider Ovid's material in *Fasti* and its limitations. We might note that the calendar itself is uneven in the distribution of major festivals, because it reflects the military and agricultural

90 W. R. Johnson in *CJ* 74 (1979–80) 7–18.

91 See Johnson 16. On the comparison of Augustus and Romulus, see Niall Rudd, *Lines of Enquiry*, Cambridge 1976, ch. 1, "Ovid and the Augustan Myth," 18–19.

year in which festivals were concentrated in spring (March–April) and autumn (September–October). Imperial dedications too might reflect the seasonal absences of Augustus on provincial tours or campaigning away from Rome. Again, we might blame Ovid for extravagance in exhausting his legendary material (most of which has no firm traditional dating to any particular month) in the early months.

D'Elia offers a fine analysis of Ovid's choice of material and interpretative principles in the *Fasti*,⁹² but it is not part of his purpose to measure the contents of one month against another. In attempting an independent analysis, I believe I can make apparent the decline in quality and variety of material over the last two months.

Ovid seems to work with six categories of subject matter. The two major subjects are both natural sources for expansion on the specific myth and cult of central deities. First, we have discussion of the calendar itself, the names and etymology and sequence of months at Rome and elsewhere. There is usually a preliminary section of over a hundred lines on this theme in each month.⁹³ Then comes the celebration of traditional festivals with explanations of the ritual and attributes, powers, and services to Rome of the god whom they honour. These are the main focus of *Fasti*, forming extensive panels, each composed of six or more topics, either in the introduction or at the centre of each month; thus January begins with a Janus panel, February and March have central panels based on the Lupercalia (Faunus) and Matronalia (Mars); April with its three great public festivals has panels for Cybele and Ceres, whose myth is allowed to outgrow its context, providing an elegiac counterpart to *Met.* 5.341–357. Ovid reserves his address to Flora for May, a month otherwise without a major festival. Vesta, as we have seen, is the focal deity of June.

A third kind of material, the legendary history of Rome, is woven in, from the double sequence recalling Aeneas' visit to Evander and the previous conflict of Hercules and Cacus, told in connection with the Carmentalia at 1.465–584, to the life of Romulus fragmented in excerpts and flashbacks over February, March, and April.⁹⁴ Again the

92 D'Elia, *Ovidio* 322 f.

93 Introductory sections; 1.27–183 (expanded in the rewriting to 298?); 2.19–54; 3.1–165; 4.19–133; 5.1–110 and 6.1–100.

94 D'Elia 345 claims that the life of Romulus and Remus is spread over 8 sections; compare 2.381–422 (the story of their exposure and rescue), 475–513 (Romulus' death), also lesser episodes at 361–380, 432–450; 3.10–70 (their con-

cults centered on Numa occupy March (3.259–392) and the Regifugium determines the expulsion of the kings in February (2.685–853). By May there is nothing left of the Livian tradition of Romulus and his family except a new story about Remus' ghost, and for June Ovid offers only the horror story of Servius Tullius' wicked daughter (6.581–637).

Another important ingredient was the new Augustan anniversaries now recorded in the *Feriale Cumanum* and the *Fasti* of Praeneste,⁹⁵ Caere, and Amiternum. A glance at the combined list of such occasions⁹⁶ shows that in contrast with the major anniversaries of January through April, May contains only the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor (*Fasti* 5.549–599) and the birthday of Germanicus—an occasion whose importance would date only from his adoption in 4 AD. If Ovid had revised book 5 before he died he would doubtless have produced a further encomium of Germanicus⁹⁷ for the occasion. In June the only imperial occasion is the adoption of Tiberius on June 26, 4 AD, listed in the *Fasti Amiternini*: it is difficult to see how Ovid could have made much poetic capital out of this even after 14 AD.⁹⁸

A fifth category of material consists of the astronomical entries. Some of these are of natural interest, like the rising constellations vital to navigation and farming (the Pleiades, *Fasti* 4.165–178) or signs of the zodiac significant to devotees of astrology,⁹⁹ or again constellations interesting for their associated myths of *catasterismos*. But others are the barest mention. Ovid has been accused of inventing one constella-

ception, birth, and exposure) 187–234 (the rape of the Sabines) and 4.806–860 (the foundation of Rome).

95 On Ovid's use of Verricus Flaccus' works for the *Fasti Praenestini* see Kraus 128–130 and Bömer 1.22–23.

96 See Ehrenberg and Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* 44–49 for January to June.

97 On the adaptation of book 1 to appeal to Germanicus, see Bömer 1.17–18 and, e.g. 1.3–26, 281–289, 589–602.

98 But compare Sir Ronald Syme, *History in Ovid*, Oxford 1978, 32, 34: "If Book VI never carried a reference to Tiberius' adoption in the entry for June 26th, that would have a bearing on the date of *Fasti*—and perhaps on the reasons for Ovid's renunciation."

99 Cancer 1.311–312; Aquarius 1.650–651; Pisces 2.458–474; 3.399–402; Scorpio 3.712–13; Libra 4.385; Aries 4.715 and 902; Gemini 5.693 f.

tion, the kite,¹⁰⁰ by misunderstanding what was in his source only a reference to the migration of the living bird, but at least his invention makes an attractive myth. A less justifiable entry is the couplet on the lyre, assigned to May 5 (*Fasti* 5.415–416), with the information that it will not appear until two more days have passed. Double notices such as the rising and setting of the same star can have a linking effect, giving a sense of continuity and the progress of the year from month to month, but still need some special allusion to avoid the impression of mechanical comment. We might note that these astronomical items range from seven each in March and April (of which only 2 and 6 respectively are bare couplets) to twelve in May, half of which are bare couplets, and eleven in June, only one of which has an associated myth.¹⁰¹

A final component is the listing of military anniversaries, which come seldom in the early months, partly because campaigns normally took place in the summer. One exception is the full narrative of the defeat of the Fabii at Cremera, inserted by Ovid at an artificially chosen date in February¹⁰² to do honour to his last potential patron, Fabius Maximus; it derives from his last reworking. While he could have transferred it there from a previous assignment to its proper date, July 18, we have no reason to believe that he actually composed any part of July; thus it would seem his original version of the six months contained no other battle narrative. But there are notices: two in April, both

100 *Fasti* 3.794 f.: the Kite is alleged to rise on March 18. There is no other reference to this constellation in ancient literature outside Pliny *N.H.* 18.23, probably copied from Ovid.

101 Astronomical notices. For March: 3.399–402 Pisces, 405–406 Bootes, 407–414 the vinedresser, 449–458 Pegasus, 459–515 Ariadne's crown, 711–712 Scorpio, 794–808 Kite (bird-star), 851–876 Aries (bare references are underlined). For April: 4.163–164 Scorpio, 165–178 Pleiades, 385–386 Libra, 387–388 Orion, 677–678 Hyades, 903–904 Aries, Sirius. In May: 5.113–128 Amaltheia, 159–182 Hyades, 379–414 Centaur, 415–418 Lyra, Scorpio, 493–544 Orion, 599–603 Pleiades, 603–620 Taurus, 696–720 Gemini, 723–724 Sirius, 731–732 Eagle, 733–734 Bootes, Hyas. June offers 6.195–196 Eagle, 197–198 Hyades, 235–236 Bootes, 469–472 Dolphin, 719–720 Hyades, Orion, Dolphin. 727 Gemini, Cancer, 733–766 Ophiouchos 786–788 Orion. Note that many of these are second references and only Ophiouchos has an associated myth.

102 On the battle of Cremera treated at *Fasti* 2.195–242, see Lefèvre II.152–156. The official date of the battle was the same as that of the Allia, July 18, a *dies nefastus*, see Livy 6.1.11.

with Augustan relevance, Caesar's penultimate Civil War victory at Thapsus¹⁰³ and Augustus' first victory at Mutina. In May there are none, but they come thick and fast in June: Brutus' victory over the Callaici, and Crassus' defeat and death on the tenth;¹⁰⁴ on the eleventh the deaths of Rutilius Lupus and T. Didius in successive years of the Marsic War;¹⁰⁵ on the eighteenth the victory of Postumius Tubertus over the Aequi and Volsci at Mount Algidus. The defeat of Trasimene on the twenty-second is balanced by the double anniversary on the twenty-third of Massinissa's defeat of Syphax and Ti. Claudius Nero's decisive defeat of Hasdrubal at the Metaurus on 207 BCE.¹⁰⁶ If Ovid could not rise to a fuller account of Trasimene, which lent itself to graphic evocation of the morning mists rising from the lake,¹⁰⁷ or of the victory of a Claudian ancestor at the Metaurus, then he was discouraged indeed. There are two sequences from *Fasti* 6.184–249 and 711–812 in which no single vignette or *aition* comes to life. Could Ovid have continued for twelve months? To my mind a real dearth of material becomes apparent in June. Perhaps July would have seemed more promising? There is the adoption of its name from Julius, the Ludi Apollinares, and the Ludi Victoriae Caesaris, with the appearance of the *Iulium sidus* to mark Caesar's apotheosis. August too, besides its glorious imperial name, offered scope for a pathetic evocation of Pharsalus.¹⁰⁸ Ovid has formally reserved one or two topics for discussion on their anniversaries in the latter part of the year;¹⁰⁹ indeed other legends still untold could have been ingeniously attached to arbitrary dates—the tales of Horatius Pulvillus, of Mucius Scaevola, Cloelia, and Cocles, of Coriolanus or Verginia. For such stories Ovid has not lost his appetite. But

103 *Fasti* 4.377–386, Thapsus was fought on April 6. Johnson 20 singles out for praise Ovid's vignette of a Caesarian veteran. Mutina (4.625–628) was fought on April 14.

104 For D. Iunius Brutus Callaicus (*RE* 57) see *Fasti* 6.461–468. I suspect that Ovid has introduced him to a favourable contrast with Carrhae, as he also follows Carrhae with the “victory” of the restored standards in 467–468.

105 6.563–568. Why would Ovid record these minor and inauspicious battles? Only the coincidence of the date gives them interest.

106 Postumius Tubertus, 6.721–724; Trasimene 6.763–766; the two victories 769–770. To write only two lines on two great victories from the glorious Hannibalic phase of Roman history is a mark of either exhaustion or boredom.

107 Compare Livy's account of Trasimene, 22.4–6.

108 Pharsalus was fought on August 9, 48 BCE.

109 Cf. Kraus 123. 3.199 and 5.147 look forward to the Consualia and the honours paid to the Lares Augusti in August : 3.57 refers to the Larentalia in December.

from September even the names of the months were without attractive etymology or associations, and the incumbent obligation to write on imperial themes might have been the most serious deterrent.¹¹⁰

Lefèvre has shown¹¹¹ that Ovid rewrote the end of the month of June to round off the volume (already considerably longer than the *Georgics*) for dedication to Fabius Maximus. Thus the couplet *tempus Iuleis cras est natale calendis, / Pierides coeptis addite summa meis* (6.797–798) is more an ending than a foreshadowing of the volume to follow. The somewhat contrived attachment of the section 799–810 shows that this was probably composed earlier, before Ovid added the reference to *Hercules Musarum* to honour Fabius' wife Marcia, and it offers little support for anyone who wishes to argue from the notorious couplet *sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos / cumque suo finem mense uolumen habet* (*Tr.* 2.549–50) that Ovid had already assembled the second group of six books to complete the year. He may still have hoped to do so, but the condition of the first six books, in which neither the sequence of patrons nor the references to Augustus as still living have been harmonized, gives the lie to any thought that he remained confident of his power to complete the work.¹¹²

What I have argued is not that the *Fasti* are a desolate failure, or devoid of the basic piety and patriotism to be convincing, but that the material was drying up. The episode of Priapus and Vesta only reflects the loss of inspiration that is apparent throughout June and parts of May. In his early months the balance of antiquarian curiosity, national pride, and outright humour is well kept, but the variety of tone is lost at the same time as the variety of appealing subject matter in May and June. Yet there is another way of looking at the *Fasti* in its present form. It is now clear that far more of book 1 and also book 2 were composed in the years of exile than scholars used to believe. Thus the high quality of an episode like Priapus' attempt on Lotis serves as confirmation of Ovid's continued—or rather renewed—creative power in his poetry

110 Compare Syme, *History in Ovid* 34 and his ensuing interpretation of Ovid's abandonment of *Fasti*, with which I largely agree.

111 Lefèvre II.154–156. He noted three “Fabian” sections, that on Cremera, 2.195–242; the honouring of the name Maximus, 1.603–606, and the section on the *aedes Herculis Musarum* rebuilt (not built, as he implies) by Marcia's father and Augustus' stepbrother, Marcius Phillipus, 6.799–810.

112 See S.G. Owen, *Ovidius Tristium Liber Secundus*, Oxford 1924, 281–282 on *Tr.* 2.549–550, Bömer 1.20–22 and Syme, *History in Ovid* 35–36.

of exile: even in the last years he could compose brilliantly and with the old unreformed verve.¹¹³

To return to the narrower theme of this article—the three parallel tales of failed rape, and their originality and sequence composition—I would like to suggest that both the Faunus story and the tale of Priapus and Lotis bear out Ovid's independence as an artist. In the first case he achieved through Virgilian reminiscence and the verbalizing of seen action, a marvelous blend of the sublime and the ridiculous, something like Plautus' treatment of *Amphitryon*, who is made first heroic and later absurd in the same comedy. In his handling of the other episode, I would suggest that Ovid first passed over the Greek narrative of Priapus and Lotis because it had no direct link with the Roman calendar, then made a brave but self-defeating attempt to adapt it to Vesta before finally letting his sense of poetry guide him to restore the myth to its proper setting and its glorious impropriety.¹¹⁴ I do not think we will ever find Ovid putting any literary heirloom to its obvious use, and the study of these episodes confirms the persistence of his talents beyond the barrier of exile.

113 Compare Syme's praise (42) for the "skill and variety" of the later compositions of exile (*Ex Ponto* 1–3) despite his low assessment of Ovid's art in the *Fasti*.

114 Note Johnson 15–16: "Alas the rapes and frustrated rapes have a special sheen, have almost a magnificence—they are written with the old debonair verve." But why "alas"?

19. The role of Evander in Ovid's *Fasti*

Although Ovid presents as the official theme of his *Fasti* the anniversaries of the Roman year: *tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum*, "the order of the calendar, with its causes, throughout the Latin year" (*F.* 1.1), the reader quickly discovers that each book of the month gains much of its structure and interest from events of Roman history and cult which are not pegged to the calendar itself. Where the events of legendary history were not associated with specific festivals, Ovid could arrange them as he chose, positioning them both within the individual books of the *Fasti* and in relation to other episodes from the same legendary generation or reign. It is this free choice from the legendary material which reflects most strongly the poet's taste and preoccupations, and marks his declaration of independence from the already dominant Virgilian tradition. Thus in building up the role of Evander, Ovid was both adopting a figure first fully realized in Virgil's *Aeneid*, and representing him in a changed context to provide his own realization of a phase of Roman prehistory that anticipated the coming of Aeneas.

Of course Ovid's *Fasti* was not a narrative epic, but aetiological, even didactic, elegy, subordinating narrative to its very different generic tradition. In this enterprise Ovid had both an Alexandrian and a Roman predecessor. Callimachus, whose *Aitia* set the precedent for Roman aetiological poetry, had chosen a looser framework for his four books of "Causes" or "Origins". It would seem that the first two books embedded the legendary narratives in a personal framework of encounters between the poet and the Muses: the third and fourth books, which the poet assembled later from elegies of varying tone and scale, did not weave the separate stories into a continuous fabric. Instead, Callimachus opened and closed the sequence with the two important courtly poems on the "Lock" and the "Victory" of Queen Berenice, his royal patroness.¹ This left the poet free to combine different kinds of narrative elegy

1 On the structure of the *Aitia* see R. Pfeiffer xxxv f., P. J. Parsons 1977, 46–50, J. F. Miller 1982, 371–77, and A. S. Hollis 1986. For a detailed discussion relating the new discoveries to Roman poetry see Richard F. Thomas 1983.

without any external constraint and allowed him to include poems composed separately for special occasions.

Propertius, who created Ovid's Roman precedent for aetiological poetry, blended his Roman legends into an elegiac book containing other poems, both love elegy and commemorative poetry. Ostensibly his programme for the aetiological poems seems close to Ovid, but when Propertius declared *sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum*, "I shall sing of rites and their days and ancient names of places" (4.1.69) he was allowing himself a free choice of rites and days and ancient names, without committing himself to either a comprehensive collection of rites or a formal sequence of days. In fact the four elegies based on old sites and monuments mostly draw on legends from the time of Romulus,² but 4.9 is concerned with Hercules, and Propertius' introductory elegy looks back before Aeneas to Evander—a foreshadowing of the greater role Ovid will give to Rome's earliest founder.

Propertius fourth book is clearly much indebted to the first book of Livy's histories, and the influence of Livy is even more apparent in the legendary instalments of the *Fasti*. It is not surprising that both poets, for example, take over from Livy the legend of Hercules and Cacus, which had been made by Virgil into a central episode of book 8 in the *Aeneid*. But in adapting and reshaping the historian's brief account Virgil showed the imagination of a great innovator. He took from Varro the tradition of Rome's earliest historians that the Arcadian Evander had come to the site of Rome two generations before the Trojan War, and he adapted this tradition to the greater glory of his own founding hero Aeneas. Virgil also knew versions of the coming of Hercules to Italy that associated him with Evander,³ and he made from these com-

Translations from the *Fasti* are taken from the version of J. G. Frazer, Loeb Classical Library, revised by G. P. Goold, 1989.

- 2 Prop. 4.2 presents Vertumnus commemorating Etruscan aid to Rome against Tattius and the Sabines (4.2.49–54), 4.4. the treason of Tarpeia in the same conflict, and 4.10 the winning of the *Spolia Opima* by Romulus, Cossus and M. Claudius Marcellus.
- 3 Polybius, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.32, made Pallas the son of Hercules and Evander's daughter Lavinia: he was buried on the hill and gave it the name Pallanteum; Dionysius himself reports the expedition and settlement of Evander "about sixty years before the Trojan War" (1.31) and follows it by the coming of Hercules and his Argive followers from Spain "a few years after" (1.34: he tells the story of Cacus in 1.39–40). The Polybian version seems to underlie the accounts attributed to Varro by Servius on *Aen.* 8.51; Varro be-

peting foundation myths a synthesis that would present Aeneas as in some sense a second Hercules, and give him the sanction of Evander's welcome and alliance.⁴ Through the long-lived Evander, whom Virgil assimilates to the Homeric Nestor, the poet created a continuity across three generations from Hercules to the Trojan hero, and through Aeneas' promise to Evander and his obligation to avenge Pallas, the heir to the kingdom on the Palatine, Virgil legitimated both Aeneas' final victory over the native Italians and his descendants' lasting claim to power at Rome.

By the time that Ovid came to compose the *Fasti* Virgil's rewriting of legend enjoyed an authority that outranked even the respected Livian narrative, and I believe we should see Ovid's choice of heroes not simply as an echo of Livy's early chapter, but as a response to Virgil: not a gesture of hostility to Aeneas and his imperial descendants, but an assertion of poetic independence: "Ich mache es anders."

The reader of the *Fasti* will find presented as founding fathers of Rome not Aeneas, who visited the city only in Virgil's fictitious narrative,⁵ but two figures, a Greek and a Latin founder: the immigrant Evander and the eponymous Romulus, inventor of Rome's first primitive calendar, representing between them the successive legends of the Palatine settlement.

Romulus was already associated with the Quirinalia of February 17, the Parilia of April 21 and the Consualia⁶ in August. But Ovid extends Romulus' participation into other months, attaching to the Lupercalia not only the story of the twins and their wolf-nurse in the Lupercal but two minor Romulean legends,⁷ and narrating Mars' seduction of Ilia as the opening panel of March.⁸ Since the story of Romulus' role

lieved that the Palatine was named either after Evander's daughter Pallantia, raped by Hercules and buried on the site, or after Evander's son Pallas who died *immaturae aetatis*.

4 For Aeneas as a second Hercules, see K. W. Gransden 1976, 14–20.

5 Aeneas occurs in the *Fasti* only as the bringer of cult; cf. 1.525–6; 4.37–38 and 77–78; 6.434.

6 The Consualia were celebrated on August 21: for this and other festivals discussed below see W. Warde Fowler 1908 and H. H. Scullard 1981.

7 The Lupercalia constitute the central panel of February, extending from *F.* 2.267–452; the supplementary legends are 359–80, attributing to Romulus the origin of the Luperci running naked, and 429–53, the legend of the infertility of the Sabine wives which led to the ritual striking of infertile women with strips of goat hide.

8 *F.* 3.11–76.

as founder priest and king was well known from Ennius even before Livy's extended narrative, Ovid can introduce the episodes out of historic sequence as the calendar or his whim dictates; thus Romulus' apotheosis precedes his divine begetting by half a book⁹ and Inuus' relief of the Sabines' infertility in February anticipates the narrative of their rape, discreetly alluded to at *Fasti* 3.199–200 with a promise of fuller detail to come.¹⁰

Ovid adopts a similar approach in his six references to Evander. In introducing the story of Evander's hospitality to Hercules and the founding of the Ara Maxima after the destruction of Cacus he was pre-empting the more obvious place for this narrative as an *aition* for the feast of Hercules Invictus on 12 August.¹¹ Although we might interpret this as a choice to free the month of August for celebration of the strictly Augustan anniversary of the Princes' triple triumph over Dalmatia, Actium and Egypt, it is unambiguously a decision to give priority to Evander, Hercules and the earliest legends of the site of Rome. Rome's Arcadian founder enters the poem as a young man in the narrative of the Carmentalia on 15 January, and is still present in connection with the ritual of the Argei in mid-May and the Matralia in June, when Ovid has exhausted the Romulus narrative.¹² Twice, in the elaborate Lupercalia-sequence (2.279–450) and in the introductory panel of April (4.55–58, 65–66), Evander and Romulus share the role of originator of Roman rites: thus Evander has virtual parity as a *ktistes* with the city's official founder.

And yet there was little known of Evander. Certainly Virgil created his memorable old king out of a tangle of fictional genealogy. In Livy (1.5 and 7) Evander is the Arcadian leader of an exiled band who establishes the cult of Lycaean Pan associated with the Lupercal and welcomes Hercules on his journey from Spain; after Hercules has killed

9 *F.* 2.475–512, appropriately on the Quirinalia, Feb. 17.

10 *F.* 3.199–200: *Consus tibi cetera dicet / illa facta die cum sua sacra canet*, "the rest that happened on this day Consus will tell you, when you shall come to sing of his rites," shows that Ovid was still hopeful of composing books to cover the second half of the year.

11 For the feast of Hercules Invictus on *Pridie Idus Sextilis* (August 12th), and for other festivals mentioned in this paper see W. Warde Fowler 1908, 193–197.

12 The last episode from the life of Romulus to be narrated in the six books of *Fasti* is the story of Remus' ghost which Ovid (apparently first in Roman tradition) gives as origin of the Remuria, his etymological variant of the Lemuria of May 9–13.

Cacus in revenge for the theft of his cattle Evander is about to try the hero for homicide when he discovers his identity and welcomes him as the hero whose coming was foretold by his mother Carmenta;¹³ in fulfilment of Carmenta's prophecy Hercules dedicates the Ara Maxima, which is thus Rome's oldest cult. Evander is also responsible for bringing the alphabet to Rome, as part of his special status as son of the prophetess (1.7.8). The Greek *ktistes* found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus is not only a child of a prophetic mother, Nicostrate or Themis,¹⁴ but associated with Hermes, either as father or maternal grandfather. Variant legends made him guilty of killing his human father or even his mother, to explain his flight and exile from Arcadia.¹⁵

When Ovid chose Evander he did not risk imitation of Virgil's splendid old Arcadian—for Ovid's Evander is both young and colourless. He wanted to compete, but not by borrowing Virgil's complex creation of Aeneas or his Nestorian Evander. Instead his young Evander, barely freed from his mother's prophetic apron strings, enabled Ovid to bypass Aeneas and recreate Rome's oldest occupation in the age before Troy. As in the counter-Aeneid of *Metamorphoses* 14, Ovid wove his stories in emulative counterpoint around the Virgilian narrative, to be enjoyed all the more by readers who kept their *Aeneid* in mind. Virgil's Evander looked back to his own arrival and hospitality to Hercules. Ovid would begin from that past and describe the settlement in process.

The Carmentalia of book 1 goes back to the first phase of Rome's evolution, introducing Ovid's readers to an all but empty site¹⁶ and an

13 Cf. Livy 1.7.10: *Ioue nate, Hercules salve, inquit, te mihi mater ueridica interpret deum, aucturum caelestium numerum cecinit, tibi que aram hic dicatum iri quam opulentissima olim in terris gens maximam uocet tuoque ritu colat*, "Hail, Hercules, son of Jupiter! You are he, of whom my mother, truthful interpreter of Heaven, foretold to me that you should be added to the number of the gods, and that an altar should be dedicated to you here which the nation one day to be the most powerful on earth should call the Greatest Altar, and should serve according to your rite."

14 Dionysius (1.31) makes Evander son of Hermes and Themis "but the writers of the early history of Rome call her in the native language Carmenta." Servius on *Aen.* 8.51 identifies Evander's mother Nicostrate with Carmenta, and on 8.130 adds that in one version Nicostrate was a daughter of Mercury. But the note of 8.130 reports that Hesiod provided a genealogy for Evander, which it does not quote, and adds the two other versions.

15 See Servius and Servius-Danielis on *Aen.* 8.51 and 333.

16 There are a few *sparsas per loca sola casas*, "huts dotted about these solitudes" (1.502).

inexperienced, troubled Evander. Through Evander's prophetic mother Carmentis or Carmenta—no mere Cumaean Sibyl¹⁷—the poet could enhance Rome's future glory, as Virgil's Sibyl and Anchises had prophesied for Aeneas in the sixth book. Ovid's narrative, extending from 1.459–586, is divided between the longer scene of the coming of Evander and Carmentis, with her two speeches of consolation and prophecy (469–542), and the shorter “action” scene of Hercules and Cacus (543–78), with its epilogue of the new cult founded by Hercules (579–82) and Carmentis' prophecy and reward (583–86).

The consolatory elements in Carmentis' first speech to her son require separate treatment: here let me give a brief outline of the narrative and prophecies of the section from 499–586. Ovid follows their ship up the Tiber to land at the spot called Tarentum, and marks Carmentis' frenzied greeting of the local gods. Her ecstatic vision owes as much to Propertius as to Virgil, as she looks into the distant future and the mighty walls of Augustan Rome (515–18) then pulls back to focus on the near future of the *Aeneid*: the coming of the Trojans (519–20), the death of Pallas her grandson and Aeneas' vengeance: *non humili uindice caesus eris*, “by no mean champion shalt thou be avenged.”¹⁸ In language recalling Cassandra's prophecy in Propertius' first aetiological elegy, Carmentis foretells the triumph of defeated Troy and defies the conquering flames: Troy's ashes will grow to encompass the world.¹⁹ In contrast, Aeneas is named only at 527, as bearer of the Trojan Penates. Ovid has delayed this reference (which logically belongs after 519–20) so that he can exploit the association of the Trojan Penates with Roman Vesta,²⁰ now in the care of Augustus and his heirs, and

17 Compare Livy 1.7.8: *Carmentae matris quam fatiloquam ante Sibyllae in Italiam aduentum miratae eae gentes fuerant*, “to his mother Carmenta, whom those tribes had admired as a prophetess before the Sibyl's coming into Italy.”

18 521–22. This is surely a subtle and competitive variation on Aeneas' words of consolation to the dead Lausus: *hoc tamen infelix miseram solabere mortem: / Aeneae magni dextra cadis*, “Yet hapless one, this shall solace thee for thy sad death: tis by the hand of great Aeneas thou dost fall” (*Aen.* 10.829–30).

19 For the reminiscence of Propertius 4.1.87–88 and the *Pergameae* ... *rata carmina uatis*, “the confirmed predictions of the Trojan prophetess” (4.1.51–54) see now C. Murgia 1989, 257–72, esp. 261–66. Murgia is surely right to adopt Mueller's transposition, but more can be said on the influence of Propertius 4.1 on this section of the *Fasti*, and I hope to return to this question later.

20 Compare *Met.* 15.861–62, 864: *di, precor, Aeneae comites, quibus ensis et ignis cesserunt ... / Vestaque Caesareos inter sacrata penates*, “Oh gods, I pray you, comrades of Aeneas, before whom both fire and sword gave way ... and Vesta

stress the religious continuity of the Palatine cult up to and beyond his own time. In this narrative sequence the role of Evander (like that of Aeneas in *Aeneid* 6 with the Sibyl and Anchises and again with Evander in *Aeneid* 8) is simply to listen and perhaps understand later when this future is realized.

At 1.541 the narrative leaps a short interval to the coming of Hercules and his combat with Cacus. Like Virgil's retrospective sequence in *Aen.* 8.185–272 and Livy's account (1.7.3–9) this leads to the foundation of the Ara Maxima, but Ovid rounds off the scene with an echo from Livy: *te mihi mater, ueridica interpretis deum, aucturum caelestium numerum cecinit*, "you are he of whom my mother, truthful interpreter of Heaven, foretold to me that you should be added to the number of the gods" (Livy 1.7.10) becomes (583–84):

nec tacet Euandri mater prope tempus adesse
Hercule quo tellus sit satis usa suo.

Nor did Evander's mother hide the truth that the time was at hand when earth would have done with its hero Hercules.

One is tempted to see nothing more in this narrative than a skilful re-orientation of Livy's text to shift the point of view towards Carmentis, the honorand of the day, while retaining the attractive combat myth of Hercules and Cacus. The textual relationship with *Aeneid* 8 is slight, because Ovid had shaped his narrative to serve three other purposes: the tribute to the cult of Vesta, whose increased prominence dates to Augustus' assumption of position of Pontifex Maximus in 12 BCE, seven years after Virgil's death; the role of Evander as an exile-figure, which is the focus of Carmentis' consolation, and the companion narrative of the coming of Ino to Rome which he will compose for the Matralia, again combining Carmentis, Evander and Hercules.

who has ever held a sacred place midst Caesar's household gods," and contrast this with its Virgilian model *Geor.* 1.498: *di patrii Indigites et Romule, Vestaque mater*, "Gods of my country, Heroes of the land, Romulus and Vesta, our mother." The *Aeneid* associates both Aeneas and Augustus with the great gods of Troy (8.11: *victosque penates / inferre*, "bringing vanquished gods," and 687–79: *hinc Augustus ... Caesar / cum patribus populoque penatibus et magnis dis*, "Here Augustus Caesar, with peers and people and the great gods of the Penates"). But the cult of Vesta was not associated with the Penates of Augustus until he absorbed her temple into his residence as Pontifex Maximus in 12 BCE.

In contrast, Ovid introduces formal imitation of *Aeneid* 8 as the framework of his reminiscences of Evander and Hercules to explain the origin of the ritual of the Argei on May 15th.

A variant legend connected these Argei with the cult of Hercules, so Ovid asks Father Tiber to tell him the real origin of the practice. Tiber's reply follows the pattern of his speech to Aeneas at *Aen.* 8.36–65, introducing Arcadian Evander (*F.* 5.643) whom he calls *Pallantius heros*, "Pallantian hero" (compare *Aen.* 8.51: *genus a Pallante profectum*, "a race sprung from Pallas") as he reports Evander's hospitality to Hercules. Tiber explains that when Hercules returned to Argos after his victory over Cacus (which can be passed over in this later narrative) he left behind some Argive followers, who now settled their hopes and homes on the Roman hills. However, as death approached they grew homesick, *patriae dulci tanguntur amore*, "touched by the sweet love of their native land" (5.653), and asked for their ashes to be consigned to his waves so that they could be carried back to Argos.²¹ Here Ovid's model is again Virgil: the pathetic description of Antor, a follower of Hercules who stayed with Evander and died fighting in *Aen.* 10.777–82: *et dulcis moriens reminiscitur Argos*, "and dying, dreams of his sweet Argos." According to the Tiber the straw dummies or Argei were surrogates for the dead, which would be carried downstream to the sea and find their way on friendly currents back to Greece.²² When he has finished Ovid's Tiber withdraws to his grotto and suspends his flow (*et leues cursum sustinuitis aquae*, "you nimble water checked your flow") like Virgil's river, and yet with a difference: at the end of his speech in *Aen.* 8.66–67 the river god only submerged. It was only after the portent of the white sow, when Aeneas sailed upstream, that Tiber actually checked his flow (*Aen.* 8.87): *Thybris ea fluuium, quam longa est, nocte tumentem / leniit et tacita refluens ita substitit unda*, "All that night long Tiber calmed his swelling flood, and flowing back with silent wave stayed thus."

Like Numa, Evander was seen as a cult founder; with Livy and Dionysius (1.31) Ovid honours him for bringing to Rome the cult of

21 The story of the Argive companions of Hercules is reported at Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.44. But Dionysius represents Hercules' followers as assimilating successfully into the community at Rome and makes no connection with the Argei.

22 5.657–660. The whole story depends on the same benevolent power of river and sea-spirits that is a prerequisite for the coming of Ino to Rome in 6.499–502 discussed below. The two fantasies seem to be of the same cloth.

Lycaean Pan, and in his introduction to April sets Evander first in the roll call of Greek colonists who founded the cities of Italy (*F.* 4.65, followed by Hercules in 4.66). In May, too, he draws on Evander's descent from Hermes, to recall his introduction to Rome of the cults of Hermes and Faunus (often identified with Pan) and the Luperi (*F.* 5.91–100). In both passages Evander symbolizes the Greek settlement of Italy (as *Graecia Maior* 4.64) and Rome's adoption of *sacra* and foreign gods (*impositi dei* 5.92) from what is repeatedly called the oldest land of Greece (5.90: *luna credita terra prior*, "land accounted older than the moon" = 2.289–90). If both the coming of Carmentis (93–98) and the cult of Faunus/Pan (5.99–102) are repetitions of previous material it is not so much for lack of themes as because Ovid is building up Rome's connection with Arcadia, Mercury's birthplace, for the month of Maia²³ and wishes to keep the city's beginnings before his reader's imagination.

These episodes deal with traditional stuff; far stranger is the complex story offered as an aetiology of the Matralia: 6.475–550.²⁴ The cult of Mater Matuta and her identification with Leucothea, the Greek cult name of Ino, was old established in Rome: indeed Cicero when discussing the worship of former mortals twice lists Ino after the canonical deified heroes Hercules, Aesculapius, Liber, Castor and Pollux as an acknowledged example of a deified mortal worshipped at Rome.²⁵ The temples of Mater Matuta and Portunus were quite close to the Ara Maxima in the Forum Boarium, which may have prompted Roman antiquarians to associate them with Hercules and the earliest history of the site.²⁶ But if Varro or any other authority before Ovid made the connection, no evidence has survived.

23 For Maia as mother of Mercury, *F.* 5.85–88, for Mercury himself 5.495–96 (travelling incognito with Jupiter), 5.664–93 (the huckster's prayer) and note the allusion to the Pleiades, of whom Maia was the most beautiful, at 599.

24 On the Matralia narrative see Emanuela Salvadori 1982 in *Sandalion* 5.205–221. Since this journal is not generally available I shall continue to cite her findings.

25 Cf. *De nat. d.* 3.48, *Tusc.* 1.28: *quid? Ino Cadmi filia nonne Leucothea nominata a Graecis Matuta habetur a nostris?* "What? Is not Ino, daughter of Cadmus, named by the Greeks Leucothea, revered as Matuta by our countrymen?" Both passages mention her after her nephew Liber/Dionysus, whom she nursed after her sister Semele's death.

26 Livy 5.19.6 reports that when Camillus built up the temple of Mater Matuta in 396 BCE he was replacing an older shrine on the spot, but there is no evidence for the cult before the fourth century. The temple of Mater Matuta and that of Fortuna nearby were damaged by fire and rebuilt in 212 (Livy 24.47.15 and

Ovid's starting point in *Fasti* 6 is the Greek tradition that Ino was maddened by Juno in retaliation for her role as nurse of Dionysus, and leapt with her child Melicertes from a cliff-top at the Isthmus:²⁷ with the aid of Panope and her hundred sister nymphs (*F.* 6.499) the poet transports mother and child in four lines (6.499–502) to the Tiber and the grove of Semele or Stimula. There the local matrons are celebrating Bacchus when Juno "stimulates" them to frenzied violence and they seize Ino, to snatch away and kill her child (515–16). It is at this moment that Hercules arrives with his cattle and puts the Bacchantes to flight. Recognizing Ino, he comments on their common fate as victims of Juno's persecution, but she tells him only part of her story, from shame at her own madness. Ovid uses the motif of rumour to make a rather abrupt connection (527–28) between the two phases of the narrative and to reintroduce Carmentis, who offers shelter and homemade cakes to the unexpected guest. Thus the *aition* for the grove of Stimula²⁸ is followed by a second *aition* for the special cakes:²⁹ but Ovid has not finished. Like a Euripidean divinity *ex machina*, Carmentis *sui ... plena dei*, "swelled with majesty divine,"³⁰ ends the rescue drama by prophesying the apotheosis and cult of Leucothea/Matuta and Palaemon/Portunus. The story thus provides a neat symmetry with the structure of the Carmentalia narrative in book 1.

Are there any grounds for Ovid's association of Evander and Carmentis with Ino? Where does this legend arise? There is no hint of it

25.7.6). See Bömer 1958, 2.371–73 on the problematic identification of the temples recorded as in the Forum of Boarium with the two foundations excavated near Sant' Omobono.

27 Cf. Apollodorus 1.9.1 (Loeb Classical Library 1.77, with Frazer's note 1) and 3.4.3 for the variant tradition that she cast him into a cauldron and for the identification with Leucothea and Palaemon.

28 A grove of Semele or Similae is attested as a site of Bacchic cult in 186 BCE in Livy 39.12.4, and the form Semele occurs in an inscription, CIL VI 9897 (see Bömer 1957, 2.374).

29 These cakes called *testuacea* because they were baked in heated pots, are explained by Varro *L. L.* 5.109 as part of the Matralia rite in his day.

30 The phrase, echoing 1.474 where Carmentis utters *ore ... pleno carmina uera dei*, "with swelling voice true strains divine," is close to the notorious tag *plena deo* cited from Ovid's lost *Medea* by Sen. Rhet. *Suas.* 3.5–7. See F. Della Corte 1971.

in Ovid's other version of Ino's apotheosis in *Met.* 4.416–562.³¹ But just as he enriched the Ino narrative of his epic with echoes of Juno and Allecto from *Aeneid* 7,³² so the various ingredients of this saga include echoes of the same Virgilian book. Roman syncretism had come to identify the two deities, Mater Matuta and Leucothea, because of their boy children Portunus and Palaemon, and their marine jurisdiction. The grove of Stimula/Semele was the site of the Bacchanal scandal in Livy 39.12.4, so it was a natural gathering place for the worshippers of Dionysus to honour his dead mother. The way in which Ovid brings Ino to Rome and subjects her to hostile attack closely resembles his extended myth of Carthaginian Anna in *Fasti* 3.543–646.³³ As Ovid invented the fiction of Lavinia's hatred as the cause of Anna's flight (3.633–38), so here he adapts Juno's indirect maddening of Amata and her women with Bacchic frenzy (*Aen.* 7.385–405) to set the crisis in motion. Who could recognize Ino and rescue her? Since she belonged to the Theban saga, two generations before the Trojan War, Ovid chose the Theban-born Hercules, the traditional rescuer;³⁴ and since Hercules' visit belonged to the youth of Evander, Carmentis was still living to serve both as prophet and the female hand to bake the cakes. Certainly Evander is only marginal in this narrative—he is mentioned at 506—and it is again Carmentis who dominates, as is proper in a tale of female cult.

I suggested earlier that this narrative would have a bearing on the shape of the earlier Carmentis narrative, and it is time to point to the symmetries, which have been well argued and demonstrated in tabular form by Salvadori.³⁵ Both narratives detail the arrival of a Greek fugitive at an aetiologically significant place; the Tarentum in book 1, the grove of Stimula/Semele in book 6. In both Hercules appears as rescuer, in

31 See Salvadori 1982, 213 f. Most recently Danielle Porte 1985, 463–64 stresses the pure fiction of this coming of Ino and her synchronization with Hercules, “un épisode nouveau jailli de sa fertile invention.”

32 See E. J. Bernbeck 1967.

33 Salvadori 1982, 215 n. 54 notes Ovid's adoption of the motif of travel to Italy for Carmenta, Anna and the Magna Mater.

34 The tradition also harmonizes with Hercules' exclusion of women from his cult at the Ara Maxima, the occasion of Propertius' aetiological elegy 4.9, in which the hero's defeat of Cacus is followed by his exclusion from the precinct of the Bona Dea on the Aventine by her women worshippers. Their hostile treatment of Hercules may have been a further influence of Ovid's invention of the hostile Bacchantes in *Fasti* 6.

35 1982, 219.

book 1 of the cattle and of the natives from Cacus' thefts, in book 6, of Ino and Melicertes when he puts the women to flight and addresses his countrywoman (519–26).³⁶

The good deed is followed by hospitality, with Carmentis as hostess of Ino: with 6.529: *hospita Carmentis fidos intrasse Penates / diceris*, "It is said that as a guest you did enter the home of loyal Carmentis and there did stay your long hunger," compare 1.545: *dumque huic hospitium domus est Tegeaea*, "while he is kindly entertained in the Tegean house." Both passages culminate in Carmentis foretelling the apotheosis of her guest: with 1.583–84, quoted above: compare her direct³⁷ speech at 6.541–49 and the fulfilment of her prophecy which ends the sequence.

Now Ovid rewrote large parts of book 1 in exile, and the allusion to the new divinity, *nouum ... numen*, Livia (1.536) is only the last of several features that tie the composition of Carmentis' main prophecy to his last years. So the affinities between the traditional myth of book 1 and the invention of book 6 reflect their closeness in time: there are other cross-references³⁸ which show, I believe, that the chief purpose of the new myth associating Ino with Carmentis, Evander and Hercules was precisely to create this narrative symmetry: by this second extended panel Ovid could both recall the earlier story and return to the earliest phase of Roman legend as he approached the end of his six books. He has even reversed the scenes, so that Hercules, whose feat formed the second instalment of the narrative in book 1, now provides the short rescue scene before the longer domestic scene in which Evander and Carmentis entertain Ino (6.529–50). In his last years Ovid must have realized that the sixth book of the *Fasti* would be his last, and there

36 The obvious vagueness of chronology here is a mark of Ovid's intention. How does this saga fit into the continuous Cacus-Ara Maxima narrative? Are we to imagine that Hercules had only just arrived in 5.519, or that he had already defeated Cacus and founded his altar? Ovid is not concerned.

37 Salvadori 1982, 216 n. 61 draws attention to Ovid's Alexandrian technique of direct citation of prophecy here to vary narrative with the future tense.

38 Note the special attention given to Carmentis' prophetic inspiration at the beginning of 1.473–74, and end of 6.537–40; the latter contains both the echoes *plena dei* (6.538 = 1.474) and *maior erat* (6.540 = 1.542). It is less remarkable that both passages contain the adjective *Tegeaeus*, 6.531 = 1.545, 627, since it occurs elsewhere in the *Fasti* (once) and *Ars* (once).

are other signs of the simultaneous remodelling of the two "outside" books which I have noted in earlier papers.³⁹

But Evander may have gained an additional meaning for Ovid after the commencement of the poem. E. Courtney argued over twenty years ago that Ovid was still writing the last books of the *Fasti* in his exile.⁴⁰ We know that the poet revised book 1 during the later years of his exile and the Evander-Carmentis sequence contains clear reference to Tiberius' succession and Livia's new title, Augusta, conferred by Augustus' will. How much of this section can we attribute to these last years? From 480–96 Carmentis offers a speech of consolation to Evander for his exile from Arcadia. "You must bear your fortune like a man," she declares: "it was fated"

... nec te tua culpa fugauit,
sed deus; offenso pulsus es urbe deo.
non meriti poenam pateris, sed numinis iram.
est aliquid magnis crimen abesse malis (1.482–86)

... no fault of man has banished thee, the deed is god's; an offended god has driven thee from the city. What thou dost endure is not the punishment of sin, but heaven's ire: in great misfortunes it is something to be unstained by crime.

This language is typical of *Tristia* 2 and many of the exile poems.⁴¹ Although in the earlier poems of exile Ovid usually admits deserving the *poena* of Augustus, he will suggest in his *Apologia* to Augustus that the penalty is excessive, just as he denies any *crimen* in his life or book.⁴² Elsewhere he will note frankly that Jupiter's thunderbolts have punished the innocent.⁴³ Carmentis' consolation *omne solum forti patria est*, "every land is to the brave his country" (493) also recalls the commonplace of

39 See Fantham "Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*" (1985) = n. 18 in this volume.

40 See Courtney 1965, 63, citing both metrical and contextual grounds for arguing composition in exile. Note that his instances 5.582 and 6.657 occur close to the Argei and Mater Matuta passages, the last in the context of the pipers' exile at Tibur.

41 Compare for *numinis ira*, *Tr.* 1.5.44 and 78, *laeso numine*, *Tr.* 2.108; *offenso deo* / *offenso numine*, *Tr.* 1.10.42; 5.10.52; *Ex. P.* 1.10.42.

42 *Tr.* 2.545–46: *sera redundauit ueteris uindicta libelli / distat et a meriti tempore poena mei*, "late and overfull is the vengeance for that early book, distant is the penalty from the time of the sin"; cf. 2.92, 240 and 265.

43 *Ex. P.* 3.6.27–28: *Iuppiter in multos temeraria fulmina torque / qui poenam culpa non meruere pati*, "Jupiter hurls at haphazard his bolts against many who have by no fault deserved to suffer a penalty."

Greek tragedy and consolation literature, attributed to Teucer by Cicero *Tusc.* 5.108, *patria est ubicunque est bene*, "one's country is wherever one does well": but the examples that precede it are no commonplace. Instead of Teucer—whose misfortunes post-dated Evander—Ovid cites Cadmus, Tydeus and Jason as honourable exiles, quoting first Cadmus as founder of a dynasty. This rare combination occurs again at *Ex Ponto* 1.3.61 f. where Ovid reproaches his would-be comforter Rufinus: *i nunc et ueterum nobis exempla uirorum / qui forti casum mente tulere refer*, "now then go and cite for me the example of men of old who bore danger with strong mind." Rufinus' Roman precedents like Rutilius Rufus give way to Jason (75–76), Cadmus (77–78), Tydeus (79) and finally Teucer (80).

Ovid in exile exploits for Evander the *topoi* which his personal poems admit to be no comfort. Exile is also a factor in Ovid's list of Greek *ktistai* that starts with Evander in *Fasti* 4.65 f. Perhaps the original list stopped short with Aeneas (77–78); if so the section was written without pathetic personal involvement. In its present form the list moves from Aeneas to his companion Solymos founder of Sulmona, and a cry of pain to Germanicus that Ovid is far away in Scythia.⁴⁴ But 85: *quo non liuor abit!* "Where does not sallow envy find a way?" fits Ovid's personal reference in 81–84 as well as the protest at the mistreatment of Venus that follows. In other words 4.79–84 is an original part of the *ktistai* sequence, and Evander and Scythia are part of the same train of thought. If there is a late insertion it must begin with Evander, not with Solymos in 79.

Finally I return to the Argei of 5.643 and their *patriae dulcis amor*. The aged Argive is buried in Italian soil despite his *mandata* (5.655–56): only his straw image is lowered into the river to float away to Argos (657–60). So Ovid in *Tristia* 3.3 feared that his body would be buried in alien soil, and begged that at least his ashes might be brought back. At 3.3.61 f. he gives his wife his *mandata*, beginning (65–67):

44 *F.* 4.81–86: *Sulmonis gelidi, patriae Germanice nostrae. / Me miserum, Scythio quam procul illa solo est! / ergo ego tam longe—sed supprime Musa querellas. / non tibi sunt maesta sacra canenda lyra. / quo non liuor abit? Sunt qui tibi mensis honorem / eripuisse uelint inuideantque Venus.* "Cool Sulmo, my native town, Germanicus. Woe's me, how far is Sulmo from the Scythian land! Therefore shall I so far away—but check, my Muse, thy complaints; tis not for thee to warble sacred themes on mournful strings. Where does not sallow envy find a way? Some there are who grudge thee the honour of the month, and would snatch it from thee, Venus."

ossa tamen facito parua referantur in urna:
 sic ego non etiam mortuus exul ero.
 non uetat hoc quisquam ...

But my bones—see that they are carried home in a little urn, so shall I not be an exile in death. This nobody forbids ...

When Ovid's health returns the longing for burial is replaced with the wish for a magic chariot *ut ... aspicerem patriae dulce repente solum*, "that I might on a sudden behold the sweet soil of my native land" (*Tr.* 3.8.7–8). But if Ovid could not return, he could send back his poetry, and the same volume of *Tristia* opens with the stealthy arrival of his little book in Rome. Like the homesick Argive of *Fasti* 5, Ovid was denied return even in death, but a token reached his home and ensured he was not forgotten. This pathetic legend in its Virgilian colours surely belongs to the time of exile, and both links and contrasts his own fate with that of Rome's earliest founder, *felix, exilium cui locus ille fuit!* "fortunate indeed to have that ground for place of exile" (*F.* 1.540). In Evander Ovid found a surrogate for his own homesickness, and a vindication of his innocence: a founder who was not a Julian ancestor, but had stepped on the grassy banks of the Tiber two generations before Aeneas and had helped to inaugurate Rome's oldest religious monument and its ritual. It was a good answer to Augustus and Augustanism.

Bibliography

- Bernbeck, E. J., *Beobachtungen zur Darstellungsart in Ovids Metamorphosen*, Munich 1967.
- Bömer, F., *Die Fasten*, 2 volumes, Heidelberg 1958.
- Courtney, E., "Ovidian and non-Ovidian Heroides", *BICS* 12 (1965) 63–66.
- Della Corte, F., "Plena deo", *Maia* 23 (1971) 102–106.
- Fantham, E. (1983), "Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*", *HSCP* 87 (1983) 185–216.
- Fantham, E. (1985), "Ovid, Germanicus and the Composition of the *Fasti*", *PLLS* 5 (1985) 243–81.
- Gransden, K. W., *Virgil Aeneid viii*, Cambridge 1976.
- Hollis, A. S., "The Composition of Callimachus' Aetia in the Light of P. Oxy. 2258", *CQ* 36 (1986) 467–71.
- Miller, J. F., "Callimachus and the Augustan Aetiological Elegy", *ANRW* 2.30.1 (1982) 371–417.
- Murgia, C., "Propertius 4.1.87–88 and the Division of 4.1", *HSCP* 92 (1989) 257–72.
- Parsons, P. J., "Callimachus: Victoria Berenices", *ZPE* 25 (1977) 1–50.

- Pfeiffer, R., *Callimachus*, 2 volumes, Oxford 1949.
- Pforte, D., *L'Étiologie religieuse dans les Fastes d'Ovide*, Paris 1985.
- Salvadori, E., "La struttura narrativa die Matralia: Ovidio, *Fasti* vi, 473–562", *Sandalion* 5 (1982) 205–221.
- Scullard, H. H., *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, London and Ithaca 1981.
- Thomas, R. F., "Callimachus, the Victoria Berenices, and Roman Poetry", *CQ* 33 (1983) 92–113.
- Warde Fowler, E., *The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Roman Republic*, London 1908.

20. Ceres, Liber and Flora: Georgic and Anti-Georgic Elements in Ovid's *Fasti*

I The *Georgics* as model

The *Georgics* stand at the threshold of Augustan literature, the *Fasti* at its end, but despite Ovid's respect for Rome's first great didactic poem, Lucretius' *De rerum natura*, and despite all the intervening achievements of Augustan poets in incorporating national and aetiological themes into other poetic genres, Ovid's poem repeatedly acknowledges by echoes of form and theme the primacy of the *Georgics* as model for his aetiological work.¹

This paper attempts to measure Ovidian response to the *Georgics* at two levels, the level of formal, verbal allusion and the level of themes and values. I have been led to focus on Ovid's treatment of Ceres/De-meter (and less prominently Liber/Bacchus) because Ceres as teacher of agriculture and benefactor of men is central to Virgil's representation of evolving human culture. But Ceres is equally important to the *Fasti* (although her sober personality makes her unappealing as a candidate for interview by the poet) as a major deity in the largely rural Roman calendar, as a symbol of the didactic principle, and for her very centrality in the Virgilian poem that Ovid is emulating.

I shall be considering those passages of Ovid's poem in which verbal reminiscence of the *Georgics* draws attention to a common theme, where echoes are not simply a common generic inheritance, but purposeful allusion. But allusion can serve many purposes. According to Seneca the Elder Ovid was so skilled in adaptation that he could modify another man's phrase to discover a new meaning: *in illius uersu suum sensum inuenit* (*Contr.* 7.1.27). This is competitive allusion.

Allusion was also practiced as a kind of compliment: when charged with plagiarism from Virgil Ovid retorted that he often borrowed Virgil's phrasing *hoc animo ut uellet agnosci* (*Sen. Suas.* 3.7). To borrow a

¹ The recent major commentaries by R. F. Thomas, *Virgil: Georgics*, Vols. I and II, Cambridge 1988 and R. A. B. Mynors, *Virgil: The Georgics*, Oxford 1990 have been a precious resource for this paper as they will be for many papers to come. It is impossible to acknowledge fully my debt to their work.

well-known phrase from an admired predecessor was precisely this: to identify and honour him as model. Just as Horace would begin an ode such as 1.37 *nunc est bibendum* with an Alcaic motto to evoke the spirit and context of his Greek model, so a generation after Virgil's death Ovid would borrow from Virgil to signal the poem, or the passage, that was his model and stimulus. This was all the more necessary in the case of *Fasti* and *Georgics* since Ovid's collective elegiac calendar poem pointed more directly to Callimachus' *Aetia* as its generic template.

But ideologically, as a poem of national institutions, the *Fasti* responds to the values of the *Georgics*, and the poem can be seen as conducting a dialogue with Virgil: this dialogue is both one of support and dissent. So Ovid has first to build up a pattern of allusion that will direct his public to the *Georgics* as an ideological model and keep Virgil's poem in their minds. In this way the reader is alerted to later, more complex or conflicting, reactions. We will find that the pattern of Georgic allusion in *Fasti* moves from sympathetic or parallel adaptation of Georgic themes and content, to competitive allusion, divergent treatment without opposition, and at the extreme to outright correction or contradiction of comparable material in Virgil.

However, two factors should make us cautious in assuming direct allusions in the *Fasti* to similar Georgic texts. First, apparently direct response to the *Georgics* may be mediated by previous Ovidian response, in his didactic *Ars amatoria*, composed before *Fasti*, or in parts of *Metamorphoses* that seem to precede the corresponding passages in *Fasti*.² Secondly, within the six books of *Fasti* we must allow for the revisions which Ovid made in his last years of exile for the rededication of the *Fasti* to the princely poet Germanicus.³ It is always possible that passages

2 See especially the discussion of the topos *Prima Ceres* below, and compare Alessandro Perutelli, 'Prima Ceres: Ovidio Amores 3.10.11 e Met. 5.341 ff,' *Studi Classici e Orientali* (1973) 179–89, which treats two such Georgic allusions, but misses the recurrence in *Fasti*. On the relative chronology of parallel passages in *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* see F. Bömer, 'Über das zeitliche Verhältnis zwischen den *Fasten* und den *Metamorphosen* Ovids', *Gymnasium* 95 (1988) 207–21.

3 The details of Ovid's revision in book 1 were first argued by F. Merkel, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*, Berlin 1841, cclxii–cclxix: see also F. Bömer (ed.), *Ovid, Die Fasten*, Heidelberg 1957–8, 1.15–20, E. Lefèvre, 'Die Lehre von der Entstehung der Tieropfer in Ovids Fasten,' *Rh. Mus.* 119 (1976) 36–64 and E. Fantham, 'Ovid, Germanicus and the composition of the *Fasti*,' *PLLS* 5 (Liverpool 1985) 243–82.

in 'earlier' books were composed later, but the revision of *Fasti* 1 makes it particularly unsafe to assume that a given passage in this book was composed before a related passage in book 4 or 5. Ovid's skill in self-imitation and variation requires the critic in pursuit of allusion to Virgil's poem of the earth, or of pointed deviation from it, to watch out for mediating allusions in Ovid's own poetic corpus.

Because my particular concern in this paper is with Ovid's response to the Virgilian treatment of Ceres and to some lesser extent of Liber/Bacchus, I will focus primarily on the first and to a lesser extent on the second book of the *Georgics*. I will proceed from simpler forms of allusion—echoes designed simply to be recognized as such—to more complex passages where Ovid has changed the emphasis or moral colouring of Virgilian material (section II), and finally to his boldest protest against what he perceived as an act of discrimination by his great predecessor (section III).

The pattern of allusive homage to the *Georgics* is set up at the beginning in Ovid's proem (*Fasti* 1.1–26), dedicated like that of *Georgics* 1 to a young prince, and representing the prince himself, rather than Apollo or the Muses, as the prime mover of the poem and source of the poet's inspiration.⁴ Both proems outline the contents of the whole poem, not the single book, and both make a double appeal to the princely patron: as Octavian is asked to grant Virgil an easy voyage and assent to his bold undertakings (*audacibus adnue coeptis*, *Geor.* 1.40) so Germanicus is urged *adnue conanti ... ire* (*Fasti* 1.15); as Octavian's beneficent power (*numine*, *Fasti* 1.6: cf. *numina*, *Geor.* 1.30) is to take on a new role (*ingredere*, *Geor.* 1.42) and accept pious vows,⁵ so Germanicus is to present himself in peaceful mood (*da mihi te placidum*, *Fasti* 1.17), to give inspiration to Ovid's song and serve simultaneously as *auspex* for the year and the poem. This combination of divine beneficence on two levels matches the different levels of *Georgics* 1.40–2 in which Octavian both inspires the poet and succours the farmers for whom Virgil is writing.

4 This is not to overlook that the *Fasti* were originally dedicated to Augustus (cf. *Tristia* 2.551–2 *tuo nuper scriptum sub nomine Caesar / et tibi sacratum ... opus*), whether or not the present proem to book 2 (2.3–18) was once the proem dedicating the whole collective poem to Augustus.

5 On *ingredere*, the commentary of Mynors notes '*ingredere* of entering a new sphere of activity as in *A.* 8.513. Caesar is asked not quite "to enter on his divinity" (Conington) but to enter on some of its functions, so that *adnue* is not inappropriate.'

The first festival of Ceres in Ovid's calendar was the *feriae sementiuae* of late January, which marked the completion of ploughing over the newly sown land. Its timing was separately determined each year (*conceptiua*) and is pointedly defined by Ovid in the language of pregnancy: *seminibus iactis est ubi fetus ager* (*Fasti* 1.662).⁶ This was a joint celebration of Ceres and Tellus⁷ and Ovid marks it with a description of the farmhands on holiday and a hymnic prayer which he will later recall (and outdo) at the goddess's own unshared celebration at the Cerialia on 12th April.

Virgil had composed for the first *Georgic* a famous description of a festival of Ceres (*Geor.* 1.338–50) which influenced Tibullus' elegiac description of a rustic holiday (usually taken to be the *Ambarualia*). For his festival Ovid bases the opening description on Tibullus' account of relief from work, echoing its features in *Fasti* 1.663–70, but reversing their order:⁸ he also shares with Tibullus the theme of his prayer to the patron deities to drive away rural pests. But instead of Tibullus' brief appeal directed against the enemies of both crops and livestock (*Tib.* 2.1.17–20), Ovid adjusts his prayer to the time and purpose of the *Sementiuae*, strictly concerned with the life cycle of grain crops. As soon as he has introduced Ceres and Tellus (*Fasti* 1.671–4) he begins to construct this prayer from the language and thought of the *Georgics*.

His opening appeal to the goddesses *per quas correcta uetustas / quænaque glans uicta est utiliore cibo* (1.675–6) evokes the benefaction for which Virgil honoured Ceres in the invocation of *Geor.* 1.7–8: *Liber et alma Ceres, uestro si munere tellus / Chaoniam pingui glandem mutauit arista*. If the language is not so close to Virgil as Ovid's formal praise of Ceres at *Fasti* 4.401–2: *homine ad meliora alimenta uocato / mutauit glandes utiliore cibo*, the tag *utiliore cibo* common to 1.676 and 4.402,

6 Here surely Ovid's *fetus* evokes a play on the procreative meaning of *concupere* (*OLD* 3a of women and animals, cf. *Fasti* 4.771 and *Met.* 4.611: *OLD* 3d of the land, cf. *Met.* 1.430–1) and the technical religious use (*OLD* 12b) that underlay *feriae conceptiuae*.

7 On the sacrifice to Ceres and Tellus, and other aspects of Roman cults related to Ceres, see H. Le Bonniec, *Le Culte de Cérès à Rome*, Paris 1957, which deals with the religious aspects of both Ovid's *Feriae Sementiuae* and Tibullus' rather hybrid festival.

8 The garlanded oxen at full mangers, *Fasti* 1.663 = *Tib.* 2.1.8–9; the suspended ploughshare, 1.665 = *Tib.* 2.1.6. The anaphora of *da requiem* in 1.668–9 copies the repeated *requiescant* of *Tib.* 2.1.5.

may point to 1.675–6 as a secondary offshoot of Ovid's own allusion.⁹ There is no doubt, however, that the body of Ovid's prayer is modelled on Virgil and designed to recall the first *Georgic*. Ovid's list of hazards in 1.683–94 echoes *Geor.* 1.150–5 (risks to the standing crop), *Geor.* 1.181–6 (pests of the grain in storage) and 1.191–2 (the risk of overgrowth in young plants). Thus 1.683–5

neue graues cultis Cerialia rura cauete
 agmine laesuro depopulentur aues.
 uos quoque formicae subiectis parcite granis

transfers to the birds of *Geor.* 1.155 the military verb applied by Virgil to the ants (*Geor.* 1.185–6 *populatque ingentem farris accerum / ... formica*) and reinforces the image with the metaphorical *agmen*: less plausibly Ovid begs the ants to spare the newly sown seed-corn beneath the soil, instead of the stored grain.¹⁰ Following the future growth of the crop the prayer turns to the climatic hazards of Robigo, (*Fasti* 1.87 = *Geor.* 1.150) and the alternatives of starvation or *luxuria*: *nec pinguior aequo / diuitiis pereat luxuriosa suis* (*Fasti* 1.689–90) moralizes the warning of *Geor.* 1.191–2 *at si luxuria foliorum exuberat umbra / nequiquam pingues palea teret area culmos*. The next couplet, 1.691–2, *et careant loliis oculos uitiantibus agri / nec sterilis culto surgat auena solo* returns to the choking weeds of *Geor.* 1.154 (and *Ed.* 5.36) *infelix lolium et steriles dominatur auenae*. Even the final prayer for *triticeos fetus*, *passuraque farra bis ignem* recalls *Geor.* 1.219 *triticeam in messem robustaque farra*.¹¹

After this ingenious combination of scattered elements from Virgil's arable Works and Days, Ovid's public has the first *Georgic* in mind, and the epilogue to the prayer can follow Virgil in thought rather than in language. Bömer has rightly noted that this is informed by *Georgic* ideology:

bella diu tenere uiros: erat aptior ensis

9 The priority of 4.402 is quite likely if Ovid revised this prayer at the time he re-edited book 1 for Germanicus.

10 Virgil uses active *populare* of both ravaging armies (*Aen.* 1.527 and 12.263) and ants (again at *Aen.* 4.403): Ovid uses the deponents *populor* (e.g. *Met.* 1.249; 2.319) and *depopulor* (besides this passage only *Tr.* 3.10.56).

11 Cf. *Met.* 5.485–6 *lolium tribulique fatigant / triticeas messes et inexpugnabile gramen*, the climax of Ovid's list of hazards attacking the fields when Ceres withdrew from her protective function. This too is clearly modelled on the same passages in *Georgics* 1. Apart from Virgil's single use in *Geor.* 1.219, and the two passages in Ovid, *triticeus* belongs exclusively to agricultural writing.

uomere, cedebat taurus arator equo.
 sarcula cessabant, uersique in pila ligones
 factaque de ratri pondere cassis erat (*Fasti* 1.697–700)

To honour the peace brought to Rome by the Augustan regime, Ovid represents in the past tense the diversion of both men and tools from their proper agricultural function: the dynasty has now ended the evils of war, against which *Geor.* 1.507–8 protested as painful present realities:

squalent abductis arua colonis
 et curuae rigidum falces conflantur in ensem.

Thus Ovid turns to the *Georgics* as his model in his symbolic evocation of ploughing, the defining act of the *agricola*, and of Ceres' protection over the crops.¹²

Ovid again calls upon the *Georgics* for a passage in *Fasti* 2 which uses the negation of Virgil's account of civilisation at *Geor.* 1.133–48 to evoke the primitive pre-agricultural world of the Arcadians (*Fasti* 2.289–300). Here he draws on the Golden Age language of both *Georgics* 1 and 2. Allegedly born before the moon (*Fasti* 1.469, 2.290) the Arcadians are here dated *ante Iouem genitum* (cf. *Geor.* 1.126) and their life is that of wild beasts *nullos agitata per usus: / artis adhuc expers* (291–2) recalling the link between *usus* and *ars* in *Geor.* 1.133 *ut uarios usus meditando extunderet artes*. Their life *feris similis*, feeding on grass instead of grain (*pro frugibus herbas*), with water for their drink, recalls Virgil's description of the simple food of plough oxen, in contrast with men at *Geor.* 3.528–9 *frondibus et uictu pascuntur simplicis herbae / pocula sunt fontes liquidi*. Their sturdy nakedness: *sub Ioue durabant et corpora nuda gerebant* (2.299),¹³ similarly echoes Virgil's praise of the early Italians under Saturn's reign *corporaue agresti nudant praedura palaestra* (*Geor.* 2.531), but both poets owe something to Lucretius' account of early man (5.925–72) which celebrates the *genus / durius*, living *more ferarum* (5.925–6, 932), their drink water, their shelter bushes and

12 I have passed over here an earlier complex of allusion in Ovid's praises of spring (*Fasti* 1.149–60) to the *laudes ueris* of *Geor.* 2.323–30 and the receptive ploughland of *Geor.* 2.223 (cf. *tum patitur cultus ager Fasti* 1.159 with *patiens uomis unci Geor.* 2.223).

13 *Sub Ioue* 'under the open sky' is surely an Ovidian joke in view of *ante Iouem genitum*!

their couch the ground.¹⁴ Like all Golden Age images Ovid's primitive people are defined by freedom from later woes, and *Fasti* 2.295–6 again echoes both Lucretius' thought¹⁵ and Virgil's language in representing early man's ignorance of the plough.

nullus anhelabat sub adunco uomere taurus,
nulla sub imperio terra colentis erat.

There is Georgic allusion in the panting ox to Virgil's introduction of the first ploughing (*Geor.* 1.44–5 *depresso incipiat iam tum mihi taurus aratro / ingemere*) and in the land *sub imperio ... colentis* to Virgil's second ploughing, which he represented as the act of a military commander training his forces:

rursus in obliquum uerso perrumpit aratro
exercetque frequens tellurem atque imperat aruis.
(*Geor.* 1.99–100)

Within this excursus Ovid by association represents agriculture in negative terms of dominance, but to do so he combines Lucretian motifs with language drawn from Virgil's ultimately positive evaluation of the farmer's heroism.¹⁶ Was he the earliest reader to find 'ambivalence' in Virgil? Or is he consciously 'correcting' Virgil to suit his own disillusionment?

II *Liber et alma Ceres*: Ceres, Bacchus, and some moral problems of cultural history from the *Georgics* to the *Fasti*

The main focus of this section of my argument will be on two passages in the *Fasti* that present contrasted aspects of the role of Ceres (and to a lesser extent Bacchus) in cultural history. These are *Fasti* 4.393–416, praising Ceres for the benefits she has given to man, and *Fasti* 1.337–62, in which she (and Bacchus) are represented as making demands

14 For man's *durum genus* cf. Mynors on *Geor.* 1.63. For his nakedness, *Lucret.* 5.970–2 *membra / nuda dabant terrae nocturno tempore capti / circum se foliis et frondibus inuoluentes*.

15 *Lucret.* 5.933–4 *nec robustus erat curui moderator aratri / quisquam, nec scibat ferro molirier arua*.

16 This view is still debated, and it is difficult to see how it can be settled one way or the other. See most recently this author's review of R. F. Thomas' *Georgics* commentaries in *CP* 86 (1991) 163–7, and the dispute between Habinek and Thomas over Virgil's attitude to animal sacrifice (see n. 32 below).

that indirectly lead to man's injustice against the very animals which serve agriculture. Parallel to Ceres' claims as benefactress are the more modest claims made for Liber/Bacchus on the occasion of the Liberalia, which will form a pendant and transition to my last section.

Fasti 4.393–416:

Hinc Cereris ludi: non est opus indice causae:
sponte deae munus promeritumque patet.
panis erat primis uirides mortalibus herbae,
quas tellus nullo sollicitante dabat;
et modo carcebant uiuax e caespite gramen,
nunc epulae tenera fronde cacumen erat.
postmodo glans nota est: bene erat iam glande reperta,
duraque magnificas quercus habebat *opes*.
prima Ceres homine ad meliora alimenta uocato
mutauit glandes utiliore cibo.
illa iugo tauros collum praeberere coegit:
tunc primum *soles eruta uidit humus*. (393–404)

aes erat in pretio, Chalybeia massa latebat.
eheu, perpetuo debuit illa tegi.
pace Ceres laeta est; et uos orate, coloni,
perpetuam pacem pacificumque ducem. (405–8)
farra deae micaeque licet salientis honorem
detis et in ueteres turea grana focos;
et si tura aberunt, unctas accendite taedas:
parua bonae Cereri, sint modo casta, placent. (409–12)

a boue succincti cultros remouete ministri:
bos aret; ignauam sacrificate suem.
apta iugo ceruix non est ferienda securi:
uiuat et in dura saepe laboret humo. (413–16)

Ovid's celebration of Ceres for the Cerialia is an extraordinary composite sequence, containing at least four themes, which I have indicated by the spacing of the twenty-four lines.

- (1) 393–404. The first twelve lines mark the traditional and Virgilian image of Ceres as benefactor, bringing man better food than acorns by showing him how to yoke oxen to the plough.
- (2) 405–8. *War and peace*. The earth laid open by the plough initiates the theme of mining, associating bronze and iron with war waged because of greed for wealth. But Ceres loves peace: her invention is dissociated from the evils that followed it.

- (3) 409–12. *Opulence and simplicity*. (cf. 400, 405). Wealth is evoked first in acorns (400), then in bronze (405), but Ceres is content with poor but honest offerings (412).
- (4) 413–16. *Right and wrong sacrifice*. Iron (through the *culter*) is also connected with the sacrifice of the ox, but it should live, so that it can do Ceres' work (403, 413–15). Let the idle sow be sacrificed.

In the first half of this hymn, then, Ovid brings out the full significance of Ceres' *munus promeritumque* through a renewed depiction of the life of primitive man in Lucretian or Georgic terms (393–9) from the paradoxical identification of grass and leaves as *panis*,¹⁷ through the transitional stage of acorn consumption to the landmark of Ceres' *meliora alimenta*. By his wording Ovid deliberately recalls the two key praises of Ceres from *Georgic* 1:

*uestro si munere tellus
Chaoniam pingui glandem mutauit arista* (1.7–8)

*prima Ceres ferro mortales uertere terram
instituit, cum iam glandes atque arbuta sacrae
deficerent siluae....* (1.147–9)

Besides honouring the traditional claim of primacy¹⁸ for Ceres as benefactress and *Protos Heures* Ovid makes his Georgic allusion clear with the echo of *mutauit* in 402 from the earlier invocation.

But this is not the first time that Ovid has adapted *Geor.* 1.147. For Calliope's hymnic introduction to the narrative Rape of Persephone¹⁹

17 This is the first instance of the prosaic *panis* in the Ovidian corpus; it will recur only in the sense of 'loaves' in *Fasti* 6.311 and 315. Elsewhere Ovid's word for 'bread' (and other cooked forms of grain) is *Ceres*; cf. *Fasti* 2.539 *mollita Ceres* (mush); 6.381 *quodcumque est solidae Cereris* (grain); 6.391 *esse Ceres uisa est: iaciunt Cerialia dona*.

18 See Thomas and Mynors on *Geor.* 1.147. Thereafter praises for the invention of bread come in the form of praise for teaching the art of ploughing, cf. *Tib.* 1.7.29–31 *primus aratra manu sollerti fecit Osiris / et teneram ferro sollicitauit humum / primus inexpertae commisit semina terrae* or 2.1.41–3 of the *ruris dei*: *illi etiam tauros primi docuisse feruntur / seruitium et plaustro supposuisse rotam. / tum uictus abiere fere* etc.

19 On Ovid's simultaneous and interrelated treatments of Ceres' quest for Persephone see S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone*, Cambridge 1987, 10–11, 42–4, 77, and F. Bömer, 'Über das zeitliche Verhältnis zwischen den Fasten und den Metamorphosen Ovids,' *Gymnasium* 98 (1988) 207–21 (published without knowledge of Hinds' book). Bömer's introduction to *Fasti* 1.15, and commentary on *Metamorphoses* 5 also precede Hinds' discussion, but see

in *Met.* 5.341 Ovid blended the motif of *prima Ceres* with *Geor.* 2.513 *agricola incuruo terram dimouit aratro* (itself a reprise of *Geor.* 1.494) to produce

prima Ceres curuo glaebam dimouit aratro.

And at *Am.* 3.10.5–14 Ovid had produced a parallel, or surely a precedent, for the whole thought sequence of *Fasti* 4.393–404.²⁰ In the *Amores* Ovid turns from complaint at the female chastity imposed by the Cerialia to the goddess's benefaction: *te, dea, munificam* (3.10.5 = *Fasti* 2.393), and explains it by the contrast of man's earlier diet with real food (*cibus*, *Am.* 3.10.10, not *panis* as in *Fasti* 4.395). Here too are the key motifs *ante* (cf. *Fasti* 2.289, and 1.337, discussed below) the primitive *glans* and *herba* (*Am.* 3.10.7–10 = *Fasti* 4.395–400). Then:

*prima Ceres docuit turgescere semen in agris,
falce coloratas subsecuitque comas,
prima iugis tauros supponere colla coegit
et ueterem curuo dente reuellit humum.* (*Am.* 3.10.11–14)

In *Fasti* 4.401–4 as in *Am.* 3.10 the thought of *Geor.* 1.147–8 is developed over two couplets, but Ovid is shifting focus to a new theme: the oxen mentioned in the traditional nexus at *Fasti* 4.403 will be central to the more tendentious issue of animal sacrifice in the moral argument of 413–16.

The iron ploughshare typical of *Geor.* 1.147 and 2.513, of *Am.* 3.10.14 and (as *aratrum*) of *Met.* 5.341, the key symbol of agriculture in *Lucr.* 5.934 *nec scibat ferro molirier arua*, is missing from *Fasti* 4.403–4 because of the sinister associations that Ovid will develop for iron—the *Chalybeia massa* of 4.405—as he follows his three interwoven themes.²¹ There is an ingenious ambiguity in 404 *eruta uidit humus* which first suggests the beneficent effect of sun on upturned soil, as in *Geor.* 1.65–6 *glaebasque iacentes / puluerulenta coquat maturis solibus aestas*, then is reinterpreted in 4.405. Through association with the stripping and penetration of the earth for metallurgy Ovid's thought moves on to the evils of greed and war. The familiar Hesiodic associations of met-

below for the debate between Bömer and Lefèvre over the relative dating of the passages on animal sacrifice in *Met.* 15 and *Fasti* 1.

20 See Alessandro Perutelli, "Prima Ceres," *Studi Classici e Orientali* (1973) 179–89.

21 Ovid's coined epithet *chalybeia* evokes both *Geor.* 1.58 *at Chalybes nudi ferrum*, and the Callimachean/Catullan curse on these mythical ironworkers: Callim. *Aetia* fr. 110.48 Pf = Cat. 66.48.

allurgy, explicitly developed in Ovid's description of the iron age at *Met.* 1.140–2,²² are simply assumed in this passage of *Fasti*. Greed (for bronze, then gold), war (with bronze, then iron weapons), and sacrifice (with iron knives) are connected, and Ovid has seeded his introductory sequence with the forward-pointing *magnificas ... opes* of 4.400. But the second theme of greed for wealth in metals (developed more fully in *Fasti* 1.197 and 211–21) is only transitional here, as the poet moves to dissociate Ceres from both wealth and war, and reaffirms her love of peace.²³

The theme of peace, more a digression than a transition, yields in the last four lines to that of sacrifice. Ovid's last lines, rejecting the sacrifice of the labouring ox, have a strong precedent in the *Georgics* and so claim attention. But this same moral issue of the sacrifice of domesticated animals is treated at far greater length in the series of *aitia* for animal sacrifice attached by Ovid to his notice for the *Agonia* in *Fasti* 1.337–456. This extended sequence incorporates both mediated and direct allusion to the *Georgics*, enclosing a retelling of Virgil's myth of Aristaeus within explanatory *aitia* for the sacrifice of pig, goat, ox and sheep.

Recent scholarship has reinforced Merkel's original observation that this sequence of *aitia* must have been composed late in Ovid's life: after he had travelled to the Black Sea (cf. the Sapaevi, 389–90, and Hellespontine Priapus 439–41); after his completion of the tale of Vesta and Priapus in *Fasti* 6.331–46, which is duplicated by the livelier tale of Priapus and Lotis in 1.393–440; and after the composition of Pythagoras' diatribe against meat-eating and animal sacrifice in *Met.* 15.75–142, which it echoes in more than one turn of phrase.²⁴

22 *Effodiuntur opes, irritamenta malorum / iamque nocens ferrum ferroque nocentius aurum / prodierat: prodit bellum quod pugnat utroque.*

23 For Ceres and peace cf. *Fasti* 1.704 *Pax Cererem nutrit: Pacis alumna Ceres*. For honours given to leaders whose victories have brought peace to Rome, compare the praise of Germanicus at *Fasti* 1.287 *Iane, fac aeternos pacem pacisque ministros* and of the dynasty in connection with the Ara Pacis in *Fasti* 1.711–21.

24 Here I accept E. Lefèvre's thesis of *Rh. Mus.* 119 (1976) 39–64, that *Fasti* 1.337–456 was composed for Ovid's final revision of book 1. His argument is based on both internal evidence of dependence on the *Met.* 15 passage, and the specific allusion to the poet's experiences on his voyage to Tomis. Note that the second allusion to his Black Sea voyage, *Fasti* 1.440 *Hellespontiaco uictima grata deo*, is designed to recall *Geor.* 4.111 *Hellespontiaci ... tutela Priapi*, the only previous use of the epithet in surviving Latin poetry.

Pythagoras' denunciation in the *Metamorphoses* opens his account of the continuous transformation of all nature, and his condemnation of sacrifice and flesh-eating traditionally rested on the Pythagorean belief in metempsychosis, but in *Met.* 15.75–142 he argues in terms of moral obligation and true piety. His attack is not on the gods, who are explicitly exonerated from mankind's acts of slaughter, but on men who have attributed the demand for animal sacrifice to the gods in order to justify their own greed for animal flesh. Thus the standard *aitia* of the sacrifice of the pig to Ceres and goat to Dionysus²⁵ are based on the human assumption of animal offence against the gods: *prima putatur / hostia sus meruisse mori ... / uite caper morsa Bacchi mactatus ad aras / dicitur ultoris* (*Met.* 15.111–15). In this passage Ceres is not even named, and when Pythagoras comes to the slaughter of the sheep (15.116–19) and ox (15.120–6) he calls this *nefas* and repudiates the attribution of these sacrifices to divine demand.

nec satis est quod tale nefas committitur: ipsos
inscribere deos sceleri numenque supernum
caede laboriferi credunt gaudere iuuenti. (*Met.* 15.127–9)

To mark the Virgilian origin of this denunciation Ovid takes up at the beginning and end of Pythagoras' invective the lines with which Virgil marked the irrevocable turning-point when human culture declined from innocence:

ante etiam sceptrum Dictaei regis et ante
impia quam *caesis* gens est *epulata* iuuentis,
aureus hanc uitam in terris Saturnus agebat. (*Geor.* 2.536–8)

He recalls these key terms *impia*, *caedere* and *epulari*, first before he moves from killing beasts of prey to the slaughter of domestic animals, and then at the climax of his attack on this domestic sacrifice.

nostrumque petentia letum
corpora missa neci *salua pietate* fatemur.
sed quam danda neci, tam non *epulanda* fuerunt (15.108–110)

cumque boum dabitis *caesorum* membra palato
mandere uos uestros scite et sentite colonos. (15.141–2)²⁶

25 Compare the accounts in Varro, *R.R.* 1.2.18–20 and 2.4.9: Virgil reports the goat-sacrifice in *Geor.* 2.378–81, but omits the pig-sacrifice from the feast of Ceres in *Geor.* 1.338–50.

26 Bömer on *Met.* 15.112 notes that *epulor* occurs here only in Ovid, and is absent from Hor., Tib., Prop. He does not draw attention to *Geor.* 2.537, although it

Contrast now the sequence on animal sacrifice beginning at *Fasti* 1.349 *prima Ceres auidae gauisa est sanguine porcae*. Even before Ovid reaches the historical account of sacrifice, he has set before his readers the reluctance (*quia non ueniant pecudes sed agantur* 323) and terror (*praeuisos ... timet hostia cultros* 327) of the victim, treated like a defeated enemy (*uictrice ... hostibus a domitis* 335.6). It is no longer the crank philosopher but the poet himself who stresses the innocence and simplicity of non-animal sacrifice (*Fasti* 1.337–45), invoking the *topoi* of *ante* and *nondum* (337, 339) familiar from *Georgics* 1.125 and 2.536–7 and Ovid's own Golden Age narrative at *Met.* 1.94 and 97. It is not the crank philosopher but Ovid who now attributes to Ceres a bloodthirsty delight in the pig-sacrifice. This is scarcely offset by the description of the killing as *merita caede nocentis* (350). Even the *culpa* admitted for pig and goat²⁷ is challenged for the ox and sheep: *quid bos, quid placidae commeruistis oues?* (1.362)²⁸

It is here that Ovid introduces the story of Aristaeus and the *Bougonia* (*Fasti* 1.364–80), ostensibly to serve as an answer to the question and an *aition* for the first sacrifice of a *bos* (cf. 362, 380). But the story as told neither matches the Virgilian narrative nor meets the need for a precedent.²⁹ Virgil's Cyrene had required the sacrifice of four *tauri* and four unbroken *iuuencae*, which were then left in a leafy grove to decompose (*Geor.* 4.538–43). Nine days later Aristaeus was to sacrifice a female calf to Eurydice before he returned to the grove. Aristaeus obeys, and returning after nine days find the bodies of the eight oxen have generated the bees (*Geor.* 4.555).

In Ovid's version Aristaeus is told by Proteus himself (not Cyrene) to sacrifice and bury a single steer: *obruere mactati corpus tellure iuueni* (*Fasti*

handles the same theme, and is the first of only four instances of *epulor* in Virgil. In *Fasti* 4.398 *epulae* is more probably a reminiscence of *Geor.* 3.527.

27 Note that *Fasti* 1.351 *sata uere nouo teneris lactenia sulcis* (or *sucis* with the Teubner) copies the rare epithet of *Geor.* 1.315, *frumenta in uiridi stipula lactenia turgent*, and the dentals of *spectans aliquis dentes in uite prementem*, *Fasti* 1.355, evoke *Geor.* 2.378–9 *duri ... uenenum dentis*, while the stress on guilt in *Fasti* 1.361 echoes both *Met.* 15.115 and *Geor.* 2.380.

28 An obvious echo of *Met.* 15.116 *quid meruistis oues?* and 120 *quid meruere boues, animal sine fraude dolisque, / innocuum, simplex, natum tolerare labores?*

29 Danielle Porte, *L'Étiologie dans les Fastes d'Ovide*, Paris 1987, 44 stresses the illegitimacy of the Aristaeus narrative as *aition*: 'la seule excuse à cette étiologie, c'est qu'il lui permet de pasticher un texte illustre.' I am arguing for a more aggressive motive, that is, Ovid's desire to expose or correct the myth of *Georgics* 4 so as to reconcile it with Virgil's expressed judgement in *Geor.* 2.536–7.

1.377) and it is this single buried steer that generates the precious swarm.³⁰

When I first studied the *Fasti* narrative I noted only the verbal allusions to Virgil's much longer *Georgic* narrative and saw the discrepancies as little more than simplifications due to Ovid's desire for brevity, or perhaps his haste.³¹ Thanks to Alessandro Barchiesi and a referee of this journal I was led to reread Ovid's entire account, not only of Aristaeus but of the sacrificial *aitia*, with new expectations. I now believe this sequence should be read not as a justification of sacrificial practice but as a historical account mixing overt praise with blame: in so far as it pretends to justify, it self-destructs during and immediately after the Aristaeus myth.

Here Ovid is certainly correcting the narrative economy of Virgil's neoteric epyllion and seems also to comment ironically on the agricultural economy of the *Bougonia*. His *epiphonema*, *mille animas una necata dedit* (1.380), hardly convinces that the slaughter of even one steer was well repaid by a swarm of bees (one is reminded of the marketing skills of Jack and his beanstalk). But in Virgil's telling of the myth the cowherd Aristaeus' mother had advised him to sacrifice and abandon ten animals.

Is Ovid also taking moral issue with Virgil? This depends on how we read Virgil's Aristaeus myth. The recent exchange between Thomas Habinek and Richard Thomas³² has left the reader to make her/his choice. If we believe Thomas, then Virgil himself doubted the morality

30 Barchiesi notes that in *obruere mactati* Ovid has economically combined both the suffocation attributed to the Egyptian *Bougonia* in *Geor.* 4.296–304, and the sacrificial act of Aristaeus.

31 For completeness I note echoes of Virgil's longer narrative: *flebat Aristaeus quod apes cum stirpe nectas / uiderat inceptos destituisse fauos* draws on *Geor.* 4.320 *multa gemens*, 339 *lacrimans*, 375 *fletus inanes*, 363 *genus ... nouae stirpis* and 104 *contemnuntque fauos et frigida tecta relinquunt*. Cyrene, *caerula genetrix*, *Fasti* 1.365, echoes *genetrix*, *Geor.* 4.363, but co-opts Proteus' colour from 388. Ovid draws on *transformat*, *Geor.* 4.441 and *uictus in sese redit* (442) to represent Proteus in 1.373–4: *transformis adulterat arte / mox domitus uinctis in sua membra redit*, but of Virgil's final phase (*Geor.* 4.531–58) the only echo is *mactatam* at *Fasti* 1.377.

32 T. N. Habinek, 'Sacrifice, society and Vergil's ox-born bees,' *Cabinet of the Muses*, ed. M. Griffiths, Atlanta 1990, 209–23, and R. F. Thomas' reply, *CP* 86 (1991) 212–18. Thomas asks 'why should we assume that Virgil is interested in expressing support for the notion of civilised society's need "to restore itself by re-establishing the right relation between man, god and beast?"' (216) and makes a strong case for the attitude in Virgil that I have claimed for Ovid.

of the myth he relates, and Ovid is merely reinforcing the moral stance of his model. If we are convinced by Habinek, it follows that Ovid is 'correcting' Virgil's viewpoint just as he is certainly correcting Virgil's narrative economy.

For students of the *Fasti* itself, however, a more serious problem has emerged from this discussion of *Fasti* 1.335–80: that Ovid here contradicts the theology of his own hymn to Ceres in *Fasti* 4.393–416. This Ceres is not peace-loving but bloodthirsty and incriminated in man's ingratitude to the domestic animals who are his sacrificial victims. The offence of human culture is not detached from the will of the gods as in *Met.* 15.127–9, nor contrasted with divine pacifism and preference for simple inanimate offerings (*Fasti* 4.407–12). Instead Ceres, *prima Ceres* (1.349), is held responsible both for the offering of the pig and for the subsequent development of animal sacrifice.

Quid tuti superest, animam cum ponat in aris
Lanigerumque pecus ruricolaeque boues? (*Fasti* 1.383–4)

In this late revision of his text Ovid shows a new level of disillusion with his society's religious culture, no doubt reflecting his own embitterment in exile, and certainly going beyond the strictures of his Pythagoras. In returning to the theme, he both reopens moral issues raised by Virgil in the *Georgics* and goes beyond them, but he also expands his confrontations with the model text to incorporate the bizarre animal sacrifice of the shepherd Aristaeus which bring the *Georgics* to an end.

The complex history of Ovid's treatment of Ceres has delayed giving due attention to Ceres' partner Liber. Richard Thomas has brought out well both the role of Bacchus as honorand of *Georgic* 2, and the ambiguity of his *Baccheia dona* in *Geor.* 2.454–7.³³ But the role of Bacchus/Liber in the *Fasti* is less prominent and is limited to his patronage of the Liberalia of 17th March.³⁴ Roman cult honoured Venus rather than Liber as patron of the Vinalia in April. Thus in the *aition* associated with the Liberalia in *Fasti* 3.715–90 Bacchus, the *uuae commentor* (*Fasti* 3.785) is honoured for quite different benefits to man; the offer-

33 See Thomas, 1.20 and 242–3, D. Ross, *Virgil's Elements*, Princeton 1987, 144–5.

34 On the festival see Bömer 2.193, 197. Ovid points in *Fasti* 3.785–6 to Liber's loss of independent *ludi*, and their supposed incorporation into the Ludi Ceriales, (*quos cum taedifera nunc habet ille dea*), but he omits Liber (and Libera too) from *Fasti* 4.393–416 and 619–20, framing the Proserpina narrative. Frame and myth alike treat the goddess in terms of Greek Demeter cult.

ings (*libamina*) and honey cakes (*liba*) linked to him by folk-etymology, and his liquid gift of honey. But the three references to the god's benefaction at 3.736 *a Baccho mella reperta ferunt*, 744 *inuenti praemia mellis habet* and 762 *iure repertori splendida mella damus*, are not as bland and indubitable as they seem, nor will they go uncontested, as I shall show in the final section.

III *uestro si munere* ... A slighted goddess and her champion

Like Ovid I have lingered deliberately over the treatment of Ceres and her gift of agriculture, and chosen three particular echoes of the *Georgics* with a purpose. Echoes without critical resonance might better be left embedded in a commentary,³⁵ but I am convinced that even neutral echoes and allusions to Virgil's authoritative poem serve as signals to alert the reader to the moments when Ovid will challenge the orthodoxy established by Virgil's text. The excursus on animal sacrifice in book 1 has proved such a challenge: I now turn to a passage in which I believe the poet has pointedly corrected Virgil's theology in the *Georgics*, a passage that can fairly be called *oppositio in imitando*.

It is well known that Virgil's invocation to the country deities in *Georgics* 1.5–20 both resembles and diverges from that of Varro in *Res rusticae* 1.1.5–7. Like Varro, Virgil appeals to twelve deities (or collective *numina*) but while he introduces Hellenistic demi-gods such as the Dryads and Pan³⁶ and the cultural heroes Aristaeus and Triptolemus, Virgil has dropped four of Varro's Italic deities: Lympha and Bonus Eventus (who never will be missed) and the very Roman Robigo and Flora.³⁷

35 If only they were noted in commentaries! Le Bonniec (in the separate commentaries on books 1 and 2 (Paris 1965, 1969), and the editions with translation of the entire surviving poem (*Fasti* I–III, Catania 1969; IV–VI, Bologna 1970)) is naturally more interested than Bömer in the passages related to agriculture and to the worship of Ceres, but the scale of his work leads him to pass over many clear instances of Georgic allusion.

36 Roman syncretism equated Pan with Faunus (cf. *Fasti* 2.271–81) but Virgil has both Pan and the collective *Fauni*, equivalent of the Satyrs, as companions of the nymphs.

37 *Quarto Robigum ac Floram, quibus propitiis neque robigo frumenta atque arbores corrumpit, neque non tempestiue florent. Itaque publice Robigo feriae Robigalia, Florae ludi Floralia institute.* (R.R. 1.6)

Ovid's calendar in the *Fasti* provides him with occasions to honour most of Varro's gods, and lets some of Virgil's outsiders infiltrate through ingenious syncretism.³⁸ But where Virgil had reduced Robigo to a natural hazard (*Geor.* 1.150) and ignored Flora, Ovid takes full advantage of these picturesque and antique deities and their festivals, which follow each other closely on 25th and 28th April. Their powers, the negative power of Robigo to blight and the positive power of Flora to fertilize, were activated when the blossom set on fruit trees and when grain and other plants formed their seed.

Flora's Varronian partner, Robigo, with its dog sacrifice, is naturally piquant to the curious. Virgil had reduced the *numen* to one hazard among many (*Geor.* 1.151). Ovid dignifies *robigo* with a personality and a prayer.³⁹ Acknowledging the power of mildew to harm the grain (*at tu ne uiola Cererem* 4.931) Ovid explains the dog sacrifice by the maleficent effect of *Canicula*, the dogstar. The material appeals to the imagination and affords learned Callimachean allusion⁴⁰ but Ovid may also have enjoyed restoring prominence to the primitive *numen* that Virgil had dispossessed.

Since Flora's festival lasted into May, Ovid postpones his celebration of the goddess until his fifth book. First he deals with the naming of the month (*Fasti* 5.1–110) and the astronomical and calendar associations of 1st and 2nd May. But on the last day of the Floralia, 3rd May, he honours Flora (or rather she honours him) with an extended interview, the most prominent sequence of the month, extending from 5.183 to 5.378, and culminating with a personal request for her favour to the poet.

To Ovid Flora stands for both cult and scenic games. Her games, last to be made annual of the six theatrical festivals of Rome, naturally appealed to the poet for the eroticism of the mimes and other popular events. But both the goddess and her games are ignored by the Augustan writers before Ovid himself, and modern knowledge of her cult derives almost entirely from this passage and from precious Varronian material preserved in the agricultural book 18 of Pliny's *Natural History*.⁴¹

38 Aristaeus, *Fasti* 1.364–80 discussed above; Triptolemus, 4.550; Dryads, 4.761.

39 *Robigo* is feminine, and *aspera*; she has *scabrae manus* (921) and a dangerous embrace (*amplectere* 924). Is there a hint of a diseased prostitute?

40 To Maira, the dog of Erigone, who joined his mistress in the sky.

41 For ancient testimonia to Flora see Wissowa, *RE* VI.2, 2747–9; for the Floralia *ibid.* 2749–51.

Not only does Virgil ignore Flora: Livy too seems to ignore her cult and public games. We cannot be sure, since his text has not survived for the year 238 BCE, when the aediles L. and Manius Publicius Malleolus financed the Aventine temple and first games of Flora with fines exacted from illicit grazing of public pastures. But for 173 BCE, the year in which Flora's games were made annual, Livy's narrative has no report.⁴²

The goddess's mime-festival was a scandal to the more severe,⁴³ and this might explain what seems to be a pattern of studied neglect under Augustus. The Princes' restoration of traditional cult was subordinate to his concern for restored morality. Certainly he seems to have been slow in restoring Flora's temple, which was finally completed by Tiberius in AD 17, along with the adjacent temple of Ceres, Liber and Libera.⁴⁴

Yet Flora's cult was ancient and respected. Varro reports (*L.L.* 5.74) that Titus Tatius dedicated an altar to her on the Quirinal: Ennius (*Ann.* 177 Sk.) adds the appointment by Numa of the *Flamen Floralis*, and Lucretius gives Flora a prominent role in his spring processional at 5.737–40:

it uer et Venus et Veneris praenuntius ante
pennatus graditur Zephyri uestigia propter
Flora quibus mater praespargens ante uiai
cuncta coloribus egregiis et odoribus implet.⁴⁵

Although the Floralia were omitted from the early Republican calendars because they were *feriae conceptivae* dependent on the phases of the moon, one calendar, the *Fasti Praenestini*, does Flora full justice. This

42 Livy reports theatrical events fully from the Megalesia, made annual in 191 BCE (Livy 36.36) to the end of our text in 167 BCE. In 173, however, his report of domestic affairs is focused on the scandal of Fulvius Nobilior's appropriation of tiles from the shrine of Hera Lacinia for his own foundation to the Muses (Livy 42.3).

43 Cf. the anecdote of Cato's withdrawal in Val. Max. 2.10.8, Sen. *Ep.* 97, Martial, *Praef.* 1.35, and Christian polemic from Minucius, *Oct.* 25.8 and Tertullian, *Spect.* 17.

44 Tac. *Ann.* 2.49: *deorum aedes uetustate aut igni abolitas coeptasque ab Augusto dedicauit ... Libero Liberaeque et Cereri iuxta Circum Maximum ... eodemque in loco aedem Florae ab Lucio et Marco [sic] Publiciis aedilibus constitutam*. It has been suggested that Flora's temple was damaged by a fire late in Augustus' reign and had not needed restoration until then.

45 Alessandro Schiesaro has suggested to me that Flora's Lucretian associations with Venus, here and implicitly in the hymn to Venus 1.7–8 *tibi suavis daedala tellus / summittit flores*, would also endear her to Ovid.

calendar was composed by the Augustan grammarian Verrius Flaccus, Ovid's primary source for the *Fasti*.⁴⁶ On 28th April Verrius' inscribed calendar commemorates the foundation of Flora's temple on the Aventine: *eodem die aedis Florae quae rebus florescendis praeest dedicata est propter sterilitatem frugum*: as we saw, Ovid acknowledges the entry on the due day in April but postpones his tribute until Vesta and Augustus have been given their due (*Fasti* 4.949–54).

Even if Flora's urban cult did not meet official approval she was none the less the embodiment of plant fertilisation and a crucial power in the agricultural cycle. Pliny's Varronian narrative makes it clear that at the season of her festival Flora was the farmer's only divine protector against *caelestis sterilitas*, generated either by dewy cold from the full or waning moon (*N.H.* 18.281–2) or by the constellations Sirius and Procyon.⁴⁷ After he has explained the climatic hazards of the end of April, Pliny expressly cites Varro on the astronomical dating of the offerings to Robigo and Flora. Pliny provides less detail than Ovid on the first celebration of the Floralia, but he names Varro as his source, and confirms the date and purpose of the new ritual: the *prisci*⁴⁸ established the Floralia on 28th April in the year 238 BCE *ut omnia bene deflorescerent* (18.286). It is clear that Flora's agricultural protection should have received at least a passing acknowledgement in the first and second books of the *Georgics*.

And Ovid reacted against this neglect. He showed it in two ways. More unobtrusively, when he recorded the temporary lapse in Flora's cult before her festival was made annual, he ascribed to Flora a retaliation against men and their crops comparable to that of Ceres⁴⁹ in the traditional Demeter narrative:

florebant oleae, uenti nocuere proterui:

46 Bömer 1.22 notes the dating of the inscribed calendar (*CIOL* I, 2nd ed., p. 206) to AD 4–10, and attributes Ovid's knowledge of its contents to his consultation of Verrius' work of preliminary research, the *De Fastis Romanis*.

47 See *Pline l'Ancien: Histoire Naturelle XVIII*, ed. Le Bonniec/Le Boeufflé, Paris 1972 with *notes complémentaires* on 281–6; *Gaio Plinio Secondo: Storia Naturale III Botanica: Libri 12–19*, ed. Aragosti etc., Turin 1984, 816–22.

48 This is the meaning of *iidem* which resumes Pliny's main argument from 18.284 *rudis fuit priscorum uita atque sine litteris ... instituerunt ferias diesque festos, Robigalia, Floralia Vinalia*, after the astronomical digression on the Robigalia in 285.

49 Le Bonniec, *Le Culte de Cérès à Rome*, Paris 1957, ch. 6, iii, 196–201, argues that Flora is only an aspect of Ceres: but their original mythical identity has no bearing on their perception as distinct by Romans of the Augustan age.

florebant segetes, grandine laesa seges.
 in spe uitis erat, caelum nigrescit ab austris
 et subita frondes decutiuntur aqua. (*Fasti* 5.321–4)⁵⁰

But before this he had put into Flora's mouth a more assertive manifesto, that contested both Virgil's claims for Ceres and Liber and Ovid's own praises. From 5.261 to 5.272, Flora asserts her responsibility⁵¹ for more than mere flowers and garlands: *tangit numen et arua meum* (262). In Georgic sequence she demonstrates line by line her power to give wealth in corn (263), grapes (264), olives (265), and orchard fruit (266). Lest the Virgilian model should be missed, her claim to protect pulse:

flore semel laeso pereunt uiciaeque fabaeque,
 et pereunt lentesc, aduena Nile, tuae (5.267–8)

echoes and varies the language of *Geor.* 1.228–9 *uiciam ... uilemque phaselum / nec Pelusiaca curam aspernabere lentis*. There Virgil warns his farmer to wait until the setting of Bootes⁵² to sow his pulse. But Virgil's advice is unavailing if the flowers of the carefully sown plant can perish because of Flora's neglect.

Flora's control over Bacchus' products is double: she protects the growing grape and by extension controls the bloom of the fermenting wine (*Fasti* 5.267–8).⁵³ Honey too is her gift, *mella meum munus*, for it is her fragrance that brings the bees to the violets and clover and thyme.⁵⁴

Now let us return to Virgil's original invocation and relate it to Ovid's text.

Liber atque alma Ceres, uestro si munere tellus
 Chaoniam pingui glandem mutauit arista

50 Cf. *Met.* 5.482–4 *primis segetes moriuntur in herbis / et modo sol nimius, nimius modo corripit imber. / sideraque uentique nocent*. We might note too the variant reading *Ceres* for *seges* at 5.322 (cf. 4.917), an exploitation of the standard metonymy that would mark Flora's power to hurt the rival goddess by her neglect.

51 Or jurisdiction? There seems to be a dispute over *prouincia*.

52 The end of October, according to Thomas *ad loc.*, who notes that pulse is harvested in the spring.

53 Cf. *OLD* *florere* 3a, *flos* 4a. Bömer has no comment on this section.

54 Even the fourth *Georgic* is touché. Flora has chosen honey flowers cited at *Geor.* 4.32, 112 and 281. Only the *cytissus* (*Geor.* 2.431 and 3.94) though commended by Varro for bees is absent from *Georgics* 4.

poculaque inuentis Acheloia miscuit uuis. (*Geor.* 1.7–9)

Ovid has twice drawn on *Geor.* 1.8 in praise of Ceres (*Fasti* 1.676; 4.401) and celebrated bread as her *munus promeritumque* (*Fasti* 4.393), but though the goddess combined with *tellus* provided *causam frugibus* (*Fasti* 1.674) she provided only a necessary, not a sufficient cause. In his more modest praise of Bacchus/Liber, Ovid had singled out the god's 'invention' of honey and used it to justify the honours of the Liberalia: *iure repertori splendida mella damus* (*Fasti* 3.762). But now Flora can affirm *mella meum munus* (5.271) and answer Bacchus' patronage of the grape as *uuae commentor* (3.785) with her services to both vine and wine. And Ovid will point her (or his) correction by one more allusion; wine and festivity need flowers, *apta ... deliciis munera* (334) as water needs wine:

donec eras mixtus nullis, Acheloe, racemis
gratia sumendae non erat ulla rosae. (*Fasti* 5.343–4)⁵⁵

The tribute of *Georgics* 1.9 has been capped by Flora's least, but most generally recognized, association: her supervision of decorative flowers and garlands.

Ovid may appeal in conventional fashion to Bacchus for inspiration⁵⁶ but it is to Flora, the neglected Italian deity, that he prays for the lasting survival of his poem:

floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aeuo
sparge, precor, donis pectora nostra tuis.⁵⁷

Ovid's admiration of the *Georgics* should be beyond doubt: and his sympathy for Virgil's attitude to both the farmer and the gods he worships. But much as he respects the Georgic gifts of Ceres and Liber to civilisation, he will set the account right, supporting Flora's counter-claim with his own appeal both to and for the goddess of fertility and festivity.⁵⁸

55 Bömer on *Fasti* 5.343 notes that these are the only instances in Latin of the Greek use of *Achelous* for water.

56 Cf. *Fasti* 3.713 *faue uati, dum tua festa cano* and 789–90 *des ingenio uela secunda meo*.

57 *Fasti* 5.377–8. This couplet is generally recognized as Ovid's adaptation of Callimachus' prayer to the Muses at *Aetia* fr. 7.13–14. The Muses' unguents have been replaced by Flora's divine fragrance and fertilizing inspiration.

58 This paper has grown out of my presentation to the Laurence Seminar in June 1989, and owes a great deal to the valuable suggestions of Phillip Hardie, Gareth Williams and the audience on that occasion. Besides taking the opportunity to thank Cambridge for its welcome then and in 1991, I would like to acknowledge helpful and stimulating comments from the journal's referees, from Sandro Barchiesi and Alessandro Schiesaro.

21. The *Fasti* as a Source for Women's Participation in Roman Cult

In the (g)olden days of the early nineteenth century, scholars turned to Ovid's *Fasti* as a precious source for Roman cult and religious practice: it was the primary source for W. Warde Fowler's great *Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic* (1899) and naturally attracted the anthropological learning of Sir James Frazer, who went on to his monumental edition after his commentaries on the Greeks Pausanias and Apollodorus.¹ It is ironic that their learning has since made it easier for more sceptical generations to look at Ovid's great poem less as evidence than as rhetoric, whether operating as panegyric or subversion.

But is Ovid so worthless as evidence for Roman cult practice? He was neither uninterested nor uninformed. We can even deduce whose calendar researches he consulted: those of Verrius Flaccus, former tutor to the imperial princes Gaius and Lucius Caesar. This can be confirmed directly from the remains of the inscribed public calendar composed by Verrius for his home city of Praeneste, and from excerpts on calendar topics preserved in Pompeius Festus' abridgement of Verrius' lost *De Verborum Significatu*.²

The problem is more one of Ovid's purposes in composing the poem, both literary and ideological. Certainly Ovid did not write his calendar poem in order to remind Roman readers, still less to instruct posterity, about the duties and privileges of participation in different cults. With rare exceptions like the women's cult of Bona Dea, Ovid's readers knew what laymen and priests were expected to do on feast days or temple anniversaries.³ Nor, of course, did he set out to provide a representative portrait of specifically female participation in cult. Women's rites find their way into the *Fasti* because they are good elegiac material, offering colourful and emotionally appealing vignettes.

1 Frazer began his classical commentaries with Pausanias (1898), then the Loeb Classical Library Apollodorus (1921), then the five volumes of *Fasti* in 1929.

2 On Verrius' calendar see references cited in this author's *Ovid: Fasti Book IV* (1998) 29–30.

3 On this cult see most recently Staples 1996, 11–54.

As an imaginative and erudite poet Ovid aimed to enrich the essential calendar structure with aetiological legends from Greek myth and Roman prehistory, diversifying his text with the rising and setting of constellations, and evoking ceremonies through picturesque details. From a more 'political' point of view he also aimed, I believe, to please (or appease?) Augustus by honouring the new imperial and dynastic anniversaries and assimilating them into the traditional Republican calendar. Indeed it is debatable whether the dead Callimachus⁴ or the living and later deified Augustus was more present as a source of authority to the poet engaged in his partly aetiological and partly encomiastic elegiac poem.

Thus what can be learned about the role of laymen, let alone laywomen, in contemporary cult is incidental to Ovid's purpose. Readers will best judge his reliability on women's participation in Roman cults by comparing the passages discussed in this chapter with information about women's religious activities in comprehensive studies like the new history and sourcebook, *Religions of Rome* (1998), or John Scheid's authoritative chapter on 'The Religious Roles of Roman Women.'⁵

Ovid's first reference to any woman in *Fasti* comes on the *Carmenalia* of 11 January with his pious prophecy of the future godhead of Augusta Julia.⁶ 'Who?' you may ask. Certainly not the first Julia, daughter of Augustus, publicly damned and exiled in 2 BCE. Let me provide another clue; the same Augusta appears again on 16 January as *tua genetrix* and restorer of the altar of Concordia.⁷ This is Livia herself, adopted in Augustus' will as Julia Augusta, so both passages originate in Ovid's remodelling after AD 14. Livia of course was unique, and no other Augustan lady, not even Augustus' sister Octavia, who shared her extraordinary religious status as 'sacrosanct',⁸ had any prospect either of becom-

4 For the influence of Callimachus in the *Fasti* the discussion in Fantham 1998, 7–18 owes much to Miller 1982, 371–417; see also Miller 1991, 7–19.

5 Beard, North, Price 1998. Scheid 1992, 377–408. For a more general investigation of Ovid's credibility as a source for religion see Schilling 1968, 9–24.

6 *Fasti* 1.536: *sic Augusta nouum Iulia numen erit*.

7 1.664: *hanc tua constituit genetrix et rebus et ara*. In this revised section of book 1, Ovid's addressee is Germanicus, Livia's grandson, adopted by her son and his uncle Tiberius to be joint heir with Tiberius' natural son Drusus. Appropriately, the most recent authorities to cite Livia's interest in Concordia are women: Flory 1984 and Herbert-Brown 1994, ch. 4, esp. 162–7. Both treatments build on Levick 1978.

8 On their early elevation to sacrosanctity in 36 BCE, and Livia's subsequent pre-eminence in Roman secular and religious life, see Purcell 1986.

ing a deity or of dedicating an altar. Just as Ovid himself returns to Livia Augusta towards the end of the extant poem, so this discussion will need to return at the end to the woman extraordinary, Livia, and her contribution to Roman cult.

Perhaps these two honorific references are sufficient to explain why Ovid does not again mention Livia on 30 January, her own birthday, and the commemorative anniversary of the Ara Pacis Augustae. Instead he follows his brief tribute to the altar by turning to the deity Pax herself: at the imagined moment of sacrifice he addresses her priests with a request that they ask the favourable gods for the perpetuation of both Peace and the imperial dynasty: (1.721): *ut ... domus quae praestat eam cum pace perennet*.

Where Ovid is silent, however, we can turn to one of Rome's best-preserved monuments to see Livia with other women of the imperial family in the procession of dedication depicted on either of the long sides of the Ara Pacis: there, Livia,⁹ Augustus' sister Octavia,¹⁰ his married daughter Julia,¹¹ and his daughter-in-law, Antonia Minor,¹² proceed with their children to make offerings in thanks for the Augustan peace at the altar's dedication in 9 BCE, just as Horace describes them in *Odes* 3.14. 3–12:

Caesar Hispana repetit penates
uictor ab ora.
unico gaudens mulier marito
prodeat iustis operata sacris
et soror clari ducis et decorae

-
- 9 Livia is surely the woman wearing a laurel wreath over her head, veiled like that of Augustus, perhaps because of her role a *regina sanctorum*. She follows Agrippa and the Flamines on the relief of the right long wall: see Simon 1968, 16 and pl. 13. For other, more controversial identifications, see following notes.
- 10 Simon 1968, 21, ps. 15 suggests that the matronly woman on the left long wall could be Octavia.
- 11 Simon (1968) 21 (ps. 17.1.19.1) identifies as Julia the 'heavily veiled young woman ... wearing a thin diaphanous veil through which the folds of her garment are visible', in the procession of the left wall. She is wearing the widow's fringed garment, the *ricinium*, but the figure is damaged, and faceless, so Simon bases her deduction on the figure's position in the procession. By an ironic twist her figure has been replaced in plaster on the altar itself, but the original has found its way to the Louvre. (I like to think of Julia escaping from the dynasty to end up in Paris.)
- 12 Simon 1968, 19 and pl. 15 notes that the figures behind Livia and Tiberius on the right long wall have generally been identified as Drusus and his wife Antonia Minor.

supplice uitta
 iam uirginum matres, iuuenumque nuper
 sospitum. Vos o pueri et puellae
 iam uirum expertae, male nominatis
 parcite uerbis.

Caesar is returning to his household gods as victor from the Spanish shore. Let his wife, rejoicing in her exceptional husband come forth, after performing the due rites, with the sister of the glorious leader and adorned with suppliant headband the mothers of maidens and the young men newly restored. As for you, boys and girls innocent of a man, avoid ill-named [or 'ill-omened': the text is contested] words.

But these women of the imperial family are still laypersons, *profani*, and would normally be expected to stop short of either altars or temples at a moment of public sacrifice. Apart from Livia¹³ none of them is *iustis operata sacris*: like the boys and girls, their contribution to the cult occasions will have been only to abstain from words of ill omen, and any sacrifices they have made will be private and domestic.¹⁴ It is rather their male kinsmen, many of them augurs, priests, and flamines, who would be officiating.¹⁵ Certainly women were encouraged to supplicate the gods, and to give them thanks—also referred to by the same word *supplicatio*. The married women of the Roman elite were even authorized after the Gallic sack of Rome in 390 to ride to the temples in thanksgiving in their special covered wagons (*carpenta, pilenta*). This is how Vulcan in *Aeneid* 8 depicts the ladies on the shield of Aeneas, riding in their wagons amid the rejoicing Salii after the Gauls had been driven off in defeat.¹⁶ In the alarms and triumphs of the Hannibalic war the

13 If she is *operata* it will be in her special capacity as *regina sanctorum*, who is known to have performed sacrifices on the Kalends of each month.

14 To quote Beard, North, Price 1998, 1.297: 'In general, however, although the attendance [*sic*] of women at most religious occasions (including *ludi*) was not prohibited, they had little opportunity to take any active religious role in state cults ... much more fundamentally (although the evidence is not entirely clear) they may have been banned ... from carrying out animal sacrifice; and so prohibited from any officiating role in the central defining ritual of civic religious activity.' On the ancient tradition excluding women from blood sacrifice, see Cazenove 1987.

15 Simon 1968, 18 distinguishes Livia, perhaps in the role as *regina sanctorum* (the altar was even dedicated on her birthday), together with Augustus, Agrippa, and the Flamines from 'the latter part of the procession, which also includes women and children'. She suggests that this, like the procession of the opposite wall, is of a less official nature.

16 *Aen.* 8.665–6: *castae ducebant sacra per urbem pilentis matres in mollibus.*

Senate decreed on several occasions that women and children should go together in procession as suppliants or in thanksgiving. But their participation in thanksgiving can be and often is taken for granted by ancient writers. We more often hear of such processions—found also in the heroic world of Homer—in times of emergency when supplication is a desperate appeal: thus Virgil describes the Latin women, led by Queen Amata and her daughter Lavinia, riding to supplicate the goddess Athena to restore her favour and victory, just as Hecuba and the Trojan women had supplicated in *Iliad* 6. This is so typical of women's role in cult that the only scene in which women are represented on the reliefs of Dido's temple in *Aeneid* 1 is the Homeric supplication of Hecuba and the women to Athena.¹⁷ When the women supplicated, it was, of course, for the whole community, not just for themselves, and we should also imagine their private devotions as being made on behalf of their whole household, rather than just their personal needs.

The ordinary woman seems to have been free to visit temples privately to make personal offering of incense¹⁸ or flowers, even if Ovid in another less devout poem ironically suggests to Augustus (*Tristia* 2. 287–300) that visits to the temples of Venus or Jupiter Optimus Maximus or Mars Ultor, or even the virgin Pallas, might provoke respectable matrons with dangerous or envious thoughts about the mythical sexual adventures of the gods.

But when women's role in public religion at Rome is raised for discussion we probably think first of the special category of the Vestals, those six selected women of noble birth who were taken up before puberty (usually aged 10) to give thirty years of service to the virgin goddess of generation and the hearth: they naturally feature at Ovid's celebration of the Vestalia,¹⁹ but he also mentions their ritual acts at the Fordicidia, when the chief Vestal burned the embryos of the sacrificial pregnant heifers, and six days later, when the people celebrated the

17 See *Aen.* 1.479–82 (the relief showing Trojan suppliants) and 11.477–82 for the Latin queen riding to the temple escorted by the matrons: *nec non ad templum summasque ad Palladis arces / subuehitur magna matrum regina caterua / dona ferens ... succedunt matres et templum ture uaporan / et maestis alto fundunt de limine uoces.*

18 Cf. *Aen.* 11.481 quoted n. 17 above.

19 On 9 June Ovid explains Vesta's choice of virgin attendants because of her own choice of virginity in 6.283–90.

Parilia with a compound based on the ash from these embryos.²⁰ But Vestals lie outside the limited religious role of ordinary women. Their special status as neither wife nor maiden, female nor male, has received two full scholarly treatments in recent years.²¹

The calendar brings Ovid to some of the most important aspects of religion in women's lives in the books of February and March, books 2 and 3. I am talking about marriage, chastity, fertility, and childbirth. Chastity naturally appealed less to Ovid than the positive aspects of sexuality. But he gives prominence, like his older contemporary Livy, to the great Roman foundation myth of chastity, the voluntary suicide of the raped victim Lucretia.²² Lucretia's vindication of her honour supposedly caused the fall of the monarchy and origin of the Republic, just as the chastity of another woman, the girl Virginia, caused the revolution that ended the powers of the Decemviri in the fifth century. Livy is also the primary source for the original patrician cult of Pudicitia, chastity, or better fidelity in marriage, attested from the early Republic, and the foundation of a rival cult of Pudicitia Plebeia in the late fourth century.²³

But fertility was even more vital to society and to the woman's self-respect than fidelity. In this account of the festival of the Lupercalia in February Ovid turns to the Roman bride who wants to become pregnant, urging her to welcome the fertile blows from the goatskin whips of Luperci, and so gratify her father-in-law.²⁴ The poet's account of the

20 For the Fordicidia see *Fasti* 4.629–40; Ovid's commemoration of the Parilia mentions Vesta rather than her human ministers, the Vestals: 4.725–34.

21 See Beard 1980, 1995. Staples 1996, 129–56 does not really advance beyond Beard.

22 *Fasti* 2.721–852. But Lucretia's last words (825–30) omit her moral message to the women of Rome as celebrated by Livy 1.59: 'no woman henceforth will be immoral because of my example.'

23 See Livy 12.23. Virginia, daughter of a patrician, had married a plebeian and was excluded from the patrician cult of Pudicitia. She retaliated by founding her own cult of 'Pudicitia Plebeia'. However, as we will see below, there is good reason to identify the cult of Fortuna discussed by Ovid in *Fasti* 6.569 f. (the *Aedes Fortunae in foro Boario*) with Fortuna Virgo, also identified with the original Pudicitia Patricia.

24 2.427–8: *excipe fecundae patienter uerbera dextrae, / iam socer optatum nomen habebit aui*. Women are usually seen in terms of male interests; when a man has no sons, he must hope that his daughter will give him a grandson. As for his daughter-in-law, unless she comes from an important family with whom a political bond is desired, she has no other function.

origin of this practice conveys the urgent need for fertility in those days of heavy infant mortality. According to his aetiology, after Romulus had procured wives for his Romans through the rape of the Sabines he found that there was still a dearth of pregnancies, so he sent husbands and wives to the sacred grove of Juno on the Esquiline.²⁵ There husbands and wives alike prayed to the goddess and her voice was heard to order with oracular ambiguity *Italidas matres sacer hircus inito* ('let the sacred he-goat penetrate the Italian mothers'). The suppliants were naturally shocked, until an augur, guessing the riddle, slew and skinned a he-goat so that women could offer their backs to be lashed with strips of its hide: Ovid tells it, in ten lunar months the *uir* and *nupta* of 437 became a father and mother (2.445–8):

ille caprum mactat; iussae sua terga puellae
 pellibus exsectis percutienda dabant.
 luna resumebat decimo noua cornua motu,
 uirque pater subito nuptaque mater erat.

He ends his account with a choice of etymologies for Juno Lucina, protectress of childbirth, either because she was goddess of the *lucus* or because she controlled the child's first experience of the light (*lucis*).²⁶

This tale of barrenness must surely be Ovid's own fiction. Certainly from at least the time of Ennius' historical drama *The Sabine Women*, the legend was canonical that when the parents of the Sabine women 'raped' by Romulus attacked Rome in retaliation, the new brides rushed on to the battlefield clutching their babies to stop the fighting between their fathers and husbands: and Ovid himself had exploited the tale in *Ars Amatoria* 1.101–32. The women's infertility cannot be reconciled with their legendary role as intercessors, yet Ovid has woven the battlefield reconciliation scene into his double celebration of 1 March, when the anniversary of the dedication of Lucina's temple coincides with the Matronalis. March was the month of Mars and Ovid

25 2.425–52. Note that concern for fertility is used as an alternative *aitio* for the feast of Carmenta in 1.619–36. According to this tale the matrons were so angry when deprived of the use of their padded vehicles (an etymological pun on Carmenta/carpenta) that they refused to carry their babies full term (i. e. aborted them). So the Senate restored their privilege and instituted two rites, one for the boys and one for the girls, to Carmenta and the midwife goddesses Porrima and Postverta.

26 For Juno Lucina and her connection with the moon, see Plutarch, *Roman Questions* 77, which may also derive from the learning of Ovid's chief source, Verrius Flaccus.

opens the book by addressing the god and retelling the story of his son Romulus. He passes from the god's rape of Silvia and fathering of Romulus and Remus, to their adolescence and Romulus' establishment of the Roman calendar, in which he made his divine father patron of the first month. All this is leading up to a puzzle based on a paradox: 'since you are so fitted to manly activities', Ovid asks the god, 'why do the married women observe your feast day?' (3.169–70):

cum sis officiis, Gradiue, uirilibus aptus,
dic mihi matronae cur tua festa colant.

Unfortunately for our concerns, although Mars offers a full and vivid narrative of both the rape and the reconciliation—neither of which were supposed to have occurred on 1 March—he adds nothing to the understanding of women's rites at the Matronalia. Instead, the god's speech offers both rape and reconciliation as unlikely explanations for the women's celebration: 'The wives of Italy have no frivolous duty in celebrating my Kalends, either because they terminated the wars of Mars by their tears, or in thanks for Ilia's successful motherhood.' Through a hymn to the fertility of spring, season of their service as childbearers,²⁷ Ovid glides back to Lucina, and the anniversary of her temple at the site of the Esquiline grove. The women should bring her flowers and pray for ease in labour. As a nice instance of the merging of religion and magic he adds an injunction: if any woman is already pregnant when she prays to Lucina, she should unbind her hair so as to release her child with ease.²⁸

How literally can Ovid's language be interpreted? He claims that Lucina's temple was dedicated (or given to the people) by the Latin 'daughters-in-law': *a nuribus Iunoni templa Latinis / hac sunt ... publica*

27 3.243–4: *Tempora iure colunt Latiae fecunda parentes / quarum militiam uotaque par-tus habet*, formally answers 170 *cur tua festa colant?* but glosses several questions. Spring is fertile, but not necessarily the human breeding season. On the other hand it is a fair analogy to present childbirth as woman's *militia*, national service, and so time for the making and fulfilment of vows: one is reminded of Medea's boast in Euripides that she would rather fight three times in battle line than bear one child.

28 3.255–8: *dicite 'tu nobis lucem, Lucina, dedisti': / dicite 'tu uoto parturientis ades.' / siqua tamen grauida est, resoluta crine precetur | ut soluat partus molliter illa suos*. Un-binding was normal before attempting to perform prayers and spells. For the negative corollary—deliberate binding to delay an enemy's childbirth—compare the gesture of Juno crossing her arms to hold back the birth of Hercules in Alcmena's tale of her labour at *Met.* 9.281–315.

facta die (3.247–8). But there were strict controls in Rome of the historical period over who could vow or dedicate a temple—it required official authorization from the Senate—and very few instances of any woman being associated with this honour.²⁹ And when are they supposed to have done this? The poet has already reported the new mothers assembling in this temple (*conueniunt nuptae dictam Iunonis in aedem*: 3.205) before the battle in the year after their rape. The tale is neatly told, but it is no use looking to Ovid for a historical record.

We have seen that Ovid tends to pass over what women actually *do* on public festivals, but he does describe a women's custom on the Ides of March at the popular festival of Anna Perenna—a goddess associated with the renewal of the year. At this early spring-festival couples went picnicking at Anna's shrine by the Tiber setting up tents, dancing, singing songs from the theatre, and praying for long years as they drank abundantly (3.523–40). All this sounds more like a party than a cult act, but the poet adds that he should explain (3.675–6): *cur cantent ... obscena puellae ... / ... certaue probra* ('why girls sing dirty songs and traditional abuse'). This is his pretext to tell a comic tale about old Anna's deception and frustration of the lecherous Mars, but there is surely something more specific here than the general partying; there must have been some kind of fescennine song, mocking men and wishing or forecasting the frustration of misplaced lust. More than that we cannot say.³⁰

Since the month of April is so rich in festivals of goddesses—for Venus (Veneralia, 1 April, and Vinalia, 23 April), for Cybele (4–10 April), and for Ceres (12–19 April), there is rather more evidence for women's cult activities in Ovid's fourth book.

Ovid gives the fullest attention to the major festivals of Cybele and Ceres, each including public games which both men and women attended. He opens his account of Cybele's festival with the goddess' ritual procession and the games in the theatre and circus—all part of her public celebrations, but of no specific concern to women. Then he introduces two mythical narratives, for the Greek origin of the cult of Cybele as Rhea when she saved Zeus by deceiving Kronos, and for the

29 See below for the legendary dedication by women of the temple of Fortuna Publica in the 5th cent.

30 See now the chapter on 'The Poet, the Plebs, and the Chorus Girls' in Wiseman 1998. Cf. Miller 1991, 138: 'the word *certa* makes it clear that the obscene verses were traditional in a "fixed" form, like other religious formulae.'

Phrygian origin of Attis worship. But the largest part of his attention is given to the coming of the goddess to Rome, as a frame for a miracle performed by the goddess on behalf of a woman. Ovid's account agrees with that of Livy in many respects. When the Senate formally decreed the invitation to the goddess, it was delivered by a distinguished group of envoys to her shrine at Pessinus in Asia Minor. The temple kingdom gave them an aniconic symbol of the goddess, a meteoric stone, which they escorted on shipboard from the Asian coast to the seaport of Rome at Ostia. But once the ship arrived at Ostia Ovid's and Livy's narratives diverge. According to Livy the elite women of Rome collectively proceeded to Ostia to welcome the sacred symbol of the goddess; it was taken from the ship by the most virtuous man in Rome, young Scipio Nasica, and then passed to the matrons, who reverently passed it from hand to hand until it reached the city some ten miles inland.³¹ But the version Ovid tells is far better known, and was known even before him. Propertius alludes in his last elegy to the miracle of Claudia Quinta pulling the sacred barge: Ovid gives a full narrative in which the sacred ship sticks at the shallow mouth of the Tiber until it is dislodged when Claudia prays to the goddess to vindicate her chastity³² by following her as she tows the barge. This timely miracle was probably a Claudian family legend, and Ovid himself claims that it was staged in the theatre. Peter Wiseman has argued cogently that it was part of a drama regularly offered to the goddess at the theatre games of the Megalesia.³³

But near the end of Ovid's more or less historical account of Claudia escorting Cybele to Rome he introduces a diversion for a cult ceremony by the little river Almo, where the image and ritual equipment of Cybele were washed under Claudia's supervision. Ostensibly only the report of what happened on the first occasion, the washing of the goddess, relates awkwardly to what we know of the full ritual in imperial times. By the time of the emperor Claudius, there was a whole long festival of Attis and Cybele held in March, at which, amongst other things, the goddess' image was washed in the pure running water of the river. This may well have happened in Ovid's time too; it is not marked in the

31 See Livy 29.14.10–14 and Fantham 1998 with introductory note on *Fasti*. 4.255–349 for more detail.

32 Prop. 4.11.51–2. Claudia Quinta is a matron in Livy and Ovid, but seems to have been thought of by Propertius, as by several later sources, as a Vestal virgin (*ministra deae*); for a Vestal the issue would be suspicion, not of adultery, but of 'incest'—any sexual contact at all.

33 See Wiseman 1985, 36; 1979, 94–9; 1998, 3, 23.

calendar, but as John Scheid has convinced me, religious acts would not be listed in any calendar unless they were a public responsibility, and as such an act by women, and women who were not public priestesses,³⁴ would not be recorded: if this is so, Ovid's only distortion is to report in April a cult act which was normally performed by the women in late March.³⁵

But this is not the only ritual washing ascribed by Ovid to this month. Partly as homage to Augustus, Ovid has made Venus patron of the whole month of April as Venus Genetrix, ancestress of the Julian imperial family. But 1 April is a festival of not one but two Venuses. In the thirty lines that celebrate the religious activities of the day Ovid uses these two rites for different aspects of Venus to frame another women's rite in honour of a most unlikely deity—Fortuna Virilis, or Manly Fortune. His account of the day's rituals is framed by an address to the women of Rome (*Latiae matresque nurusque* 133) and a parting request to Venus to protect the women in their capacity as her daughters-in-law (*tuas ... nurus* 162), and descendants of Aeneas.³⁶ To recall Mars' approving explanation of women's cult in the previous book he begins this whole section with an echo of 3.234 *rite colunt matres sacra diemque meum. Rite deam colitis*, the poet affirms at 4.133–4, *Latiae matresque nurusque / et uos, quis uittae longaque uestis abest*. 'You are acting properly to worship the goddess, both you mothers and daughters-in-law, and you others who go without the *uittae* and long *stola*.' So there are two kinds of women, the respectable ones, brides and their mothers-in-law, wearing

34 Unlike the Greek cities Rome had no priestesses for her native cults. Apart from the Greek priestesses of Ceres/Demeter mentioned below, we know priestesses only of Cybele and Dionysus: the Bacchanalia banned in the early 2nd cent. had originally been women's rituals conducted by women priests; the scandal arose from the inclusion of men as priests and votaries. But there were women priests of Dionysus like Agrippinilla, leader of a thiasus of over 400, recorded on a 2nd-cent. AD inscription south of Rome. (See Beard, North, Price 1998, 1.271, 298.)

35 See, however, Porte (1984a).

36 Since *Aeneadae* in Latin is the regular m. plural echoing the Greek patronymic, *Aeneadas* acc. in 161 must come from Greek *Aeneades*. We note again *nurus*, daughters-in-law, where Ovid could have distinguished the young brides as *nuptae*. He may have had in mind the foreign origin of Rome's first Sabine wives, but since he calls the women 'descendants of Aeneas' it is more likely that he thinks of the *nurus* as under the authority of their dowager mothers-in-law. *Matres* is commonly used as a synonym of *matronae*, and can be applied to all but the newest brides.

the formal ribbons binding their hair and the long over-gown, and the others. The poet exploits this group address and his speech of instruction in the successive rituals to blur a social issue; did all women perform each of the three rituals he will describe; or were they socially stratified?

First he honours the Veneralia by giving instructions (4.135–8 *demite, lauanda est, reddite, danda est*) for the ritual washing of the goddess' cult image. The women must remove the golden necklaces of the goddess and all her jewellery so that she can be washed all over. Once she is dry, they are to replace her golden necklace, and give her fresh flowers and a new supply of roses. And the women must wash themselves too, but clutching myrtle branches, 'because she had to hide from peeping satyrs and used the myrtle to cover her body; that is why you must repeat her action now.'³⁷ So Ovid describes two different rituals of washing a goddess' image in this single book—one of them not attested in any other Roman source. And he seems to be inviting all the women to join in bathing the image, though this kind of ritual was usually only performed by a few attendants, often indeed by virgins. We noted in connection with the washing of Cybele's image that women's rituals would not be listed in public calendars, because they were not required of public officials. But what makes the washing of Venus suspect is less the lack of corroborating evidence than Ovid's close imitation of the consciously stylized artificial language of his instructions of a famous literary model—Callimachus' elegiac hymn called 'the Bathing of Pallas' which celebrates an equally unattested ritual in which women bathe the image of Pallas Athene in Argos. Could he have invented the whole episode as a pretext to imitate the famous Hellenistic hymn?

At 145 (*discite nunc*) Ovid begins a new set of instructions to the women. He explains why they give incense to Fortuna Virilis (Manly Fortune), 'in a place moist with hot water.'³⁸ What is he talking about? The inscribed *Fasti Praenestini* of Ovid's expert source, Verrius Flaccus, though damaged, reports this offering to Fortuna Virilis on 1 April: 'women supplicate in crowds to Fortuna Virilis, and the humble ones even do so in the baths.' When I attempted my own interpretation

37 There are other festivals on which women should particularly practice washing themselves, notably 15 Aug.; cf. Plut. *Roman Questions* 100.

38 Here I tentatively read *calida* with Frazer and Bömer, against the variant *gelida* adopted by Castiglioni Landi and most recently Alton *et al.* 1988.

of these rituals in my recent commentary,³⁹ I tried to resolve the conflicting implications of Ovid's notice and that of his learned friend Verrius by stressing the normality of women using public baths in Ovid's time. But of course this fits Ovid better than Verrius. It was indeed normal for women to use the public baths, but Verrius obviously envisages his *humiliores* as doing something too daring for their respectable sisters. I have been persuaded by Champeaux's specialized study of Roman Fortuna⁴⁰ that we must divide the rites offered to Fortuna Virilis—essentially a fertility deity—so that the respectable women do indeed bathe in the public baths, but at a time set aside for women, while the 'lower' kind of women uninhibitedly bathed along with the men: hence the explanatory footnote in the *Fasti Praenestini*: 'for this is where men are attracted to the women.'

Ovid's last instalment of instructions to the women, marked by a new imperative *nec pigeat* (151) bids them take a ritual drink of milk, honey, and poppy seeds,⁴¹ because this is what Venus herself drank on her bridal night. When they drink they must pray to Venus, because she preserves beauty and good behaviour and reputation. This surely introduces the third ritual, performed as worship of the aspect of Venus called Verticordia, 'the Changer of Hearts.'⁴² The phases of this cult are clearly recorded by Livy and other sources. As Ovid indicates

39 There I have ventured to differ from the similar account given by Scheid 1992.

40 Champeaux 1987, 1, ch. 6, 375–409, here 384. She sees the old cult of Fortuna Virilis in which all the women would have bathed together, probably in the Tiber itself, gradually being displaced by the mid-Republican cult of Verticordia, to which the myrtle and the drinking of the ritual *cocetum* belong. By the time of Plutarch (*Numa* 19.3), then Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.12.15) and John Lydus (4.65) the cult of Fortuna Virilis is no longer observed and the rituals are fused into homage to Venus Verticordia alone. On the larger issue of why Virile Fortune should apparently be worshipped only by women, Champeaux uses the analogous Fortuna Barbata to argue for an originally masculine cult in which women came to share because of its benefit of fertility: this would have been abandoned by the men, when the feminine cult of Venus was assigned to the same date.

41 The so called *cocetum*, not unlike the Attic *kukeon* (on which N. J. Richardson 1974), consumed as part of the cult of Demeter.

42 I have translated as if Venus' new epithet denoted her power to change the hearts or attitudes of others (the women), since this moral improvement was what the Roman elite needed. Ovid himself derives it from Venus' change of her own heart *uerso ... corde*, that is, her softening of heart towards Rome. I suspect him of deliberate reinterpretation, but can offer no conclusive argument.

(4.157–60), the cult was created in response to a decline in morality *proauorum tempore* (more likely towards the end of the third century): one of those lapses which happened periodically in Rome, and which the authorities used to counter by establishing yet another cult of Venus.⁴³ The issue was of course keeping the women under control: there were few limits on male sexual activity. This time the Sibylline Books ordered the Roman Senate to give new honours to Venus, and as a result Venus relented towards them and was named after this change of heart. Here our knowledge of the phases of this cult can be supplemented from Valerius Maximus and Plutarch. When the statue of Venus Verticordia was authorized, the affair was put into the hands of the elite women, who devised a way to choose who would dedicate it. First a hundred married ladies were chosen, then ten out of these were selected by lot, from whom finally the consul's wife Sulpicia was appointed to dedicate the statue for her meritorious chastity.⁴⁴ A century later, in 114 BCE, the Vestal virgin Licinia—herself later accused of unchastity—gave Verticordia a temple for her worship.⁴⁵

So did all the women observe all these rituals? Hardly. Only a very few women could be involved in washing the goddess' image in the river's running water, but surely anyone could frequent the baths, and do so without loss of respectability: recent studies seem to have established that women did have their own public baths at this time, and so might bathe in respectable circumstances. But would the women who wanted to appeal sexually to men also be concerned to protect their good reputation?

It seems that Ovid has deliberately wrapped the three different celebrations together so as to confuse the women's roles in association with each cult or offering. What is he up to? My own suspicion is that he is reacting against the bourgeois insistence on distinguishing honest women from elegiac mistresses, ladies of the night, or even simple working women. By addressing all the women together with the same imperatives for each cult in turn he can associate all women together in what may well have been practiced by only some of them. We can measure his indulgence for the less respectable ladies in the care with which he celebrates that other Venus festival, of Erycina by

43 Compare Livy's account (10.31.9) of Fabius Gurgus' new shrine of Venus erected with the proceeds of fines for women's immorality in 296 BCE.

44 See Valerius Maximus 8.15.12 and Fantham 1998 on 155–62.

45 See Plutarch, *Roman Questions* 83 and Fantham 1998 on 155–62.

the Colline Gate, on 23 April.⁴⁶ For this the street women (*uolgaes puellae*) are to honour Venus, who is well disposed to the earnings of licensed ladies (*professarum quaestibus*). There was only one 'profession' for women in those days: *profiteri* means to declare yourself on a public list, and the only public list for women was the aedile's register of public prostitutes. According to the reformed poet of love, 23 April is the day when these loose-living ladies offer incense and garlands of myrtle and mint and roses, and pray for beauty and popular favour and seductive gesture and language. To my mind Ovid has carefully balanced the two feast days of Venus and their celebration within his poetic book, designing the objects of their prayers on 1 and 23 April as complementary; while the well-born ladies ask Verticordia for *mores* and *bona fama*, the others ask for the seductive airs and graces that are far more to the point and will ensure their continued popularity.

I have postponed treating the Cerealia, or feast of Ceres. This was one of Rome's oldest festivals, consisting of a day of cult and sacrifice, followed by three to four days of theatrical performances and a final day of chariot races in the Circus. In Athens the Thesmophoria, one of the major festivals of Ceres' counterpart, Demeter, was exclusively for women, and concerned with the fertility of crop and women. And women could share with men initiation into the rites at Eleusis, in which, as far as we know, the loss and recovery of Persephone was enacted, at least in symbolic form. Rome has imported a plebeian cult of Ceres with Libera (Proserpina) and Liber (Bacchus or Iacchus), as early as the fifth century, giving them a temple on the Aventine. Because of Ceres' association with the grain crop and the later public dole of wheat, she was a favourite image on Republican coins, which may show her wearing a crown of wheat or holding an ear of wheat: some celebrate the games of Ceres, and others illustrate two phases from her search for Proserpina: a myth so significant for cult and so popular that it was told twice by Ovid. In the longer version in *Metamorphoses* 5 the muse Calliope recounts Ceres' adventures in Sicily as she searched for her daughter. But it is *Fasti* that tells the version truer to the Greek narrative as we know it from the Homeric hymn.⁴⁷ Here Ceres first searches in Sicily by night and day, taking

46 Erycina is Aphrodite of Mount Eryx in Sicily, a cult employing sacred prostitutes, which was brought to Rome by Fabius Maximus during the Hannibalic war as a political gesture towards Sicily.

47 This has been established in detail by Hinds 1998.

up torches which she kindles from Etna, then flies in her chariot drawn by serpents to Eleusis in Greece, where she is welcomed to the home of young Triptolemus and forecasts his role as inventor of the plough.⁴⁸

Only after her stay at Eleusis, according to Ovid's version as told here in *Fasti*, does Ceres discover that Jupiter has agreed to give her daughter to his brother Dis in the underworld. Both here in the *Fasti* and in Ovid's other version, however, Ceres is given powerful arguments against Jupiter, justifying her right to share in deciding on the choice of her daughter's husband. It is these arguments, rather than, as in Ovid's other version, the damage inflicted by Ceres on the crops on earth, which determine Jupiter's bargain that Proserpina shall spend part of each year on earth with her mother.⁴⁹ The symbolic meaning of the myth is taken to be the sowing and spring growth of the grain, but the narrative of Ceres' search and complaints would have a more literal significance for women, who would almost all know the time when they had to lose their daughters to marriage, when they would no longer control their access to a beloved child.

Oddly, however, the only references to contemporary ritual acts within Ovid's Proserpina narrative are to Greek practices.⁵⁰ Stranger still, our poet has actually anticipated in April the divine narrative which Roman women celebrated much later, after midsummer—the *Sacrum Anniversarium Cereris*.⁵¹ This was a specifically women's cult, and Cicero, who calls it a Greek ritual, confirms elsewhere that its priestesses had to be Greeks and were imported from the Greek cities of Velia or Naples.⁵² On this summer vigil the Roman matrons re-

48 The bulk of the narrative in *Metamorphoses* is concerned with Ceres' wanderings in Sicily before she learns of Proserpina's rape and approaches Jupiter to demand her daughter's restoration. Her visit to Attica and gift of the plough to Triptolemos is only reported parenthetically at the end in *Met.* 5.642–56.

49 Cf. *Fasti* 4.587–618 with *Met.* 514–71.

50 The lighting of torches (4.493) and the breaking of a fast at evening (4.535–6). We might add the ritual drink *kukeon* which seems to be described by Ovid at 4.547–8.

51 On this occasion, which occurs at a point in the calendar after the six months covered by Ovid, see Spaeth 1996, 12, 13, 105–7, and Fantham 1998, 393 n. This was a night vigil, and the only one expressly approved in Cicero's religious law code of *De leg.* 2.21 and 36. But he also allows for 'those made on behalf of the people in proper form'. This category would include the nocturnal *sellisternium* of Juno offered at the Ludi Saeculares of 17 BCE and AD 204. Nocturnal rituals had been part of the indictment against the Bacchanalia in 186 BCE.

52 Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.115, *Balb.* 55.

enacted the loss of Proserpina, crying out to her repeatedly at the street intersections of the city. The Greek practices—of lighting torches at evening, of the ritual drink of milk, honey, and barley—would belong not to the April Cerealia but to this women's summer ritual. In another poem, *Amores* 3.10, Ovid throws more light on the ritual. After honouring Ceres for her benefactions he reproaches her because his girl is obliged to sleep away from him: 'a feast day calls for sex and song and wine! These are the offerings men should bring to the gods.'⁵³

So the women's vigil probably entailed abstinence from wine as well as from sexual intercourse. Propertius complains about similar sexual abstinence by his mistress in honour of Isis, and an earlier passage in the *Fasti* reports the same *secubitus* in preparation for the worship of Bacchus.⁵⁴ It was understood at Rome as in most cultures that men were impure for religious purposes after intercourse, but there is so little interest in women's religion that this seems to be our only evidence for prohibitions affecting them.

This is perhaps the best place to mention another restriction on women's sexual activity which Ovid highlights and even personalizes. As he approaches the June Vestalia he claims that he was about to give his own daughter in marriage, and so made inquiries about the right time to do so: (6.221–2: *tempora taedis / apta ... quaeque cavenda forent*). Women apparently should not marry between 6 and 13 June (the Ides) during the period when Vesta's shrine was being spring-cleaned, and Ovid's authority is no less than the wife of the Flamen Dialis, who confirms that she herself cannot even consort with her wedded husband, the Flamen, at that time.⁵⁵ Given that Plutarch cites other

53 On this poem and distich see Miller 1991, 45–6.

54 Sleeping apart to be pure for Isis, Prop. 2.31; for Bacchus, *Fasti* 2.328–30: *positis iuxta secubere toris / causa repertori uitis quia sacra parabant / quae fecerent pure, cum foret orta dies*.

55 Why does Ovid use the *flaminica* as his informant? The *flaminica* and her husband the *flamen Dialis* were subject to multiple taboos. (According to Gellius 10.15 and Plutarch, *Roman Questions* 40 and 109–13, he would forfeit office on her death.) Besides other taboos affecting her (cf. Gellius 10.15.26–7), Plutarch, *Roman Questions* 86, reports that the Flaminica may not bathe nor adorn herself during the period of the rite of the Argei in May, a time in which other women may not marry; hence perhaps the other requirement mentioned by Plutarch, that she must adopt a stern demeanour (*skuythropazein*). It is part of Ovid's search for variety that he should not mention this restriction in his discussion of the Argei in May, but introduce it only in one of the two periods concerned.

such restrictions, how many of these taboos on marrying, or married intercourse, may have gone unmentioned in our sources.⁵⁶

Ovid's half-year of festivals marks one other day which was specially celebrated by women, and this for two different but related cults. On 11 June women gathered to celebrate the Matralia in honour of Mater Matuta, but it was also the day for honouring the shrine of Fortuna in the Forum Boarium: indeed the temples of the two goddesses were adjacent, and both cults were associated with the same legendary king, Servius Tullius. As Ovid expresses it after he has told the legend of the goddess' coming to Rome (6.569): 'The same day and founder and location are yours, Fortuna,' *lux eadem, Fortuna, tua est, auctorque locusque*. There is evidence in other elders and contemporaries of Ovid, in Varro, Livy, and Festus' Epitome of Verrius Flaccus, that associates the two female deities more closely.⁵⁷ But Ovid treats their cults separately and serially; first he summons the women to worship on this anniversary of Servius' temple to Mother Matuta (6.475–80):

Ite bonae matres (uestrum Matralia festum)
 flauaque Thebaeae reddite liba deae:
 pontibus et magno iuncta est celeberrima Circo
 area quae posito de boue nomen habet.
 hac ibi luce ferunt Matutae sacra parenti
 sceptriferas Serui templa dedisse manus.

Go then, good mothers (the Matralia is your feast day), and offer golden honeycakes to the Theban goddess. There is a much-frequented area near the bridges and the great Circus which takes its name from the statue of an ox; men say that there in this day the sceptre-bearing hands of Servius dedicated a holy temple for Mother Matuta.

56 Plutarch actually implies a much wider taboo in stating (*Roman Questions* 105) that it is not customary for maidens to marry on a public holiday, only for widows. This would seem to exclude even Kalends, Nones, and Ides; see Macrobius, *Sat.* 1.15.21.

57 Livy 5.19.6 confirms Servius as founder of the temple of Mater Matuta: Varro ap. Nonius 189 reports that the Fortuna of the Forum Boarium was also called 'Fortuna Virgo'; who, according to Festus 282 L, was also construed as 'Pudicitia': *Pudicitiae signum in foro Boario est ubi Aemiliana aedis est Herculis. Eam quidam Fortunam esse existimant. Item uia Latina ad miliarium IIII Fortunae Muliebris, nefas est attingi, nisi ab ea quae semel nupserit*. It is not clear to what aspect of the two cults item applies. As Wissowa 1912, 207 argues, this is also the 'Pudicitia Patricia' from which Virginia was excluded in the narrative of Livy 10.23.3 f. (see n. 23 above).

Matuta is called *Thebana dea* because she was equated with Ino, nurse of her nephew Dionysus. Cicero, who reports the identification of Matuta with Leucothea, the deified form of the Theban queen Ino, does not try to explain the equation.⁵⁸ In Greek myth Hera vindictively maddened Ino so that she threatened her children: Phrixus and Helle escaped on the golden ram, but she caught up Melicertes and jumped with him into the sea. Together they were saved from drowning by being transformed into the sea deities Leucothea and Palaemon. Building on this Ovid confects a mythical coming of mother and child to Rome in the time of Evander: persecuted by Roman Bacchantes, Ino is rescued by Hercules and heralded as the Roman goddess Matuta by Evander's prophet mother Carmenta.⁵⁹ The poet thus incorporates into his fiction two types of female religiosity—Maenadic worship and prophetic inspiration—more acceptable in the heroic period than in the late Republic and his own time.⁶⁰

However, Ovid is also more informative than usual on the form of cult observed. He notes the ritual practice of driving out a slave girl from the celebration, and another anthropologically interesting feature: the women do not pray to Matuta for their own child, but for their sisters' children. This is probably a trace of an older matrilineal element in Italic society, but Ovid associates both practices with Ino's mythical biography (6.551–62): she was nurse to her sister's son, and she hated slave girls because a slave girl informed on her to her husband. The poetic narrative is fantasy, but the ritual taboos are also discussed in Plutarch's *Roman Questions* 16 and 17; indeed Plutarch cites the local Greek practice of banning slaves (and Aetolians too) from the shrine of Leucothea.

58 See *De nat. deor.* 3.39 and 48: *Ino dea ducetur et Leucothea a Graecis, a nobis Matuta dicitur cum sit Cadmi filia?* See now Smith 2000.

59 The persecution is instigated by a disguised Juno (6.507–22); for Carmenta's prophetic frenzy (she swells with inspiration like Virgil's Sibyls *sanctior et tanto, quam modo, maior*) see 6.541–8 at 545: *Leucothea Graeis, Matuta uocabere nostris*; Ovid echoes Cicero's distinction.

60 The Maenadic cult of Bacchus was banned throughout Italy by decree of the Senate in 186 BCE, though individual worship remained licit. Prophecy too was restricted to official consultation of the written texts attributed to the Sibyl and controlled by the Decemviri.

Who was Matuta and what did she do for women? Dumézil has argued from the root *matutinus* that she was a Dawn goddess,⁶¹ but the Romans themselves did not know her origin, and saw her only as a protecting goddess like Fortuna. And even Fortuna was a deity they preferred to particularize by defining genitives or adjectives.⁶² Wissowa lists along with Fortuna Virilis, whom we met in the women's baths, a number of Fortunes associated with a particular family or college, Fortune the Favourer or Watcher (Obsequens, Respicens), and two Fortunes associated with women: the Fortune of the temple attributed to King Servius Tullius in the Forum Boarium, probably Fortuna Virgo, and Fortuna Muliebris.⁶³

The distinctive feature of the Forum Boarium temple was its cult statue, heavily veiled in a toga of mysterious weave. Ovid identifies this as King Servius himself (6.571 *hoc constat enim*),⁶⁴ but reports that others construed it as Fortuna or Pudicitia. Ovid relishes alternatives, and provides not one but three explanations why the statue was veiled: Fortune herself covered the king's face in shame (573–80); or the Roman people did so to put an end to their grief after his assassination (581–4); or Servius covered his own head before death to avoid looking his murderous daughter in the face (584–620). The poet has devoted attention to this oddity in order to justify a women's cult practice or taboo: married women must not touch the statue's drapery, because the day on which Servius' face is exposed will bring the abandonment of all modesty (620): *haec [sc. Lux] positi prima pudoris erit*. Did women come collectively to pray here on this anniversary? Or was this a general warning to any woman who might come alone?

Understanding the various cults of Fortuna is one of the most baffling problems in approaching Roman cult. But that of the Fortune of

61 Dumézil 1970, 1.50–55. For other sources see Beard, North, Price 1998, 1.51 n. 157.

62 Cf. Dumézil 1970, 1.42.

63 See Wissowa 1912, 208=12. Are these complementary? Did the girl pass from the cult of Fortuna Virgo as she married to come under the protection of Fortuna Muliebris? Both female fortunes are listed by Plutarch, *Roman Questions* 74, in a discussion of Servius' many foundations for the goddess that is expanded in *On the Fortune of the Romans* 10. But he does not include the cult of Fortuna Muliebris there, perhaps because he has already reported the legend of its foundation (on which see below) in *On the Fortune of the Romans* 5.

64 Ovid's view is shared by Dionysius 4.40.7, Valerius Maximus 1.8.11, and Pliny, *N.H.* 8.194. But in 8.197 Pliny reports a contradictory claim that the statue was Fortuna herself.

women (Fortuna Muliebris), though not considered in Ovid's calendar poem,⁶⁵ is known to have been founded by and for women, and inaugurated at least by an officiating priestess. According to Dionysius 8.55–6, when Coriolanus' stern mother led the matrons of Rome to confront him and shame him from attacking the city in 493, the Senate honoured them by erecting an altar and temple to Fortuna Muliebris at the point where he was turned back. The married women were authorized to nominate a priestess and chose a woman, Valeria who had helped to organize the deputation to Coriolanus.⁶⁶ Dionysius reports that she officiated at the sacrifice, uniquely on this occasion performed *by the women on behalf of the Roman people*. Indeed the goddess' statue actually spoke her approval of the women's act, saying, in language we have also read in Ovid: 'you have dedicated me in proper fashion.'⁶⁷

Why did they need divine confirmation? Since, properly speaking, women had no property, they were not in a position to dedicate anything beyond their personal effects—such as the maiden clothes which the bride would dedicate to Fortuna Virgo.⁶⁸

This temple, set outside Rome, provides a link back to my point of departure through Livia, who restored it, because of its association with chastity and marital respectability: only *uniuiuae* might enter the temple of Fortuna Muliebris,⁶⁹ and it spoke for Livia's concern for marital harmony. So too did the dedication that follows immediately after the story of Fortuna and Servius Tullius, as Ovid brings the *Fasti* towards its early closure: we saw Livia restore the temple of Concord and enrich it with an altar in January (1.650–1), an act marking her worthiness of her

65 Ovid's calendar does not go beyond 30 June. The temple anniversary falls in July and the feast day on 1 December.

66 This detail suggests that Dionysius' source was Valerius Antias. See now 'Valerius Antias and the Palimpsest of History' in Wiseman 1998, 88. But leaving aside her name, the story of the priestess is authenticated by Livy, Valerius Maximus, and Plutarch in *On the Fortune of the Romans* 5.

67 The same miraculous speech is reported in Val. Max. 1.8.14 *Rite me, matronae, uidistis, riteque dedicastis*.

68 Wissowa's evidence for this practice (1912, 207) is partly Virginia's reference in Livy 10.23 to her own dedication to Pudicitia on marriage, and partly from the Christian Arnobius 2.67, who refers to the goddess as Fortuna Virginalis.

69 Cf. Festus 282 quoted n. 57 above. Livia's act of restoration is known from the fragmentary inscription: Purcell 1986, 88 and n. 58.

unique husband.⁷⁰ In June again (6.637–44) he describes how she presented Concord with a glorious temple and portico on the site of Vedius Pollio's scandalous mansion; it now became her offering to her husband: *te quoque magnifica, Concordia, dedicat aede / Liuia, quam caro praestitit ipsa uiro*.⁷¹

As Nicholas Purcell (1986) has shown, Livia set herself up as a model for the women of Rome, and the embodiment of Augustus' moral policies. Ovid has skilfully distributed the record of her actions over the calendar to make her stand for women's religious role at both his beginning and as nearly as possible his ending. As he declares of Augustus' actions, so we may say of Livia's pointed choice of shrines to set a noble example: *sic exempla parantur*.⁷² If Ovid tells us less than we would like about the ordinary women's religious life and practice, one woman at least has been given credit for all her public religious acts, and her religious roles and honours reflect the cults and ideals set before elite women in the days of poet and emperor.

70 1.650: *sola toro magni digna reperta Iouis* lavishes on Augustus as honorific Ovid might have withheld when he wrote the first draft of *Fasti* 1. See Herbert-Brown 1994, 162–7 for a full discussion of this passage.

71 On this portico see Herbert-Brown 1994, 145–56. She rightly insists on the coherence of this passage with the preceding passages honouring the women's cults of Matuta and Fortuna, but points out that according to Dio 55.8.1 the Porticus was dedicated in January and jointly with her son Tiberius. Thus Ovid has taken a gesture of family concord between mother and son and interpreted it as a confirmation of concord between husband and wife, reinforcing this message by associating the event with the women's festivals of Mater Matuta and Fortuna. As she points out (148), Ovid out of tact towards Livia passes over the normal requirement that no one except *uniuirae* should participate in the Marilia (also true of the cult of Fortuna Muliebris). By linking these three cults Ovid can focus attention on wifely virtue and Livia's role in providing the model of that virtue.

72 Flory 1984 made this the title of her excellent study.

References

- Beard, M. (1980), 'The Sexual Status of Vestal Virgins', *JRS* 70, 12–27.
- (1994), 'The Roman and the Foreign: The Cult of the "Great Mother" in Imperial Rome', in N. Thomas and C. Humphrey (eds.), *Shamanism, History, and the State* (Ann Arbor), 164–90.
- (1995), 'Rereading Vestal Virginité', in R. Hawley and B. Levick (eds.), *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments* (London), 166–77.
- North, J., and Price, S. (1998), *Religions of Rome, I: A History; II: A Sourcebook* (Cambridge).
- Bremmer, J. N. (1987), 'Slow Cybele's Arrival', in J. N. Bremmer and N. M. Horsfall (eds.), *Roman Myth and Mythography* (BICS suppl. 52; London), 105–11.
- Cazenove, O. de (1987), 'Exesto: l'incapacité sacrificielle des femmes à Rome', *Phoenix* 41, 159–73.
- Dumézil, G. (1970), *Archaic Roman Religion*, 2 vols., tr. P. Krapp (Chicago).
- Feeney, D. (1998), *Literature and Religion at Rome* (Cambridge).
- Flory, M. B. (1984), 'Sic Exempla Parantur: Livia's Shrine to Concordia and the Porticus Liviae', *Historia* 33, 309–30.
- Guarducci, M. (1971), 'Enea e Vesta', *MDAI (R)* 78, 73–118.
- Hinds, St. (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. (Cambridge).
- Latte, K. (1960), *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich).
- Michels, A. (1967), *The Calendar of the Roman Republic* (Princeton).
- North, J. (1986), 'Religion and Politics, from Republic to Principate', *JRS* 76, 251–8.
- Porte, D. (1984), 'Claudia Quinta et le problème de la lavatio de Cybèle en 204 av. J-C', *Klio* 66, 93–103.
- Purcell, N. (1986), 'Livia and the Womanhood of Rome', *PCPS* 32, 78–105.
- Scheid, J. (1992), 'The Religious Roles of Roman Women', in P. Schmitt Pantel (ed.), *A History of Women from Ancient Goddesses to Christian Saints: A History of Women, I* (Cambridge, Mass.), 377–408.
- Schilling, R. (1954), *La religion romaine de Vénus* (Paris).
- Scullard, H. H. (1981), *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic* (Ithaca).
- Simpson, C. J. (1991), 'Livia and the Constitution of the Aedes Concordiae: The Evidence of Ovid *Fasti* I. 637 ff.', *Historia* 40, 449–55.
- Smith, C. (2000), 'Worshipping Mater Matuta: Ritual and Context', in E. Bispham and C. Smith (eds.), *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy: Evidence and Experience*, 136–55.
- Spaeth, B. (1996), *The Roman Goddess Ceres* (Austin).
- Turcan, R. (1992), *Les cultes orientaux dans le monde romain*, 2nd ed. (Paris) (= *The Cults of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1996)).
- Vermaseren, J. J. (1977), *Cybele and Attis: The Myth and the Cult* (London).
- Wiseman, T. P. (1999), 'The Games of Flora', in B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle* (Studies in the History of Art 56; Washington, DC), 194–203.

- (2000), 'Liber: Myth, Drama and Ideology in Republican Rome', in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic: Politics, Religion and Historiography c. 400–133 BC* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 23; Rome), 265–99.
- (2004), *The Myths of Rome* (Exeter).
- Wissowa, G. (1912), *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 2nd ed. (Munich).

IV

Passion and Civil War in Roman Tragedy and Epic: Seneca, Lucan and Statius

22. Andromache's Child in Euripides and Seneca

Before I first met Desmond Conacher fifteen years ago I knew him through his fine interpretations of Euripides. I hope it will be fitting to offer him in affection and gratitude these pages which start from Euripidean drama and lead to its echoes in Senecan tragedy, the subject of my own recent work. Desmond's humanity and sympathy have encouraged me to colour what might have been a piece of formal *Quellenforschung* with a more personal concern: how Euripides represented in these plays the relationship of mother and child, depicting the confusion of motives which we call parental love. Until forty years ago few scholars paid attention to Euripides' treatment of children, and *The Drama of Euripides* by our late colleague George Grube was exceptional in examining and relating the different aspects of this theme found in the tragedies. But 1954 saw both A. M. Dale's *Alcestis*, with its magisterial comment on the famous child monody of that play, and the dissertation of Rudolf Kassel, who wrote in Latin glowing with insight and humour of the presentation of children from Homer to the death of Aristophanes: some of his finest pages are devoted to the children of Euripides. Most recently G. M. Sifakis¹ has discussed the conventions governing child roles in Sophocles and Euripides, and argued for the performance of these roles by actual children. His conclusions have enabled us to recognize the standard features in scenes concerned with children and concentrate on what is distinctive. While there can be little variation in portrayal of the unformed children themselves, Euripides' two *Andromache* plays differ both from each other and from Seneca's *Troades* in their depiction of the relationship between mother and child.

1 The following studies and editions will be referred to by the names of their authors: D. J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama*, Toronto 1967; G. M. A. Grube, *The Drama of Euripides*, London 1941; A. M. Dale (ed.), *Euripides: Alcestis*, Oxford 1954; Rudolf Kassel, *Quomodo quibus locis apud veteres scriptores Graecos infantes atque parvuli pueri inducantur describantur commemorentur* (Diss. Würzburg 1951), Meisenheim am Glan 1954; G. M. Sifakis, "The Children of Greek Tragedy", *BICS* 26 (1979) 67–80; P. T. Stevens (ed.), *Euripides: Andromache*, Oxford 1971; Elaine Fantham, *Seneca's Troades*, Princeton 1982.

Students who explore what is said about children in Greek tragedy soon discover that the key words παῖς and τέκνον suffer from the same functional ambiguity as the English word ‘child’; each denotes both the young infant or unfledged human and the parent’s child, defined by relationship, irrespective of maturity. While the plural is particularly prone to the second function in generalizations about heredity and generation problems, even the singular is more often applied in tragedy to the son of the speaker, or another figure, than to small children;² tragedy is not a child’s business and children are introduced into drama only for their importance to their parents, set before us as the passive objects of love or hereditary hatred. Thus the children of Greek tragedy are predominantly boys, the parent’s heirs and hopes for the continuation of the family and the protection and cherishing of their shades after death. My title “Andromache’s Child” has been chosen because her role as mother of the two boys Astyanax and “Molossus”³ determines the treatment of these children, rather than their distinct heroic fathers or their childlike natures.

It is a corollary of these rather obvious remarks that the Greek theatre normally communicated concern for children through the adult speakers, seldom bringing children on stage, and even more rarely allowing them a spoken part. But, to quote Kassel’s vivid phrase, *scaena Euripidea paruulis scatet*. He suggests that from the early *Alcestis* to *Troades* over twenty years later only *Hippolytus* of the dated plays is without children.⁴ We cannot make assumptions about lost plays, but his speaking

2 Like Kassel and Sifakis I am concerned with *paruuli*, little children up to seven years, and leave aside in this paper young girls who have reached puberty such as Polyxena or Iphigenia in *I.A.* Such roles are virtually adult, and these girls are valued and addressed in their own right by their parents. The frequency of παῖς/τέκνον in the sense of parent’s child (son or daughter) in *Andr.* may be atypical because of the stress on this relationship in more than one family or generation: Peleus–Achilles–Neoptolemus–Molossus and Menelaus–Hermione as well as Andromache–Molossus (52 out of 65 instances denote children as offspring), but *Tro.* offers a similar proportion; παῖς/τέκνον denote the little child in only 13 of 52 instances counted.

3 Molossus is the name of Andromache’s and Neoptolemus’ eldest child in most versions of the legend, and appears in MSS of *Andr.*, but is not thought to have been assigned by Euripides: cf. Stevens 94 citing Dale 83: “children are usually kept anonymous in Greek Tragedy, but their names were the kind of detail that commentators loved to supply.”

4 Kassel 37.

children all seem to belong to the early dramas, and whereas Molossus has a lyric, sung role, the little Astyanax is naturally treated as silent.

Andromache is an extraordinary play, almost melodramatic in its black and white characterization and adventurous action of rescue at the point of death. The introduction of Stevens reviews the evidence for dating and sets it firmly between 425 and 422;⁵ thus Euripides created this hybrid plot, which paradoxically allies Andromache with her former enemies from the house of Achilles, some seven to ten years before he chose to handle the traditional tale of Andromache's bereavement in the trilogy of 415. The prejudice against Sparta shown in the unscrupulous selfishness of Menelaus, Hermione and Orestes, has been explained both by the probably date of the play and by the scholiast's claim that it was produced outside Athens, perhaps for an unsophisticated community with its own feud against Sparta. Certainly the poet had to innovate to produce the confrontation between Andromache and Hermione, for whatever the action of Sophocles' *Hermione*, *Andromache* was the first play to blend the Molossian legend of her child or children by Neoptolemus with this variant on Hermione's dual betrothal first to Orestes, then Neoptolemus.⁶ Only Euripides gave Andromache a son by Neoptolemus at the time of his marriage to Hermione, thus creating the sexual triangle which leaves barren bride and fertile concubine confronting each other in his absence on the fatal journey to Delphi.

The first action (1–765) centres on the threat to Andromache's child and his rescue, confirming Grube's claim that it is the child, not the possibility that Andromache is still sharing Neoptolemus' bed, that provokes Hermione's fury.⁷ But there is much emphasis on sexual jealousy, and the contrast between the two women is designed to raise issues of wives' behaviour and the evil of mistaken marriage alliances. Euripides has engineered the opening situation to exploit the paradox

5 Stevens 15–21

6 Schol. *Andr.* 445, quoted by Stevens 15. On the links between Athens and Molossia see Conacher 180; on the Argive connection, D. L. Page, *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays presented to Gilbert Murray*, Oxford 1932, 207–230; on the legend of Neoptolemus' death at Delphi see Conacher 169, Stevens 2–3. Theognis claimed Hermione was pregnant by Orestes when Neoptolemus received her from her father; other versions gave her a son by N., but Pherecydes made her failure to conceive by him the motive for N.'s visit to Delphi.

7 Grube 201 n. 1; but P. D. Kovacs, "The Andromache of Euripides," *APA American Classical Studies* 6 (1980) 9–18, argues that Hermione's jealousy is essentially sexual.

that Andromache has proved a better mate to the son of her husband's killer than his lawful wife. But if Greek literature's first devoted wife has been put into the position of the "other woman," she does not have her values. From the beginning she is shown as a mother, and the audience's concern is focused on the theme of childbearing: Andromache's first sentence in her narrative prologue looks back on her happiness as "Hector's childbearing wife" (4), where a rare use of the adjective παιδοποιός⁸ intends to recall the formal terms of Athenian marriage παιδων ἐπ' ἄρότῳ and the use of παιδοποιεῖσθαι for the begetting of citizen children in wedlock. The deaths of Hector and Astyanax, "the child I bore my husband" (9), are mentioned only here, quickly followed by her account of Molossus, the new male child she has given her master. She had hoped that if he survived (16–17) she would have support in misfortune, but since the marriage Hermione has hated her, claiming that she used magic to keep her unloved and childless. Every word relates status and fulfilment to motherhood. The theme of children even colours the lesson in wifely tolerance that Andromache gives Hermione, based on her loyalty to Hector: although there was no tradition that Hector had other partners, Andromache affirms her loyalty not by stressing her toleration of Hector's "other women," but by boasting that she suckled his children by such concubines.

Although the play has opened with the report of Menelaus' threats against Andromache and her son, whom she has sent into hiding, the spectator's fears for the boy are set aside during this first episode between Andromache and Hermione, displaced by the debate over good and bad wives. But the second episode brings the boy on stage as focus of the action. Menelaus has seized him and now offers Andromache his life, if she will leave the altar to die in his stead; otherwise the boy must die for her offence (ἄμαρτία, 317). As she renounces her own life she addresses her son for the first time in the play, to express the value of children:

Dear child, I your mother will go to Hades so that you need not die. If you sail safely past your doom, remember your mother, and how I suffered and perished, and tell your father with kisses and tears as you put your arms around him what I dared: for children are really life (ψυχή) to all men;

8 Παιδοποιός occurs also at *H.F.* 902 and *Rhes.* 980, applied to abstractions. The verb παιδοποιεῖσθαι is used conventionally of formal marriage at *Heracl.* 524 and *Or.* 1080. The nearest Euripidean parallel to *Andr.* 4 is *Tro.* 853–4 τεκνοποιόν ἔχουσα ... πόσιν ἐν θάλάμοις.

whoever reproaches men without experiencing this has less grief but his happiness is hollow misfortune (413–420).⁹

The child is important, then, to Andromache as he is to her rival: but what are her feelings for him? Euripides speaks ambiguously at 25 ff., as if Andromache valued her son as a pledge of her own survival; even now, when she will sacrifice herself for him, her love of the child as ὀφθαλμὸς βίου (406) is mixed with objective arguments—a calculation that there is hope for her future, whereas she will incur shame if she lets him die.¹⁰ If this seems calculating to us it is perhaps because we are less interested than the Greeks in the validity of arguments, but Euripides also had a difficulty of his own creation in attempting to portray Andromache as a loving mother to her son. His audience was likely to make the same judgement as Hermione in 170–3, that Andromache was unnatural to sleep with the son of her husband's killer and beget a son by a murderer.¹¹ Hermione is blind with jealousy, but the charge would trouble anyone who knew from Homer the story of Andromache's real husband Hector and her royal son. How then could Euripides stress her love for this interloper, Neoptolemus' child? It is true that he goes some way to rehabilitate Neoptolemus, who is not, as he was in the *Little Iliad* (fr. 19 Allen), the killer of Astyanax, and has gone to Delphi to do penance, but Andromache still sees herself as Trojan, arguing in 201–4 that the Greeks will not accept

9 Kassel 49–50 notes that Andromache is speaking in character here; he contrasts this praise of parenthood with the reproaches of the chorus in *Med.* 1090 f. against childbearing for the agony it has brought Medea and Jason. But Kassel's citation of Antiphon suggests that the sophistic tradition was rather to argue *against* than for the conventional desire to have children. The phrase ὀφθαλμὸς βίου seems rare. *LSJ* compares only Pindar's use of ὀφθαλμὸς for adult heroes at *Ol.* 1.210 and 6.16.

10 Méridier, perhaps influenced by the similar phrasing of 26–7, interprets 409 as hope for Andromache herself deriving from her son's survival, but this conflicts with the antithesis she is making. Garzya, Bornmann, Ebener and Stevens agree in seeing 409 as "hope of survival for her son." On shame as a motivation for dying on behalf of a loved one in other relationships, compare Eur. *Alc.* 954–961 (Admetus reproaches himself with the disgrace of letting Alcestis die for him) and *I.T.* 674–686 (Pylades rejects the shame of surviving his friend Orestes).

11 Something of the horror at this change of partner is shown in *Tro.* 665–8 where Andromache, anticipating enforced intercourse with her captor, reviles the woman who casts away her husband for a new bed and takes another lover.

her children (*sic*) as rulers, since they associate her with Hector, and her past as a Phrygian princess.

The climax of the confrontation with Menelaus comes with the joint supplication of mother and child; the boy shares with Andromache an amoebaic lyric in glyconics and pherecrateans, answered by the contrasting anapaests of Menelaus. Although many supplicant scenes in Euripides involve children,¹² it is exceptional that they should give voice. As Sifakis points out,

little children are conventionally depicted as very young and helpless; because of their immaturity and ... lack of responsibility and initiative they cannot be active participants ... that is why children do not take part in the dialogue and usually remain silent. However they are swept by and into the course of events and Euripides has allowed them in a few cases to express their sentiments, always at a moment of emotional climax, always in song (72–73).

Only four surviving Greek tragedies, all by Euripides, give speech to a child. Closest to *Andromache* in technique is the early *Alcestis* (438 BCE) in which the boy makes a lyric appeal and laments to his mother in a strophe and antistrophe.¹³ Dale noted that “childishness on stage in anything approaching a realistic sense would be unthinkable within the Greek tragic convention.”¹⁴ Sifakis goes further, asserting that “the convention for the representation of children on the tragic stage is that they are conceived, typecast and shown as miniatures of adults” (70). Euripidean adults often compare children to young chicks; Molossus like *Alcestis*’ son, uses the adult image, crying out “mother, mother, I cringe beneath your wing” (*Andr.* 504). In Dale’s words “the child sings the sentiment its elders feel for it.”¹⁵

So too when he appeals to his father for help (508–9), it is help “for your dear ones,” the objectifying φίλοις instead of “for me” or “for us.”

12 Sifakis 67 notes the presence of suppliant children in *Herac.*, *H.F.* and *Suppl.*, where they are silent roles, but oddly separates from these the scene in *Andromache*.

13 *Alc.* 393–403, 406–415. On his farewell to his dying mother see Dale 83–85, Kassel 42. In *Medea* the children speak only the obligatory stichomythic pair of trimeters as they are killed inside (1271–2, 1277–8). In *Suppl.* the boys’ chorus is probably older, but Collard and Stevens agree in dating the play close to *Andr.*, so that it may be seen as part of a tendency in the dramatist current in the late 420’s.

14 Dale 85, cited by Sifakis 69 with approval.

15 Dale 85, cited by Sifakis 69.

His three phrases in the antistrophe offer formal echoes of the strophe; twice, he uses abstractions; the cry "what theme can I find to turn aside my doom" (μέλος, 527, breaks the dramatic illusion) is matched by his last words "what trick can I devise to escape evils" (535–6). But his central plea is that of all suppliants: "spare me from death."

Menelaus violates his oath in planning to kill the suppliants, but his resolve to destroy the child of his enemy reflects another commonplace of the child-scene,¹⁶ which will recur in the Trojan plays of both Euripides and Seneca. "It is arrant folly to leave enemies born of enemies when you have the power to kill them and eliminate the threat to your household," says Menelaus (519–521). His fear is confirmed by Peleus' hope that he will rear the boy "as a great enemy to these people" (723–4). The boy-child is both loved and feared as avenger and replacement of his father.

But this may have been the last play in which Euripides gave words to a child: in 422 Aristophanes created his own burlesque of the Euripidean child-scene in *Peace*. Did the paratragedic lyric¹⁷ of Trygaeus' daughter deter Euripides? Perhaps this is unlikely, but perhaps he had already found child-roles a problem in other ways. We do not find him giving children parts in the datable later plays. In *Troades*, where Astyanax does not speak, Euripides will find another and more poignant way to show his nature through his words.

There is an immense contrast in tone between *Andromache* and *Troades*. When Euripides devised his fictional action in the earlier play he was working both with and against the Homeric tradition of Hector's loving family. In *Troades* he had a choice of motivation for Astyanax's death, but little else. Lesches in the *Little Iliad* had described Neoptolemus himself taking the little boy by the foot and hurling him from a tower in Troy's ruined walls; Arctinus' *Iliou Persis* made Odysseus his murderer.¹⁸ Euripides does not bring on Odysseus as a character in *Troades* (he had already done so in the similar scene of *Hecuba*) but, perhaps with Andromache's captive future in mind, he has chosen to hold Odysseus rather than Neoptolemus responsible, and spreads Astyanax's

16 Kassel 51–52, citing *Hec.* 206 which is missed by Sifakis 69 and 78 (VIb).

17 The daughter's first speech incorporates patches of Euripides' recent *Aeolus*, and the ensuing dialogue (124–148) parodies lines and details of action from his *Belero-phontes*.

18 Cf. Stevens 1; full testimonia in Fantham 51–52.

condemnation and burial over two chiasmatically symmetrical episodes separated by the confrontation with Helen.

The first of these forms the pivot of the play for Hecuba, turning her last surviving hope to despair. As Andromache is led on with her son the chorus welcome him as “dear Astyanax, Hector’s scion” (571)¹⁹ but he goes unmentioned during the dialogue between Hecuba and Andromache over her fate in captivity, until Hecuba urges Andromache in 685 ff. to forget Hector and treat her new master with respect, giving him the welcome enticement of her good character (699–700) so that she may rear her son as Troy’s greatest hope, and his descendants live to restore the fallen city. Besides the bitter irony of its timing we may see in these words a retrospective irony evoking the earlier play, in which Andromache’s good behaviour did not protect her. As soon as Hecuba’s hope is uttered Talthybius appears, the reluctant bearer of the Greek verdict (721–5) that Astyanax is to be thrown from the battlements, and warns Andromache that she must submit to ensure that he is allowed burial. Both this scene and the burial scene contain speeches of the greatest tenderness, and Hecuba’s later speech over his corpse is no less moving than Andromache’s farewell to the living child. Any interpretation would be inadequate, but I must summarize, if only to bring out the motifs which Euripides’ successor will adopt. First, pride in the boy’s heritage, the honour shown by Greek fear of him and the nobility and excellence of Hector for which he will die (740–4); then anger that the son she bore to be a prince is to be a sacrificial victim for alien Greeks (745–8). Her words tell us that the little boy is crying, and suggest his incomprehension²⁰ as he clutches at her clothes like a nestling (749–750). She must speak the dreadful forecast of 752–6 for herself, for he cannot understand. This is a little child who still loves nuzzling with his mouth and arms like a baby animal, breathing the sweet smell of baby-flesh, recently weaned and set free from swaddling clothes.²¹ Shirley Barlow has said of a later

19 Astyanax is named only here at the moment of his introduction and in the lyric after his death (1120), since his name cannot be fitted into trimeters without metrical violence. Seneca oddly does not name Astyanax in the lyrics of *Troades* but his name occurs in the lyrics of Sen. *Agamemnon* (640).

20 So too *And.* 498–500; cf. Kassel 45–46 and 57, citing *I.A.* 1241–4, omitted by Sifakis 69 and 78 (IV).

21 Compare with the evocative *χρωτός ἡδύ πνευμα* (757), Medea’s outcry just before she kills her children, *Med.* 1071–5. In both scenes Euripides combines acute physical awareness of the child with more stylized expressions; the ab-

passage of this play,²² “perhaps Euripides sees physical reality as being the strongest hold still over human beings.” It is this last embrace that drives Andromache to curse Helen, guilty as her son is innocent, thus preparing the appearance of Helen as focus of the approaching episode.

Aristotle believes that the sufferings of the absolutely good make bad tragedy because they are morally intolerable to the audience;²³ what would he say of the murder of a child? Perhaps this is why Euripides did not write such a play earlier. Here at least he tries to give the spectators the comfort of tears for Astyanax's burial, the respect shown by Talthybius and the honour of his father's shield which Neoptolemus has offered from his spoils (1136–42).

The inverse symmetry of the related episodes begins with Hecuba's recantation of the hopes she vainly put before Andromache in 702–5; like Andromache (740–4 and 765 “why did you kill this innocent child?”)²⁴ Hecuba begins “why, Greeks, did you fear this child and perpetrate a new kind of murder? In case he should restore a fallen Troy? Then you were truly worthless.” Conventions of funeral practice required that mourners should praise the dead man's lineage and merits of body and mind before lamenting the achievements that death has forestalled.²⁵ So now Hecuba recalls briefly the life and death which he should have had, dying in battle for his city after reaching manhood, marriage and divine royalty, ἰσοθέου τυραννίδος (for the child would have been king). But her most moving words evoke his injuries, the horrible rictus of his wound gaping to the bone and the scalping of his hair which his mother lovingly dressed. His arms are like his father's, but dislocated (1179; she does not recall that his father's body too was mutilated and dragged behind Achilles' chariot). Most poignant of all,

stracts ὑπαγκάλισμα *Tro.* 747, προσβολή *Med.* 1074, and note the strange distancing of σχῆμα καὶ προσωπον εὐγενὲς τέκνων, *Med.* 1072.

22 *The Imagery of Euripides*, London 1971, 81, commenting on *Tro.* 1194–9 and 1173–4.

23 Arist. *Poet.* 13.1452 b 36; but this does not envisage the tragedies of women and children, or anything less than a free and responsible man.

24 For the innocence of the child οὐδὲν αἴτιον (765) cf. *Andr.* 497–500, Sifakis 69 and 78 (V).

25 Cf. Menander Rhetor 434–7 (ed. D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, Oxford 1981): the main body of the funeral eulogy should consider past, present and future of the dead man, contrasting present with happy past, stressing age and manner of death, relating past upbringing, talents and services and looking to his future in marriage and parenthood. For the child Astyanax all these must be represented as unfulfilled.

Hecuba recalls how he told her, with childish pride, that he would shear a lock to offer to her tomb and bring crowds of friends to speak loving words at her grave (1182–4). These are the open words of a child young enough to be free of embarrassment at speaking of her death, and proud of his leadership among his peers. If they suggest an older child than we imagined in Andromache's arms, perhaps a boy of five or six, Euripides has exchanged consistency for his most vivid child-portrait, and for the sad irony that the old queen is now burying her grandson (1185–6).²⁶ The epitaph she imagines for him is a reminder to Euripides' Athenians of the shamefulness of their own cruelty at Melos. With her women Hecuba performs a *thrénos*; she can bury him with no prizes or memories of his horsemanship, or archery or hunting trophies (1209–13), only the ornaments which he should have worn at his wedding to a princess of Asia, and Hector's victorious shield which she honours with garlands (1218–23). Her last comments on the hollowness of funeral offerings, a comfort to the givers but useless to the dead, recall that Astyanax is about to enter another world; she may bandage his wounds now, but it is his father who will take care of him in the kingdom of the dead (1234). Whether Euripides or his public believed in an afterlife or not, the line offers the comforting image of a child returned to his father's loving care. These two episodes are not so much a drama as a simple re-enactment of the child's death and the natural mourning of his kin; everything repeats traditional acts but the expression is fresh and immediate. Without twists of intrigue or paradoxes or revaluation, the episodes of *Troades* move us because they enter into the love and grief of the family that has been brought to an end.

From their earliest adaptations of Greek tragedy the Romans were influenced by identification with their Trojan ancestry to favour Trojan themes for their plays; Ennius wrote a famous *Andromache Captive*²⁷ and the last Republican playwright of merit, Accius, wrote an *Astyanax* of

-
- 26 See also Conacher 144. Kassel notes the inconsistency in representing his age (55) which is necessary for this vivid characterization. This seems to be Euripidean practice: in *H.F.* 71 ff. the children are given the behaviour of five- or six-year-olds, but later in the play (1360) are to be buried as babies at their mother's breast. In both passages (*Tro.* 1173 ff.), as Kassel points out, narrative conveys the children's nature more vividly than would have been possible on stage.
- 27 On Ennius' *Andromacha Aechmalotis* see H. D. Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius*, Cambridge 1969, 235 ff., Fantham 63–64. A fragment quoted by Cic. *Tusc.* 1.105 refers to Astyanax's death hurled from the walls.

which some twenty scattered lines survive. Inevitably much is uncertain about this play, not least the question of its dependence on a Greek model, but the fragments make it clear that the drama followed the capture of Astyanax by the Greeks and ended in his death: there were scenes among the Greek leaders in which Calchas advised them what must be done to enable them to sail freely from Troy, and the Greeks, determined on his death, hunted the missing child; several more detailed fragments show a Greek leader interrogating a man (perhaps a shepherd?) who has found the child trying to hide in the hills, and a later scene in which a Trojan speaks of mourning for someone (the dead child? Hector?) whose glorious name is scratched on the rocks. To reconstruct, scholars have resorted to retrospective assumptions based on Seneca's tragedy and on a summary account of the child's death given by Servius.²⁸ It is significant that this play implies a Trojan attempt to send the child to safety and a struggle to repossess him, a motif reminiscent of Euripides' *Andromache*. It would be extraordinary if Accius had not included a confrontation between Andromache and his Greek captor, but the fragments, though favourable, do not even establish that she had a role. Once the child was captured and brought on-stage, there would be no resort except supplication, as in *Andromache*, but no traces survive to suggest how the play ended except a last fragment:

abducite intro: nam mihi miseritudine
commouit animum excelsa aspecti dignitas

where *excelsa aspecti dignitas* may even imply a refusal to supplicate²⁹ like that of Euripides' Polyxena in *Hecuba* 345 ff.

It is unlikely that Seneca, who was uninterested in the early Roman dramatists, was influenced by this play when he adapted the killing of Astyanax, along with the sacrifice of Polyxena, for his double tragedy *Troades*; but when he introduces the order of Calchas that Astyanax is to be killed at the end of the second act, he follows it with an action centred on Andromache's attempt to hide and protect her child. Unlike the version of Accius, Seneca will make Andromache conceal the child on stage in his father's tomb, so that her fight to hide him from Ulysses

28 On the fragments of Accius' *Astyanax* see Fantham 65–67.

29 It is not clear whether we should imagine Andromache as subject of this fragment or perhaps a slightly older Astyanax. But it should be the victim whose dignity overwhelms the speaker.

is conducted before the audience, and the one prolonged scene carries them through concealment, detection, surrender, supplication and submission, ending with the performance of the death rites over his living body.³⁰ The play makes extensive use of ideas and sequences of dialogue from Euripides' *Troades*,³¹ but in this scene the action is far closer to that of *Andromache*: we have the hiding of the little boy from the threat to his life, the mother's confrontation with a treacherous and powerful enemy, divided between a first phase in which she can still hope the child is safe and defy her enemy, and a longer phase when she and the child are at his mercy and must supplicate; Seneca gives to Andromache a formal lyric supplication in anapaests; the child does not speak³² but her words control and describe his suppliant action: as in *Andromache*, the foreign captor rejects his suppliant because it is seen as folly to let the child of an enemy survive.³³ But whereas Peleus stepped in to rescue his great-grandchild there is no rescue for Astyanax, and the last phase of the scene returns to the mourning pattern of Andromache and Hecuba in Euripides' *Troades*.

I have simplified to bring out the resemblance of the action, one close enough, I believe, for Seneca to have devised his own variation on Euripides' other Andromache-tragedy and transferred it to her son Astyanax. But he has greatly elaborated the element of intrigue and deception to create a suspense more prolonged than that of Andromache. Borrowing from Aeneas' vision of Hector, which warned him to save Ascanius and Anchises from Troy,³⁴ he has invented a dream of Hector to warn Andromache of the threat to her son and motivate her flight to the deserted tomb. The choice of the tomb for a hiding place is loaded

30 While it is possible that the action of the play or this third episode is derived by Seneca from the Augustan tragedians (see Tarrant, *HSCP* 82 (1978) 261 and Fantham 70), the only evidence for any imperial tragedy about the fall of Troy is Terentianus Maurus' citation of three snatches of choral lyric from Pomponius Secundus, cf. Klotz, *Scaen. Rom. Frag.* 312.

31 On Seneca's relationship to Euripides' *Troades* and *Hecuba*, see Fantham, Introduction 71–75; the *index locorum* (398–9) lists over twenty passages in which Seneca adapts ideas and phrases from Euripides' *Troades* and almost as many from *Hecuba*.

32 Later (792 below) he will speak two words, the most extensive role of a child in Senecan tragedy; the child victims of *H.F.* and *Medea* do not speak at all.

33 Sen. *Tro.* 550–1, 589–593 and 736–7 represent Astyanax as a threat to the Greek children of his generation whom he will grow up to attack; cf. Menelaus, Eur. *Andr.* 519–522, 659–666 and n. 23 above.

34 *Aeneid* 2.270 ff.; on the details of imitation in Seneca see Fantham on *Tro.* 443.

with potential significance³⁵ which Seneca will exploit for its ironies. Once Ulysses arrives, bringing, like Talthybius, the news that the child must die, she tries to deceive him by a feigned monologue lamenting that her son is lost, perhaps dead; in a second answer to his probing she changes the story; she did not want to gladden the Greek with the news that Hector's child is dead,³⁶ but she must swear now, even by Hector's burial, that he is lying among the dead—a precarious truth that almost satisfies Ulysses. He is about to leave (604–5) when he senses her fear; the child must be alive. In a counter-deceit he pretends that his men have seized the child, and her immediate terror proves that the child is nearby. His second deceit exploits both her two loves. Since the child cannot be found, he declares, Calchas has proclaimed that Hector's tomb must be destroyed and his ashes scattered over the sea to appease it. Driven beyond endurance she voices her anguished indecision (642–666) as if she had a choice between saving and betraying her son; if she leaves him in the tomb, living child and dead father will be mangled together. She turns first to abuse of Ulysses, then hallucination (681–5): believing Hector's spirit has come to save her, she rushes like a mad-woman against the soldiers, and falls exhausted. Only then does she attempt supplication, and when that too fails, begs time to prepare her son for death. In two extended speeches she mourns over the life he has missed, and gives him her offerings, committing him to the care of Hector in the world below. His death, passed over in Euripides' *Troades* (1133–35) because there is no way to glorify the death scene of a helpless baby, becomes one of the two climactic narratives of the last act, when the Greek messenger reports the martyrdom of first Astyanax then Polyxena to the waiting women at the moment of their departure from Troy.

My concern here is to indicate both the way in which Seneca used the main ideas of Euripides' dialogue, and the change of tone and emphasis in his treatment of Astyanax and his mother's love for him.

The most conspicuous difference is a loss of warmth; Latin is not free with everyday affective words like Greek *philos*, but the pattern of allusion and address to the little boy is noticeably less spontaneous and more conscious of status. Euripides' Trojan women welcome him

35 Cf. 486 *optime credam patri*; 519 *tuque coniunx conde depositum meum*, 603 *ut luce caruit inter exstinctos iacet / datusque tumulo debita exanimis tulit*.

36 At 597 *Hectoris proles obit*, I believe Andromache deliberately mocks the Greeks by adopting their phrasing in the "good news" she passes on through Ulysses.

as “dear Astyanax, Hector’s scion” at 571 and name him again after his death (1120), but Seneca’s chorus neither name nor mention the child. While Euripides’ women greet Astyanax as his father’s son (571) and Talthybius, quoting the Greek decree, calls him child of a great father (723), both mother and grandmother will address him as dearest (740, 1147) and their words are full of expressions of love for the child, living (especially 757–8, 761–3, 790) and dead.

Seneca’s play is far more concerned with Astyanax’s enemies, but it is not Greeks alone who treat him as a symbol. It is natural for Calchas to decree the death of *Priami nepos Hectoreus* (369) and Ulysses to call him *Hectorea suboles* (528), *futurus Hector* (551), or more simply *Hectoris natum* (554): the conventional image of the boy as Hector’s scion (*stirps*, 535) is reinforced by four analogues for the power of heredity; the choice strain of seed (536), the young steer succeeding to his father’s leadership of the herd (537–540), the shoot springing from a felled tree, to match its parent and overshadow the forest, or the neglected ash that will revive as blazing fire: every variation contributes a new aspect. It is to this image that Ulysses returns as he is about to leave, reporting the completion of his task (*stirpe sublata Hectoris* 605). All this is good characterization of the Greek leader, but Seneca has made his Andromache almost as formal: in four hundred lines there is only one tender address (766). When she comes to the tomb³⁷ she speaks of him to the chorus as *hic* (420–2); it is he who keeps her in life, though she wishes to die since she saw Hector killed; but fear is more dominant than love in her attitude. Describing her vision she tells the old man how she forgot her son in yearning for Hector (459) and when she turns to speak to the child, it is as *magni certa progenies patris* (461). She lovingly celebrates his likeness to his father in each detail of features and deportment. Nor is this an accidental overstress on Seneca’s part; for him it is the essence of Andromache’s personality that she loves only Hector and cares for the child only as a miniature of his father. Forced to decide between risking the living child to save the tomb, or keeping silent to let both be destroyed together, as she reasons aloud she swears loyalty to Hector: “I call the merciless gods to witness and the true gods, spirits of my dead husband: dear Hector, there is

37 Talthybius in Eur. *Tro.* 1130 ff. describes the departure of Andromache from Troy “groaning for her country and bidding farewell (προσεννέπουσα) to Hector’s tomb.” This idea may have been the germ from which Seneca’s imagination conceived the third act of his play set at the tomb.

nothing that pleases me in my son except you" (644–6). This is reflected in every word she addresses to her son. Before Ulysses has come, when she must persuade her child to go down into the tomb, her words take pride in his revulsion, interpreting it as courage that disdains to show fear or hide itself (*pudet timere* 505). To avoid the awful sacrilege of the tomb's destruction she turns suppliant and orders him to kneel at his master's feet—the scene which most resembles Euripides' *Andromache*. He must not, she says, think it shameful, but forget his royal ancestry, Priam's jurisdiction as King, and even Hector, and act the captive (705–715). There is a faint concession to the child's simplicity and bafflement in the words *si tua nondum funera sentis / matris fletus imitare tuae*, perhaps a deliberate recall of Euripides' *Tro.* 749, "you weep, do you guess your doom?"

Seneca has taken over from Euripides' *Troades* the ill-timed evocation of Astyanax's role as rebuilders of Troy; it is Andromache's fondest hope for her son, suggested by his heroic likeness to Hector; she voices it before Ulysses appears (469–475) and will recant it in a passage of similar length and form at the moment when Ulysses has rejected her supplication (739–745). Euripides made Hecuba reject her hopes only when she looked at the child's corpse;³⁸ the hope was destroyed. Seneca puts the words into Andromache's mouth in desperation to persuade her captor, thus differing from the use of the "hope" motif in either of the Euripidean plays we have considered.

The moment comes when Andromache accepts her child's death and the need for burial. None of the Trojan women will be left to give burial, but she can perform in advance some of the services due to the dead. Even then her tender words *dulce pignus* (766) see the little boy as earnest of her love for Hector, a token of the past and now dead husband, and as the glory of his family and country. The unfilled hopes which illustrate his cut-off manhood are public actions: the exercise of rule over allies (*iura nec populis dabis* 722), conquest and revenge on fleeing Greeks (733–4) and on Pyrrhus, inheritor of the blood-feud caused by Achilles' mutilation of Hector. The other touches of local colour, allusions to the *lusus Troiae* and perhaps a Salian ritual in Trojan temples, are a poor parallel for Hecuba's lament over Astyanax's lost companionship with his peers and later marriage.

The little boy speaks only two words, *miserere mater* (792), seeking pity not from his captor (as in Euripides' *Andromache* 534) but from

38 Cf. Eur. *Tro.* 702–5 and 1159–66 discussed above.

his mother; and well he might protest at the load of family and public responsibility she has laid upon him. As she makes the formal offering of tears, kisses and a lock of her hair, she finds new hope: that he will be a messenger for her to Hector, bearing her pleas to rescue her from Greek slavery; the kisses she gives him are for his father; *sume quae reddas tuo / oscula parenti* (808–9). Is there no thought for the child? It is difficult to forgive Seneca for his final touch as she takes the poor child's garment for a comfort because Hector's dear burial chamber and his spirit were in contact with it. I do not believe Seneca intended to depict an abnormal pathology, but the mother's last words to her child express a love not for him but for his father.

Consider how Seneca has arrived at Andromache's situation. He has taken from *Andromache* the issue of choosing between the child's life and her own and replaced it by a situation in which she believes she is choosing between his life and the preservation of his dead father's remains. There is in fact no real chance for Astyanax, once Ulysses detects where he is hidden, but Seneca's Andromache sees her husband's *manes* as her god (644). So long as she can save her son without prejudice to the tomb she will fight for the child with all her might; Seneca has given his heroine the masculine virtues of courage and defiance instead of gentleness. But he forces upon her the choice between the tomb and child, in order to demonstrate her values.

"L'épouse l'emporte sur la mere," said Nisard 150 years ago,³⁹ but that is only half the story. We could adduce considerations of ancient social values or the harshness of child mortality to suggest that it was normal for a wife and mother to give her love and services to her husband before her children, but that is not the real issue. The explanation lies partly in Seneca's perception of Andromache as the most devoted of mythical wives,⁴⁰ partly in his Roman concern with the public obligations of members of the ruling class, whether contemporary senators or Roman princes. Their value lay in their ability to perform their duties: once this freedom was removed from them, there was no reason to prefer their life over their death; but death entitled the man of *uirtus* to the absolute respect which he might not hope for in life under tyranny.

39 *Etude de moeurs et de critique sur les poètes latins de la décadence*, Paris 1834, 151.

40 We might compare Virgil's portrait of Andromache surviving only to tend the cenotaph for Hector in *Aeneid* 3.303–313: there too she lives only for the dead, but there is no conflict between her love of Hector and Astyanax: both are mentioned together at 3.487–491.

Preference for the dead over the unfree living should be considered alongside the specific choice of this wife for husband over child.⁴¹

The death of Astyanax wins him this respect. Seneca has modelled his death-narrative to match the sacrificial death of Polyxena, offered as bride to the dead Achilles, for there was a famous precedent in Euripides' *Hecuba*, adapted in *Metamorphoses* 13, Ovid's *Iliou Persis*. It is to Ovid that Seneca is most indebted for his Polyxena.⁴² But Stoic heroism can easily be predicated of a royal virgin, who in Euripides was fully conscious of the power of her free acceptance of death to save her from indignity and create a glorious example for her countrymen. How can it be imposed on little Astyanax? How old is Seneca's child? In Act 3 he seemed (like Euripides' child) too young to understand, and capable of only the simplest responses of fear. But the child in the messenger-narrative walks quickly to his place of execution and glares bravely (*intrepidus animo*) around him like the cub of a wild animal who practices his bite even before his teeth have power to kill; the doubtful text of 1098 does not affect Seneca's image of a proud young male, unweeping when all around him weep, who symbolically anticipates and aborts Ulysses' rite by leaping to embrace the soil of his hereditary kingdom.⁴³

Is this how little children die? In his search for a model of courage and national pride Seneca has done justice to the prince whose death is a symbolic triumph. But we still wait for the promise of burial, and when Andromache asks who will cover his body and give it a grave the messenger's reply seems to exclude it: his body with the noble features of his father (1113) is disfigured beyond recovery. "In this too," Andromache replies, "he is like his father." These are her last words—a distortion of Hecuba's loving address, "O arms, sweet likenesses of your father's arms, but how you lie dislocated before my eyes!" (1178–79) Seneca's mother can even take pride in her child's disfigurement, because it echoes his father's death and mutilation.

Seneca's play has many good qualities; symmetry of rise and fall, antithesis of Greek and Trojan, a swift and inevitable action, and speeches

41 See Fantham 78–92, "Death and the Dead in Seneca's *Troades*."

42 See Fantham 31–32 and commentary on 1118–1164.

43 The stress on Astyanax as the heir to the monarchy explains why in 1090 he is called not "Hector's child" but *paruulus Priami nepos* as he was at the beginning (369) *Priami nepos Hectoreus*; the *regnum* as well as its future champion must be destroyed.

of rhetorical power; even the characters are more rounded and sympathetically conveyed than some of his extremes of vice and virtue. But his Andromache rings hollow; she does not love her child as Hecuba loves Polyxena; his helpless survival is merely an obstacle to her reunion with Hector by a self-inflicted death. The child is feared and loved by Greeks and Trojan solely as Hector-to-be. Many phrases show Seneca's admiration for Euripides, but can imitate only the turns of circumstance and argumentation, and his level of understanding is closer to the uncertain touch of the politicized *Andromache* than the unforgettable compassion of the *Trojan Women*.

23. Statius' Achilles, and His Trojan Model

Statius' last, unfinished poem, the *Achilleid*, is a more varied and charming work than readers of the *Thebaid* could ever have imagined, and is perhaps the most attractive approach to this highly imitative and professional poet. It is generally agreed that both Statius' diction and his narrative form are greatly influenced by Virgil and Ovid: but if he considered the Theban poem as his own *Aeneid*, we might fairly see the *Achilleid* as more akin to the *Metamorphoses*;¹ diction and epic devices may remain recognizably Virgilian, but the relaxed tone, the gentle irony and open humour take us into Ovid's world.² As an illustration, the brief episode in which Thetis conveys her sleeping son from Thessaly over the sea to Scyros probably draws its original inspiration from Venus' substitution of Cupid for Ascanius in *Aeneid* 1: Venus' son procures his own arrival, but she spirits away the sleeping Ascanius; 'at Venus Ascanio placidam per membra quietem / irrigat et fotum gremio dea tollit in altos / Idaliae lucos' (*Aen.* 1.691–3). But the tone of *Ach.* 1. 228–31 ('ipsa dehinc toto resolutum pectore Achillem ... ad placidas deportat aquas et iussa tacere / litora') is made Ovidian by the magical (almost science-fiction) speed of the dolphin-drawn water-craft and the incongruity of Chiron's affection with his equine nature:

prosequitur diuam, celeresque recursus
securus pelagi Chiron rogat, udaeque celat
lumina, et abreptos subito iamiamque latentes
erecto prospectat equo, qua cana parumper
spumant signa fugae, et liquido perit orbita ponto. (232–5)

1 The discovery of Achilles by Ulysses is handled in *Met.* 13.162–8 as part of Ulysses' list of his services to the Greeks: Ovid also presents Achilles' seduction of Deidamia as an *exemplum* in *Ars* 1.679–700.

2 I base my statements about recognized influence initially on the two recent editions of the *Achilleis*; O. A. W. Dilke (Cambridge 1954), and Jean Méheust, Éditions Les Belles Lettres (Paris 1971). Negative claims about diction or imagery in Virgil and Ovid have been cross-checked by consultation of the concordances: for Virgil, *A Vergil Concordance*, H. H. Warwick (Minneapolis 1975); for Ovid, *A Concordance of Ovid*, Deferrari Barry and Maguire (Washington 1939). Only the *Thebaid* is used by J. H. Mozley, 'Statius as an Imitator of Virgil and Ovid,' *CW* 22 (1933) 33–8.

But principles of genre have probably been the obstacle deterring Stasian scholars from considering another thematically relevant influence on this poem: I am referring to Senecan tragedy, and particularly to the *Troades*. Of recent editors Dilke notes in passing the phrase *trux puer*, applied to Achilles at *Ach.* 302, also found at *Tro.* 832 ‘iam trucis Chiron pueri magister’; but the epithet is natural enough to have been an independent choice. Méheust xxix speaks of ‘des traits empruntés à la tragédie de Sénèque’, but this footnote directs us only to references in the play³ to the story of Achilles—the prophecy which decided Thetis to hide him on Scyros (*Tro.* 213–14) and the home of Neoptolemus, his child, on Scyros itself. Mere allusion to the same well-known mythological event is not evidence of imitation or even influence. It is only when we meet echoes of phrasing or imaginative turns of thought that it makes sense to suspect imitation. For instance, in *Tro.* 439–40, listed by Méheust, the phrase *cognati maris* may be the inspiration of *cognata ... aequora* in *Ach.* 2–3. But the verbal affinity is slight and the context unrelated. How do we judge the two later passages exploiting Achilles’ kinship with the sea-goddess to glorify his seduction of Deidamia? At 665–6 the hero comforts her in her pregnancy ‘quid defles magno nurus addita ponto? / quid gemis ingentis caelo paritura nepotes?’ Confronting her father, he offers this variation (897–8) ‘Peleus te nato socerum et Thetis hospita iungunt / adlegant-que suos utroque a sanguine divos’.

Statius is advancing the same arguments which Seneca gave to Helen at *Tro.* 879–82, when she brings Polyxena the false report of her betrothal to Achilles’ son:

te magna Tethys teque tot pelagi deae
placidumque numen aequoris tumidi Thetis
suam uocabunt, te datam Pyrrho socer
Peleus nurum uocabit et Nereus nurum.

Here we have a similar context, but since it is a recognized *topos* of both courtship and consolation after seduction⁴ to praise the suitor’s family,

3 I can see no good reason for Méheust (xxix n. 6) quoting *Tro.* 223 ‘Captaeque tellus nobilis Briseide’, or 350, ‘meus captis quoque / scit parcere ensis’.

4 For the *topos* in courtship compare Ov. *Ars* 1.555–6, *Her.* 16.171–78, as consolation for seduction, Hor. *C.* 3.27, 73–6 (Kiessling-Heinze’s parallel from the scholiast on *Od.* 11.322 makes a different point, offering marriage to Dionysus as consolation for desertion by Theseus), and Ov. *Met.* 5.525 f. I owe the last three references to the kindness of the anonymous referee.

the common argument need not entail imitation. Only the similar formulation of *Ach.* 897 and *Tro.* 880–2 suggests reminiscence. We must reserve judgement, but each new coincidence of phrasing will increase the probability that Statius has used his predecessor's treatment of the material.

Let us examine another cluster of mythological allusions common to both works. At *Ach.* 86 f. Jupiter foretells Achilles' greatness to Thetis, as Catullus' Parcae had foretold the future of their unborn child to Peleus and Thetis at their wedding. There are four elements in the Statian prophecy: the first, but only the first, is directly modelled on Catullus.⁵ Here are the others:

modo crassa ire uetabit
flumina, et Hectoreo tardabit funere⁶ currus
impelletque manu nostros, opera inrita, muros.

Hectoreo funere is a startling, mannered, phrase, and the commentator Placidus quotes the slightly easier *pondere*; but either comes very close to *Tro.* 414–15 'cum ... graui gemeret sono / Peliacus axis *pondere Hectoreo tremens*'; in each passage the chariot is hampered and straining with the hero's powerful corpse. Statius' innovation is the extended use of *tardare*, but even this may be provided by Seneca's version of Achilles choking the rivers,

corporibus amnes clusit, et quaerens iter
tardus cruento Xanthus errauit uado. (*Tro.* 186–7)

Finally *impelletque manu* surely echoes *Tro.* 204–6 'cuius unius manu / impulsa Troia ... dubia quo caderet stetit', and the god's allusion to

5 Cat. 64.344 'cum Phrygii Teucro manabunt sanguine campi': cf. *Ach.* 86 'tepido modo sanguine Teucros undabit campos.' Compare also the imitation in *Culex* 306 'Teucris cum magno manaret sanguine tellus / et Simois Xanthique liquor.'

6 Though unaware of the Senecan parallel, Dilke and A. Marastoni (Leipzig 1974) are inclined to adopt *pondere*, the reading in Lactantius Placidus' commentary, since *funere* may have crept into the text of 88 from 85 above. The adjective *Hectoreus* is Virgilian, cf. *Aen.* 1.273, 3.301 and 488, 5.190 and 634, and 2.543 '*corpusque exsangue Hectoreum*'; this is transferred by the *Culex* to the context of Achilles' mutilation of and chariot-ride: 324–5 'Aecides ... *Hectoreo lustrauit corpore Troiam*'. Did Statius know the *Culex*? He is uninfluenced by 306, so it would seem there is no need to assume dependence here.

the god-built walls of Troy, echoing an Ovidian phrase, prefers Seneca's synonym 'muri', as in *Tro.* 478 'arx illa pollens opibus et *muris deum*'.⁷

However, what first drew my attention to Statius' use of Seneca was not the application of similar phrases to the same mythological events, but the treatment of a similar mythological episode, where situation and rhetorical purpose can be transferred; for as the fearful Thetis disguises the young Achilles, but must first persuade him to accept the womanish clothes, so the fearful Andromache, in Seneca's play, had tried to hide the young Astyanax in his father's tomb, but needed first to persuade him to accept the shame of hiding. Compare now from Thetis' speech in Statius:

cedamus, paulumque animos submitte uiriles
atque habitus dignare meos (259–60)

and

cape tuta parumper
tegmina nil nocitura animo. Cur ora reducis
quidue parant oculi? Pudet hoc mitescere cultu? (270–2)

with Andromache's words;

succede tumulo nate—quid retro fugis
tutasque⁸ latebras spernis? agnosco indolem,
pudet timere. spiritus magnos fuga
animosque ueteres, sume quos casus dedit,
... cedendum est malis. (503–6)

Can we doubt that Thetis has learned from Andromache? But there is more: in the same sequence compare *Ach.* 269 'progenitum Stygos amne seuero / armaui – *totumque utinam*' ('if only I had not left the heel undipped') with Hector's words at *Tro.* 453–5, 'Troia quod cecidit gemis? / *utinam* iaceret tota' ('if only no tower were left standing').

7 As with *undare*, Statius has given a new construction to *tardare*, which is applied by Virgil (*Aen.* 5.453, 12.746, etc.) and Ovid (in *Met.* only at 13.81 and 383) to heroes hampered by wounds or grief. On the walls of Troy compare the formulation of *Met.* 12.587 '*inrita* qui mecum posuisti *moenia Troiae*'. Note that *Ach.* 811 '*ipsa iam dubiis nutant tibi Pergama muris*' may be influenced by *Tro.* 206 '*dubia quo caderet stetit*'.

8 Editors (most recently Giardina) prefer the reading of A., *turpesque*, or Ritschl's *turpesne*; but see Leo's defence of *tutas* (read only by Ambr. D 276) in *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*, Berlin 1878, 1.2; for Andromache to admit the shelter is *turpis* to beg her own question, nor can we interpret *turpes* as *tamquam turpes*, implying only the child's motive.

Seneca's meaning is concealed from the listening Andromache, but that last standing tower will be fatal to Astyanax; the motif is identical.

Statius resumes his narrative at 283: '*quis deus attonitae fraudes astumque parenti / contulit?*' Each element of this introductory phrase finds a precedent in Seneca's Astyanax-scene: at 569 where Ulysses recalls his detection of Achilles: '*uicimus matrum dolos / etiam dearum*', at 627, '*fraude materna abditum*', and at 736, '*matris maeror attonitae*'. In addition the inflected accusative of *astus* is conspicuously rare. While Virgil and Ovid use only the conventional adverbial ablative *astu*,⁹ Seneca in this scene of *Troades* uses both *astu* (752) and the accusative plural *astus* (523 and 613): he is the first author known to have done so.

There is a clear echo of one image from Seneca to Statius at *Ach.* 385–6 when Thetis entrusts her precious child to the land of Scyros:

cara mihi tellus, magnae cui pignora curae
depositumque ingens timido *commisimus astu* ...

Andromache had made the same appeal to the earth of Hector's tomb, and with more point, since treasures were so often preserved by burial underground. After the old servant has confirmed that her son is safe within, using the first element of the metaphor, '*claustra commissum tegunt*' (512) she turns to the tomb and shade of her husband

dehisce tellus, tuque coniunx ...
sinu profundo conde *depositum meum*;
adest Ulixes, et quidem dubio gradu,
uultuque, nectit pectore *astus callidos*. (519–23)

As a coda to this matching of scenes, we might note that when Ulysses is addressed by Diomedes at *Ach.* 542,

tu tantum prouidus *astu*
tende animum uigilem, fecundumque erige pectus

the main inspiration of Statius' diction is not Seneca, despite casual affinities with 523, but Ovid; for both Seneca and Statius drew elements

9 *Astu* occurs three times in Ovid, at *Met.* 4.776, 7.419, and 13.193. It may also be the correct reading at *Her.* 9.45, '*irae Iunonis iniquae*', where *astu* was conjectured by Bentley and independently by Housman. It occurs four times in Seneca, but only once outside this scene of *Troades*, at *Phae.* 153.

of their portrayal of Ulysses from his magnificent self-justification in the *Armorum Iudicium* of *Metamorphoses* 13.128–370.¹⁰

Instead of hunting verbal echoes, which may leave the impression that Statius created his poetry like a jackdaw's nest, I want to cap my arguments with Statius' highly individual adaptation of a solemn and heroic simile, applied by Seneca to the young Astyanax; again Astyanax becomes Achilles (this time Seneca is printed first):

sic ille magni paruus armenti comes
 primisque nondum cornibus findens cutem
 cervice subito celsus et fronte arduus
 gregem paternum ducit et pecori imperat. (*Tro.* 537–40)

Statius reserves this hint of the young hero's future leadership for the moment when the transvestite Achilles sights Deidamia, and feeling his first sexual urge, suppresses it out of respect for his mother—pure comedy.

ni pudor et iunctae teneat reuerentia matris,
 ut pater armenti quondam ductorque futurus
 cui nondum toto peraguntur cornua gyro,
 cum sociam pastus niueo candor iuuenecam¹¹
 aspicit, ardescunt animi primusque per ora
 spumat amor, spectant hilares obstantque magistri.¹² (*Ach.* 312–17)

One would expect to find influential similes based on the young steer in Virgil or Ovid; Méheust adduces *Aen.* 12.715 and *Met.* 9.46, but these represent only the classic conflict of two bulls fighting for domination symbolized by the coveted cow; the *color* and the formulations bear some resemblance to *Ach.* 316–18, but omit the element of human analogy with the young future leader. Only Seneca anticipates the

10 From this speech, note 13.193 'matrem quae astu decipienda fuit', and 326 'nec ... cessante meo pro uestris pectore rebus ...', 369–70 'nec non in corpora nostro pectora sunt potiora manu, uigor omnis in illis. At uos, o procures, uigili date praemia uestro'. Both *uigil* and *prouidus* are Ovidian: cf. *F.* 4.764, *Met.* 12.18.

11 Méheust rightly notes an echo of Ovid. *Am.* 2.12.256, 'uidi ego pro niuea pugnantes coniuge tauros: / spectatrix animos ipsa iuuenca debat'.

12 A last word on Achilles and Astyanax; the physical description of Hector reflected in Astyanax at *Tro.* 466 'sic tulit fortes manus / cervice fusam dissipans iacta comam', and of Astyanax, as steer at 539 'cervice subito celsus et fronte arduus', may be recalled by Statius at *Ach.* 339 'sic ergo gradum, sic ora manusque / nate feres' and 368–9 (where Achilles stands out among the maidens) 'quantum cervice comisque / emineat, quantumque umeros et pectora fundat'; but may be mere variations on epic portrayal of young heroes.

idea of 313–14. Astyanax's future will be cut short, and the symbolic simile revived for the moment of his tragic seizure in *Tro.* 794–8; but Achilles is about to blossom, and Statius, borrowing the Senecan image, has converted it by the change of context into a glorious forward-looking evocation of energy, fertility and hope. The steer's inexperience adds Ovidian piquancy to the situation, like the cowherds' earthy delight in the prospect of a pedigree hero to be sired.

To drag in other possible allusions would be an anticlimax; for the sake of completeness I append in a last footnote¹³ other similar turns of phrase in *Troades* and *Achilleis* which may be related. But Senecan tragic diction can be glimpsed in so many places in the *Achilleis*; I have confined my attention to the single play *Troades*, in order to show how the precedent of Andromache's attempt to hide her threatened child led Statius to adapt specifically from the brilliant third act of the tragedy, and apparently to borrow traits of characterization for his Achilles, not only from direct Senecan description of Achilles, but also from the portrayal of the doomed Trojan child.

13 Possible echoes: *Tro.* 40 (cf. also 1060–2) '*meus ignis iste est, facibus ardetis meis*': cf. *Ach.* 31 '*me petit haec, mihi classis, ait, funesta minatur*'. *Tro.* 1165 f. '*petite iam tuti domos, optata uelis maria diffusis secet / secura classis*': cf. *Ach.* 63 '*eunt tutis terrarum crimina uelis*'. *Tro.* 475 '*tam magna timeo uota*': cf. *Ach.* 145 '*superant tua vota modum*' (both of vows made by the mother for her heroic son). *Tro.* 1141–2; '*astra cum repetunt uices / premiturque dubius nocte uicina dies*': cf. *Ach.* 242 '*iam premit astra dies*' (dawn, not dusk as in Seneca). *Tro.* 391 '*iuratos superis ... lacus*': cf. *Ach.* 291–2 '*iurandaque nautis insula*'. *Tro.* 56 '*columnen euersum occidit / pollentis Asiae*': cf. *Ach.* 530 '*euersorem Asiae*': but the primary inspiration is *Aen.* 12.545 '*Priami regnorum euersor Achilles*'. *Tro.* 507 '*intuere turba quae simus super* (the few survivors)'. Cf. *Ach.* 910 '*turba sumus*' ('my son and I are already a fighting band'). But both probably derive from Ovid *Met.* 1.355 (Deucalion and Pyrrha realize they alone survive); '*nos duo turba sumus*'.

Most of these should be regarded merely as coincidences of diction; only at *Tro.* 475/*Ach.* 145 do situation and diction coincide sufficiently to suggest that this pair may belong with the sure cases of imitation above.

24. Incest and Fratricide in Seneca's *Phoenissae*

Almost every aspect of the Senecan text known as *Phoenissae* has been disputed except its authorship. The title, *Phoenissae* in the Etruscus, *Thebais* in the A-tradition of MSS, seems in each case to have been imposed for extraneous reasons, the former because of the close relationship between the text's second Jocasta-based phase and the opening episodes of Euripides' *Phoenissae*, the latter under the influence of Statius' epic poem of the Seven against Thebes.¹ Euripides' chorus of Phoenician captives is not tightly integrated with his play, but there is no reason other than convention to assume that Seneca had intended to compose choral material for these scenes, still less to identify the chorus as Phoenician women. Do these scenes represent a complete dramatic action? Hardly, since the long opening dialogue lacks the characteristic expository material of a prologue² and the extended last scene reaches a stalemate with no indication of either a moral resolution or a physical *exodos*.³ Indeed the crucial deaths of the brothers in mutual slaughter and of their mother from grief must surely have been the climax of any drama projected by Seneca as they were for Euripides. Do these scenes represent a continuous action in the Senecan sense, which need not entail continuity of both place and time? So most scholars in recent years have argued. Opinion has moved away from the negative judgement of Leo, that these were two detached declamations, arbitrarily grouped after Seneca's death,⁴ to look for the recurring themes and

1 Cf. Leo 1963, 75 f.

2 Cf. Leo 1963, 76 f.

3 Cf. Mesk 1915, 313 f. He argues that the end of the scene was either unfinished or lost after composition.

4 Leo 1963, 75 f. Leo believed the presence of Oedipus in Thebes during the second Jocasta-based sequence was incompatible with his wandering on Cithaeron in the first phase, since he interpreted the setting on Cithaeron as an imitation of Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, representing Oedipus' journey towards Athens. For refutation of this see Mesk 1915, 297. Zwierlein 1966, 107 f., also stresses the discontinuity of the separate scenes ('contradictory, abrupt and unlinked scenes ... not organised in a contained context of action'), but recognizes that this is not different in kind from Seneca's other plays. Tarrant

reactions that bind together the response of Oedipus as father and Jocasta as mother to the destructive hatred of their sons.⁵ Perhaps the most positive interpretation is the recent study by Ilona Opelt, who sees in these lines a play which lacks only the final episode and choruses whose content she is prepared to surmise. It would be difficult to endorse her suggestions for the choruses, some of which she separates by less than fifty lines of dialogue, but many will favour her argument that the action was intended to culminate in a messenger's report to Oedipus of the death of his sons and mother-wife.⁶

The undramatic disproportion between scenes of *affectus* and scenes of action makes it difficult for the reader to grasp the form of this text.⁷ Five scenes follow each other without the intervention of any chorus, yet in such a way that there must be discontinuity of place and time.⁸

Scene I 1–319. Oedipus and Antigone are wandering at the foot of Cithaeron; at 306–12 she is supplicating at his knees to dissuade him from suicide, and he has barely granted her request when a messenger brings news that Polyneices (neither he nor Eteocles is ever named in the iambic verse of our text) has drawn up his forces to do battle against Thebes.

Scene II 320–62. First the messenger (320–27) then Antigone (347–49) urge Oedipus to intervene between his sons and save Thebes from attack, but he curses the sons with the fulfilment of their hatred in war and turns away in disgust to hide in the mountain forest. We must assume that Antigone and the messenger leave in silence.

1978, 229 n. 81, has summed up the issue: 'Seneca neglected traditional dramatic form in favour of unifying motifs and images because his conception (and experience) of tragedy was more literary than theatrical.'

5 Mesk 1915, 299 ff., lists verbal echoes and parallels in the two emotionally contrasted scenes. For further correlation see below.

6 Opelt 1972a, 284 f.

7 Paul's discussion (1953) is based on a misleading distinction between drama of *Handlung* (action) and drama of *Affectus* (emotion). Associating the former with an early period in Seneca's literary development, the latter with a supposed Euripidean period, he was led to argue somewhat inconsistently that Seneca composed the second, Jocasta-based part of *Phoenissae* first and designed the Oedipus scenes later to supplement it. But individual Senecan tragedies contain both phrases of action and of affective discursive rhetoric.

8 For this analysis, and for the disagreement of the MSS in recording scene-divisions see Tarrant 1978, 229, and Zwierlein 1966, 107 f.

- Scene III 363–426. In Thebes Jocasta laments the treachery of her sons; her sympathy is with Polyneices, but she can support neither without harming the other. A servant reports the confrontation of the armies and begs her to intercede. The forces stand arrayed for battle: she leaves after calling on supernatural powers to sweep her down to the battlefield.
- Scene IV 427–42. We must assume a shift in time and/or space as the servant describes Jocasta's swift arrival on the field and the stand-off of the armies. All save the brothers let fall their weapons (in terms of staging, this speech makes impossible even a non-classical change of scene from palace frontage to the battlefield. What is unseen during the monologue must be the setting of the next scene. Even allowing for the insertion of a choral ode, it is inconceivable that Jocasta and her sons would come on stage to begin the episode when 414–19 have already declared that the armies and their leaders are in position for battle).⁹
- Scene V 443–664. Arguing chiefly with Polyneices Jocasta pleads with her sons to stop short of the crime of war against each other (464–651). Her last claim, that rule over Thebes can only harm the man who wields it, leads to a brief dialogue with Eteocles in which he declares his resolve to keep power at any price (651–64).

Even viewed as a recitation-drama the work is unbalanced, notably in the inadequacy of the final Stichomythia to impose a coda on the intercession-scene, but it is given cohesion because Oedipus' self-characterization and depiction of the corrupt nature of his sons are realized before us in their behaviour when they reject the appeal of Jocasta's piety and reason. Incest, the perverted love that is more criminal than ordinary enmity or murder, compounds heredity in breeding their fratricidal hatred: their father's curse is both a response to their evil nature and a

9 For this unprecedented violation of conventions governing off-stage action see Tarrant 1978, 252; 'they accomplish a change of scene, so that the setting described in them becomes the actual setting of the scene which immediately follows ... no other "redefinition" of the scene in ancient drama, including early tragedy and Old Comedy, is quite so bold. The physical limitations of the ancient theatre seem completely left behind, and the properties of narrative and dramatic poetry uniquely juxtaposed.' Tarrant offers *Phd.* 580–88 and *Ag.* 775–81 as partial parallels.

secondary cause precipitating the self-destruction of Oedipus' house.¹⁰ While the Jocasta-scenes derive a conventional characterization from Seneca's adaptation of Euripides' *Phoenissae* 1–689, Seneca has explored independently in the Oedipus scenes the experience of *nefas* (call it sin, or guilt or crime) and the different explanations that can be offered for its transmission to the brothers: for this reason the first phase, however inconsistent, deserves a detailed analysis.

The long opening scene is built around the gradual change of focus from Oedipus' perception of his own guilt to an increasingly ominous portrayal of his evil sons whose actions will generate the tragedy. Thus Oedipus' opening speech of 50 lines draws on aspects of his past; he is returning to Cithaeron because it was the death-place of so many kinsmen (Actaeon, Pentheus, Dirce, and Ino's attempted suicide and murder of her son (13–25)) and was intended to cause his death in infancy. The ill-omened baby exposed for death looks with morbid longing on the mountain that should have killed him,¹¹ but with horror on the mother who gave him life; by a paradox the murderous Agave and Dirce were kinder mothers than the loving Jocasta (*tam bonas matres* 26). His daughter's love, like that of her mother, is destructive (*pestifer* 38) and at the end of this complaint he will try to drive her away for fear he should repeat the incestuous relationship he experienced with his mother. In contrast the vengeance of Laius, dramatically conveyed in a hallucination of his angry shade demanding punishment,¹² is not developed as a source of moral or psychological interpretation.

The themes of this first speech are reconsidered in the next (twice its predecessor in length) which now adds to the analysis of his own guilt and incomplete expiation the new dimension of transmitted guilt. Throughout this scene Antigone's role is conventional; so long as her father is obsessed with self-loathing she will urge the proper arguments against taking his own life (51–79, 182–215). Her pleas to choose life

10 On the curse, see Opelt 1972a, 276; she rightly parallels the curse and its implementation in these scenes with the action of the Fury upon Thyestes in the prologue of Seneca's *Agamemnon*, and of Tantalus in the *Thyestes*; the effect of the curse is revealed in the behaviour of the tragic personae of the ensuing scene(s).

11 *Meus Cithaeron* (13). Mesk 1915, 307, compares Soph. *Oed.* 1451 ff. and Oedipus' reproach at *Oed.* 1391 that Cithaeron had failed to kill him.

12 Seneca increases the incidence of such hallucination in the plays he adapts; cf. *Med.* 958–71 (the Furies, followed by ghost of Absyrtus) and *Tro.* 680–84 (Andromache's hallucination of Hector's ghost come to her aid).

and reject death are the moral principles familiar from Seneca's prose works, inappropriate to the extent that they presuppose a morally normal addressee. But Oedipus is so far from 'normal' that he can reject Antigone's *pietas* (80–98) on two grounds: in view of his own guilt it is an impiety to keep him alive, but it is also unnatural for any child of his blood to behave with devotion. Himself a *nefandum caput* (7) he has fathered a *nefanda domus* (80). Nature will reverse her laws if he and his become pious. His self-blinding has atoned only for guilt towards his mother (93), not to his father (90). Symbolically he reaches for the sword with which he killed his father to execute himself.¹³ This sword makes Seneca's transition; perhaps, Oedipus adds, his sons have this weapon together with the kingdom. Like the kingdom the sword is seen as generating crime (108) and in a foreshadowing of the formal curse to follow he wishes that the sons, conceived of as still sharing the kingdom, may share use of the destructive sword. It is not because the names of his sons defy iambic metre that Seneca blurs the two and implies that they are sharing in the guilty kingdom,¹⁴ although we know that Polyneices must have been refused his turn some two years back (370–373 below). Rather Seneca wants to stress the inescapable inheritance of their guilt; to differentiate, to stress the victimization of Polyneices at this stage, would undermine his demonstration of moral causality.

13 In Sophocles' play Oedipus' only weapon seems to have been the staff (*sceptron*) of 810 f. While this too has a potential for symbolism, Seneca has invested the sword with an almost magical destructive power in 106–09. But this is a rhetorical flourish, and Seneca makes no attempt to renew the symbolism in Jocasta's sense of intervention: *clude uagina impium ensem* (467 f.) is unstressed in the general context of disarming Polyneices, as is *quid strictum abnuis / recondere ensem* addressed to Eteocles in 489 f.; instead the symbolic focus is turned to *sceptra* as cause of corruption (584, 648) and object of desire (599). Euripides gives more stress to the sword as death weapon in *Phoenissae* 1374, 1404 ff., 1417, 1420. At 1455 Jocasta snatches a sword to kill herself 'from the corpses'; that is, Euripides does not allow the listener to determine whether she dies by the sword of Eteocles or Polyneices. It is the symbol of death in battle, not of specific guilt or power as in Seneca.

14 The names Eteocles and Polyneices occur freely in all cases and several positions in the trimeters of Euripides' *Phoenissae*. Euripides fits some forms of *Eteocles* into his first and second feet by using the dissyllabic *Eteode-es* and accusative *Eteodea*; if Seneca was nervous of these forms he could have used at least the genitive *Eteoclis* and ablative *Eteocle* attested in Statius, and would have had no difficulty with the attested forms of *Polyneices*.

A new motif digresses from this, the first reference to his murderous sons: instead of death Oedipus pauses to consider taking the place of the sphinx, since he sees himself as a more unnatural monster,¹⁵ whose incestuous union and offspring constitute a more terrible riddle (121–39). The motif evokes the image of his presence brooding balefully over Thebes, but cannot advance the main theme. Returning, then, to his death-wish, Oedipus expresses his sense of pollution: every part of him is guilty (*totus nocens sum* 158). Like Jocasta in Seneca's *Oedipus* and later in this text, Antigone affirms Oedipus' innocence of the offences he committed in ignorance (203–5) and argues that his blindness is equivalent to the penalties of death or exile.

Oedipus' reply, that he is fleeing himself, is reinforced by the idea that his entire consciousness has taken on the guilt he tried to dispel by blinding himself (219–25). The sense of *nefas* leads him to reformulate his life-history, from condemnation in the womb by the prophecy given to Laius (245–47) to the fulfilment of the oracle by an impious father-murder and a piety even worse: the loving of his mother (*sed matrem amavi* 262). He articulates an ascending scale of evil in which father-murder is outstripped by incest, a crime to shame even patricide (267), the worst offence that Nature can produce. But as he speaks he conceives the possibility of a worse, still undefined offence, and claims he had begotten the men to commit it (*qui facere possent dedimus* 274). At this stage Seneca treats the evil of Oedipus' sons as consequence of their rule at Thebes (274–78, a variation on 107–10). Now he describes it as if from second sight (*praesagit* 278), the violation of their agreement and Polyneices' return at the head of a hostile army. Oedipus did not know this in 107–10 and will only learn it when the city appeals to him in 320–27, although the events go back two to three years. As in 107 ff., prophecy is used to suggest moral inevitability, where the report of mere events would be less significant. Oedipus sees the impending destruction of Thebes as proof of his sons' paternity, and so rejects Antigone's appeal to live on in order to reconcile them; he sees their wickedness and power-lust as incurable. Seneca offers a confusion of attitudes here. Oedipus' immediate response is that he wants to die before watching his descendents surpass him in evil, but this is incompatible with

15 Oedipus is treated as a portent more unnatural than the sphinx at Sen. *Oed.* 640 f., *implicitum malum / magisque monstrum Sphinge perplexum sua* ('a tangled evil and a monster more perverted than his own antagonist the Sphinx').

both his endorsement of his sons' wickedness in the next scene and his decision to live for the sake of his loving daughter (308 ff.).

As motivation this is nonsense. Oedipus' desire to kill himself is belated, some three years after the recognition of his terrible offences, but there is no reason for him to renounce it before Antigone's unspoken pleas at 308 ff., when he has resisted her valid arguments from 51–79 and 182–210. The last minute change of heart is a common feature of Senecan technique. As Zwierlein has noted,¹⁶ he aims to exhaust the emotional potential of each situation, including alternative response, before moving forward. Only now is he ready for a change of circumstance, the entrance of a messenger from Thebes asking his intercession against the invading army of the displaced brother (320–27). Oedipus' description of the brothers, who again are treated as a pair without differentiation, almost renders unnecessary the curse which he directs against them in 328 ff. They are greedy for blood and power, warfare and treachery, driven by anger (299), crazed by the intoxication of ruling (*regno pectus attonitum furit* 302) without respect for father or country, holding nothing evil since their very begetting was evil: *nefasque nullum per nefas nati putant* (300). Antigone shared their parentage, but in this family we see that *nefas* is only transmitted in the male line. Before, Oedipus abhorred their natures; now with a reversal of emotion he gloats over their emulation of his precedent (331), his glory and renown (335). All the old moral values are inverted as he urges them to live up to their heredity, first in destroying their city and family home that he and his bed have polluted (346). After Antigone breaks in and begs him to yield to the needs of his people,¹⁷ he carries his curse one degree further, from civil war to fratricide, and the armed destruction of their mother:

frater in fratrem ruat;
nec hoc sat est: quod debet ut fiat nefas
de more nostro, quod meos deceat toros;
date arma matri.

16 Zwierlein 1966, 108 n. 42: 'Es ist Senecas Eigenart, ein Pathos-Motiv bis zum äußersten auszuschöpfen.'

17 I follow Giardina's text in attributing 320–27 to the *Nuntius*, but 347–49 to Antigone despite the arguments of Leo 1963, 79 ff. The appeal from Thebes must be brought by a new speaker, but the tone of 347–49 is not compatible with the status of a messenger addressing an ex-monarch; rather it fits Antigone's role as the voice of reason. I do not see any difficulty in her allusion to her own brothers as *liberi*, 'your children'.

Let brother attack brother; nor is that enough. If, as must be, evil is to occur in our customary fashion, as fits my kind of union, give arms to your mother. (*Phoen.* 335–58)

We can infer his meaning from the outcome, since in Euripides' play Jocasta killed herself with the sword of one or other son. But why this wording? For the effect in context is misleading. The most common use of *arma dare* is of literal or metaphorical arming, or equipping for combat. But the brothers do not turn their mother into a combatant. The wording of 450, *dexteras matri date*, will later provide a strong contrast with Oedipus' aggressive command, but that effect is not apparent when he speaks here. This phrase should provide a climax of awfulness beyond the other wicked deeds which he demands from his sons. And it should involve a *nefas* committed against their mother, parallel to his own actions; *ut fiat nefas de more nostro*. Oedipus' sin against his mother was incest; the enormity would be outdone if his incestuous sons were to emulate him and do sexual violence to their mother/grandmother. Despite the fact that there is among the sexual uses of *arma* no parallel for *arma dare* in this sense,¹⁸ despite the extreme nature of this interpretation—or rather because of it—I fear Seneca was trying to mould his language here to suggest this outrageous climax. Have we not already had to suggest that he may do sexual violence to Antigone?

Oedipus withdraws to a mountain cave to await news of the fraternal war that he has invoked.

In the second portion of the text, centred on Jocasta, a different ethos prevails. Where Oedipus had embodied self-loathing and the desire to see his sons' lives culminate in destruction, Jocasta still acts from love and the desire to save them from themselves. In Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* Jocasta has been blamed for her famous speech rejecting

18 For *arma dare* of metaphorical arming cf. Ovid *Met.* 10.546, *Ep.* 6.140; in an erotic context *A.A.* 2.741, 3.1; *Rem.* 674, *Ex P.* 3.3.47. These passages do not denote sexual violation or consensual intercourse; the latter is a fairly common use of *arma* in Propertius, though disputed in some passages e.g. 1.3.16; 3.8.29 (more certain are 3.20.20; 4.8.88). *Arma* denote the *membrum uirile* in the *Priapea*, Martial and Petronius, but none of these instances afford a firm parallel to the use of *arma dare*. However, Professor Tarrant has drawn to my attention a similarly strained allusion to incest in Sen. *Ag.* 32, *per omnes liberos irem parens*, where the use of *ire* is unparalleled outside Martial and the *Priapea*. Opelt 1972, 95, interprets this reference as 'Muttermord', but there is equal difficulty in understanding *date arma* of military attack (which has no point in the context) and sexual assault.

prophecy and concern with divine intervention in favour of living at random, as one can most easily survive.¹⁹ Winnington-Ingram has recently suggested in modern terms that Jocasta is moved by affection and a natural womanly urge to support and comfort her husband; better perhaps to see in the simplicity of her attitude the lack of moral responsibility carried by the woman as opposed to the man, and especially the ruler, according to Greek views. From a woman, whose role is that of supporter or dependent, no moral reflection need be expected, though of course the heroine worthy of dominating a tragedy like Antigone must be seen as morally responsible and making conscious decisions. In Euripides, and to a great extent in Seneca,²⁰ Jocasta is depicted as free from the preoccupation with guilt which characterizes her husband-son, and given only the natural love of children and country which we could expect from a matron of spotless life. Her sexual offence was equal to that of Oedipus, but it is treated as irrelevant. However, to this basic Euripidean personality Seneca has added one passage imposing a sense of guilt absent from Euripides and so created a parallel between his own Oedipus and his Jocasta; for these lines their self-images coincide though they diverge in every other aspect of their behaviour. Oedipus (269–74):

scelerisque pretium maius accepi scelus.
leue est paternum facinus. in thalamos meos
deducta mater, ne parum sceleris foret
fecunda – nullum crimen hoc maius potest
natura ferre. si quod etiamnum est tamen,
qui facere possent dedimus.

As reward of crime I won a greater crime. The deed against my father is trivial; my mother came as a bride to my bed, and lest this should seem too small an offence, was fertile. Nature can produce no offence worse than this—or if one still exists I have created the men to perpetrate it.

19 Soph. *Oed.* 977–983. See Winnington-Ingram 1980, 183 f.: ‘Jocasta is governed by her affections, and will use any means, whether it is denial of Apollo or prayer to Apollo, if she can calm the disturbed mind of her husband.’

20 Note however that in Seneca’s *Oedipus* Jocasta condemns herself for violating the moral laws of man: *omne confusum perit, incesta, per te iuris humani decus ... non ... unquam rependam sceleribus poenas pares / mater nefanda* (‘through you, impure women, all the beauty of human right has been confounded and destroyed. I shall never pay a penalty equal to my crimes, I the abominable mother’, 1025 f., 1028–31).

Jocasta (366–69):

fecit scelus. sed misera non ultro suo
sceleri occurrit. hoc leue est quod sum nocens;
feci nocentes. hoc quoque etiamnunc leue est;
peperi nocentes.

She committed a crime, but, poor woman, did not run to welcome her crime. It is trivial that I am guilty; I made others guilty. This too is still trivial; I gave birth to guilty men.

Jocasta's speech has more expository content—no doubt because it is loosely modelled on Euripides' prologue to *Phoenissae*—than Oedipus' first speech. Thus these twenty lines include the facts and timing of Polyneices' exile and return, and state clearly her own moral dilemma: she favours the victimized son, but whatever she can wish for either son will harm the other. Now a servant—or perhaps the same messenger who came to Oedipus—appeals to her to prevent the conflict. His double plea to reconcile the brothers and restore peace to the city is supported by Antigone (403–06) and Jocasta rushes out to separate the armies by exposing her own body to invoke the sanction of *pietas*,²¹ mother-love, against the brothers' conflict (409–11). Her proclamation *nulum teste me fiet nefas* ('no evil will occur while I am a witness', 412) is set in opposition to the fury of Oedipus invoking a *nefas* from his sons to match his own offences at 355–58 (quoted above). What we will now witness is the failure of positive *pietas* to counteract inherited and dynamic evil. After the messenger's extraordinary commentary on her arrival at the battlefield the scene resumes with Jocasta calling all the anger of her sons upon herself, *in me omnis ruat / unam iuuentus* ('let all the young fighters turn their attack on me', 443 f.), counteracting Oedipus' *frater in fratrem ruat* ('let brother attack brother', 355). As she describes herself, *media se opponit parens* ('the parent interposes herself', 457). Roman imagination had been caught by this episode in the saga of the Seven against Thebes, so similar to their own legends of the Sabine women and of Coriolanus. Compare Propertius' extraordinary self-description in 2.9.49–52:

21 For *pietas* in Jocasta cf. 380 f; hoped for from her sons, 409, 410, 451, 455 (opposed to *scelus* 456); in Antigone, 536 (cf. 82, 310); in Jocasta's appeal, renewed at 585.

non ob regna magis diris cecidere sub armis
 Thebani media non sine matre duces,
 quam, mihi si media liceat pugnare puella,
 mortem ego non fugiam morte subire tua.

The Theban leaders for the sake of a throne did not fall in more dreadful armed combat, with their mother to intercede, than I, who will not shirk death at the cost of your death, if I may fight with my beloved to intercede.²²

Jocasta holds herself guilty as the mother who gave birth to both leaders (449) and her appeal for their hands in pledge of reconciliation (*dexteras matri date* 450), though expressed in standard terms, achieves exact antithesis to Oedipus' final curse (*date arma matri* 358 above). She turns first to Polyneices, urging him to disarm (467–73), then to Eteocles (483–99) before expressing her love and pity for the fugitive Polyneices (500–25). As yet no *nefas* has been committed (cf. 451–54: *error* only becomes *nefas* with full understanding of their actions). She appeals to him as mother and in the name of Antigone and Oedipus evokes the horrors of victory. Royal power will only make him more ruthless (583 f.). For Jocasta kingship represents a curse; for Polyneices it seems essential, if he is not to live dishonoured as a landless consort of his Argive wife (595–97). In answer Jocasta offers him the hope of conquests outside Greece, in which he could enjoy Eteocles' cooperation²³—a war his father and mother could endorse (599–624). This can only strike the reader as the language of an alien world—the normal world to which Oedipus and his sons have never belonged.²⁴ The alternative, of war against his brother and his city, Jocasta presents as offering either a criminal defeat (632 f.) or criminal victory (639 f.). Eteocles will

22 While the meaning of *media ... matre* is undisputed, Propertian scholars have differed in their interpretation of *media puella*, seeing her as either arbitrator (deciding for the victor) or prize, rather than intercessor.

23 This might be the shadow of some fourth-century Athenian propaganda in the style of Isocrates, but there is no trace of this in Euripides' *Phoenissae*. Better to assume Seneca has in mind the Trojan War and the cooperation of Agamemnon with his wronged brother Menelaus in that expedition.

24 We may note that there is no contact between Oedipus and Jocasta in Seneca's text nor in the *Phoenissae* of Euripides. But in Euripides Oedipus speaks with horror of his curse that has caused his sons' death (1610–14), whereas Seneca depicts him as rejoining in the deadly war that they will take on. 537, 552 ff. and 623 all assume that Oedipus feels the same love of his children and country as Jocasta herself.

be punished for his usurpation by the consequences of ruling: *regnabit. est haec poena* ('he will be ruler; this itself is punishment', 646).

Polyneices is given no reply: instead Eteocles dismisses his brother as an exile and clasps his power to him. The hatred it entails is dearer to him than love, which would only weaken his absolute exercise of power. For this he is prepared to destroy the very objects of his rule; wife, home and household gods, the land itself. The exchange—and the text—ends with his glorification of 'power at any price':

imperia quouis pretio constant bene. (Phoen. 664)

Two crimes against nature, acts that destroy the family, dominate this play. The first is incest, leading in Seneca's version to the paradox that love can be evil, and a mother a source of dread and pollution. Oedipus' horror of Jocasta relates to two phases in his existence—when he was in the womb and already fated to destroy father and mother (245 ff.) and when he returned to it as her lover. Seneca had expressed this in his *Oedipus* with horrid vividness. The greatest crime at Thebes, according to the ghost of Laius, is a mother's love, *maternus amor*, whether objective or subjective in force.

*inuisa proles, sed tamen peior parens
quam natus. utero rursus infausto grauis
egitque in ortus semet et matris impios
fetus regessit, quique uix mos est feris
fratres sibi ipse genuit.*

Hated as a child, but worse as father than as son; a second time weighing on the ill-omened womb, he drove himself into his place of origin and heaped up criminal children of his mother, begetting his own brothers—a practice barely known to savage beasts. (*Oed.* 636–40)

The idea of the mother's love as crime dominates the first phase of *Phoenissae*, from Oedipus' envy of his kinsmen who experience the innocence of cruel mothers (25 f.) to his fear of lust for Antigone; *timeo post matrem omnia* ('after my mother I fear everything', 50).

Although at 92 f. he sees his self-blinding as atonement to his mother the guilt persists and at 260 he makes the pointed contrast between the crime of killing his father, but loving his mother. He womb becomes the locus of his guilt (245 ff.) as it is for Jocasta in Seneca's own addition to the Euripidean context, *hunc petite uentrem qui dedit fratres uiro* ('aim at this belly which gave brothers to its husband', 447). In the light of these allusions her appeal to Polyneices, *per decem mensum graues uteri labores* ('by the heavy ten-month suffering of this womb',

535 f.), takes on an altogether different *color* from, say, the appeal of Hecuba to Hector by the breasts that suckled him.²⁵ While Jocasta is seemingly undisturbed in her love for her sons by the recollection of their unnatural parentage the reader is not allowed to forget it. Polyneices must fear even his mother's loyalty when nature has been violated: the violation he names is his brother's treachery (*post ista fratrum exempla* 479), but it has already been identified by Oedipus as the fact of Jocasta's motherhood and their birth.

In *Oedipus* too Seneca had called Oedipus' fatherhood a violation of nature ('Nature which overthrew her sanctioned laws in Oedipus alone, devising a new kind of birth', *Oed.* 942–44) and he remodelled Jocasta's death to match her offence; for her choice of death is to strike at 'the womb which bore both husband and sons': *uterum capacem qui uirum et natos tulit* (*Oed.* 1039). Sophocles' Jocasta had hanged herself—like his Eurydice—a death not designed to point to specific sexual guilt. Indeed Greek tragedy does not approach Seneca's sexual colouring of her suicide, even in the suicide by the sword of the betrayed Deianeira.²⁶ But Seneca returns more than once to the womb as symbol of a woman's guilt. It is as though the offence of sexuality and motherhood outside the norm, Roman *stuprum*, were the female counterpart to the male's offence of murder. Leo was so offended by Medea's words in *Med.* 1012 f. that he excised them as unworthy of Seneca, but her urge to stab herself through the womb in case she might be carrying a child by Jason is authenticated by Jocasta's words, or Hippolytus' formulation of his loathing for female sexuality in Phaedra and her mother Pasiphae: *ille te uenter tulit* ('it was that belly gave you birth', *Phd.* 693). It is in keeping that in *Agamemnon* Thyestes' incest with his daughter at Apollo's command is touched with the same revulsion: *coacta fatis nata fert uterum grauem / me patre dignum; uersa natura est retro* ('my daughter coerced by fate bears a laden womb worthy of me as father. Nature has been forced back on herself', *Ag.* 33 f.).²⁷ The references to child-

25 See *Iliad* 22.79–83.

26 On the sexual colouring given by Sophocles to Deianeira's suicide in *Trach.* 924 ff. see Winnington-Ingram 1980, 82. She strikes below the liver and diaphragm (931), perhaps alluding to the liver as the seat of the passions (see Onians 1954, 85), but it should be noted that the liver was commonly aimed at whether in suicide (*Eur. Or.* 1063) or murder (*Eur. Phoen.* 1421; *Med.* 379; *Hel.* 982 ff.). Euripides' Jocasta pierces her throat in *Phoen.* 1457 f.

27 Both *uertere* and *retro* occur in similar Senecan contexts in association with the overthrow of natural law (see also n. 33 below). Compare the climax of the

bearing and the womb in the corpus of Euripides are both fewer and freer of shame or transferred sexual guilt. If Hippolytus himself does not voice loathing of the female in these physical terms it is not because of any prudery in Euripides: where pregnancy is relevant, in *Bacchae* where Zeus had to transfer and incubate his son by Semele, or *Andromache* where the infertile Hermione accuses Andromache of witchcraft, Euripides can speak plainly.²⁸

Is it simply that Seneca's generation was intensely aware of physical pain, of wounds and disease? There is some evidence for an increase in preoccupation with gruesome wounds and disfigurement in Silver Latin epic. But Seneca's choice of incest-dominated myth and focus on the woman's physical guilt seems to invite Freudian interpretation. It is with some reason that the psychoanalytically trained Marc Rozelaar has attributed to Seneca an Oedipus-complex of his own.²⁹ There is evidence for this at several levels in the composition Seneca wrote for his mother to console her for his exile, the *Consolatio ad Helviam*. We might discount the emotionally overcharged portrayal at her grief at separation from him, but it is more disturbing to read his adaptation of the conventional wound-imagery of grief with its new and shocking vividness:

grauissimum est ex omnibus quae unquam in corpus tuum descenderunt
recens uulnus ... non summam cutem rupit; pectus et uiscera ipsa divisit.

nurse's diatribe against Phaedra's intended seduction of her stepson, *Phd.* 173: *perge et nefandis uerte naturam ignibus*. Both Opelt 1972, 92–118, and Rozelaar 1976, 528 ff., note the associations of reversal or overthrow implied by *retro* with *nefas* and the violation of natural law. But *retro* in the incest-contexts of *Pho.*, *Oed.*, *Ag.*, and *Phd.* may denote the return of the younger generation to the old for mating; cf. Sen. *Oed.* 636 f., *egitque in ortus semet ... regessit*, and the first adynaton of *Phoen.* 85, using *regerere* to evoke the same unnatural return to source: 'the river turning back will pile up its rushing waters at their source.' Knox 1955, 113–15, has shown that the persistent imagery of Oedipus' incest in Sophocles depicts him 'ploughing the fields where he himself was sown' (e.g. 1497 f.).

- 28 See Eur. *Andr.* 158, 356; *Ba.* 91, 527, 1306. At *Hipp.* 165 the association of the womb with irrational anxiety is in keeping with Hippocratic medical theory. On hysteria in Greek medicine and disease of the uterus in Greek tragedy see Simon 1978, 242–44 and 257–59. Despite the mistrust of women and their otherness which Simon illustrates from Greek sources, I find no expression in Greek tragedy of male fear of the womb as contaminating or destructive.
- 29 Rozelaar 1976, 17 f., 27–29, 52, 82 (where however he argues less convincingly that Seneca was homosexually oriented).

This fresh wound is the most severe of all that ever penetrated your body; it did not merely split the surface flesh but severed your breast and entrails. (*Helv.* 3.1)

non ex intacto corpora tuo sanguis hic fluxit; per ipsas cicatrices percussa es.

This blood did not flow from your body when it was free from injury, but you were struck across the very scars of your wounds. (*Helv.* 15.4)

Perhaps even stranger is the praise the son showers on his own mother for not concealing her pregnancies:

numquam ... tumescentum uterum abscondisti quasi indecens onus, nec intra uiscera tua conceptas spes liberorum elisisti.

You never ... concealed your swelling womb as if it were an unattractive burden, nor crushed the embryos of future children within your flesh. (*Helv.* 16.3)

Should a son—who must have been pretty young when his mother was pregnant with her last child—be so aware of her body and look back so wistfully on her physical nature?

A Jungian might stress instead of suppressed mother-lust the longing of men for the security of the womb,³⁰ and for this too Seneca offers evidence in his ambivalent account of the newborn baby at *Ep.* 102.26 f.:³¹

ex maternorum uiscerum calido mollique fomento emissum adfluit aura liberior ... ueniet qui te reuellat dies et ex contubernio foedi et olidi uentris educat.

A freer breeze blows gently on the child released from the soft warm wrapping of his mother's flesh ... the day will come to tear you away (from physical life) from cohabitation with that vile and stinking belly.

Seneca's detailed and sensitive account of the infant's distress at birth is followed by a change of attitude as the *natalis dies* of the soul frees it from the corruption of the body; thus the 'vile and stinking belly' is perhaps primarily the body and only obliquely the mother's womb of the parallel.

30 Compare Rozelaar 1976, 124, and the material gathered by Neumann 1955, ch. 4.

31 For further reference to the embryo and the transition of birth, see *Ep.* 121.18 and 124.8, which follow Stoic theory in denying consciousness to the embryo but affirming adaptation in the form of *oikeiosis* from the moment of birth.

The *nefas* of incest determines the nature of the sons *per nefas nati* (300), born in sin;³² they were similarly *impios fetus* and *male in lucem editis* in Sen. *Oed.* 638 f.; 939. Their evil nature is caused by their unnatural parentage, but at the same time provokes the curse of Oedipus which brings on their mutual destruction. There is another motivation for their crime: the Kingdom itself, seen as corrupting whatever possesses it (107 f., 276 f.) and this theme, the earliest of Oedipus' explanations for his sons' evil natures, will return at the end when Jocasta tries to persuade Polyneices of the destructive force of power. But like incest—love misdirected—fratricide—hatred misdirected—is presented as a violation of Nature which has invalidated her law: *nihil iam iura naturae ualent / post ista fratrum exempla*: 'the laws of Nature no longer hold, after this behaviour among brothers' (478 f.).³³ The theme of *nefas* per-

32 Cf. *Ag.* 30 *nefandos concubitus* with Tarrant (1976), *ad. loc.* The phrase is Ovidian; to *Met.* 6.540 (rape of the wife's sister) and 9.123 *concubitus uetitos* (rape by a centaur) add 10.350–53 *at tu dum corpore non es / passa nefas, animo ne concipe, neue potentis / concubitu uetito naturae pollue foedus* (father-daughter incest). Seneca varies these phrases at the beginning and end of the stream of synonyms poured out by the nurse in *Phd.* 160–70: *coitus nefandos ... stupro ... scelus ... amoris impii flammis ... nefas ... facinus ... horridum ... concubitus nouos*. (See Opelt (1972), 107–9).

33 Only in tragedy does Seneca consistently apply *iura/leges naturae* to human morality. Compare with *Phoen.* 478 and *Oed.* 25, *parum ipse fidens mihimet in tuto tua / natura posui iura* (avoidance of parricide and incest); 875 f., where he calls his deeds *exitium iuris sacri*; 943, *illa quae leges ratas Natura in uno uertit Oedipode*; and Jocasta's outcry that through her *omne confusum perit ... iuris humani genus*. So too *Phd.* 914, *ferae quoque ipsae Veneris euitant nefas / generisque leges seruat insitus pudor*. In *Oed.* 371 ff. *natura versa est, nulla lex utero manet / ... conceptus innuptae bouis / ... implet parentem* ('nature has reversed itself, no law is observed in the womb, but the embryo of an unmated cow fills his own mother'), the physical violation of nature is designed to reflect the moral violation of Oedipus' incest. In the philosophical and natural works the laws of nature are usually physical, such as the inevitability of death for mortal creatures (*Helv.* 13.2, *Nat.* 3 pref. 16; 6.32.2) or the motion of heavenly bodies (*Helv.* 6.8), or course of rivers (*Nat.* 3.12), or behaviour of underground ore (*Nat.* 316.4). In *Ben.* 6.31.6 the laws are violated by Xerxes' crossing of the Hellespont (or possibly the attempted canal through Athos). In *Ben.* 4.17.3 the reference is moral; no one, we are told, has so deviated from the laws of nature as to choose to be wicked for its own sake; in *Ep.* 4.10 and 25.4 the laws are used to define the minimum of food and shelter for human survival. Opelt 1972 is too free in asserting a violation of these laws wherever *nefas/nefandus* or *scelus* are named.

sists (412, 453, 497, 526 f., 531, 639) doubled by *scelus* (456, 494, 530, 538, 542, 633, 643).³⁴

So too in the prologue of *Thyestes* Seneca's Fury sets in motion the Atreid curse, originating in competitive crime between brothers. *Longum nefas eat in nepotes* ('let the lasting evil pass through their descendants', 28 f.). The brothers are to hold nothing barred, until all values are annihilated.

nihil sit ira quod uetitum putet;
fratrem expauescat frater et natum parens
natusque patrem, liberi pereant male,
peius tamen nascentur...
... fratris et fas et fides
iusque omne pereat.

Let there be nothing anger holds forbidden; let brother shudder at brother and father at son, as son fears father; let children die horribly, yet be born more evilly still ... let all Right and Honour and Justice between brothers die. (*Thy.* 39–42, 47 f.)

There was in Latin poetry, even before the Civil War of Caesar and Pompey, a tradition of defining the crimes that destroyed the family and separated man from the age of innocence acceptable to the gods. Closest to the two crimes of *Phoenissae* is the portrait of human corruption in Catullus 64.399 ff. Earth became steeped in crime, *scelus nefandum*, and for Catullus fratricide and maternal incest begin and end the indictment.³⁵

perfudere manus fraterno sanguine fratres ...
ignaro mater substernens se impia nato
impia non ueritast diuos scelerare penates. (parentes V)
omnia fanda nefanda malo permixta furore
iustificam nobis mentem auertere deorum.

34 Opelt 1972 uses *nefas* as the key to her interpretation of the tragedies, and believes that Seneca has chosen his tragic themes to reflect the action of *nefas*; but the concept and its derivatives are far more prominent in some tragedies—notably those dealing with incest and fratricide—than others, such as *Troades*, *Medea* or *Hercules Furens*.

35 It is usually assumed that Catullus' model for this account was Hesiod, *Works and Days* 174 ff. (see Fordyce *ad loc.*). Hesiod, however, does not include any sexual offences, or offences committed by women, in his indictment of greed, jealousy and competition for power. Commentators agree that the incest reference of Catullus cannot relate to the Oedipus-story, since the mother knowingly seduces her son.

Brothers soaked their hands in brother's blood ... the mother, wickedly laying herself beneath her unwitting son, did not fear, wicked woman, to pollute the family gods; all these acts speakable and unspeakable confused in evil frenzy have turned away from us the just minds of the gods. (Catullus 64.399, 403–06)

Only Catullus includes incest—and in a form which, as scholars have emphasized, cannot be related to Oedipus or any well-known myth—with the standard familial crimes: for Lucretius fratricide was the culmination of the inhumanity that greed and the lust for power brought to society.

sanguine ciuili rem conflant diuitiasque
conduplicant auidi, caedem caede accumulantes,
crudeles gaudent in tristi funere fratris
et consanguineum mensas odere timentque.

Men create their property and wealth from citizens' blood and greedily double it, piling up slaughter upon slaughter, they cruelly delight in a brother's sad death and hate and fear the hospitality of their own kin. (*De rerum nat.* 3.70–73)

The Civil War gave Horace and Virgil immediate motivation for their focus on the *scelus fraternae necis* and Virgil's fratricides occur within a context of other familial crime; *infidos agitans discordia fratres* ('discord harassing treacherous brothers', *Geor.* 2.496) based on the lust for wealth (*Geor.* 2.507) and power (*Geor.* 2.508 f.) leads to the climax, *gaudent perfusi sanguine fratrum* ('they exult soaked in their brothers' blood', *Geor.* 2.510). Again it is Civil War which colours Lucan's account of fratricide:

sed fecit sibi quisque nefas ...
... infandum domini per uiscera ferrum
exegit famulus: nati maduere paterno
sanguine; certatum cui ceruix caesa parentis
cederet: in fratrum ceciderunt praemia fratres.

Each man committed his private crime ... the slave drove a wicked sword through his master's entrails; sons were steeped in father's blood. They quarrelled as to who should claim the parent's severed neck; brothers fell prize to their own brothers. (*B.C.* 2.147–51)

In this sequence the crimes of brothers are seen as worse than those even of sons against their father; the crime of Eteocles and Polyneices against each other is worse than that of Oedipus against Laius.

Only in Ovid's account of the fall of man from the grace of the Golden Age do we again find the Catullan range of offences combining

male and female violation of the family; oddly fratricide is played down—*fratrum quoque gratia rara est* ('affection between brothers too is rare', *Met.* 1.145)—but the offences of women are not directly sexual:

imminet exitio uir coniugis, illa mariti,
lurida terribiles miscent aconita nouercae.

The husband looms murderously over his wife, and she over her partner; dread stepmothers brew the aconite that brings death-pallor. (*Met.* 1.146 f.)

Why has Ovid left out sexual offences? Was he sensitive to his own vulnerability on the topic? Or should we argue that in the Roman world of emancipated upper-class women the symbol of female guilt has given way to murder in pursuit of wealth; that women have learned to ape men in criminality?

Ilona Opelt has rightly argued that the divergent elements of the diptychal *Phoenissae* are bound by the common tragedy of parental love;³⁶ we see the fulfilment of Oedipus' curse upon his sons and the inability of Jocasta's love and advocacy of *pietas* to prevent the final fratricide. Of the two offences against nature which pervade Seneca's text fratricide was and remained a Roman obsession, but incest—the archetypal component in the Oedipus-myth—has I believe received a special, obsessive attention from Seneca. In *Phoenissae* as in *Agamemnon*, *Thyestes*, *Oedipus* and even *Phaedra*, it symbolizes the *scelus* between male and female that imparts to the normally beneficent force of love or sexuality a destructive power to outdo the traditional evil of hatred and murder. Senecan tragedy was above all a vehicle of horror, and it is possible that the horror of misdirected sexuality provided an outlet for the intensity of his own unreconciled Oedipal conflicts.

Bibliography

- Knox, B., *Oedipus at Thebes*, 2nd edn., New Haven 1955.
 Leo, F., *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae Vol. I, Observationes Criticae*, Reprint Berlin 1963, orig. publ. Berlin 1878.
 Mesk, J., "Senecas Phoenissen", *WS* 37 (1915) 288–322.
 Neumann, E., *The Great Mother*, tr. R. Manheim, New York 1955.

36 Opelt 1972, 285: 'Die Phoenissen aber sind letztlich die Tragödie der Elternliebe: Der Vater Oedipus, der den Fluch über die Söhne verhängt, die Mutter Jocasta, die ihn vergeblich zu hindern sucht, setzen in beiden Teilen die scharfen Akzente, schaffen den Rahmen zur Tragödie des Brudermordes.'

- Onians, R. B., *Origins of European Thought*, 2nd edn. Cambridge 1954.
- Opelt (1972), I., "Senecas Konzeption des Tragischen", in E. Lefevre (ed.), *Senecas Tragödien*, Darmstadt 1972, 92–128.
- Opelt (1972a), I., "Zu Senecas Phoenissen", in E. Lefevre (ed.), *Senecas Tragödien*, Darmstadt 1972, 272–85.
- Rozelaar, M., *Seneca: Eine Gesamtdarstellung*, Amsterdam 1976.
- Simon, B., *Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece*, Ithaca, N.Y. 1976.
- Tarrant, R. J., "Senecan Drama and its Antecedents", *HSCP* 82 (1978) 213–63.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P., *Sophocles: An Interpretation*, Cambridge 1980.
- Zwierlein, O., *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas*, Diss. Berlin, Meisenheim-am-Glan 1966.

25. Caesar and the Mutiny: Lucan's Reshaping of the Historical Tradition in *De Bello Civili* 5.237–373

Lucan must surely be one of the most challenging authors for the student of Roman literature, since his fusion of history and imaginative art doubles the hazards of any interpretation of his poetic methods, or his relation to the historical tradition. I was prompted to this investigation when the accident of teaching the first and fifth books of the *De bello civili* in immediate succession made me aware of the relationship which Lucan has constructed between Caesar's first encounter with his soldiers, set at Ariminum in 1.231–32, and the later confrontation at the mutiny of Placentia, which occupies a similar position in book 5. But what started as a rhetorical interpretation required an understanding of historical sources—if not of actual relation to fact—and of Lucan's structure within the individual book and the work as a whole, and led finally to investigation of the complex relationship between Lucan and the Alexander-tradition. The scene in book 1 needs no separate analysis: it has been well discussed both by R. J. Getty in his separate edition¹ and in A. W. Lintott's wider study, "Lucan and the History of the Civil War."² My concern is rather with Lucan's interpretation of the mutiny. Why and how has he reshaped the historical tradition in his presentation of this dramatic scene?

The original version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada in Ottawa in June 1982. I would like to express my appreciation to M. Morford for his generosity in discussing the topic with me and making available his own research in progress; his suggestions gave me new and wider perspectives (chiefly in sections II and IV), and convinced me of the dependence of both Lucan and Curtius on the declamatory tradition about Alexander.

1 Lucan: "*De Bello Civili*" *Liber I* Cambridge 1940; repr. 1955, xxxiii–xxxiv.

2 CQ 21 (1971) 488–505, esp. 497–98.

I. Historical

In discussing Caesar's close bond with the men of his legions, Suetonius (*Iul.* 69–70) reports two occasions on which he was confronted with mutiny; in both cases the historical context seems to be undisputed. Late in 49 when Caesar was returning from Spain, he sent orders ahead for the men of the ninth legion to proceed to Brundisium, orders which clearly indicated a forthcoming campaign in Greece or the East. The ninth had been with Caesar since 58 without change of personnel, and the prospect of being sent East when they were newly returned from the western limits of civilisation was too much. They mutinied against their officers, and it took Caesar himself to quell them, which he did by execution of the ringleaders and the threat of ignominious discharge.³ Two years later the men of the tenth legion—another long-service legion—rebelled in Campania, when they found out that they were to be sent to Africa. After others had failed or died restoring order, Caesar unhesitatingly confronted them, shaming them by the single epithet *Quirites*, “Roman civilians,” into new eagerness to serve, although he declared himself ready to dismiss them.⁴ Both stories are confirmed by later historical tradition; we may compare Appian 2.47.194 for the mutiny at Placentia and 2.93.388–96 for the later episode. Dio likewise reports both affairs, crediting Caesar with a long moralizing speech at Placentia that would certainly have bored any self-respecting legionary into violence or despair (41.27–35), but giving only a brief account of the later mutiny (42.52–55) featuring the celebrated use of *Quirites*. The first mutiny appears in Plutarch's life of Caesar only as a shadowy allusion to discontent,⁵ and is not surprisingly suppressed by Caesar's own narrative, so that Suetonius' account has the most authority; only Lucan offers an earlier surviving version. But it would be reasonable to assume that Pollio included the episode in his histories, and its omission from the Epitome of Livy 110 does not exclude the likelihood that it was treated by Livy. H. P. Syndikus in fact considers Livy as Lucan's source for the episode, and has argued, from common treatment of the mutineers' grievances in Appian and Dio, that Livy presented their complaints in indirect speech, as in Dio, and gave direct

3 For other sources, cf. M. Gelzer, *Caesar: Politician and Statesman*, trans. P. Needham, Oxford 1968, 219 n. 6.

4 Cf. Gelzer, *Caesar*, 263 and n. 2.

5 *Caes.* 37.

speech only to Caesar himself.⁶ Lucan, as we shall see, represents both the mutineers' alleged grievance (that they were exhausted by long years of fighting) and the motive which Livian tradition saw as their real complaint (that they were not allowed to sack Rome), but was to change the *color* of the whole episode to serve his portrayal of Caesar as the embodiment of *scelus* (5.262, 286, 314). But Syndikus' analysis will also be rhetorically important, because he is able to show that in the episodes corresponding to book 5 and to the Ariminum scene of book 1 Livy provided a single speech, for Caesar the commander, and that it is Lucan who has turned each speech into a pair: but whereas in book 1 he provides Caesar with an answer from the loyal centurion Laelius, in book 5 he supplies the speech of the mutineers to which Caesar gives his scornful reply.

II. Structural

Within the compass of this paper it is only possible to indicate briefly how this episode relates to Lucan's organisation within book 5, and to parallel episodes, whether of mutiny or of other relations between Caesar and his men, in other books of the epic. However, some understanding of the narrative sequence in book 5 will be necessary if we are to appreciate the setting and dramatic *color* of our episode.⁷

6 *Lucans Gedicht vom Bürgerkrieg* (Ph.D. diss., Munich 1958), 38–39. Syndikus assumes Livy's distinction between the alleged and real motives of the mutineers on the basis of Dio 41.26.1, where the alleged motive corresponds to Lucan 5.262–67 and 273–74, the real motive to 5.267–73. Note that in the Spanish mutiny of Livy 28.24–29, the grievances of the malcontents are merely represented in indirect speech, whereas Scipio is given a full-dress harangue (28.27–29).

7 On the structure of book 5, see the excerpt from W. Rutz, *Studien zur Kompositionskunst und zur epischen Technik Lucans* (Ph.D. diss., Kiel 1950), reprinted in *Wege der Forschung* 235: *Lucan*, ed. W. Rutz Darmstadt 1970, 181–84. Note also Rutz's argument (*Das römische Epos*, ed. E. Burck, Darmstadt 1979, 167–68) that the mutiny of Placentia, which belongs to book 4 both in place and time, has been deliberately postponed to this position. Rutz believes Lucan wanted to end Book 4 with the death of Curio and open the second tetrad with the powerful scene of Pompey's assumption of the command in Greece. I would suggest an additional motive for the displacement—Lucan's desire to contrast Pompey's receipt of the command from the Senate with Caesar's demonstration of his power to reassert command over the army which had

The book is introduced by the key sentence *alterna duces bellorum uulnera passos ... / seruauit fortuna pares* (1, 3); thus it covers the actions of both leaders during a time when they maintain equal success. It begins and ends with Pompey, presiding over the quasi-Senate (15–57) and deciding to send Cornelia to safety (722–815); both sections culminate in an ominous foreshadowing of Pompey's downfall (814–15) and death (57–64a). The extended account of Appius' consultation of Phe-monoe at Delphi (65–236) ends in a picture of death and sea-violence, before Lucan breaks off abruptly, to resume with a series of scenes that follow the sweeping progress of Caesar from Western Spain across Europe. The mutiny at Placentia (237–373) is quelled, and leads to the forced march to Brundisium, Caesar's crossing with the unhistoric nocturnal sea-calm (412–60), his impatience with Antonius' delay (461–503), and the extended climactic sequence of his attempted re-crossing of the Adriatic during the great storm (504–702). Appius, like Caesar, is impatient and enforces obedience, and Lucan imparts to this quieter theme of prophecy a sense of spiritual storm which is part of the ebb and flow of violence, of action and inaction, in the wider context of 64–703. We might note the words *quies* (148 and 195) and *cessare* (157), which will recur in later episodes, the sea storm image of 216–18 *nec fessa quiescent / corda, sed ut tumidus Boreae post flamina pontus / rauca gemit*, and *Rhamnus, artatus rapido feruet qua gurgite Pontus* (234). In Caesar's calming of the mutineers we have a movement from storm to calm, which we might compare with the actual sea-calm of 424–55, itself invented as a foil for the storm of 504–653. Besides the recurring variations on *quies* (desired at 373 *parta quies*, deadly in 442, and again desired in 505) and on *cessare* (deadly at 444, obstructive in 498 and negated by the action of the winds in 608 *non Euri cessasse minas*), there is a clear sequence of storm-words grouped so as to parallel the metaphorical storm of Caesar's mutineers and the real tempest of the Adriatic:

originally put itself into his hands: this is a contrast of legitimate and illegitimate command, of authority given and authority almost withdrawn.

MUTINEERS	ADRIATIC
255 <i>murmur</i>	571 <i>murmura ponti</i>
261 <i>effudere minas</i>	578 <i>sperne minas ... pelagi</i>
303–4 <i>nec dum desaeuiat ira / expectat, medios properat temptare furores</i>	583 <i>medias per rumpe procellas</i> 586–87 <i>nec longa furore / uentorum saeuo dabitur mora</i>
300 <i>tumultus</i>	592 <i>pelagi caelique tumultu</i>

Indeed the impatience of Caesar confronting the mutiny (303–4 above) foreshadows his impatience both in spurring his own contingent to cross the Adriatic (409–11) and in addressing the reluctant Antonius (492–94 *ne retine dubium cupientes ire per aequor, / si bene nota mihi est, ad Caesaris arma iuuentus / naufragio uenisse uolet*), and finally in braving the storm-laden night, *sponte per incautas audet temptare tenebras* (500). From the beginning of the mutiny to the end of the storm the tempo is controlled by Caesar's speeches, retarding and calming in 319–64, impetuous and accelerating in 413–23, 481–96, 577–93, and 654–71. Shipwreck, literal and metaphorical, binds this section of the book, in the paradoxes at 455 *naufragii spes omnis abit* and in 494 *naufragio uenisse uolet*, and is embodied in the imaginary *naufragus* of 520 and 573 and in Caesar's own charmed survival as *felix naufragus* (699).

The mutiny itself has been shown by H. Nehr Korn to have its counterpart at 9.217–93, where Tarcondimotus' attempt at desertion is quelled by Cato's great speech in the name of liberty (256–83).⁸ This occupies the corresponding position in the first book of the third tetrad, in which Cato replaces Caesar as the dominant leader of men, as established by Rutz's reconstruction of the twelve-book epic. Cato's reproof shows the hollowness of Caesar's personal assertion of supremacy over his men. The spokesman thinks only of personal loyalty to Pompey and asks, like the mutineer of 5.273, *nam quis erit finis, si nec Pharsalia pugnae? / nec Pompeius erit?* (9.232–33). His appeal to old age (233–35), his protest against the *scelus* of continuing the war now that Pompey is dead (248; cf. 5.262, 286), correspond to the protests of Caesar's men at Placentia, and the structural parallel is maintained by Cato's reply.

8 *Die Darstellung und Funktion der Nebencharaktere in Lucans Bellum Civile* (Ph.D. diss., John Hopkins, Baltimore 1960), 259–60. On Lucan's tetradic composition and proposed end, see Rutz, *Studien*, 210–16. F. M. Ahl, *An Introduction to Lucan*, Ithaca 1976, 316–26, reviews other arguments for the death of Cato as the intended terminus of the epic.

“Desert in peace!”, *uadite securi* (9.272), echoes Caesar’s *uadite, meque meis ... relinquite fatis* (5.325). Let them kill him and claim their reward (280 *mercede*; cf. 281–82 *ceruicis pretio ... meritum*), Cato will fight for *libertas*—the *libertas* which we know he will achieve only with death at the real end of this struggle. The final proof of this compositional parallel comes in Lucan’s epiphonema, *sic uoce Catonis / inculcata uiris iusti patientia Martis* (9.292–93), to which we will return.

Nehrkorn has also shown how Caesar recalls several of the issues raised by the mutineers in his pre-battle speech at Pharsalus, reversing his own claims to give them a sense of responsibility for the victory to come.⁹ But it appears that students of Lucan have not noticed the significant reversal, in this confrontation of mutineers and commander in book 5, of the first encounter between Caesar and his men at Ariminum, where his speech provokes the endorsement of the *primipilus* Laelius. A rhetorical analysis based on key phrases and arguments will be necessary to confirm this claim.

III. Rhetorical

The picture of a seditious crowd or mutinous force quelled by a man of strong personality and eloquence is a favourite theme of both epic and historical writing in the Roman tradition. The first major simile of the *Aeneid* (1.148–54) portrays a potential revolution quelled by a statesman who *regit dictis animos et pectora mulcet* (1.153). Livy presents a major mutiny against Scipio Africanus in Spain; the grievances of the malcontents are given in indirect discourse (28.24–26), but to Scipio he gives a magnificent speech occupying three chapters (28.27–29). Tacitus, too, devotes a large part of *Annals* 1 to the mutiny on the Rhine and Germanicus’ response (1.31–32; cf. 34–44); we shall see in the last section how Quintus Curtius took over from Greek historiography a glamorized tradition of Alexander’s courage and charisma in dealing with mu-

9 See Nehrkorn’s discussion of the mutiny episode, *Darstellung und Funktion*, 164–66, and Ahl, *Lucan*, 202–4. Note especially the echoes that Nehrkorn singles out from book 5 to book 7: 7.250–53 *rerum fortuna meorum ... in minibus uestris quantum sit Caesar habetis* reverses 5.327 and 354; 7.263 *mutato iudice* recalls 5.291 *ingrato ... iudice*; 7.264 *non mihi res agitur* corrects 5.357 *iam certe mihi bella geram*: and 7.268 *omnia dum uobis liceant nihil esse recuso* recalls 5.288 *omnia posse manus*. She sums up (p. 170), “Caesar hat bewiesen, dass er beides sein kann, Führer (*dux*) und Kamerad (*socius*).”

tiny on two separate occasions. For the rhetorical tradition of Rome there was no greater proof of the importance of eloquence and *auctoritas* than this power of the orator to calm an angry mob.¹⁰

It is not surprising, then, that Lucan chooses to make a battle of wills out of the mutiny at Placentia and designs the rhetoric of this confrontation to serve both a dramatic purpose—illustrating the changed relationship of leader and men—and a structural function, recalling our first experience of Caesar's power to control his men. In terms of geography and narrative sequence, Lucan has departicularized whatever he found in his sources, using the episode instead to develop in isolation (neither Placentia nor northern Italy is named) the battle for control between master and men. The counterpart is the first *contio* set by Lucan at Ariminum but based ultimately on Caesar's speech to the thirteenth legion at Ravenna in *Bellum civile* 1.7. Lucan has concealed the fact that different legions are involved. As far as his readers are concerned, these are the same men, and this assumption increases the emotional impact of their changed attitude. Lucan has composed paired speeches for both occasions to balance the scenes, and provided a chiasmatically symmetrical arrangement. Before invading Italy, Caesar appeals to his legion for support in a speech of fifty-two lines (1.299–351) and is answered, after a short sketch of their reactions, by the loyal declarations of the centurion Laelius in a speech half the length (358–86): returning to Italy after the Spanish campaigns, the ninth legion protests to Caesar (5.261–95) and, after Lucan's own extended apostrophe and editorial intrusion,¹¹ is answered by Caesar in a longer and conclusive speech (5.319–64). In both contexts the effect of his speech is obedience beyond expectation and the guarantee of his total control over his forces.

But the symmetry is carried through by Lucan in every detail of argument and phrasing. Caesar at Ariminum addresses his men as comrades (1.299 *bellorum o socii*), basing this title on their shared hardships experienced in the northern lands (301 *Arctois ... in aruis*) and Alpine cold. After a powerful account of Pompey's injustices at Rome (303–

10 Compare from *De oratore*: 1.31 (*quid*) *tam potens tamque magnificum quam populi motus ... unius oratione conuerti?*; 2.35 *eiusdem et languentis populi incitatio et effrenati moderatio*; 2.337 *quia summa dignitas est populi, grauissima causa rei publicae, maximi motus multitudinis ... maximaque pars orationis adiuuenda est ad animorum motus ... concitandos, saepe etiam a temeritate ... reuocandos*.

11 Lucan's narrative (295–96 and 316–18) frames a sequence of comment (5.297–315) which is itself enclosed by apostrophe to the gods (297–99) and to Caesar (310–16).

32), he calls for an end of this oppression, *quem tamen inueniet tam longa potentia finem?* (333), and complains that the rewards of toil are being snatched from his men (341 *praemia belli*) and himself (340 *merces*). Let them enjoy their triumph under any commander, even if he is victimized. After protesting vigorously (343–45) that they are being cheated by the Senate of their plot of land at home for security in old age (*senectus*), he appeals for action to recover their rights and guarantees them divine support (349 *nec numina derunt*).

Each of these points will have its counterpart in Lucan's organisation of the mutineers' grievances in book 5. So too will the main points raised in Laelius' reply to Caesar. He begins in indignation at Caesar's *patientia* (1.361), his long-suffering in enduring such tyranny from a civilian Senate (compare also 365 *degenerem patiere togam regnumque senatus*). He calls the Civil War just that (366), though Caesar had not invoked the word: "Is it so wretched," he asks, "to be victor in civil war?" (*civili uincere bello*). They have been to the farthest Ocean for him (370) and wish only to follow him. For him they will kill kinsmen, plunder temples, and take cities by storm, be it Rome herself that they sack. After the speech all swear the service of their *manus* (a recurring term used to treat the soldiers as a mere weapon or instrument of Caesar's warfare) to serve in whatever wars he commands.

So in book 5 Lucan cuts from his description of Appius Claudius' consultation at Delphi to Caesar, apparently at the ends of the earth; returning after subjugating Spain, he is about to carry his banners into another world (238). At this moment the gods almost divert the course of fate, and his soldiers, *fideles / per tot bella manus* (242–43), all but desert him. Released from individual fear by collective action, they voice their protests against him, apparently to his face. But where are they, and where is he? No hint that they are separated by the distance between Massilia, from which Caesar hurries to join his forces, and Placentia; no hint yet that he is not with them, and no naming of the legion; they are apparently isolated, face to face as the crisis approaches, in a limbo defined only by the cosmic *aquilas alium laturus in orbem* (238).

The anonymous or collective mutineers are given a speech incorporating the themes raised by both Caesar and Laelius in the *contio* at Ariminum, so as to reverse Caesar's former claims and the response of his original audience. Beginning with the appeal *liceat discedere, Caesar, a rabie scelerum* (261–62), in which the *scelus* to which they seek an end has become Caesar's, instead of that of Pompey and the Senate, they reject his quest for war over land and sea, reminding him of their services

terris Arctois (268). In return for those real wars he has given them *civil war* (they welcomed this in book 1). They have taken Rome, but they were not allowed after all to plunder the gods' temples. If Rome is not enough, what end will there be—*finis quis quaeritur armis?* (273). Like the theme of *scelus*, the search for an end has been transferred from Pompey to Caesar's war-lust. Let him look at their old age, denied a peaceful death at home, and recognize who gets the rewards of the crime of civil war; thus the *merces*-theme is not subverted by the defining genitive *sceleris* (285). Let him discover that his success depends on their services, *istas ... manus* (287–88). Caesar was a real commander, *dux*, by the Rhine; here he is merely a *socius*, an accomplice in crime. Thus the word he generously applied to them at Ariminum (299) is turned against him. Nor need he hope for victory from divine support (293–94); if his soldiers turn away from him he will have to accept peace; for Caesar's inverted morality, this ideal is paradoxically represented as a terrible threat.

In the editorial interlude Lucan invokes divine intervention; when morality fails, then let *discordia* at least impose an end on the civil war, *finem civili faciat discordia bello* (299). He even repeats the mutineers' opening outcry, *liceat scelorum tibi ponere finem* (314), thus combining 261 and the allusion to *scelus* in 286, as if Caesar, or Lucan, could now reverse history. But Lucan knows how to make Caesar a more powerful orator than his mutineers, and his address interweaves all the motifs of both the *contio* at Ariminum and the mutineers' collective denunciation. Ironically, Lucan can do this while making it clear that Caesar was absent during the protest and so has not heard the speech in person: compare 319 *qui modo in absentem uoltu dextraque furebas*. His reply is unanswerable, not on moral grounds, but as an appeal to their self-interest, showing it to be bound up with his own.

Baring his breast to their blades, Caesar offers them an end to war—over his dead body. They are no longer honoured as *socii*, but called by the contemptuous collective *miles*, and he vindicates his own status as *dux inuictus* (324), denying both his former use of *socius* and theirs. His own hands (*manus* again) and fate will find him soldiers and a crowd to share his triumphs and take the rewards of their toil (331 *rapta mercede laboris*), leaving them a shabby crowd of old men to watch as civilians (334 *iam plebs Romana*) the triumph of other men. The gods are indifferent to the common folk, and all humankind lives for the benefit of the few great men. Their reputation as terror of the North (344 *orbis horror ... Arctoi*) would have been failure and defeat

with a Pompey to lead them; they would be like the deserter Labienus, now wandering over land and sea. In this way he inverts their claim that victory depends not on the favour of the gods but on their own support. Surely the gods do not care for them, since they have guaranteed Caesar the advantage of fighting instead with fresh soldiers (351–53). He has the chance to arm hands greedy for everything, for whom the world is not enough (356 *quibus hic non sufficit orbis*). With the words *iam certe mihi bella geram* (357), Caesar turns to impose his control over them, ordering their departure; *discedite castris* literally grants their original request, *liceat discedere*, Caesar, and to cap the dismissal he calls them *ignavi Quirites*, bidding them hand over their standards to real men, while the ringleaders take the punishment they deserve.

At Placentia order—a perverted order—and obedience—to a wicked purpose—have been restored. The echoes and correspondences do not end with Caesar’s speech. Lucan portrays the men as exceeding their leader’s expectations in their submissiveness (369–70 *uicit patientia saeui / spem ducis*), for they provide not only willing instruments for his verdict but eager victims, offering their throats for the cutting. *Patientia* occurs only five times in Lucan’s epic: in the soldiers’ first protest against Caesar’s long-suffering of Pompey’s *potentia* in the *contio* of book 1, in this demonstration of their submission to Caesar, and three times as a positive moral value in book 9; the first of these is Lucan’s epiphonema on Cato’s suppression of the mutiny, *sic uoce Catonis / inculcata uiris iusti patientia Martis* (9.292–93).¹² In these words we read a comment on the evil *patientia* of Caesar’s army.

Why did Lucan transfer to this first mutiny Caesar’s famous use of *Quirites* when he put an end to the second affair and dealt with the revolt of the truth legion in Campania in 47 BCE? Surely because he did not intend to treat the second mutiny; one such episode is enough. But this does not prove that he did not intend to cover the major events up to and including the African campaign. If, as I believe, he saw the death of Cato as the consummation of his epic, he had nothing to gain by reporting a second successful assertion of power by his antagonist in terms similar to the first.

12 The other instances are 9.403 *gaudet patientia duris* and 880–81 *sic dura suos patientia questus / exonerat*.

IV. Literary-Historical: Lucan and the Alexander-Tradition

The other aspect of this episode which provokes attention is the calculated discontinuity of its introduction. The historical context is reduced to the simple *domitis ... Hiberis*, as though Caesar had newly conquered the Spanish tribes for Rome, and his troop movements are idealized as *aquilas alium laturus in orbem*, raising to a level of heroic warfare the reality of a mutiny in a familiar Cisalpine town and embarkation for northwest Greece; the earlier phases of the mutiny are similarly ignored in order to focus the reader upon the figure of Caesar, and Caesar alone, perched on his little mound of turf (316–17), taming a raging mob and setting the fates on their course again. Without falsifying the historical record, Lucan has stylized it and given it a heroic *color* drawn, I would argue, from the idealized tradition of Alexander's campaigns.

What we have, of course, is not Caesar's imitation of Alexander, but literary Alexander-*aemulatio* such as P. Green has recently illustrated from other authors before and besides the *De bello civili*.¹³ Such colouring is well attested elsewhere in Lucan and demonstrated by W. Rutz, not only for Lucan's portrayal of Caesar himself at Ilium and Alexandria (9.957–99; 10.14–53), but more extensively in his presentation of the true hero, Cato, and his march across the desert in book 9.¹⁴ The imitation began before Lucan and can be illustrated from the *Suasoriae* of the Elder Seneca, of which the fourth deals with Alexander's entry into Babylon in face of the omen portending his death, while the first *Suasoria*, *Deliberat Alexander an Oceanum nauiget*, is particularly relevant to this aspect of our theme—the emphasis on Ocean and the limits of the world. Seneca's excerpts from Augustan declaimers repeatedly hard on Ocean and *alius orbis*: compare Argentarius (1.2) *resiste, orbis te tuus reuocat*; Moschus (1.2) *non quaerimus orbem sed amittimus*; Silius (1.3) *imperium tuum cludit Oceanus ... Alexander orbi magnus est, Alexandro orbis angustus est*; Marullus (1.3) *orbem quem non noui quaero, quem uici relinquo*. But closest to Lucan is the excerpt not from prose but from epic, not on Alexander, but on the exploits of Germanicus Caesar. It is Albinovanus Pedo who voices this protest (Sen. *Suas.* 1.15):

13 "Caesar and Alexander: *aemulatio, imitatio, comparatio*," *AJAH* 3 (1978) 1–26.

14 "Lucan und die Rhetorik", in *Lucain*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, Geneva 1968, 233–58.

quo ferimur? fugit ipse dies orbemque relictum
ultima perpetuis claudit natura tenebris.
anne alio positas ultra sub cardine gentes
atque *alium flabris inactum quaerimus orbem?*

For Pedo, the other world is imagined beyond the northern Ocean; for the Alexander-writers, too, the assumption was that he had led his army not just to the Beas (Hyphasis) or even to the Ganges beyond, but within reach of the eastern Ocean itself. When Caesar is depicted as carrying his standards *alium in orbem*, Lucan can only be suppressing geographical reality to foster a comparison with Alexander. This characterization is also to be found in the Roman Alexander-narrative of Q. Curtius Rufus, and the rest of my paper is concerned to show how Lucan has derived the colouring for his Caesar from the Alexander-tradition which we can see independently applied by Curtius in the two famous mutinies of books 9 and 10. There are formal resemblances both of rhetorical shaping and of episodic sequence so close that one is tempted to argue for a relationship of direct adaptation, but any attempt to formulate such a hypothesis founders on scholars' continued disagreement about Curtius' dating.

The historian has been variously assigned to the time of Claudius or of Vespasian's accession, or in the most recent study, to the principate of Trajan. Dating is usually influenced by the well-known outburst of joy and gratitude at the accession of the new emperor, who is supposed to have saved the state from civil war. This passage comes near the end of the work, at 10.9.3–6, and, since J. Stroux, has been commonly related to the relief felt at the advent of Vespasian in AD 69. But A. B. Bosworth has now argued from details of military technique in the narrative that Curtius can hardly have written before the time of Trajan.¹⁵ On stylistic grounds I would place Curtius rather with Velleius and Valerius Maximus in the generation before Lucan, a time still uninfluenced by the new style of Seneca, or of course Tacitus. But it is not necessary to invoke Curtius' priority when Lucan's treatment can clearly be related to the wider tradition.

In the latest study of Curtius' narrative of the mutiny at Opis, W. Rutz suggests that the resemblances between the speech composed by

15 For the dating of Curtius, see J. Stroux, "Die Zeit des Curtius", *Philologus* 84 (1929) 233–51; W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, Vol. 2, Cambridge 1948, pp. 91–122; and now A. B. Bosworth, "History and Rhetoric in Curtius Rufus," *CP* 78 (1983) 150–54.

Curtius for Alexander and Caesar's speech in Lucan book 5 arise from their separate dependence on Livy;¹⁶ but although he makes a good case for affinities between Curtius and Livy's version of the Scipionic mutiny (Livy 28.27), there are no strong leads to the influence of Livy on Lucan in our passage.

Twice in the later phases of Alexander's eastern expedition the King was confronted by a mutiny; the first time, in fact, proved the turning point at which he was forced to retreat. Both Arrian and Curtius tell how he had led his men to the last river of the Punjab, the Beas, and was eager to press on beyond it into India proper toward the Ganges, when his men, worn out, soaked by monsoon, and panicked by tales of the monstrous elephants of the Indian kingdoms beyond the river, refused to go any farther.¹⁷ Both Arrian and Curtius, as Tarn has argued, depend on Ptolemy and so represent the same subtradition, and both provide a pair of speeches, for Alexander and for his lieutenant, Coenus, voicing the men's despair. We find a similar format in the later mutiny at Opis, when Alexander planned to send home his oldest veterans and the Greeks and Macedonians mutinied, demanding that they too be allowed to return: here again Arrian and Curtius provide a speech for Alexander, but the speeches have little in common with each other.¹⁸ In his appendix "the Speeches in Arrian", Tarn has shown that Curtius has on both occasions composed his speeches independently of Arrian's model, but has transferred from the famous speech at Opis the finale, which he inserts into his presentation of the harangue at the Beas.¹⁹ That is, Curtius composes without concern for historicity, and is con-

16 See "*Seditionum Procellae*: Livianisches in der Darstellung der Meuterei von Opis bei Curtius Rufus" in *Livius: Werk und Rezeption: Festschrift für Erich Burck zum 80 Geburtstag*, ed. E. Lefèvre and E. Olshausen, Munich 1983, 399–409. Rutz draws no conclusions about the possible dependence of Lucan on Curtius, or vice-versa: "alle Gemeinsamkeiten dürften durch das gemeinsame Vorbild Livius erklärbar sein" (408 n. 29).

17 Arrian 5.25–27, with which compare Curtius 9.2–3. Plut. *Alexander* 62 makes the river the Ganges. On the speeches, see Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, Vol. 2, appendix 15: "the Speeches in Arrian (and Some in Curtius)", pp. 285–89. For a modern narrative of the episode retaining the spirit of Curtius, see R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great*, London 1973, 366–72. Tarn argues that Coenus was never present. Lane Fox interprets the conflicting evidence to assume that Coenus was present, but died shortly after the speech.

18 Arrian 7.9–10, with which compare Curtius 10.2–3; cf. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great*, 423–30.

19 *Alexander the Great*, 2.287.

cerned only with the potential rhetoric of the situation. But it is precisely the rhetorical finale in each of Curtius' speeches which comes closest to the key passage in Lucan from 5.325–58. First, consider the speech at Opis, Curtius 10.2.27–29:

facessite hinc ocios! ego cum Persis abeuntium terga tutabor. neminem teneo; liberate oculos meos, *ingratissimi ciues* ... triumphabo mehercle de fuga uestra, et, ubicunque ero, expetam poenas hos cum quibus me relinquitis colendo praeferendoque uobis. iam autem scietis, et quantum sine rege ualeat exercitus, et quid opis in me uno sit.

As Tarn points out, the use of *ciues*, meaningless in its Hellenistic context, shows contamination, less from the literary tradition of Caesar (of which Lucan is the earliest datable and extant witness) than from the anecdotal tradition of *exempla* and *dicta memorabilia* traded in the declamatory school.²⁰ Indeed Curtius presents the whole episode as an *exemplum*; the soldiers watch the arrest of the ringleaders without protest: *siue nominis ... siue propria ipsius ueneratio siue fiducia tanta ui exercentis imperium conterruit eos; singulare certe ediderunt patientiae exemplum* (10.3.3).²¹ Surely this tale of submissiveness has served in part as a model for the Caesarian mutiny as Lucan came to know it and has presented it in book 5.

We find the same basic *color* in the last phases of Alexander's speech at the Beas, in Curtius 9.2.33–34. Curtius thought it was worth bor-

20 *Alexander the Great*, 2.296, where he oddly claims that Curtius "is therefore copying from the incident itself." Rutz, *Livius: Werk und Rezeption*, 401–7, drawing on C. Hosius, "Lucan und seine Quellen," *Rh. Mus.* 48 (1893) 380–97 notes these affinities between the final section of Alexander's speech in Curtius and Lucan's writing for Caesar, and compares also the narrative colouring of Curtius 10.3–4 with Lucan 5.369–73.

21 Note, however, that neither the mutinies against Caesar nor those of Alexander are listed under, e.g. *de disciplina militari* in Val. Max. 2.7. I list here for convenience the anecdotal material from the Career of Alexander used by Valerius Maximus: 1.1 ext. 5 *de religione neglecta* (blinding of his soldiers at Miletus); 1.4 ext. 1 *de auspiciis* (founding of Alexandria); 1.7 ext. 2 *de somniis* (dream of assassination attempt by Cassander); 1.8 ext. 10 *de miraculis* (omen of his approaching death); 3.8 ext. 6 *de constantia* (trust in his doctor Philippus); 4.3 ext. 4 *de abstinencia* (Diogenes and A.); 4.7 ext. 2 *de amicitiae uinculo* (A. and Hephaestion); 5.1 ext. 1 *de clementia* (A. and the frozen soldier; A.'s generosity in death); 6.4 ext. 3 *de grauius dictis* (A., Parmenio and the defeated Darius); 7.3 ext. 1 *de uafre dictis* (A. and the muleteer); 8.14 ext. 2 *de cupiditate gloriae* (the world too small); 9.3 ext. 1 *de ira et odio* (his killing of Cleitus and Callisthenes); 9.5 ext. 1 *de superbia et impotentia* (claim of divine paternity).

rowing from the Greek tradition of the second mutiny, and his finale is similar to the one discussed above:

inueniam qui desertum a uobis sequantur. Scythae Bactrianique erunt mecum, hostes paulo ante, nunc milites nostri. mori praestat quam precario imperatorem esse. ite reduces domos! ite deserto rege ouantes! ego hic aut uobis desperatae uictoriae aut honestae morti locum inueniam.

The tone is more self-pitying than that of Caesar, who would never have admitted the possibility of challenge to his *imperium*, or death and defeat, but the motif is the same. And we find another echo in the reply of Coenus, who voices the exhaustion of Alexander's men, *paene in ultimo mundi fine consistimus ... in alium orbem paras ire* (9.3.7–8). Had Curtius perhaps spent some of his youth on that favourite first *Suasoria*?

One other episode from the Alexander-tradition is relevant to this central portion of Lucan's fifth book. Shortly after the enforced abandonment of his march east, Alexander, smarting to wipe out the shame of a moral defeat, risked his life in an attack on a city of the Malloi (Multan, as it is now called);²² scaling the walls ahead of his *hetairoi*, he became isolated in combat with the townsfolk and was severely wounded, so that several days passed during which men feared for his life.

Only when he is recovering does Craterus voice the universal indignation that he could risk his life for so small a cause. He argues, "It is you who make us victorious: do not endanger all your people by risking your life. For who either desires or is able to survive you", *quis enim tibi superstes aut optat esse aut potest?* (9.6.9); "leave us to face the routine hazards and save yourself for exploits worthy of your greatness. I beg you, let us be worthless in your sight [*uiles tibi*] in some other way; we will go wherever you command" (9.6.14). Caesar, too, exposed himself to danger after quelling the mutiny, though the celebrated night voyage was some four to five months after the episode at Placentia. Lucan leads into this episode as soon as Caesar has landed in Epirus. When Caesar has almost perished in the storm, and even uttered his own funeral *lau-*

22 See Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great*, 379–82; Curtius 9.4.15 (Malli), 9.4.26–5.30 (siege and wound). Craterus' speech is given at Curtius 9.5.6–6.15 where Ptolemy is reported as making the same protests. Plut. *Alex.* 63 narrates the episode immediately after the retreat from the last river; but although he is consciously creating parallels between his lives of Alexander and Caesar, he does not in *Alex.* 63 provide a sample of loyal reproaches parallel to *Caes.* 38.

datio (Lucan 5.654–71), a timely tenth wave casts him up on the shores of Epirus as the dawn approaches. Angry at the risk to his life, his men surround him with protest. Why does he risk his life leaving them, *uiles animae* (683), to suffer their fate? Did none of them deserve the honour of not surviving him, *nullusne tutorum / emeruit comitum fatis non posse superstes / esse tuis?* (687–89). Both turns of phrase occur in a few lines, as they do in Craterus' protests. If anything, the awkwardness of Lucan's double negative *nullusne ... emeruit non posse ... esse* bears the mark of a secondary composition, *aemulatio* which does not quite succeed; it is almost as if in outdoing Craterus Lucan had obscured his meaning.

In both authors we have the same sequence of moods—the disloyalty of mutiny followed by shaming and restored loyalty; in both, the external danger to the leader renews the devotion of his men. But whereas Alexander's comrades have passed days afraid for his life, Caesar's men in Lucan have slept all night to be confronted at reveille by a wet but healthy commander, so that they have to imagine the dangers he might have succumbed to. We know that Lucan greatly exaggerated the episode of the night voyage, which was originally little more than a wild crossing of the Aous estuary.²³ We can also compare a similar movement in Plutarch²⁴ and Appian for evidence that this particular emotional sequence was used by the Caesar-tradition before either Plutarch or Lucan. For Plutarch follows the discontent of Caesar's soldiers on their way to Brundisium with remorse, when they find Caesar departed and sit on the cliffs looking with longing towards Epirus, waiting to be reunited with him. The next anecdote is the desperate night voyage that ends in the reproaches of Caesar's men when he returns to the camp, because he did not trust them enough to fight without summoning Antony's contingent: this contrast of resentment, followed by Caesar's daring and his men's reproach, surviving even in Appian's brief version (2.57–58), presumably goes back to Pollio. Plutarch and Lucan both depict the relationship between the commander and his men in terms of the irrational shifts of lovers' passion: the soldiers act like *erastai* towards their beloved Caesar, a pattern recognizable both

23 See Gelzer, *Caesar*, 228–29 and n. 1; Syndikus, *Lucans Gedicht*, 9. Pollio is the likely source of both Appian and Plutarch. Dio (41.46), like Lucan, romanticizes the episode.

24 *Caes.* 37 (complaints on the march to Brundisium), 38 (the boat on the Aous). Note that Plutarch equips Caesar with a twelve-oared boat and terminates his voyage before he reaches the open sea.

in Greek sources for Alexander and his *hetairoi* and in Curtius' Roman version. Again, despite the close verbal echoes, it seems rather that Curtius and Lucan are adapting the same rhetorical tradition based on the Alexander-narratives, Curtius for the original theme and material, whereas Lucan has used it to reinforce the element of Alexander, the *proles uesana Philippi*,²⁵ in his anti-hero Caesar.

In conclusion, we find that Lucan has deepened the significance of his drama of mutiny by two principal techniques: first, by recalling the key episode at Ariminum from book 1 in which Caesar's initiative met with loyal encouragement from his men at the moment of entry into Italy and civil war; and second, by importing into his characterization of Caesar here and in adjoining episodes of book 5 details from the tradition of the world-conqueror at the eastern edge of the *oikoumene*. These, I would suggest, were known to him not from continuous histories, whether in Greek or Latin, but from declamations or declamatory excerpts memorized and preserved in the schools.

25 Lucan 10.20.

26. *Religio ... dira loci*: Two Passages in Lucan *De Bello Civili* 3 and Their Relation to Virgil's Rome and Latium

I. Although there is a certain grimness about many of the manifestations of the supernatural in the post-Homeric world of Virgil's Italy, there can be no doubt of the religious awe and sense of place reflected in both communities visited by Aeneas in books 7–8, Latinus' city and Evander's simpler foundation on the site of Rome. The wider purpose of this paper is to illuminate the change between Virgil's representation of *religio* in his epic world and the attitude to the traditional cults displayed by Lucan's historical narrative. This change is a double one, occurring in both the world of the poem and in the poet himself. The more specific purpose is to illuminate the poetic aims of two scenes in Lucan's third book concerned with sacred places and human response to them—one set at Rome, the other in supposedly barbaric Gaul—and to show that these scenes are more closely related in narrative function than has usually been assumed.

The more significant of these episodes occurs at Rome in Caesar's occupation in spring 49 BCE I shall argue that Lucan has modified the historical evidence and coloured his diction to evoke an analogy between Caesar's violation of the *Aerarium Saturni* and the opening of the Gates of War in *Aeneid* 7.601–22, and to root that analogy in a perceived loss of true *religio*.

All the historical sources make it clear that the civil bloodshed of the earlier civil wars and the propaganda of the conservatives had led both the political classes and the common people of Rome to dread the consequences of Caesar's return. In fact it would be brief and non-violent, and Lucan himself compensates for this relatively peaceful episode by a series of anticipatory threats, prophecies and forebodings in his first two books. Thus in the first book Caesar's loyal troops at Ariminum offer bloodthirsty descriptions of the atrocities they are prepared to commit against their city and fellow citizens if he will lead them (1.373–86): at Rome itself the panic that provokes the flight of Pompey and the conservatives (1.469–522), is followed by a triple wave of portents

and prophecies that bring the book to a climax of suspense. The mood is renewed when the second book moves through the anticipatory mourning of Rome's women and angry forebodings of her fighting men to the appalling recollections of the older generation. In this retrospective narrative Lucan provides the unbounded horrors which the occupation of Rome in his own civil war—that of Caesar and Pompey—denied him. As the old survivor describes the destruction of both liberty and life in the last two occupations of the city, Marius' random killings are capped by the systematic judicial murder of the Sullan proscriptions and the massacre of Italic soldiery in the very voting pens that symbolized the *res publica*.¹ In the event, Caesar's campaign down the east coast of Italy to Brundisium demonstrated how little he was concerned with the city which Lucan ironically designates *caput mundi, bellorum maxima merces* (2.655), rather than with confrontation² with Pompey and his army. His unopposed occupation of the city proved a relief to those who had stayed, but a challenge to the epic poet. Caesar's worst actions were the convening of the Senate in the absence of most of its senior members, and the emptying of the military treasury kept in the temple of Saturn, overriding the veto of the tribune L. Caecilius Metellus. What would Lucan make of this? How could he give to this anticlimax the horror of a city violated?

In book 3 Caesar's coming is outlined with amazing brevity.³ Lucan marks only the fear felt by the Italian cities on Caesar's march, and his characteristic speed⁴ as he passes Aricia and Alba, signalled as ancient

-
- 1 See on the embedded narrative of the old survivor G. B. Conte, "La guerra civile nella rievocazione del popolo: Lucano II.67–233," *Maia* 20 (1968) 224–53. For evidence of popular fears in Cicero's letters and the historians see *Lucan: de Bello Civili: Book 2* ed. Fantham, Cambridge 1992, 67–233n, p. 91.
 - 2 Or negotiation, according to Caesar's own narrative in *B.C.* 1, but this option is suppressed by Lucan.
 - 3 But this brevity is dense with associations: see the excellent commentary of V. Hunink, *M. Annaeus Lucanus: Bellum Civile Book III*, Amsterdam 1992, which will be cited constantly in this paper, and the important recent study of C. M. C. Green, "The Necessary Murder: Myth, Ritual and Civil War in Lucan Book 3," *Class. Ant.* 13.2 (1994) 203–33.
 - 4 Cf. 3.51 *praecipiti ... uiro* (with Hunink *ad loc.*) and the typical *iam ... superauerat* of 3.84, echoing 1.183 *iam gelidas Caesar cursu superauerat Alpes*. Hunink 66 rightly notes the affinities between this passage and 2.439–46.

sites of cult and power,⁵ to gaze from an unnamed summit at the city he has not seen for almost ten years.

qua sublime nemus, Scythiae qua regna Dianae
 quaque iter est Latiis ad summam fascibus Albam;
 excelsa de rupe procul iam conspicit urbem.

(3.86–8)

We should look carefully at the terms in which Lucan's Caesar, his contemporaries and the poet's authorial voice represent that city and his seizure of the treasure. In keeping with the epic tradition Lucan sees Rome as the historic walled city of Romulus or Servius, the *moenia Romae* (3.90, repeated in 3.99) which in Caesar's time were long submerged in the city's expansion. Even in Caesar's eyes this Rome, which is now in his power (*suae ... Romae*) is *deum sedes*, the abode of the gods (an echo of Camillus' heroic refusal to transfer his city to Veii after the Gallic sack):⁶

miratusque *suae* sic fatur *moenia Romae*
 'tene, *deum sedes*, non ullo Marte coacti
 sic deseruere uiri?'

(90–92)

The fears of onlookers too are represented in terms of walls, and gods:

namque ignibus atris
 creditur, ut captae, *rapturus moenia Romae*
sparsurusque deos.

(98–100)

5 The significance of these references has only now fully been brought out in Green's paper, which demonstrates (see especially 208–14) the continued awareness of the Avician rite in imperial Rome and shows how the ritual challenge of the *rex nemorensis* at Aricia is set up by Lucan as a paradigm for Caesar's role as challenger to Pompey. The paper traces the implications of the Arician rite for Lucan's narrative and characterization of Caesar both in and before book 3.

6 Cf. Livy 5.51–54, esp. 52.2–3: *urbem auspicato inauguratoque conditam habemus; nullus locus in ea non religionum deorumque est plenus; sacrificiis sollemnibus non dies magis statim quam loca sunt in quibus fiant. Hos omnes deos publicos priuatosque, Quirites, deserturi estis?* and the last sentence: *hic omnes propitii manentibus uobis di*. For more sinister associations with Romulus and Servius, see Green 203–8; 211–13.

Thus the poet renews the Virgilian reverence for the city, and evokes a new *Iliou Persis* in which Caesar will seize its walls and scatter its gods. But the same words will return in a different context.

Lucan's version of Caesar's convening of the Senate denies with deliberate partisanship the constitutional legitimacy of its convocation, though it was convened by tribunes and attended by at least some senior statesmen.⁷ It is an equally deliberate anachronism that Lucan sets the meeting in the Palatine temple of Apollo constructed by Caesar's heir.⁸ What Caesar lacks in ruthlessness is supplied by the fears of his craven Senate, and the negative elements in Lucan's account will contribute to the colouring and associations of the scene that follows, when Lucan ostensibly moves away from its constitutional functions:

phoebea Palatia complet
 turba patrum *nullo cogendi iure senatus*
e latebris educta suis; non consule sacrae
fulserunt sedes ...
 sedere patres censere parati
 si regnum, si templa sibi iugulumque senatus
 exiliumque petat. *melius quod plura iubere*
erubuit quam Roma pati.

(3.103–6, 109–112)

Among the *plura* which Caesar did not ask from the Senate were the right to make war on the forces led by Pompey, and the funds to finance his campaign. He assumes that right and meets opposition only when he prepares to take his funding by force. This is first introduced in the abstract terms of its political significance. Liberty, we are told, embodied in one man, tested the power of right to resist might, *uiribus an possint obsistere iura per unum / ... experta uirum* (113–4), and drove the tyrant figure of Caesar to rage.

The episode that opens at 3.114 is in fact Lucan's first, inexplicit, reference to Caesar's assault on Rome's military treasury, the *Aerarium Saturni*.⁹ This account assumes a readership familiar with the story reported by Plutarch *Caesar* 35.4–11, and Appian *B.C.* 2.6.41:

7 M. Gelzer, *Caesar, Politician and Statesman* (tr. P. Needham, Oxford 1968) notes that the Senate was legally convened by the tribunes Antonius and Cassius (Cassius Dio 41.15.2) and attended by two consulars, Sulpicius Rufus (Cos. 51) and Volcarius Tullus (Cos. 66) (Cic. *Att.* 9.19.2; 10.3a.2, *Fam.* 4.1.1).

8 Dio (*op. cit.*, n. 3) reports that the Senate met outside the Pomerium.

9 For details of this *aerarium sanctius* see Hunink 84. According to Cic. *Att.* 7.21.2 the Pompeians too had tried to break in and appropriate the treasure, and failed.

He hewed down the bars of the public treasury, (τὰ δὲ κλεῖθρα τῶν δημοσίων ταμείων ἐξέκοπτε) and when Metellus, one of the tribunes, tried to prevent him from entering, threatened him with death. He took away money hitherto untouched, which as they say had been deposited there long ago, at the time of the Gallic invasion, with a public curse upon anybody who should take it out except in the case of a war with the Gauls.¹⁰

We cannot assume from the silence of Livy's *Periochae* that Livy did not mention the affair, and even Caesar reports the obstruction of Metellus to his plans without any allusion to the treasury.¹¹ Like *pugnax Domitius* in 2.479 Metellus hastens to oppose Caesar as the Temple of Saturn (*Saturnia templum*) is under attack:¹² like a latter day Horatius Coclus Metellus stands before the entrance facing Caesar's *agmina* while the doors are not yet unbarred.¹³ But between Metellus' action and his speech of defiance, Lucan provides his public with a reading of this event.

usque adeo solus ferrum mortemque timere
auri nescit amor; pereunt discrimine nullo
amissae leges, sed pars uilissima rerum
certamen mouistis, opes ...

(3.118–21)

Virgil had damned the love of gold, but for causing the brutal murder of a child guest—

10 The common source for the story is probably Asinius Pollio, who was consulted by both Appian and Plutarch. Lucan omits the retort of Caesar given by Appian that he had already subdued the Gauls "and so released the Republic from the curse." Plutarch (who tells the story again in *Pompey* 62.1) offers much more detail, including Caesar's explicit repudiation of Metellus' right of free speech (*Libertas* in Luc. 3.145) in times of war, and his claim to the right of life and death over all the Republicans as his prisoners of war. Plutarch adds that Caesar had to send for a locksmith to break in, and that he finally threatened to kill Metellus, who withdrew in fear.

11 *Subicitur etiam L. Metellus tribunus plebis ab inimicis Caesaris, qui hanc rem* (Caesar's proposed delegation to Pompey) *distrahat, reliquasque res, quas cumque agere instituerit, impedit* (Caes. B.C. 1.33.3).

12 On the parallel with Domitius see W. D. Lebel, "Lucans Pharsalia: Dichtungsstruktur und Zeitbezug," *Hypomnemata* 44 (Göttingen 1976), 196–7, and Hunink 84.

13 What is Caesar (or his force) actually doing? There is some ambiguity in *ingenti ... reuelli / mole*: Braund translates abstractly "with huge exertion" but Hunink and most translators assume a battering ram or "heavy equipment" (Widdows).

Quid non mortalia pectora cogis,
auri sacra fames?

(*Aen.* 3.56–7)

In the inversion offered by Lucan, what seemed an honourable defence of Liberty and Law is exposed as the result if not of personal greed, certainly of a code that values *opes* more highly than the *iura* of 113. The values implicit in Metellus' action are reiterated and confirmed by Metellus' own words: *nullasque feres nisi sanguine sacro / sparsas, raptor, opes* (125). But in Lucan's introduction, Caesar the raptor (cf. *rapturus moenia*) was seen as *sparsurus ... deos*. Are *opes*, then, Rome's new gods? Ovid had said so, or his Janus has said so to him, in the late remodelling of the first book of the *Fasti*.¹⁴

As a tribune Metellus is sacrosanct, and cites the doom of Crassus as evidence that defiance of tribunician power will bring down the vengeance of the gods. To get his soldiers' pay Caesar will be forced to violate the tribune's sacred person (*sanguine sacro*)¹⁵ and so incur divine anger; *non feret e nostro sceleratus praemia miles* (130). But Metellus is defeated by Caesar's angry contempt (134–40) and Aurelius Cotta's reasoning (145–51).¹⁶ What matters for our argument is not the complex ideological resonances of Cotta's *libertas ... populi quem regna coercent / libertate perit* (145–6) but his recognition that Caesar is seeking the means of war (*diri mala semina belli* 150) and yielding will simply accelerate Caesar's departure.

14 Cf. *Fasti* 1.193–4 *uix ego Saturno quemquam regnante uidebam / cuius non animo dulcia lucra forent*, and 207–9 *at postquam fortuna loci caput extulit huius / et tetigit summo uertice Roma deos / creuerunt et opes et opum furiosa cupido*.

15 Applying the terms of Green's argument, Metellus could be viewed as an unworthy would-be surrogate for Pompey, whose "sacred blood" Caesar rightly disdains to shed, since his commitment is to engage only with the fading *rex nemorensis* Pompey.

16 On the identity of this Cotta, a maternal kinsman of Caesar, see J. L. Ferrary "A Roman non-entity": Aurelius Cotta Tribun de la Plèbe en 49 avant J.-C." in *L'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine. Mélanges J. Heurgon*, Rome 1976, 285–92. But Ferrary's identification as the former consul of 65 BCE, L. Aurelius Cotta, is problematic in view of Cicero's evidence that Volcacius and Sulpicius Rufus were the only consulars present in 49. The consul of 65 was certainly Caesarian and at Rome in 44, but it is more likely that this was a younger member of the same family and a tribune, as indicated by the *Adnotationes*.

Metellus is led off (whether by Cotta or under guard is left unclear) and the temple is forced open.

*tunc rupes Tarpeia sonat magnoque reclusas
testatur stridore fores: tum conditus imo
eruitur templo multis non tactus ab annis
Romani census populi ...*

(154–7)

What is Lucan recalling by this dramatic symbolism, as the Tarpeian rock protests, echoing the grinding temple doors as they open to expose the stored treasure? In Virgil's great ekphrasis on the Gates of War, the opening of the doors is twice represented: in the ancient context of the ritual in Latinus' city, and in the contemporary ritual when the gates of Janus are opened by the consul at Rome to mark the declaration of war. Virgil interweaves ancient and modern versions of this *mos ... sacer*.

*mos erat Hesperio in Latio, quem protinus urbes
Albanae coluere sacrum, nunc maxima rerum
Roma colit ...*

(*Aen.* 7.601–3)

In the Rome of Augustus these doors made sacred by *religio* are opened only when the senate is resolved on combat, and opened by the consul himself in ritual clothing.

*sunt geminae Belli portae (sic nomine dicunt)
religione sacrae et saeui formidine Martis:
centum aerei claudunt uectes aeternaque ferri
robora, nec custos absistit limine Ianus.
has ubi certa sedet patribus sententia pugnae
ipse Quirinali trabea cinctuque Gabino
insignis reserat stridentia limina consul.*

(*Aen.* 7.607–13)

And in Latinus' city too, Virgil implies, due custom was followed, and the king ordered by the people to open the gates as declaration of war.

*hoc et tum Aeneadis indicere bella Latinus
more iubebatur tristisque recludere portas.
abstinuit tactu pater auersusque refugit
foeda ministeria, et caecis se condidit umbris.
tum regina deum caelo delapsa morantis*

impulit ipsa manu portas, et cardine uerso
 Belli ferratos rumpit Saturnia postis.

(*Aen.* 7.616–22)

Lucan has already shown how the Senate which bowed before Caesar was no proper body, but a *turba* without consul or curule magistrate to authorize its convening (3.104–7). Now he deploys elements from both contexts of *Aeneid* 7.601–22 in a new setting to mark the pause before the unbarring of the temple, at 117 (*nondum reseratae ... aedis*) and the moment when the rock echoes the doors' opening clang in 3.154–5 *reclusas / ...stridore*. Two of these terms occur in only one other passage in the *Bellum Civile*: *stridor* at 1.237 *stridor lituum clangorque tubarum*, *recludere* at 5.531.¹⁷ In both Virgil and Lucan there is an intervening obstruction to the fatal opening—the scruples of Latinus, the defiance of Metellus—before the angry protagonist intervenes, and it is perhaps no coincidence that Lucan has applied to the temple of Saturn the same epithet, *Saturnia*, in the same sedes, which it occupies as Juno's epithet in 622.¹⁸

We must ask, then, how this remodelling of the historical encounter relates to the larger question of *religio*, and how the scene's moral implications are brought out by the resonances of the Virgilian ritual. The word *religio* itself does not occur in Lucan, perhaps because the word was receding from Roman thinking: in Ovid too, with his vast output, and a whole work—the *Fasti*—concerned with cult, and various kinds of reverence and awe, *religio* is found only twice: in a description of a sacred place in *Metamorphoses*,¹⁹ and at *Fasti* 3.264, to which we shall return. But even without *religio* Lucan constantly evokes a sense of fear, awe, horror and mystery in face of the supernatural, by words of fear,

17 Luc. 1.237 is a variant on the Virgilian *clamorque uirum stridorque rudentum Aen.* 1.87 (itself modelled on Pacuvius): *recludere* in 5.531 is relatively colourless, though the agent is again Caesar: *reserare* occurs four other times in Lucan (2.507, 682; 5.70 and 6.600): it is notable that each instance releases misfortune or evil.

18 Substitution of adjective for possessive genitive is conventional poetic diction, but I have found no other instance of *Saturnius* applied to the *Aedes Saturni*. The Capitoline itself was originally *mons Saturnius*, and the citadel upon it was called *Saturnia* according to Varro *L.L.* 5.42, cf. *Aen.* 8.358.

19 10.692–4 *fuera prope templa recessus / religione sacer prisca, quo multa sacerdos / lignea contulerat ueterum simulacra deorum*. This ancient repository of *xoana* is a closer precedent for a Roman *fauissa* set aside for discarded dedications and sacred images than for a temple treasury with its bullion.

by *horror*, *dirus*, and the suggestive use of negatives and indefinites. Virgil on the other hand calls upon *religio* to convey the awesome significance of the Gates of War *religione sacrae et saevi formidine Martis* (7.608), as he does for more than one sacred place in Troy (*Aen.* 2.151, 188, 365 *religiosa deorum limina* 715), for Latinus' palace (7.172–3 *tectum ... horrendum siluis et religione parentum*) and for the Capitoline hill in *Aen.* 8.347–54:

hinc ad *Tarpeiam sedem et Capitolia* ducit
aurea nunc, olim siluestribus horrida dumis.
iam tum *religio* pavidos terrebat agrestis
dira loci, iam tum siluam saxumque tremebant.
'hoc nemus, hunc,' inquit 'frondoso uertice collem
(*quis deus incertum est*) *habitat deus*; Arcades ipsum
Credunt se uidisse Iouem, cum saepe nigrantem
Aegida concuteret dextra nimbosque cieret.'

In Virgil's Capitoline, I believe, there is the other antimodel for Lucan's enhancement of the treasury episode. As Lucan's Caesar called Rome *deum sedes*, so Evander singles out for its numinous power the Capitoline, *Tarpeiam sedem*, possessed by some deity unnamed, *quis deus incertum est*, whom Virgil's contemporaries will know as Jupiter Optimus Maximus. Virgil's narrative confirms the *religio* felt by the Arcadian shepherds before the uncleared woodland on the hill, and implies the presence of the yet unidentified Jupiter by the thunderclaps heard from it. This former woodland on the sacred site has become in Lucan's narrative the backdrop of the temple of Saturn,²⁰ and the Tarpeian Rock itself, Saturn's original citadel²¹ responds to the sound of the violated temple doors in 3.154. Evander may have celebrated Saturn's coming and the bringing of peace to Rome and Latium, but the temple shows no sign of peace or of Saturn's presence. Instead it is occupied by the new god *Opes* (3.121, 125) and it is this power alone that provokes even a temporary reverence from the degenerate Romans of Caesar's day:

20 The remains of the temple are at the junction of the Clivus Capitolinus and Vicus Iugarius beneath the Capitoline, the *Rupes Tarpeia* in its full sense. (Cf. F. Coarelli, *Guida Archeologica di Roma*, 1974, 50 for the location on the forum plan. For the original woods of the Capitoline compare the Asylum set *inter duos lucos* and Dion. Halic. 2.15.4.

21 Cf. Varro *L.L.* 5.42, *Aen.* 8.358 *hanc Saturnus condidit arcem / ... illi fuerat Saturnia nomen*.

pereunt discrimine nullo
 amissae leges, sed pars uilissima rerum
 certamen mouistis, *opes*.

(3.119–21)

We should have expected this; already in Lucan's analysis of the causes of war *opes nimiae* (1.160) had corrupted the behaviour of the nation and its magistrates,²² and in the first foreshadowing of Caesar's march on Rome, Laelius had promised that if Caesar ordered his troops to strip the gods and fire their temples (1.379) the flame of the military mint would smelt and confuse the deities: *numina miscebit castrensium flamma monetarum* (1.380). The gods are equated with their statues of precious metal melted down for bullion to make military pay, a foreshadowing of this very event, but of its moral rather than literal significance: it is not the statues of the gods, but the reverence due to *numina*, that falls victim when the itemized spoils and bullion of Saturn's treasury are exposed to the light and taken for military pay.²³ This is a force which will prove as evil as the spirit of war, Virgilian *Furor*, that crouches in the *Belli Portae* of *Aen.* 1.293–6.

Lucan has invested the city and its environs with a measure of Virgilian sanctity as he narrates Caesar's approach to Rome, because the emotional impact of this scene will depend on disillusionment from the traditional reverence for the holiness of the site. This passage is designed to show that *religio*, in the proper sense of "the feeling of awe, anxiety, doubt or fear ... aroused in the mind by something that cannot be explained by a man's experience ... which is therefore referred to the supernatural," "the feeling that prompts to worship,"²⁴ is no longer to be found in Caesar's Rome.²⁵

22 *Opes* are listed first among the *publica belli semina* (cf. 3.150 *mala semina belli*) of 1.158 f. Lucan is reiterating the topos of Rome's corruption by wealth usually attributed to the conquest of Greece and Asia in the second century: the same topos was cited by Janus in *Fasti* 1.207–9 (n. 14 above).

23 Two perhaps less cogent links suggest themselves: one between the two sections of Caesar's activities at Rome through his exposure of the treasure (156, *eruitur* and 167, *egeritur*) and his convening of the pseudo-senate 105 *e latetibus educta suis*, the other between the *tristi ... rapina* of 167 and the *tristes ... portas* of *Aen.* 7.617. The adjective is common enough (31 times in Lucan) but this is the only instance of the epithet with *rapina*.

24 These definitions derive from W. Warde Fowler, *Roman Essays and Interpretations*, Oxford 1920, 7–15, 7, 11.

II. So where is *religio* to be found? We follow Caesar now to the notorious grove outside Marseille, but with a digression to recapitulate the literary pedigree of this *purpureus pannus* that will be largely familiar to students of Roman literature.²⁶ It can be inferred that when Horace wrote off the *lucus et ara Dianae*²⁷ as a poetic cliché in *Ars Poetica* 16, such ekphrases were already a commonplace in Virgil's time, and that Virgil is exceptional in the modesty of his allusions to such sacred sites.²⁸

Virgil's account of the Capitoline at *Aen.* 8.347–54 is unique. This is why Seneca takes it, rather than, say, the sacred grove at Caere,²⁹ as inspiration for his letter describing the numinous, the source of *religio* in sacred groves: *illa proceritas silvae et secretum loci et admiratio umbrae in aperto tam densae atque continuae fidem tibi numinis faciet* (*Ep. Mor.* 41.3). Between Virgil and Lucan most descriptions of sacred groves do not go beyond establishing the enclosed nature of the sacred space and the god to which it belongs: they do not indulge extensively in *Stimmung*, “atmosphere”.

Ovid's many variations on the sacred place (one of those cited below is not a *lucus* but a *lucus*, associated with Diana of Aricia) draw on Virgilian precedent, but with economy, outlining in a distich the set-

25 Historical evidence suggests that this materialism and irreligion could coexist with intense forms of religiosity and superstition among exceptional men like Nigidius Figulus. Lucan's text, as Green's article has demonstrated, provides evidence of his own consuming interest (not necessarily belief: see D. C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic*, Oxford 1991, 274) in traditional cult, but also of his conception of the time of Caesar's civil war as godless: a time when men lacked belief or faith in the gods and the gods repaid them by hostility. J. W. H. G. Liebeschuetz's discussion “The system rejected: Lucan's *Pharsalia*,” 140–54 in *Continuity and change in Roman religion*, Oxford 1979, focuses on Lucan's beliefs rather than those he demonstrates in his Caesarian world (except briefly on 148). He mentions neither of the passages discussed here. Feeney has provided a valuable reassessment of Lucan's attitudes towards the gods, reaffirming their presence and their role in the epic.

26 For both ancient instances and secondary literature see Hunink 168–9.

27 Here again Green's article should prompt reconsideration. Already at the time of *Ars Poetica* the clichéd grove is a grove of Diana, and the stress on its altar allows the suggestion of human sacrifice. Can it be that the *lucus horridus* was underway as a literary exercise or display piece even before the examples known to us of the *locus amoenus*?

28 Persius 1.70 *nec ponere lucum / artifices nec rus saturnum laudare* shows that this was still a recognized exercise in Lucan's own time.

29 *Aen.* 8.597–9 *est ingens gelidum lucus prope Caeritis amnem, / religione patrum late sacer, undique colles / includere caui et nigra nemus abiete cingunt*.

ting for each religious (or quasi-religious) event. The groves of *Amores* belong to the Muses of Tragedy and Elegy (2.1) and to Juno of Falerii (3.13). All four samples from the *Fasti* are settings for encounters with deities or semi-divine *numina*—Juno, Hippolytus-Virbius, Picus and Faunus.

stat uetus et multos incaedua silua per annos
credibile est illi *numen inesse loco*.

Am. 3.1.1–2

stat uetus et densa praenubilus arbore lucus;
aspice: concedes numinis esse locum.

Am. 3.13.7–8

monte sub Esquilio multis incaeduu annis
lunonis magnae nomine lucus erat.

Fast. 2.435–6

uallis Aricinae siluae praecinctus opaca
est lacus *antiqua religione sacer*.

Fast. 3.263–4

lucus Auentino suberat niger ilicis umbra
quo posses uiso dicere ‘numen inest’.

Fast. 295–6

silua uetus nullaue diu uiolata securi
stabat Maenalia *sacra relictā deo*.

Fast. 4.649–50

It is difficult to come much closer to the opening of Lucan’s Massilian ekphrasis than *Fasti* 4.649–50. However, the encounter introduced by this distich is itself an adaptation of a Virgilian episode, *Aen.* 7.81–95, in which Latinus learns from Faunus by incubation in the grove of Albu-neia the destiny of his daughter Lavinia. It is between Ovid’s largely Virgilian groves, and those of Seneca and Lucan that the main development and transformation seems to occur. Leaving aside the sinister grove of necromancy in Seneca’s *Oedipus* we might take as example the self-consciously hybrid nature of the horrendous palace grove of Atreus in Seneca’s *Thyestes*. Seneca draws attention to its Virgilian ancestry in the description of Latinus’ palace.³⁰ At the same time the continued de-

30 Sen. *Thyestes* 645–64 as against 665–82: see R. J. Tarrant (ed.), *Seneca: Thyestes*, Atlanta 1985, *ad loc.*

scription replaces the sense of *religio*, that is the awe proper towards something essentially good, if severe and therefore to be feared, with the horror we feel before the supernatural power of evil.

We are ready now to follow Caesar to the Massilian grove and his next act of sacrilege. The grove outside Massilia has to serve many functions, but its origin is literary, rather than historical or ethnological. Not only Massilia but the Gallic communities for over a hundred miles within reach of Massilia had civilised cultures, enhanced by Greek influence for centuries before the formation of the Roman *provincia*: sacred groves undoubtedly existed but to known gods with conventional cults.³¹ What could not have existed is the ominous *lucus horridus* depicted by Lucan in 3.399–425 with its heritage of human bloodshed. Despite the pointed allusion to Diana of Aricia in 3.86 as Scythian, and Lucan's earlier introduction of *Taranis Scythiae non mitior ara Dianae* in the Gallic catalogue of 1.446, Lucan does not present the bloodied grove of 399–425 as a grove of Diana.³² In Caesar's own report of his preparations for the Massilian campaign there is nothing more specific than

naues longas Arelate numero xii facere instituit. quibus effectis atque armatis diebus xxx a qua die materia caesa est ... his D. Brutum praeficit, C. Trebonium legatum ... relinquit. (*B.C.* 1.36.4–6)³³

The acknowledged literary functions of the Massilian grove is to assimilate Caesar in his readiness to hew down sacred trees to the hubristic Erysichthon of Callimachus and Ovid.³⁴ But beyond this inter-

31 Caesar's portrait of Gallic religion in *B.G.* 6.16–17 dwells on human sacrifice but describes the Gallic gods themselves in syncretistic Roman terms: he normalizes where Lucan selects the most alien and barbaric features of Gallic religion. Green's evidence on the Massilian cult of Artemis/Diana is valuable (219–20), but if anything the provenance of the cult statue on the Roman Aventine from Massilia (Strabo 4.1.4–5) confirms that historically these were respectable civic cults free of primitive human bloodshed.

32 "The groves in Gaul and Massilia are hauntingly alike," says Green 219, but here I cannot go along with Green's arguments. If Lucan insists that the cult gods are unknown to the worshippers (3.417), all the historical evidence she offers cannot justify the claim (n. 50) that Lucan is presenting the grove as one of Diana/Trivia.

33 Though as noted by Phillips (see n. 34 below) Trebonius' action in *B.C.* 2.15.1 *omnibus arboribus longe lateque in finibus Massiliensium excisis et conuectis* comes closer to the present scene.

34 This was established by O. C. Phillips in *CP* 63 (1968) 296–300: the interpretation of the grove episode in the whole Massilian context has been explored further in Jamie Masters, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, Cam-

textual analogy Lucan seems to have intended a more indirect but more comprehensive judgment on the fate of religion in and outside the Roman world. We have seen that no *religio*, no reverence for the gods, survives either in Caesar or in those who defend Rome against him.³⁵ But here as part of a supposedly barbarian cult is a concentration of awe for the supernatural: it is remote from Rome, it belongs to those who are opposing her, and it too will be defeated by Rome's future master.

lucus erat longo numquam uiolatus ab aeuo
 obscurum cingens conexis aera ramis
 et gelidas alte summotis solibus umbras.
 hunc non ruricolae Panes nemorumque potentes
 Silvani nymphaeque tenent, *sed barbara ritu*
sacra deum: structae diris altaribus arae
 omnisque humanis lustrata cruoribus arbor ...

(3.399–406)

non ulli frondem praebentibus aurae
arboribus suus horror inest. tum plurima nigris
 fontibus unda cadit, simulacraque maesta deorum
 arte carent caesisque extant informia truncis.
 ipse situs putrique facit iam robore pallor
 attonitos: *non uolgatis sacrata figuris*
numina sic metuunt: tantum terroribus addit
quos timeant non nosse deos ...

(3.410–17)

non illam cultu populi propiore frequentant
sed cessere deis.

(3.422–23)

Here are *numina* indeed to inspire *religio*, but awe is compounded by revulsion: both the description of the “barbaric” grove and the reaction of neighbouring peoples are created out of negations,³⁶ as a systematic in-

bridge 1992, 20–42. Note esp. Masters 25, “Lucan’s version itself is something of a desecration, if not specifically of Ceres’ grove, then certainly of Ovidian groves in general: instead of a *locus amoenus* we are given a *locus foedus* so to speak.”

35 Even Metellus is associated only with affirmations of political values, *iura, libertas* (113–14) and his own tribunician sacrosanctity, to which he subordinates the gods: *certe uiolata potestas / inuenit ista deos* (3.125–6).

36 As John Bramble notes in his masterly chapter on Lucan in *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Vol. 2, Cambridge 1982, “Lucan is at his best when he has

version of the sacred Italian groves in Augustan poetry and out of the reverent piety associated with them.³⁷ We might compare the way in which ancient recommendations for *psogos*, invective, constructed it as the mirror image of encomium: so the *locus horridus* is generally constructed by inverting each feature of the conventional *locus amoenus*. In Lucan's *lucus horridus* the explicit negations (*non ruricolae Panes ... / non ulli ... aurae... / non ... sic metuunt* etc.) are more pointed than mere contrasting and opposing epithets could ever be. The fearful ignorance and avoidance of the people contrive to make the Massilian grove a very different kind of supernatural place from Virgil's or Ovid's groves, and reinforce the bravado of Caesar's defiance. Into this dread and eerie place Caesar comes to obtain this raw material for war—not bullion but timber. He violates, and triumphs over, the supernatural.³⁸

Taken together, then, the two scenes are designed as a progression, as Caesar violates sites that should be objects of reverence, breaking open the temple doors and felling the sacred wood to activate first the bullion then the raw timber to prosecute his war. This is the narrative significance connecting the episodes, but they also carry the critic beyond Lucan's immediate intention to consider what has happened to *religio* and to the sense of *numen* since Virgil's evocation of Rome's early faith. Here—and we could cite other supernatural places from Lucan's epic like Erichtho's bivouac at the Thessalian entrance to Hades—

some pattern to follow, adapting, reversing or negating it" (543). Bramble's detailed study of what he calls "the negation antithesis" explicitly contrasts the Massilian grove with Virgil's grove at Caere *Aen.* 8.597–603, adding "Lucan's variation strips Nature of her functions, suggesting an uncanny automatism" (544–5).

- 37 The possible pre-existence of a tradition of *topoi* for the *lucus horridus* itself suggested in n. 27 above need not exclude the continued modelling of such descriptions as antitheses of positive models.
- 38 No-one doubts that the sacred oak attacked by Caesar is in some sense Pompey, and that Caesar is depicted as successful in his sacrilege: it is part of Lucan's world that such sacrilege goes unpunished (I miss a reference in Green to the late Judith Rosner-Siegel's influential paper "The oak and the lightning; Lucan *Bellum Civile* 1.135–57," *Athenaeum* 61 (1983) 164–77). Readers should consult Green 209 and 220–223 for her further claim that Caesar's sacrilegious act and proclamation of his sacrilege (437) is specifically that of the challenger to the *rex nemorensis*: the equation which it requires of chopping down a sacred oak with cutting the golden bough is one reason to stop short of this identification; another is the immediate function of his words; to encourage others to follow him. Both objections may seem too literal to invalidate her careful and impressive argument.

there is power, but it is vicious, and the very unknowability of these unrecognizable *numina* makes them nearer to demons than gods. Seneca's groves, Lucan's Massilian grove, and the future groves of Silius' Libyan Naiads and their guardian serpent, or of Statius' Theban Diana, are marked by a stress on the evil, the unnatural blackness, of the place itself: the same ambiguity as in the *suus horror* of Lucan's windless trees.

The anonymous Olympians too of the *Bellum Civile*, Lucan's *superi*, are more often *immites* or *saeui*, marked by their hostility to Rome or to mankind. It is in keeping with this negative perception of the divine, or, in other terms, with the new "silver" predilection for evoking evil and horror, that Lucan's Rome has lost its capacity for *religio*, while the *religio* of the free world resisting Rome is tainted with a quite unhistorical barbarism.

27. The Angry Poet and the Angry Gods: Problems of Theodicy in Lucan's Epic of Defeat

Victrix causa deis placuit sed uicta ... poetae. Despite a general assumption that Lucan kept the gods out of his epic, I would argue that he simply kept them out of engagement on the battlefield. If we are rightly curious about why he omitted divine causality from his opening enumeration of causes for the civil war, it is not long before his narrative provides portents in plenty to demonstrate divine anger to the Romans and to his readers. And the poet himself repeatedly reproaches the gods, but is far from consistent in his reproaches: at times he accuses them of active hostility to Roman liberty; on other occasions he seems only to blame them for inertia or indifference. Once, but only once, he will go so far as to assert that “they do not exist—or at least not for us” the Romans: *sunt nobis nulla profecto / numina* (7.445–6). But within ten lines he has corrected himself. The gods do exist: they are simply Epicurean gods “who do not care about mankind”: *mortalia nulli / sunt curata deo* (454–5). Indeed Lucan ends the same outburst by holding them responsible for the Pompeian defeat, when he interprets the deified line of Caesars as the good Republicans’ revenge upon the Olympians—retaliation for purposive divine action.

And purposive divine action is the norm before and after the poet’s self-generated crisis in the thick of battle. But Lucan’s epic comes to us with a lot of baggage: the historiographical inheritance of Livy’s teleology of empire, and its counterpart, the epic inheritance of Virgil’s providential *fata*. Superficially in Virgil the best man/nation wins and the divine superstructure is merely retarded by the misguided Juno’s obstruction, providing the necessary narrative deferral. Lucan’s uncle Seneca believed in a providential Stoic deity, and might have been expected to find a level of interpretation of the Caesarian civil war which directed a higher kind of victory toward the just and proper side. And so he does, whenever he is focused on the moral victory of Cato, and his choice of death as liberty from Caesar. But Seneca’s far fewer allusions to the

events of the civil war at a communal, political, level¹ accept the triumph of might over right without attempting to explore the theological implications: compare the early *De ira* 2.2.3–4: *quis non contra Mari arma, contra Sullae proscriptionem concitatur? quis non Theodoto et Achillae et ipso puero non puerile auso facinus infestus est?* (“Who is not roused against the weapons of Marius, against Sulla’s proscriptions? Who is not incensed against Theodotus and Achilles and the boy himself who dared such an un-boyish crime?”) Indeed his sense of human anger against tyrannical injustice is closely linked here to the power of song and imagery to stir men’s indignation: *cantus nos nonnumquam et citata modulatio instigat Martiusque ille tubarum sonus; mouet mentes et atrox pictura et iustissimorum suppliciorum tristis aspectus* (“Singing sometimes stirs us and quickened rhythm and the familiar sound of Mars’ trumpets. Our minds are affected by a shocking picture and by the gloomy sight of punishments even when they are just”). *Cantus* (“singing”) and *modulatio* (“rhythm”) evoke the form, and war and suffering the content, of epic, and Lucan, *ardens et concitatus* (“fiery and passionate,” Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.90) is above all the epic poet of indignation. A major section of this chapter will explore the anger expressed by our poet and his Republican protagonists, Cato and Pompey, against the gods for Caesar’s victory. Against the extravagantly self-contradictory tirade at Pharsalus we can pit a whole range of explicit and implicit reproaches to the gods which mount in volume up to and around the death of their victim, Pompey.

And the victorious Caesar? On the one occasion when the gods are challenged by Caesar himself to vent their anger upon him, nothing happens. If success is confirmation of divine support, he has it until the last phase of the unfinished poem at Alexandria² and as history confirmed, for four years beyond.

I would like to start from some general implications of using divine retribution in historical narrative before treating in more detail Lucan’s chief Augustan predecessors: Livy, his historiographical source, and Vir-

1 For some Senecan discussions of the significance of Cato and his exemplary suicide cf. *Prov.* 2.9–12; 3.14; *Constant.* 1.3; 2.2–3; *Tranq.* 9.16; *Ep.* 14.2–13; 95.69–71; 98.8; 104.29–33. On the cause of Pompey and its survivors in Africa see *Ep.* 24.9; 71.8–10, also comment on individual Republicans at *Ben.* 1.10.2; 2.20; 3.24; 5.17.2; 5.24.

2 Here I am dissenting from the eloquent but to me unconvincing readings of Haffter 1957, 118–26; Masters 1992, 244–59; and John Henderson 1987, modified in Henderson 1998, 171–6.

gil, his epic antimodel. For Livy we now have the useful monograph of David Levene, *Religion in Livy*, to which I believe I can add some nuances relevant to my particular focus. For Virgil I will naturally be building on Feeney's splendid *Gods in Epic*, but also reconsidering ideas from Gordon Williams' unjustly neglected *Technique and Ideas in Virgil's Aeneid*.³

After this opening section and a brief summary of explicit references to divine anger in Lucan, I want to consider how Lucan short-circuits the issue of justification through Roman guilt, and carries through the notion of divine support for Caesar even when it seems to be challenged by circumstance. In the third section I focus on the poet's own anger against divine jurisdiction for destroying liberty and its defenders: as a corollary we will have to judge whether the increasing prominence of a Caesarophilic *Fortuna* is the poet's device to disengage the personal and collective gods above (*superi*)—and if so, how far he has succeeded. An epilogue returns to Caesar and advances some arguments for seeing him as the chosen instrument of divine punishment in Lucan's poem.

Ira Deorum and Its Role in Historiography and Epic Before Lucan

Discussion of divine anger is inevitably tied to the larger subject of divine justice. It will be useful, I think, to go back to the basic presuppositions behind human assumption of divine anger. In Homeric epic the gods are not judged: we can read their acts as just punishment or as self-interested, even arrogant, retaliation. Often mythology shows the gods as all-powerful, but behaving at best like kings, at worst like angry tyrants. Mortals are punished or metamorphosed by individual gods for competing or even comparing themselves to a god; they are treated like servants, disobedient or disloyal to their masters. The anger of a god, Apollo, opens the *Iliad* although its proclaimed and continuing theme is the anger of a human, Achilles. The anger of a god instigates tragic actions like the *Hippolytus* and *Trojan Women* of Euripides. In the *Iliad* the sins of the leaders are visited on the people: *quicquid delirant reges plectuntur Achiui* ("whatever folly the kings commit, the Achaeans

3 G. Williams 1983; Feeney 1991; Levene 1995.

pay for it").⁴ In Euripides *anaitioi*, women and "innocent" non-combatants, suffer in divine punishment of a prince or nation.

It seems that in classical Greek thought an increasing expectation of divine morality and justice cannot completely expel the older amoral reading of divine control. Anger is refined into the concept of retribution or righteous anger, yet not just the sceptic Euripides but even Herodotus, whose narrative generally represents victory and defeat as morally deserved divine dispensations, offers occasions when speakers read the gods collectively as jealous and destructive.⁵

But just as men in a community seek an explanation of the disease or bereavement of individuals, so the historian looks to divine action for an explanation of natural disasters like the plague and flood, or the military defeats of societies.⁶ If the gods are both all-powerful and just, then a defeated or ruined nation must have offended; or if no recent offence can be identified, the offence must have been incurred either by its individual leader or by a past generation.⁷ Again the recording historian or poet will show a different attitude to the misfortunes of the enemy—for which it is easy to blame breaches of oath or treaty or other impious behaviour—and to those of his own society. If a nation suffers a setback, it is relatively easy, as Parker notes, for that society to blame disaster on a ritual error, since it can then be cancelled out by ritual expiation.⁸ Or there is the alternative, for both the society and its historians, of producing a scientific rather than a religious explanation, and blaming defeat on the incompetence of a commander. Given a relatively sophisticated society like classical Athens or Rome, its writers of history will prefer these scientific or tactical explanations for the defeats to their own people, and reserve for theodicy events set in the mythical past, or episodes that cannot be otherwise explained. But material and moral explanations can also be combined: this is how modern writers account for ecological disaster such as the dreadful flood of 1999 as caused by,

4 Hor. *Epistles* 1.2; Parker 1996, ch. 8, 241–2 notes that the gods were expected to respond to the offences of kings by causing suffering to their whole people.

5 I am thinking of Solon's words in 1.32, where he warns Croesus of impending ruin by representing the gods (*to theion*) as both jealous and troublemaking.

6 Here I am following the general argument of Parker 1996, ch. 8 and 9. But Parker (237–8) uses the contrast with Judaism and Old Testament narrative to bring out the relative willingness of the Greeks to see, for example, disease as sent in divine caprice.

7 See Parker 1996, 201–2.

8 Parker 1996, 271–8.

for example, global warming, itself the product of the developed nations' misuse of the atmosphere.

Divine anger was so established by the time of Rome's first poets that it is a regular trope in Plautus and Terence. Besides actual *poena/-ae* ("punishments") there is no obvious equivalent of retribution,⁹ but ideas of justice or propriety are invoked at, for example, *Rudens* 1146, *tibi hercle deos iratos esse oportet* ("the gods ought to be angry with you"). Most often divine anger is inferred from past misfortune, but it may instead be grounded in a moral judgement that some action ought to incur a future penalty.¹⁰ The everyday invocation of angry gods in comedy will have its equivalent in the rhetoric of more formal genres.

So consider now the task of the Hellenistic or Roman historian: not just as a composer of tragic histories in which human offences are shown to produce their downfall, but as a writer of the continuous history of his own nation from its humble origins. The work of a universal historian like Livy must follow his own society from a legendary age into a barely known early Republic before he reaches the periods when international warfare with Pyrrhus or Hannibal was documented by more or less contemporary Greeks. How will he handle religious causality? When will he invoke the anger of the gods, and when will he interpret events only on a political and military level? And is there a way he can have his scientific causation and still exploit the theme of divine anger and punishment? This topic has been handled most recently by David Levene, working from the previous assessments of Walsh¹¹ and Liebeschuetz.¹²

9 *Indignatio*, righteous anger, which might have served the purpose, never conveys actual retribution, and is primarily the name of a rhetorical figure.

10 Misfortune: (supposedly congenital) Plaut. *Mil.* 314, *quis magis dis inimicis natus quam te atque iratis*; Mostell. 564; cf. Augustus on the deformity of Claudius: Sen. *Apocol.* 11.3, *corpus eius dis iratis natum*; in reaction to a single calamity: Plaut. *Poen.* 452, 465, 645; Ter. *Phorm.* 74; judgemental statements: Plaut. *Curc.* 557 (the gods have been propitiated and so ought not to be angry with the speaker); and a nice combination of inference at Ter. *An.* 664, *mi deos [satis scio] iratos fuisse qui auscultauerim*, followed by the eavesdropper's curse, 666, *at tibi dignum factis exitium duint*. In *Amphitryo*, where gods are also scheming intriguers, their comments and curses at 392, 934 and 1022, *tibi Iuppiter dique omnes irati certo sint*, play ironically on the normal usage.

11 Walsh 1961, ch. 3, esp. 57 n. 3 and 68–9.

12 Liebeschuetz 1967 and 1979.

Levene constructs his study around four questions, of which the most important is: “what phenomena [can] be taken as indicative of divine intervention into human affairs and what [does] such intervention indicate?”¹³ After reviewing the implications of the prodigies, auspices, and omens that Romans read as divine warnings or expressions of anger, he turns to the considerable variation in Livy’s presentation of prodigy lists from one decade to another. His book is in fact constructed around finding explanations, often in terms of literary choice, for the omission or displacement of prodigy lists, and other forms of supernatural intervention.

But at the same time, Levene shows by close examination of the relevant texts how Livy avoids committing himself either to faith or to scepticism about the divine control of history, largely framing allusions to religion within citation of tradition or divergent reportage. In reviewing only the more limited passages in which Livy, and indeed Virgil and Lucan, allude to divine anger, I will rely more on Levene’s second mode of analysis than the first, which seems to me more subjective. We will see that many of Livy’s allusions to manifestations of divine anger are distanced by attributing them either to tradition or to specific sources, while others occur in speeches, and even in the speeches of suspect characters.

Straight theological explanation for “acts of god,” natural disasters, and national defeat, are most common in Livy’s first decade; of the twenty-two allusions to divine anger in the first pentad about two-thirds report events as manifestations of divine anger; four are against individuals—the *prava religio* (“faulty religious observance”) of Tullus Hostilius which led to his death by thunderbolt (1.31.8), the murderous impiety and pollution of the Penates by Tullia (1.48.7), the refusal of Latinus to obey a recurrent dream ordering him to warn the senate of a violation of the Ludi Magni (2.36.6), and the death of the blasphemer Annius.¹⁴ But Levene notes that in 9.29.11 both the blinding of Appius Claudius and the extinction of the Potitii are merely ascribed “by tradition” (*traditur*)

13 Modified from Levene 1995, 1.

14 This instance (8.6.4) nicely illustrates the disclaiming of responsibility by referring to different sources; some *auctores* had a crash from heaven and others had Annius actually killed “whether the tales are true or invented as a fit representation of divine anger,” *et uera esse et apte ad repraesentandum iram deorum ficta*.

to the wanton changing of ritual. Livy does not dispute this, but neither does he take responsibility for it.¹⁵

At the level of national misfortune, a plague is read as divine anger (3.6.5) and met with supplications to appease the gods in 3.7.8, as happens again after another plague in 7.2.4 and 3.3. In the latter case theatrical games are devised as “appeasements of divine anger” (*caelestis irae placamina*) but a Tiber flood shows “the gods [have] rejected the acts of appeasement” (*dis aspernantibus placamina irae*). In contrast to his straight narrative of divine retribution against Veii in book 5,¹⁶ Livy reports without endorsement a senatorial speech attributing a plague at Rome to the recent election of plebeian consular tribunes 5.14.4). On the other hand, references to divine anger at 13.6.11 and 13.9.10, as in 10.28.17, occur in the serious context of the ritual “self-sacrifice” of *deuotio*.¹⁷

In general Livy offers alongside genuine invocation of “divine anger” (*deorum irae*) as number of rhetorical uses: in an oath at 2.45.14, and as a figure or trope in speeches at 3.9.7; 5.11.16; 9.1.3 and 11; and 9.11.10. The last cases are surely to be discounted, since they come from Pontius the Samnite.¹⁸

Livy is understandably more restrained in alluding to divine anger during the prolonged phase of defeat and loss in the Hannibalic war narrative. While Trasimene and Cannae and their aftermath do indeed produce a number of references to religious offences by the guilty

15 9.29.19, *traditur inde, dictu mirabile, et quod dimouendis statu suo sacris religionem facere posset ... omnes intra annum cum stirpe extinctos*.

16 Compare the Veientine error in electing a king (5.1), the omens anticipating divine desertion in 5.15–16, and the references to *fata* framing the narrative of the city’s capture in 5.19.1 and 22.8.

17 Cf. 8.6.11, *placuit auerruncandae deum irae uictimas caedi*; 8.9.10, *sicut caelo missus piaculum deorum irae qui pestem ab suis auersam in hostes ferret*; 10.28.17 reports the younger Decius’ repetition of his father’s formula of *deuotio* to divert onto the enemy *caelestium inferorumque iras*. Besides the instance of divine retribution for Annii’s sacrilege (8.6.4 above), 8.33.7 refers to public prayers *quae saepe deorum iras placant*.

18 Pontius is at pains to argue that the gods have forgiven past Samnite offences and are now acting with the Samnites against the Romans: cf. 9.1.3, *expiatum est quicquid ex foedere rupto irarum in nos caelestium fuit*, and 11.10, *nec moror quo minus in civitatem † oblectam † sponsione commissa iratis omnibus dis, quorum eluditur numen, redeant*.

commanders,¹⁹ and to the attitudes of the gods, there is no literal report of divine anger. However, four successive speeches allude to the attitudes of the gods²⁰ before Fabius Pictor is sent to Delphi to find out “what kind of offerings can appease them” (*quibus precibus supplicisque deos possent placare* 22.57.5). But the few specific references to divine anger in these books all occur in speeches: a blasphemous speech by the disloyal Hirpini (23.42.4), an unconvincing speech by the deserters from Cannae (25.6.6), an honest enough speech by the Locrian envoys about the anger of Proserpina against Pleminius (29.18.10), and a brief witticism by Fabius Cunctator rejecting as plunder the gigantic Tarentine statues of their war gods (27.16.8): “Let them keep their angry gods!” And one might add from the fifth decade Perseus’ dishonest exploitation of the concept when he accuses his brother of plotting the death of his father, Philip.²¹ The only other event attributed to divine anger is the fate of Fulvius Flaccus (42.28.12), sent mad by Juno Lacinia after he plundered her roof-tiles to adorn his own Roman temple, where his offence has been extensively denounced by “all without exception” (*uniuersi*) in the Roman senate. And it should be noted that such generally attributed speeches seem to be a favourite vehicle in Livy for allusions to the right relations between men and gods.

There is one occasion in our extant books when Livy seems to treat civil war as a manifestation of divine anger. He introduces the tale of the maid of Ardea in book 4 with a comment comparing the internal “strife of factions” with “famine and plague and other such things as men attribute to divine anger as being the worst of public misfortunes” (4.9.3).²² This reaction to civil conflict may serve as an indication of how Livy presented civil strife in the introduction to the *causae ciuiliū*

19 Note in particular Fabius’ speech after Trasimene, 22.9.7: *quaeque piacula irae deum essent deos ipsos consulendos esse*.

20 22.49.7; 51.4; 53.11; 55.5. Note that in 54.8 Livy withdraws from his own narrative, which suggests that he may have offered a precedent for Lucan’s famous refusal to narrate at 7.552–6. Here is Livy’s counterpart: *itaque succumbam oneri neque adgrediar narrare quae edisserendo minora uero faciam*.

21 40.10.2: but cf. Livy’s own comment at 40.5.1.

22 *Frui namque pace optimo consilio cum populo Romano seruata per intestina arma non licuit, quorum causa atque initium traditur ex certamine factionis ortum, quae fuerunt eruntque pluribus populis exitio quam bella externa, quam fames morbiue, quaeque alia in deum iras uelut ultima publicorum malorum uertunt*. Note that the antecedent of *quae* is probably the explicit plural *arma* rather than a plural extrapolated from *factione*, but both are causally linked.

armorum et initia (“causes and beginnings of civil conflict”) of the Caesarian civil war in the lost book 109.

If we turn to Livy’s contemporary Virgil, with epic’s greater license for representations of divine action and motivation, the first sentence introduces Juno’s anger as cause of Aeneas’ sufferings: *saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram* (“because of savage Juno’s unforgiving anger,” 1.4). Juno’s anger will be responsible for more than the opening storm of the *Aeneid*, but her interventions, familiar material, are no index of the larger divine justice that prevails in the outcome. Instead I will look at Jupiter, who, as Feeney says, refrains from anger in Virgil’s epic. So he does, but anger is part of his nature and function as ruler of gods and men.

Thus in the account of Hades we read how Jupiter wielded his thunderbolt to punish the blaspheming Salmoneus (6.585–94) and in his account of the forging of Jupiter’s weapon of retribution Virgil includes both fear and anger, *fulgures terrificos sonitumque metumque ... flammisque sequacibus iras* (“terrifying flashes and sound and fear and rage with pursuing flames,” 8.431–2). Human fear of divine anger, like the subjects’ fear of the angry tyrant, is the strongest demonstration of power, which is why *ira* forms the climax of Virgil’s list here and elsewhere.

Three cities meet their doom in the *Aeneid*, if we include the doom of Carthage imaged at the end of book 4 (669–71).²³ In Virgil’s account of the fall of Troy divine anger dominates as the overwhelming causality. The Romans saw the justification of Troy’s doom in Laomedon’s original perjury and deception of the gods, but since the narrator of Troy’s fall is the Trojan Aeneas, his reaction to the divine verdict is limited to his personal experience, and coloured by his sense of injustice. From the moment when Panthus reports the departure of the gods from their altars (2.351–2), Aeneas’ account is full of reproach: against Minerva who fails to save her priestess from rape: *heu nihil inuitis fas quemquam credere diuis!* (“Alas, in nothing may one trust the gods if they are unwilling,” 402), lamenting the death of the just man Ripheus (*dis aliter uisum*, “the gods decided otherwise,” 428), and quoting the climatic conclusion of Venus’ apocalypse: *dium inclementia, diuum / has euertit opes, sternitque a culmine Troiam* (“it is the gods, the relentless gods, that overturn these riches and topple Troy from her height,”

23 From the beginning of the *Aeneid* (1.20, *Tyrias olim quae uerteret arces*) Virgil has foreshadowed the fall of Carthage to Rome in the second century BCE. Within book 4 equally Dido’s downfall is foreshadowed by sinister omens and prodigies (4.452–65).

602–3). *Inclementia* (“relentlessness”) is a term of blame, and Aeneas’ own report adds to this a note of destructive evil: the gods appear as *dirae facies, inimicaque Troiae / numina magna deum* (“terrible shapes, the mighty powers of the gods, hostile to Troy,” 622–3). Even the epithet *dirae* (“terrible”) evokes the dreadfulness of the avenging Furies who will be Jupiter’s last and nastiest servants in bringing the epic to a close.²⁴ Neither in book 2 nor later will Virgil repeat his earlier acknowledgement of *Laomedontiae periuria Troiae*, “the broken oath of King Laomedon” that incurred this divine action.²⁵ In contrast, Aeneas’ own family receives an act of divine forgiveness. Anchises argues that he is doomed, because Jupiter struck him down as an offender when he betrayed Venus’ secret: *iampridem inuisus diuis et inutilis annos / demoror, ex quo me diuum pater atque hominum rex / fulminis adflauit uentis* (“Long hated by the gods and useless I have lingered ever since the father of the gods and king of men breathed on me with the winds of his thunderbolt,” 2.647–9). But now, in response to his prayer, Jupiter sends his thunder again—as a favourable omen on the left, and when Virgil returns to Anchises he has become *cura deum* (“the gods’ concern,” 3.476).

Aeneas’ narrative is filled with anger—of gods, and Greeks, of the dying Priam and Aeneas himself, to a degree we will not meet again until Juno’s anger in book 7 exploits the Fury (*Dira*) Allecto to enrage individuals and communities. But Virgil is too much of an artist to limit himself to an unambiguous code of *irae*. In book 7 when Juno launches into her great speech of *indignatio* (“indignation”), her grievance is that she has not been allowed to sate her anger as Jupiter indulged Diana’s angry destruction of Calydon (*concessit in iras / ipse deum genitor*, 305). But after Allecto spreads her infection it is human anger that takes over and dominates the books.²⁶

24 Cf. 12.845, *geminæ pestes cognomine Dirae*, anticipated by the description of Cælaeno in 3.211–15, *insulae Ionio in magno quas dira Cælaeno / Harpyiaequæ colunt aliae ... / tristius haud illis monstrum, nec saeuior ulla / pestis et ira deum*.

25 This offence is Virgil’s own explanation for Roman suffering in the civil war at *Georgics* 1.502; cf. Hor. *Odes* 3.3.27. Priam’s grandfather Laomedon broke his promise to reward the gods Apollo and Neptune for constructing the walls of Troy.

26 While most readers have resisted the claim of G. Williams 1983 that Virgil’s gods are tropes for the motivation of human players, there is a much stronger case for reading Allecto in this way; see G. Williams 1983, 24: by this stage the poet has enough confidence in the reader’s ability to understand Allecto’s actions as a trope to indulge in a figural expansion that brings the action of the

It is as though divine anger subsides when it is absorbed by human combatants. In the early conflict of book 10 Virgil offers the surprising contrast of pity for the futility of human anger shown not only by Juno for Turnus but by Hercules, Jupiter,²⁷ and all the gods: *di Iouis in tectis iram miserantur inanem / amborum* ("the gods in Jupiter's house pity the useless anger of both," 10.758–9). After the Latin defeat the multiple casualties of this battle are read by Latinus, in the first explicit evocation of *ira deum*, as "divine anger" at his people's breach of the treaty with Aeneas: here indeed we might talk in Williams' terms of a trope, since divine anger appears as a gloss or an inference from the mention of "graves" (11.232–3):²⁸

fatalem Aenean manifesto numine ferri
admonet ira deum tumulique ante ora recentes.

That Aeneas is summoned by fate, with clear divine intent, is the warning given by the anger of the gods and the fresh graves before his eyes.

Turnus duly answers in Latinus' terms, although he tries to reject this reading of the defeat: he promises single combat as a sort of *deuotio*, whether his death is needed to dispel divine anger or, as he would prefer, he will fight to win glory through valour.²⁹ Divine anger and its symbolism return with the implied rejection by Pallas Athene of the Latin women's supplication (11.477–81) and the relentless progress in book 12 from the violated truce to the sack of Latinus' city—the third city to fall in the epic narrative—and death of Turnus. Feeney has pointed out how Virgil's authorial protests highlight the impropriety of anger in his gods and Jupiter's decision for war at the beginning and end of his epic: *tantaene animis caelestibus irae?* ("Can divine breasts rage so fiercely?" 1.11) and: *tantone placuit concurrere motu, / Iuppiter, aeterna gentes in pace futuras?* ("Was it your wish, Jupiter, that peoples that

Fury to the very border of allegory. For essentially this whole series of scenes is a figure, related to personification and allegory, designed to represent the way in which at times certain emotions seem almost to achieve an independent existence so that the same pattern of behaviour springs up spontaneously in various places."

27 Juno for Turnus 10.611–20; Hercules for Pallas and Jupiter's past grief for Sarpedon, 10.464–72.

28 This is confirmed by the reported speech of Diomedes, 11.305; *bellum ... cum gente deorum / inuictisque uiris gerimus*.

29 11.443–4, *nec Drances potius, siue haec est ira deorum / morte luat, siue uirtus et gloria, tollat*.

would live in everlasting peace should clash in such a huge upheaval?" 12.503–4).

This protest against divinely induced civil war³⁰ is perhaps the only explicit proof that the poet, or at least one aspect of his value system, shares the Stoic belief that anger was alien to the divine nature, in fact unworthy of the gods.³¹ Yet the worst divine malice comes after Virgil's protest, and seems to answer his indignant question affirmatively, first with Jupiter's pleased recognition of his own angry nature in Juno (12.830–1):

es germana Iouis Saturnique altera proles
irarum tantos uoluis sub pectore fluctus.

You are the genuine sister of Jupiter, Saturn's other child, so huge are the waves of rage that surge beneath your breast.

Anger, then, is Jupiter's own characteristic, and Ovid is not the only one to see anger as *Ioue digna* ("right for Jupiter").³² Almost immediately after this admission comes the savage symbolism of the Dira (8.45, 865), sent by Jupiter to annihilate Turnus. In narrative terms, Turnus' collapse springs directly from his long-delayed recognition that the gods are against him. What paralyses him with fear is not his adversary Aeneas, but divine anger: *di me terrent et Iuppiter hostis* ("What terrifies me is the gods and Jupiter's hostility," 895).

Much of this is only too familiar, but I have recalled it in order to contrast Virgil's representation of both divine and human anger with what Lucan will make of them. In Virgil there is certainly pity for those punished by the gods and protests from both speakers like Aeneas and the poet himself against divine actions. Human anger is shown in contrast as pitiable, largely harmful to the protagonists and ultimately futile. Only Aeneas as the man of destiny is allowed to succumb to anger without suffering for it; this may not be ethical justice but it is fated.

30 "Civil war," because in the same phrase Virgil stresses the destined unity of Latins and Trojans.

31 This is argued or even assumed not only by the Epicureans (cf. Lucretius 2.646–51; Cic. *Pis.* 59; *De nat. deor.* 1.45; 3.91) but by the Stoics and by Cicero himself in *De nat. deor.* 1.45; 2.70, 167; 3.90–1 and *De officiis* 3.104, as it will be again by Seneca, for example *De ira* 2.27.

32 See *Met.* 1.166 with the comment of Feeney 1991, 199.

From Virgil to Lucan: The Gods Off-Stage

Before considering the helpful treatment by Feeney (1991) of this aspect of the divine in Lucan, let me return for a moment to the more provocative comment of G. Williams (1983): "Lucan is ... useful in showing one advantage the poet won from using a divine machinery. Lucan dispensed with gods in his epic: one result of this is a constant series of authorial invasions on [*sic*] the text to provide explanation, or rather, to ensure that the reader will view the particular events in the same way as the poet does."³³ He himself goes on to point out that Lucan will have found it advantageous "to enter his own text in person." I would go further. Lucan had always wanted to enter his own text, and when he does he often implicates the gods in his comments. He did not "dispense with" the gods, but constantly returns to their supposed responsibility for the vicissitudes of the narrative.

Feeney approaches the gods in Lucan through a preliminary discussion of historiography: he argues that characterful narration of divine actions is the irreducible line of demarcation between epic and history: on this he cites the verdict of Kroll, "epic achieves its characteristic effect through stunning and extraordinary displays of power to which the gods above all contribute."³⁴ After all, as Feeney reminds us, Caesar is confronted by a reproachful fatherland (*Patria*) even before he takes the first hostile step of crossing the Rubicon: in reply, he affirms that he is following Fortune,³⁵ and soon after he guarantees his men divine support (*nec numina derunt*, 1.349). But it is true, and perhaps surprising, that Lucan has omitted the gods from his opening analysis of the human motives and causes for the war, shifting the divine causes to the end of book 1 and beginning of book 2.³⁶ This separation detaches from the horrors of civil war the offences of the leaders and people of Rome which Lucan could have chosen to present explicitly as incurring divine punishment: there is, for example, no hint of the impiety of the preceding generation of civil wars. Why do the reminiscences of the aged sur-

33 G. Williams 1983, 17.

34 Feeney 1991, 261, citing Kroll "Das Historische Epos," in *Sokrates* N.F. 4 (1916) 1–14 (not accessible to me).

35 The apostrophe *te*, *Fortuna*, *sequor* (1.206) is more than a figure here; it sets up a rival deity: as *Patria* waves him back, *Fortuna* supposedly calls Caesar forward.

36 Note, however, *inuida fatorum series* in 1.71 and the framing allusions to the amoral *Fortuna* (1.84 and 160).

vivor from the civil wars of Marius and Sulla include no declaration of Roman responsibility for the impious atrocities described?

No doubt these omissions are why Feeney (272) suggest that the opening statement of book 2, *iamque irae patuere deum* ("And now the gods' anger was patent") is not enough, because "curiously, there is no explanation or description of the divine anger." And yet Lucan has set an expansive description of prodigies and Roman response to them in the last 185 lines of book 1, prodigies introduced in terms of divine dispensation: *o facilis dare summa deos eademque tueri / difficiles!* ("O gods, so ready to bestow supremacy, so reluctant to preserve it!" 1.510–11).³⁷ Indeed this exclamation bears out two further points in Feeney's analysis: that Lucan seems to believe in the gods, continually addressing them and affecting to attribute to them motives and intention but that as poet he equally consistently has not access to "the operation of the divine" and "is radically uncertain of everything to do with their motives and meanings."³⁸

In a useful survey of how varying Roman authors construed divine responsibility for the civil wars, Paul Jal³⁹ distinguished between texts which blame men for causing war through their impiety against the gods, and those which instead reproach the gods themselves for their passivity in the face of civil war. But it is not so simple or uniform: in discussing Lucan alone Jal detected and isolated three or four different attitudes to the gods: that of Cato (normally a spokesman for the poet's belief) who claims his own reluctant participation will be a charge to level against the gods (2.288), and progressively more angry reactions in the poet's own voice. While Lucan at times depicts the gods as indifferent spectators at a gladiatorial show (*parque suum uidere dei*, "the gods saw their paired opponents," 6.3), his assumption of divine injustice becomes more frequent as he approaches the defeat of the Republic and its leader. Jal also notes accusations by the poet of divine jealousy and trick-

37 These prodigies were reserved by Virgil in *Georgics* 1.466 onwards for celestial grief at the death of Caesar. Did they occur at the moment of Caesar's invasion in Livy's narrative? We cannot infer anything from their omission from the *Periocha* of Book 109. They were probably in Livy, since they occur in Appian *B.C.* 2.36; however, they are not found in Dio or Plutarch's *Lives* of Caesar and Pompey.

38 Feeney 1991, 274 and (quoted) 278.

39 Jal 1962, 170–200.

ery.⁴⁰ It is worth pausing to examine two of Jal's passages more closely. In 4.243–5 Lucan is protesting at the resumption of hostilities in Spain after the brief *concordia* of fraternization between the armies:

itur in omne nefas, et quae Fortuna deorum
inuidia caeca bellorum in nocte tulisset
fecit monstra fides.

I was happy to read that Susanna Braund (1992) and I read this in the same way: "They proceed to every guilt, and their loyalty commits horrors which if Fortune had inflicted them in battle's blind night would have been to the gods' discredit." This is surely right, rather than Jane Joyce's "to spite the gods," and is supported by other references to *inuidia*.⁴¹ At 4.807–9 the poet is more explicit: Rome would have been blessed and had happy citizens "if the gods above had cared as much for our liberty as for revenge": *si libertatis superis tam cura placeret / quam uindicta placet*; only Tacitus would take this further in the opening of his *Histories*: *non esse dis curam securitatem nostram, esse ultionem* ("the gods are concerned not for our safety but for our punishment," 1.3). Yet neither in Lucan nor Tacitus are we told what Roman deeds the civil wars are sent to punish: are we to assume the vicious circle that these civil wars were merely punishment for earlier, less world-wide, civil wars?

There is no doubt that the anger of the gods which opens Lucan's second book is designed to echo Virgil's account of the fall of Troy in the fall of the free Roman Republic. This is why despite four or five allusions to divine anger in book 1⁴² Lucan holds back his statement of revelation until book 2, "And now the gods' anger was patent." This is his equivalent of Venus' apocalypse, and is followed by explicit assumption of divine volition; forty lines later, when Rome's fighting men beg the gods *date gentibus iras* (47), we should seriously consider translating this not just as "instil anger in the barbarians" but "give *your* anger to the barbarians." Let them attack Rome so that our fighting may be proper war, not civil war. Divine anger is reiterated at 2.85 in the strange phrase that describes the exiled Marius as *superum protectus*

40 This is implied by his report of Pompey's response to the pressure of Cicero 7.86, *ingemuit rector*.

41 2.35, *nullis defuit aris / inuidiam factura parens*.

42 1.510, *o faciles dare summa deos eademque tueri / difficiles*; 524, *superi ... minaces*; 617, *atque iram superum raptis quae siuit in extis*; 649, *quod cladis genus, o superi, qua peste paratis / saeuitiam?*

ab ira: he is not “protected from divine anger” but “protected by divine anger”—against Rome, so that he can begin its destruction.⁴³

After establishing divine hostility to Rome in books 1–2 Lucan returns to the gods only to display their indifference to sacrilege. Caesar’s anger which opened the epic⁴⁴ returns when he re-enters the narrative at 2.493⁴⁵ and dominates the action at Rome,⁴⁶ where he plunders the temple of Saturn scot-free, and at Massilia. Here, when his men hesitate to fell the trees of a grove sacred to unknown Gallic gods, Caesar like a modern Erysichthon seizes his axe and attacks a tree: *iam ne quis uestrum dubitet subuertere siluam / credite me fecisse nefas* (“Now none of you need hesitate to cut down the wood: believe that the guilt is mine!” 3.436–7).⁴⁷ When his men obey, the poet adds it is not because they no longer fear the supernatural powers, but they fear Caesar’s anger more (*expensa superiorum et Caesaris ira* 3.439). Caesar’s anger is more immediate. The Massilian youth are glad, hopeful that their gods will punish such impiety: *quis enim laesos impune putaret / esse deos?* (“Who would imagine that the gods are injured without taking revenge?” 3.447–8). But Caesar’s success shows the limitations of the gods. Like Fortune they “leave the wicked unharmed and can only be angry with the unfortunate”: *seruat multos fortuna nocentes, / et tantum miseris irasci numina possunt* (3.448–9).

Caesar’s enjoyment of divine favour is confirmed more indirectly by Lucan’s presentation of the mutiny of book 5: the ringleaders boast that “for all the favour of the gods, Caesar will not be able to fight his war without his soldiers” (*licet omne deorum / obsequium speres, irato milite, Caesar, / pax erit* 5.294–5). They believe their own fighting power outweighs the gods’ support for Caesar: but he in turn quells their mutiny by his authority alone and nothing contradicts his own retort that the gods are indifferent to groundlings (5.341–2, 351–2).

43 Compare Lucan’s model, Sinon, in *Aen.* 2.257, *fatisque deum defensu iniquis*.

44 At 1.146, 207, and 292.

45 Cf. 2.493, *calida proclamat* (Bentley, kept by Shackleton Bailey: *prolatus* MSS) *ab ira*.

46 3.111, 133, 136, 142. On 3.111, *tamen exit in iram*, Shackleton Bailey (1982) 93 corrects Housman’s interpretation and proposes *tamen exciet iram*. He argues that the anger must be Caesar’s, and is “soundly historical.” It seems that Caesar was most prone to violent anger when dealing with civilian (i.e. not military) opposition.

47 Commentators have noted that Lucan models his narrative on Erysichthon’s impiety in felling the sacred tree in Callimachus’ *Hymn to Demeter*.

Not speeches but events are the index of divine intent. Thus in book 7 we can reject statements about the gods in the speeches of Pompey and Caesar alike. Both speeches are deception, whether of the audience or also of the speaker himself. Caesar invokes the gods, asserting that they will favour him for his clemency (7.311–15):

di, quorum curas abduxit ab aethere tellus
 Romanusque labor, uincat quicumque necesse
 non putat in uictos saeuum destringere ferrum
 quique suos ciues, quod signa aduersa tulerunt
 non credit fecisse nefas.

Gods—your cares have been distracted from the ether by the earth and throes of Rome—make victorious the man who does not think it necessary to draw the savage sword against the conquered, who does not believe that fellow-citizens committed a crime because they bore opposing standards.

But Caesar's own behaviour after the battle will give the lie to his pretence of earning divine support through clemency. Pompey too must appear confident when addressing his army, but Lucan's audience or readers have learned his reluctance to fight against his tactical judgement, and feel the hollowness of his claim that his own leadership is a guarantee of divine support: *non iratorum populis urbique deorum est / Pompeium seruare ducem* ("to preserve Pompey as leader is not the act of gods who are angered with the people and with Rome," 7.354–5). The hindsight of history betrays him, since every Roman knew he was not saved, and this speech itself ends in a pitiful contemplation of defeat. At this point I would like to move on beyond the passage I first cited, where outrage at Caesar's victory sent Lucan's narrative out of control, because we will learn more from the less familiar narrative presentation (*color*) and authorial comments that follow Pompey's flight to his death and beyond.

The Gods, Fortuna, and Pompey's Death

It is the contradictions of 7.445–9 that lead Ahl to his judgement that "the Olympians have ceased to function and no longer wield any power in human affairs."⁴⁸ He is more accurate when he continues "the gods ... have no dramatic role in the *Pharsalia*." But though the gods are not seen to intervene in the action, Lucan continues throughout the epic to

48 Ahl 1976, ch. 8, here 281.

imply their active hostility as often as their harmful indifference. The passionate self-contradictions of Pharsalus permit no inference about the poet's fundamental beliefs, only that he is re-experiencing in the telling the moment when Roman lovers of Republican *libertas* ("liberty") lost faith in the gods.

So why does Lucan continuously appeal to the gods, or for that matter to the semi-abstract *Fortuna*? It has often been suggested by readers who see 7.445–52 as a turning point that after Pharsalus Lucan turns away from the gods to hold arbitrary *Fortuna*⁴⁹ responsible for the increasingly unwelcome course of events, but there is reason to question this. Despite the poet's general overuse of apostrophe, we can detect a suggestive pattern in his appeals to the supernatural. In book 7, certainly, he will invoke the gods only once again, as he contemplates the spreading of the civil war over the Roman world at 869–70, *o superi, liceat terras odisse nocentes / quid totum premitis, quid totum absoluitis orbem?* ("O gods above, permit us to hate the lands that are guilty. Why do you place the burden upon the entire world and so acquit it?") But this is a final and emphatic position. To determine Lucan's allocation of responsibility between the gods and *Fortuna* we need to examine two patterns: first the general context and role of *Fortuna* through the epic, and secondly the pattern of intensified appeals to, and comments on, both gods and *Fortuna* as Lucan approaches the death of Pompey.

From the beginning of *De bello civili* Lucan uses *Fortuna* in both an unmarked and a marked sense. Shackleton Bailey and other editors before him have tried to distinguish with a lower case unmarked *fortuna*, as in *fortuna loci* ("luck of position") or *fortuna belli* ("fortune of war") or *fortuna prior* ("former favour," 1.134–5); in contrast the *Fortuna* that favours Caesar or victimizes Pompey is capitalized. But anomalies soon challenge this neat division: compare (as printed in Shackleton Bailey's text) 1.109–11, *populique potentis ... / non cepit fortuna duos* ("a mighty people's prosperity ... was not enough for two men"), with 160–1, *opes nimias Fortuna mundo subacto / intulit* ("once the world had been subdued, Fortune introduced excessive wealth"). To avoid ambiguity, I will use only instances in which either (a) *Fortuna* is said authorially by Lucan to harm Pompey or help Caesar or (b) *Fortuna's* behaviour is cited in parallel to that of the gods, as in 3.448–9 discussed above:

49 *Fortuna/Tyche* is particularly associated with short-term reversals, events that do not seem to fit into a teleological pattern or be adequately motivated by prior guilt or failure.

seruat multos Fortuna nocentes / et tantum miseris irasci numina possunt (“often their good fortune guards the guilty and the gods can only be angry with the unlucky”).

To confirm first that Lucan does not see Fortuna as a causality distinct from the gods, let me cite more examples of parallel comments. At 5.57–9 the poet apostrophizes Ptolemy as *non fidae gentis dignissime regno, / Fortunae, Ptolemaee, pudor, crimenque deorum* (“you, Ptolemy, well deserving power over an untrustworthy people, you, the shame of Fortune, a reproach against the gods”). At 7.205–6 Lucan grieves for the leaders: *o summos hominum, quorum Fortuna per orbem / signa dedit, quorum fatis caelum omne uacauit* (“O mightiest of men—your Fortune gave displays throughout the world, the entire sky was intent on your destiny!”). Fortuna and the gods, then, together provide the portents for the battle.

More often, however, Fortuna is involved in the fates of single individuals; above all of Caesar⁵⁰ and Pompey; indeed she tends to disappear from Lucan’s narrative in parts of books 3–6 where neither leader is involved in the action. As early as 2.727–8, “exhausted by his triumphs” she has “abandoned” Pompey (*lassata triumphis / desciiuit Fortuna tuis*); at 3.169 Pompey’s Fortuna has roused to warfare oriental allies “doomed to fall along with him;” at 3.394 Fortuna is “hastening to impose Caesar on the whole world.” At Pharsalus itself Pompey realizes that the gods and fate have left him: *transisse deos Romanaeque fata* (“he realized that the gods and Roman destiny had switched allegiance,” 7.647) and Fortuna betrays him: *quamque fuit laeto per tres infida triumphos / tam misero Fortuna minor* (“fickle Fortune is as far beneath him in his days of misery as she was in his happy days of three triumphs,” 685–6). In contrast Caesar sees both Fortuna and the gods on his side (*Fortunam superosque suos* 796).

Why is this relevant to the question of anger? Because Pompey’s downfall and fugitive state lead in book 8 to an increasing stress on Fortune’s treatment of him;⁵¹ and his death, with the defeat of liberty, drives Lucan to violent anger against both gods and Fortune. One

50 This is, of course, in keeping with Caesar’s own stress on the power of Fortune: at *De bello civili* 3.10 the reported version of his own communication with the Republicans invokes Fortuna three times at 3, 6 and 7. The biographical tradition concurs with Lucan in attributing to Caesar public claims to enjoy Fortune’s favour.

51 Fortune is mentioned either in narrative or speech at 8.21–2, 72, 95–6, 150, 271, 313, 334–5, 427; there are other unmarked references.

would not attribute to the poet the pessimism of Pothinus' treacherous advice if Lucan had not himself spoken in the same terms: compare Pothinus' words *dat poenas laudata fides cum sustinet ... / quos Fortuna premit, fatis accede deisque / et cole felices, miseros fuge* ("Loyalty, though praised, pays the cost when it supports the people Fortune crushes. Side with the fates and the gods. Court the fortunate and avoid the failures," 8.485–7) with Lucan's comment in 3.448–9 *seruat multos Fortuna nocentes / et tantum miseris irasci numina possunt* ("often Fortune guards the guilty and the gods can only be angry with the unlucky"). Lucan is angry with the gods and Fortune alike, as even his largely mild and acquiescent Pompey is angry, but this anger is itself a response to the belief that the gods/Fortuna have caused his ruin out of an unwarranted and unearned hostility. Lucan cries shame on Fortune and the gods in connection with Ptolemy's honours in 5.58–9⁵² and repeats his denunciations to frame the death scene. Even while acknowledging that Pompey has been condemned by Fate⁵³ Lucan denounces gods and Fortune alike: *Septimius, qui pro superum pudor, arma satelles / regia gestabat...* ("Septimius who—shame on the gods above—carried the weapons of the king," 597–8); *quis non, Fortuna, putasset / parcere te populis...* ("Who would not have imagined that you were sparing the peoples, Fortune...", 600–1); and *dedecus et numquam superum caritura pudore / fabula, Romanus regi sic paruit ensis* ("a dishonour and a story which will always shame the gods above—a Roman sword obeyed the king like this," 605–6). And Pompey himself dies "disdaining to present his bare head to Fortune" (*indignatus apertum / Fortunae praeberere caput* 615–16). Lucan has not made an end of these outcries, and if many more invoke Fortuna than the gods, he turns to them at least once more as responsible for this chain of indignities: *sit satis, o superi, quod non Cornelia fuso / crine iacet* ("O gods above, let it be enough that Cornelia does not lie with her hair loosened ...," 739–40). There is an important but problematic instance of such apparent anger against the gods in the extended description of the dead Pompey: "men who saw his mutilated head acknowledge that the reverend beauty of his holy body was preserved and his features angry with the gods; that the last moments of death had changed nothing of the man's demeanour and expression" (8.665–6). Suddenly we seem to have an extraordinary dis-

52 *Et tibi ... Fortunae, Ptolemaee pudor, crimenque deorum.*

53 8.567–9, *nisi fatorum leges ... / damnatum leto traherent ad litora Magnum*; see also 575.

sonance. If we are to follow the manuscripts, Pompey's nobility of appearance in death is combined with an *iratum ... deis faciem* ("his features angry with the gods," 665). Yet Pompey himself seemed reconciled at the moment of death, when he addressed the gods and called himself happy; *sum tamen, o superi, felix nullique potestas / hoc auferro deo* ("Yet I am fortunate, o gods above, and no deity has the power to take this away from me," 630–1). Here he denies that worldly ruin can destroy his inner happiness:⁵⁴ in the light of this and of the immediate context of 666, many editors have been unhappy with *iratumque deis faciem*. Housman after careful consideration of alternatives retained the MSS reading, but Shackleton Bailey (1982, 1997) has argued for and printed Francken's *placatumque deis*, which is translated by Susanna Braund as "reconciled with the gods".⁵⁵ If we see Pompey in his last speech as withholding just anger, the sense would be well conveyed by *placatum*: the dying man has actively controlled the anger he could properly have felt.

On the other hand, while *placatum* is consistent with Lucan's usage,⁵⁶ two further uses of *placare* in book 8 could be used as arguments both for and against changing the text in 665. At 8.772, *si quis placare peremptum / forte uolet* ("if anyone should want to placate you in death") and again in the poet's own comment at 8.855–8, *quem non tumuli uenerabile saxum / ... / auertet manesque tuos placare iubebit?* ("who will not be diverted by your grave's venerable rock ..., not be compelled to placate your shade?"), men are expected to placate the dead Pompey's shade. Is he then still angry? With both men and gods? Caesar himself will urge his audience in Alexandria to placate the shade of Pompey (9.1092), and imagine how his forestalled reconciliation with his son-in-law could have enabled Pompey to pardon the gods in his defeat: *tum pace fideli / fecissem ut uictus posses ignoscere diuis* ("then in faithful peace

54 This seems to be contradicted by Lucan's editorial judgement at 706–7 that Pompey was *felix nullo turbante deorum / et nullo parcente miser*. Has the poet already forgotten that he was using a higher concept of felicity in 630–1?

55 Unfortunately Shackleton Bailey 1982, 99–100 repudiates *iratumque* without advancing any arguments for Francken's *placatum*. Contrast Joyce 1993: "his face still glared at the gods," and Widdows 1988, who adopts *inuictam*: "his mien was as ever solemn and seemly, that of a man who defied the gods." But Lucan elsewhere speaks of Pompey as *uictus*, and limits his use of *inuictus* to Caesar (5.324; 10.346); Cato, morally *inuictus*, (9.18); Antaeus, in an ironic anticipation of his defeat; and Rome (in a diplomatic speech 3.334). In contrast with Cato, Pompey is *uictus*.

56 *Placare* is found ten times: cf. 2.173–4, *manes / placatos Catuli*, in the same sedes.

I could have helped you in defeat forgive the gods,” 9.1101–2). Is Caesar then acknowledging that the gods have been unjust? Logically, his words seem to imply that Pompey’s defeat (not just his murder) was unjust, but this is focalization through Pompey’s eyes, not Caesar’s own judgement.

Lucan does not return to the question of divine responsibility, except in passing, before the text of the epic comes to an end. There is no last word on the subject. So we must go back to the beginning and *uictrix causa deis placuit* (“the gods favoured the conquered side,” 1.128). What mattered in the civil war was victory, the index of divine intent, but in declaring the gods’ partisanship for Caesar and the Caesars the poet never brings this defeat of liberty together with a clear acknowledgement of Roman guilt: he thus continues angry with gods whose anger against Rome he seems neither to understand nor to forgive.

Epilogue: *Ira Deorum / Iovis Ira / Caesaris Ira*

Besides the anger of the gods, the anger of one mortal leader, Caesar, is scarcely less prominent in the *De bello civili*. From his first introduction in the opening sequence of causes as *acer et indomitus quo spes quoque ira uocasset* (“fierce, indomitable, drawn wherever hope and indignation summoned,” 1.146) through his comparison to the Libyan lion who *subsedit dubius, totam dum colligit iram* (“crouches in hesitation till he has concentrated all his rage,” 207), Caesar accumulates anger, as in his reaction to Curio’s speech at 1.292–3 *ipsi in bellum prono tantum tamen addidit irae, / accenditque ducem* (“though Caesar was already keen for war, he increased his rage and inflamed his leader”). It is anger that characterizes Caesar, and this anger is the momentum behind the conflict, returning in almost every scene where he appears: three times, for example, in one episode of book 3, *magnum uictor in iram / uocibus accensus* (“by these words the victor was inflamed to mighty anger,” 133), *dignum te Caesaris ira / nullus honor faciet* (“no office you hold will make you worthy of Caesar’s anger,” 136), and *nondum foribus cedente tribune / acrior ira subit* (“when the tribune does not yet leave the doors, a fiercer anger comes over him,” 142). No less than in Ovid’s poetry of exile,⁵⁷ “Caesar’s wrath” (*Caesaris ira*) is a force in its own

57 For the phrase in this form and sedes cf. 8.134, 643, and 765. Ovid reports the

right, given increasing prominence with Pharsalus and the book of Pompey's downfall.⁵⁸

Caesar has only one rival for this claim: the dead Alexander, *terrarum fatale malum, fulmenque quod omnis / percuteret pariter populos* ("an evil deadly to the world, a thunderbolt that struck all nations equally," 10.34):⁵⁹ like Caesar, the thunderbolt-Alexander, initially driven by the fates (*fatis urgentibus actus* ...) was also "removed by fate," this time acting to "avenge" or liberate the world (*terrarum uindice fate / raptus*, 10.21–2). Caesar too is fated to die in his prime, but until that time enacts divine anger against Rome.⁶⁰

Should we not then make a further identification, between Caesar, the human thunderbolt (*qualiter expressum uentis per nubila fulmen*, 1.151, developed 152–6), and the traditional weapon of the angry Jupiter? Jupiter's bolts were the weapon of his *ira*; indeed, as we saw in Virgil's forge scene, *irae* were a vital ingredient of their manufacture.⁶¹ There is already in the *Aeneid* an increasing focus on the anger of Jupiter alongside collective divine anger: hence Jupiter's own comment to Juno at *Aeneid* 12.830–1 that her anger proves her kinship to him; hence his reliance on the deadly Dira, *Dei ira* (literally "god's anger"), to destroy Turnus. No doubt as a consequence of the establishment of Augustus' autocratic power, the anger of the collective gods is no longer active in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: instead there are countless instances of the arbitrary anger of individual gods, but most prominent of all is

anger of (Augustus) Caesar as *Caesaris ira* at *Tr.* 1.2.3 and 61; 1.3.85, etc. and relates Augustus' anger (and potential clemency) to that of his celestial counterpart in *Tr.* 233–40.

58 Only in the climax of Pharsalus does Lucan go beyond *ira* to associate Caesar with actual battle rage—*rabies*; cf. 551, *hic furor hic rabies, hic sunt tua crimina Caesar*, and 557, *hic Caesar, rabies populis stimulusque furorum / ... agmina circum/it uagus atque ignes animis flagrantibus addit*. This is followed by the unique comparison of Caesar with Mars (= Ares) at 567–71.

59 There are more affinities than differences in Lucan's parallel portraits of Greek and Roman autocrats: cf. 1.153–6, *populosque pauentes / terruit ... / ... magnamque cadens magnamque reuertens / dat stragem late*, with 10.30, *fatis urgentibus actus / humana cum strage ruit* ... and 34–5, *fulmenque quod omnes / percuteret pariter populos*.

60 For Caesar's death as fated in vengeance of his crimes see 7.595, *meruit fatis tam nobile letum*, and 9.17, *scelerum uindex in sancto pectore Bruti / sedit*.

61 See *Aen.* 8.431–2, quoted above, and *Ov. Met.* 15.811–12, where Jupiter describes the celestial archives *quae neque concussum caeli neque fulminis iram / nec metuunt ullas tuta atque aeterna ruinas*.

the anger of Jupiter. As was noted above, Ovid introduces Jupiter possessed by this anger (*ingentes animo et dignas Ioue ... iras*, "a mighty wrath worthy of Jupiter's soul," *Met.* 1.166) and exercising it to destroy the human race: in his epilogue Ovid will boast of his work of art as surviving even *Iouis iras* (15.871). This would surely be blasphemy if it were not a coded allusion to Augustus Caesar, parallel to more overt allusions in *Tristia* 2 and the poetry of exile.⁶² But even without interpreting Lucan through Ovid, his text gives us the basis for a further claim: that Lucan in *De bello civili* is presenting his Caesar, and *Caesaris irae*, not just as analogue, but as the actual representative and embodiment of the divine anger which overthrew the Roman Republic and the liberty of its elite.

Bibliography

- Ahl, F. M., *Lucan: an Introduction*, Ithaca 1976.
- Barchiesi, A., "Endgames: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* 6", in D. Roberts, F. Dunn and D. Fowler (eds.), *Classical Closure*, Princeton, N. J. 1997, 181–208.
- Feeney, D., *The Gods in Epic*, Oxford 1991.
- Haffter, H., "Dem zwanken Zünglein lauschend wachte Caesar dort", *MH* 14 (1957) 118–26.
- Henderson, J., "Lucan: the word at war", *Ramus* 6 = A. J. Boyle (ed.), *The Imperial Muse*, Bendigo, Australia 1987, 165–211.
- Henderson, J., *Fighting for Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War*, Cambridge 1998.
- Jal, P., "Les dieux dans les guerres civiles", *REL* 40 (1962) 170–200.
- Joyce, J. W., *Pharsalia: Lucan*, tr. with introduction, Ithaca, NY, 1993.
- Levene, D., *Religion in Livy*, Oxford 1995.
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G., "The religious position of Livy's history", *JRS* 57 (1967) 45–55.
- Masters, J., *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*, Cambridge 1992.
- Parker, R. C. T., *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford 1996.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., "On Lucan", *PCPhS* 28 (1982) 91–100.
- Walsh, P. G., *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*, Cambridge 1961.
- Widdows, P., *Lucan's Civil War, Translated into English Verse*, Bloomington, IN 1988.
- Williams, G., *Technique and Ideas in Virgil's Aeneid*, New Haven CT 1983.

62 See Barchiesi 1997.

28. *Discordia fratrum* : Aspects of Lucan's Conception of Civil War

My topic is Lucan's association of civil war with *discordia* at every level, from the family, to the community, to the cosmos and its most discordant elements, the winds which seem to have been passed over as analogues for the destructive forces of Caesar (especially) and Pompey. Although I will avoid the *Hubris* of trying to cover the cosmos itself I shall try to do justice to Lucan's own ambitious and universalizing approach. Over a century after Caesar's wars he was tackling a theme grown too familiar¹, and reaching out for means to convey the shock and awe which his fellow citizens had once felt at the equal impieties of Caesar's invasion and Pompey's desertion of Italy itself. As modern readers of Lucan we tend to give most of our attention to the dominant personalities, a ruthless Caesar, a fading Pompey and a stern and morally rigid Cato—historical figures that have been familiar to us since our schooldays—and Lucan recreates them in bold and memorable terms; but their context too is important and I would like to focus away from the protagonists to the civic and cosmic background of this conflict.

So let us take Lucan's first sentence, where two words of extreme moral condemnation, *sceleri* (2) and *nefas* (6)² frame two evocations of armed violence designed to shock; the physical self-wounding of the Roman people *populum ... potentem in sua uictrici conversum uiscera dextra* (2–3) and the battle lines of opposing kinsmen—*cognatas acies*. The

1 I regard Eumolpus' *Bellum Civile* as the best evidence for the familiarity of poetic treatments of this theme in Lucan's day. We cannot prove that Lucan had read Petronius' work, (which he certainly did not imitate), but Petronius must have composed the *Satyricon* during Lucan's lifetime, since the two men met their deaths in the same spate of Neronian executions. We also have evidence for poems fifty years earlier dealing with later phases of the Civil Wars from Cornelius Severus, and the anonymous *Bellum Actiacum*.

2 These generic words for crime and evil are preferred to specific impiety (even positive *pietas* is rare), cf. 1.353. Lucan concentrates on *scelus* and *nefas*: cf. 1.35 *scelera ipsa nefasque*, and 1.667 *scelerique nefando*: also the adjectives *nefandus* 1.21, 325, and *sceleratus* (not *scelestus*) in e.g. 2.251 *scelerataque proelia*.

graphic *uiscera* is more vivid and violent than *sanguis*, but Lucan opposes to the regular recurrence of phrases like *ciuilis sanguis* a surprisingly high incidence of *uiscera*,³ whether we translate it as flesh or entrails. And Lucan's next instance at least is designed to recall this first case. It comes from Laelius' speech of hysterical loyalty to Caesar. "Is it" he asks "so dreadful to triumph in a civil war? Any man against whom your bugles sound in battle is not my fellow citizen."

pectore si fratris gladium iuguloque parentis
condere me iubeas plenaeque in uiscera partu
coniugis, inuita peragam tamen omnia dextra. (1.376–8)

If you bid me bury my sword in my brother's breast and father's throat, and the flesh of my pregnant wife, I shall perform all of these deeds, though with a reluctant right hand.

We will return later to our main theme of fratricide and parenticide; for the moment note the extreme brutality of killing one's own child in the pregnant womb. This is a Caesarean, and the phrase is again Caesarian when Lucan represents Caesar's strange boast before Pharsalus—the words which indirectly gave rise to our conference title: "A safe and self-inflicted destiny awaits me: any of my men who looks back before the enemy is conquered, will see me piercing my own flesh: *me securo manebit / sors quaesita manu. fodientem uiscera cernet / me mea, qui nondum uicto respexerit hoste* (7.308–10). The poet in person at the height of his denunciations declares that only the sword will satisfy civil hatred and draw hands against Roman flesh: *odiis solus ciuilibus ensis / sufficit et dextras Romana in uiscera ducit* (7.490–91)⁴ and even when the battle is ended by Pompey's flight Caesar still continues to wreak murderous violence on his slaughtered fatherland: *tu, Caesar in alto / caedis adhuc cumulo patriae per uiscera uadis*: "Caesar, in this still mounting pile of slaughter, you wade through your country's flesh" (7.721–2). This has been the image of Caesarian aggression, and will only be reversed just before the poet breaks off his narrative in book 10. Pompey's death will not be avenged "until his country's swords enter Caesar's flesh," *dum patrii ueniant in uiscera Caesaris enses* (10.528–9). The mutilation theme of the poem stretches to the epic's last surviving lines.

3 As is well-known the stimulus for Lucan's imagery is Anchises' rebuke to Caesar and Pompey in *Aen.* 6.833 *neu patriae ualidas in uiscera uertite uires*.

4 Cf. 7.579 *scit cruor imperii qui sit, quae uiscera rerum*: "he knows what constitutes the life-blood of empire and the nation's flesh."

However, beyond the proem, once past the controversial praise of Nero, Lucan launches a second beginning and a new level of imagery to which too little attention is usually paid: he goes to the other extreme, no longer personifying the war in the maddened Roman people (*quid in arma furentem / impulerit populum* (68–9) but depersonalizing it as both political and cosmic discord—and my theme in this paper will be his use of the latter, macrocosmic figure. Lucan was not just a political poet: he also aspired to be a scientific poet, a student of natural philosophy like Lucretius and Manilius. As Michael Lapidge demonstrated in his definitive article “Lucan’s imagery of cosmic dissolution,”⁵ Lucan had been shaped by a Stoic education, and despite his own anti-providential reading of history he inherited “a rich tradition of Stoic cosmological vocabulary stretching back to Chrysippus ... and displayed striking originality in applying this vocabulary” (370). But Lapidge’s proper concern with Stoic thinking does not consider how far the poet’s language and conception of world destruction also matched that of the Epicurean Lucretius, or how it was grounded in the pragmatic world of Roman warfare and military engineering. The *compages* of the universe⁶ held together by Stoic *syntonia* in *B.C.* 1.72–3 is also the natural word for the framework of ships and siege engines: Lucretius spoke of *machina mundi*, and Manilius of both *machina* and *compages*,⁷ as does Seneca in his *Natural Questions*. Lucretius uses the image *moles et machina mundi* only once in his entire poem. Lucan too uses the same cosmic image only once: *totaque discors / machina diuulsi turbabit foedera mundi*, to quote Duff’s fine translation “the whole distracted image of the shattered firmament will overthrow its laws.” (79–80) Elsewhere Lucan limits *machina* to the standard *machina belli* (used 3 times). But the poet is obsessed by disintegration—when he mentions *compages* it is always under threat: the Delphic priestess’ human frame (5.119), the un-

5 *Hermes* 107 (1979) 344–70; see also “Stoic Cosmology,” in *The Stoics*, ed. John M. Rist, Berkeley 1978.

6 The whole conception is Manilian: cf. 1.719 *raraeque labant compagine rimae*, “with the slackening of the framework cracks are opening,” tr. G. Goold, and 1.727, 840.

7 *Machina mundi*: cf. *Lucr.* 5.95–6 *multosque per annos / sustentata ruet moles et machina mundi*; echoed in *Manilius* 2.803–5, 807 *aeternis ueluti compagibus orbis / quae nisi perpetuis alterna sorte uolantem cursibus excipient ... dissociata fluat resoluta machina mundo*, 3.357 [*caelum*] *quem gelidis rigidis fulcit compagibus axis*, and 4.828 *tellus uariis compagibus haerens*. For *compages* of the hollow framework of earth containing the winds cf. *Seneca N.Q.* 6.18.3.

stable Libyan terrain (9.647) and even the vaults of heaven itself strain and falter in the sea-storm of 5.633 *motaque poli / compage laborant*.

In Lucan's introductory analogy of disintegrating superstate and universe the *compages mundi* breaks down with the clashing and collapse of constellations, generating reversals of nature's laws as the earth repels the sea and the moon rebels against her brother sun. The whole mechanism of the shattered universe is *discors* (79) throwing the laws or contract of nature (*foedera mundi*) into confusion. To these physical *foedera* the contract of triumviral tyranny (*foedera regni*) at Rome corresponds, thrown into confusion as the world's masters at first collaborate to ill effect (*male concordēs* 87) then their jarring cooperation (*concordia discors* 98) breaks down in reluctant peace. That is, their cooperation only lasted a brief time because it was always already jarring. The same key words will mark the outbreak of war at the beginning of the second book: *manifestaque belli / signa dedit mundus, legesque et foedera rerum / praescia monstriifero uertit Natura tumultu* (2.1–3) "The universe emitted open signs of the war and Nature forewarned overthrew the laws and contract of the world with an uprising full of portents."

Discord is the best symbol of civil war because it does not put the blame on either party: it is an inherent systemic clash or collapse. This is why Virgil uses Discord to mark the outbreak of war in *Aeneid* 7, an impious if not explicitly civil war, which goes back beyond Virgil to Ennius and beyond Ennius to the cosmic *neikos* of Empedocles. Norden demonstrated more than a century ago how Virgil had responded to Ennius' *Discordia* (*Ann.* 225–6 Sk.), the elemental *paluda uirago* (*Ann.* 220–21 Sk.) who forced open the Gates of War to offer resistance to Hannibal in book 7.⁸ Let us keep the focus on Discord while tracing the role of impersonal *discordia* and *discors* first in the political allusions to civic discord of historians, then at a cosmic level in scientific poetry.

Sallust constructs the introduction to his *Bellum Catilinae* around concord and discord: Catiline's upbringing amid *discordia civilis* (*Cat.* 5) is almost immediately opposed by the civic *Concordia* which led to Rome's early growth (6.2, repeated at 9.1), and the anomalous plural usage in 9.2, where the early Romans kept their quarrels for

8 This is a famous locus, but along with Norden, *Ennius und Vergilius* 8, 10 f., see F. Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms*, Heidelberg 1963, 82 f, Fraenkel, *Kleine Beiträge* 2, 1964 (= *JRS* 35 (1945) 1–14), and N. M. Horsfall, *Virgil's Aeneid 7: A Commentary*, notes on 7.335, 540–640 and 545 (p. 360).

the enemy: *discordias cum hoste exercebant*. If the word *discordia* does not itself occur in the political excursus of 37–38, it is still the underlying theme, from the *aliena mens* of the people to the detailed account of the opposing parties in 38.1–2. Similarly while Sallust avoids the word in the *Iugurtha*, he reflects the concept first in the family strife *dissensio* among Micipsa's natural and adoptive sons (12.1) then in the schism among the Numidians (*in duas partes discedunt Numidae* 13.1) and later the Roman *dissensio* of 37.2. Adherbal's speech is full of fraternal discord (14. esp. 13–15, see below) which is repeated at Rome in 41 *mos partium atque factionum ac deinde omnium malarum artium*, especially 41.5 *omnia in duas partes abstracta sunt: res publica quae media fuerat dilacerata*, and as Wiedemann has shown, discord is characteristic alike of Numidians and Romans.⁹

Lucretius as well as the Stoics stressed the role of *Concordia* in the constructive power of the atomic swirls, and when Horace alluded to *rerum concordia discors* (*Epistles* 1.12.19) he seems to have been thinking as much in terms of Epicurean as of Stoic cosmology. Ovid drew the cosmology of his *Metamorphoses* eclectically, taking from Empedocles the quarrelsome or ill-assorted particles (*discordia semina*) of *Met.* 1.8–9, reconciled when his divine demiurge assembled and bound them together in cooperative peace (1.25 *concordi pace ligauit*, in which we note the political concept *pax*). Manilius in turn presents this discordant world of opposite first particles as *discordia* made fertile: *discordia concors / quae ... omnis partus elementa capacia reddit* (1.142); again, as Lapidge has shown, Manilius stresses the consequences when the *compages* or *machina mundi* is dissolved. Just so Lucan's Brutus invokes cosmology, hoping to persuade Cato from joining the coming war: he contrasts the peace maintained by great bodies with the surrender of lesser beings to discord: *lege deum minimas rerum discordia turbat / pacem magna tenent*, 2.272–3).

Leaving aside these cosmic notions in scientific philosophical poetry, let me retrace the concept of *discordia* in Virgil's successive genres, relating the incidences of *Discordia* and *discors* in his allusions to civil war to a parallel from Nature most apparent in the war of the winds. How does Virgil refer to civil war? He never speaks of *bellum ciuile*, the normal usage in both late Cicero and Sallust, using *ciuilis* only once to denote

9 See T. Wiedemann, "Sallust's *Iugurtha*: Concord, discord and the digressions," *Greece and Rome* 40 (1993) 48–57.

the *ciuilis quercus* for saving a citizen in battle.¹⁰ Nor does he distinguish civil wars from external conflicts as *impia bella*, though the neuter plural is one form of *impius* which fits comfortably into the hexameter. Indeed his only use of *impius* precedes his earliest reference to the discord of civil war in *Ecl.* 1.70–72:

impius haec tam culta noualia miles habebit
barbarus has segetes: en quo discordia ciues
produxit miseros:

An impious soldier shall possess these well-tilled plough-lands, a barbarian these crops: see to what point discord has driven our unhappy fellow-citizens?

And we might add the honest countryman who lives far from quarrelling warfare, *procul discordibus armis* (*Georgics* 2.459), “unswayed by political ambition or wealth or Discord that harasses faithless brothers;” *illum non populi fasces, non purpura regum / flexit et infidos agitans Discordia fratres* (2.495–6).

So in *Aeneid* 7 Allecto usurps Discordia’s role in starting hostilities (note her record of fomenting battle between loving brothers, 7.335¹¹) and Juno takes over Discordia’s act of opening the Gates of War, but Virgil nonetheless recalls his Ennian model in Allecto’s boast of Discord achieved at the moment of first bloodshed: *en perfecta tibi bello discordia tristi* (7.545). At a further remove from the action Discordia personified is found among the evils and affliction at the entry to Hades, and fights with the other spirits of belligerence hovering over the battle of Actium:

saeuit medio in certamine Mauors
caelatus ferro, tristesque ex aethere Dirae¹²
et scissa gaudens uadit Discordia palla. (*Aen.* 8.700–702)

10 At *Aen.* 6.772 the heroes of prehistoric Latium wear their temples shaded with *ciuilis quercus*.

11 See Horsfall *ad loc.*, and note that Virgil has several examples of such loyal brothers ready to avenge each other in battle.

12 Given that this is one of Virgil’s rare uses of *impius*, we might argue that the adjective designates the soldier as not just fighting his own fellow-citizens, but fighting on the wrong (i.e. aggressive) side. But *impius* at e.g. *Georgics* 1.468, (cited n. 19) clearly makes no distinction between sides. Lucan uses it only once, and outside the context of civil war, addressed by Appius to the cheating priestess of Delphi in 5.158, whose impiety is towards Apollo himself.

Mars rages in the heart of the conflict, engraved in steel, and the grim Dirae <come> from the heaven and Discord marches exultant with torn robe.

Winds as forces of destruction

Now I would like to extend this argument to trace Lucan's association of the destructive force of civil war not only with internal discord but with the external destructive forces in the cosmos: as Caesar is compared in his first great image (1.151–7) to a thunderbolt, product of the winds: *expressum uentis ... fulmen* (as Alexander will be at 10.30–34 *terrarum fatale malum fulmenque*) so he is compared to a wind or fire needing material for its destructive force.¹³ And this is probably the most apposite moment to introduce what may be an explicit analogy made by Seneca and Livy before him between the destructive (and beneficent) powers of the winds, and the power of Caesar to do both good and evil; unfortunately the Senecan text almost certainly does not name Caesar, but his uncle Marius—another destructive force in Lucan.

Late in his book about the winds, at *N.Q.* 5.18.4, Seneca sets out some of the benefits brought by the winds (keeping the atmosphere fresh, transferring needed rainfall, ripening crops and enabling men to communicate and trade, etc.), then adds; that this would have been a great benefaction of Nature if men's folly had not perverted it.

Nunc quod de C. Mario uulgo dictatum est et a T. Livio positum, in incerto esse utrum illum magis nasci an non nasci rei publicae profuerit, dici etiam de uentis potest; adeo quicquid ex illis utile et necessarium est non potest his repensari quae in perniciem suam generis humani dementia excogitat.

As it is, like the proverbial saying about C. Marius reported by Livy, it is unclear whether it would have been better for the state if he had been born or unborn, this can also be said about the winds ...

But as the allusion shows, winds are mostly invoked not as isolated instances of destruction but in the plural, the quarreling brothers, whose

13 Here editors sometimes print the text of *N.Q.* 5.18.4 as *quod de Caesare maiore (?) uulgo positum est et a Tito Livio positum*. Clearly Livy included in his moral comment on Marius/Caesar, a comparison with the winds. But as Vottero shows (*N.Q.* 5.8 *nota critica*) both Hine ("Livy's judgment on Marius," *LCM* 3.83–87) and P. Jal, *Tite Live: Histoire Romaine XXXIII*, Paris 1979, 253–6 argue cogently for Marius. And I know of no parallel for the use of *maiore* to designate Julius Caesar.

discord is singled out in Ovid's cosmogony. They would annihilate the cosmos if they were unleashed:

uix nunc obsistitur illis,
cum sua quisque regant diuerso flamina tractu
quin lanient mundum: tanta est discordia fratrum.

Even now they can hardly be resisted, as each one directs his gusts in opposing regions, from tearing the universe apart; so great is the conflict of these brothers.

Although the description comes from Ovid's cosmogony, the conception goes back to Virgil and Lucretius and beyond both, to imagery in Homer. Hardie has brought out in *Cosmos and Imperium*¹⁴ the affinity between the escaped winds of Aeolus that disrupt Aeneas' voyage to destiny, and the evil forces of Titans and Giants in the Hesiodic tradition of assault on Olympus and gigantomachy. But the winds are not just the ruin of Odysseus and Aeneas and their sailors. (They are united in Virgil's description.) The clash of the winds with each other is the farmer's nemesis as they destroy the crops. Virgil introduces the disastrous summer storm in *Georgics* 1 with the clashing battles of opposing winds *omnia uentorum concurrere proelia uidi* (1.318) and warns repeatedly of their rising (1.351, 356, 365, 431, 455.) Winds fighting with each other provide similes for the heat of battle at *Aen.* 2. 416–7 *aduersi rupto ceu quondam turbine uenti / confligunt*, "as when a hurricane has broken out, opposing winds clash" and at 10.356–9 (recalling Homer's unique verb (*eridaineton*) denoting the strife of East and South wind in the simile at *Iliad* 16.765);

magno discordes aethere uenti
proelia ceu tollunt animis et uiribus aequis
non ipsi inter se, non nubila, non mare cedit,
anceps pugna diu.

Just as clashing winds in the great heaven raise up battles with matching spirit and strength; neither do they or the clouds or the sea give way, and the fight is long indecisive.

14 Oxford 1986; chapter 3, 90–97, especially 92–3 and n. 23, on *Aeneid* 1.58–59, *ni faciat* ... the provident intervention of Jupiter and in this case of Neptune. So also Hardie's *The Epic Successors of Virgil: a study in the dynamics of a tradition*, Cambridge 1993, 60–61. Note that Seneca recalls the Aeolus episode in his discussion of wind-generated earthquakes at *N.Q.* 6.18.3.

It is of course easier to demonstrate the physical havoc wreaked by the winds or their association with battling armies in Roman poetry, than their role as symbol of civil strife, but this too may be a very old theme. Quintilian (8.6.44) identifies Horace's *Ode* 1.14 (*O navis, referent te*) as a political allegory based on Alcaeus' fragment 326 *asunnetêmi tôn anemôn stasin*, "I cannot take in the *stasis* of the winds." Now Liddell and Scott allow for two interpretations of *stasis*: in the first, neutral, reading it is simply the setting or direction of the winds, but the alternative which I would adopt reads it as their conflict. This matches their record in Roman poetry, starting with Lucretius, who stresses the invisible force of wind (1.270) describing in 277–279:

Sunt igitur uenti nimirum corpora caeca
quae mare, quae terras, quae denique nubila caeli
uerrunt ac subito uexanti turbine raptant.

Thus indeed winds are unseen bodies which sweep over the sea, the earth and even the clouds of the sky and suddenly carry everything away in a harrying whirlwind.

Lucretius notes the power of winds to lay waste all three *regna* of earth, sky and sea. In the extended first simile of his account of Nature (280–97) he singles out winds as creating sweeping destruction (*strages*¹⁵) like a mountain torrent in spate or a powerful river, although unlike the river they cannot be seen (*corpora caeca* 295 goes back to 277 above). They are again the driving force of Lucretius' weather descriptions in book 6 as their battles (*pugnantibus uentis* 6.99) generate thunderclouds (cf. 6.124 *ualida uenti collecta procella*, "gathered by the sturdy storm of wind," 127, 137) and seem to attack the shattered temples/regions of heaven itself: *displosa repente / opprimere ut caeli uideantur templa superne* 285–6. *Vis uenti* is almost a fixed phrase, repeated at 281, 295, 300.

Most relevant to Lucan's image of dissolution is Lucretius' account of the time of destruction, *exitiale tempus*, and the *exitium* of the cosmos at 6.557–60, where the flattening force of subterranean winds disrupt earth's crust in an earthquake (*incumbit tellus quo uenti prona premit uis*) and men fear to believe in the coming annihilation:

metuunt magni naturam credere mundi
exitiale aliquod tempus clademque manere
cum uideant tantam terrarum incumbere molem!

15 *Strages* is Caesar's word; cf. 1.156–7 *magnamque reuertens / dat stragem late*.

quod nisi respirent uenti, uis nulla refrenet
res neque ab exitio possit reprehendere euntes. (6. 565–69)

Men fear to believe that some time of destruction and disaster awaits the nature of the mighty universe, when they see so great a mass of lands weighing down. And if the winds did not take breath, no force would rein them in, nor could it pull them back from the destruction on which they are bent.

Now I hesitate to claim that Lucan actually presents the winds as counterparts or symbols of civil discord. Influenced as much by Ovid's cosmogony as by Virgil or Lucretius, he does not draw a direct analogy between the physical discord of the winds and the civic discord of Rome.¹⁶ It may seem too bold to recall here the Stoic principle of *sympatheia* in which Nature and her elements are affected by and reflect human evil: certainly Lucan does not spell out any claim that the violence of nature is provoked by the violence of man—not in the way that *sympatheia* generated by human evil permeates Senecan tragedy, especially and explicitly in the solar eclipse of the *Thyestes*. Instead Lucan uses winds chiefly in their own right as the discordant forces of Nature,¹⁷ most extensively in 4.50–78, where he borrows Ovidian language to describe in terms of dry and wet winds the onset of the spring floods in Caesar's Spanish campaign.

Each of the winds is assigned its role and vectors, recalling their first appearance in Ov. *Met.* 1.60–61 and their return in Ovid's flood narrative. Lucan signals his model by imprisoning the dry Aquilo (4.50 *siccisque Aquilonibus* = *Met.* 1.262) and 4.63 *torsit in occiduuum Nabataeis flatibus orbem*, echoing Ovid's allusion at *Met.* 1.61 to Nabataean kingdoms traversed by Eurus and the far shores warmed by the setting sun (*Met.* 1.63 *occiduo ... sole*.) Lucan's expansive vision embraces the cosmos, invoking all four elements—*aer*, *aether*, *terra* and *aequor* – in portraying

16 Compare A. Loupiac, "La Poétique des Éléments dans la Pharsale de Lucain," *Latomus* 241, Brussels 1998. Loupiac's discussion of winds as "l'air en mouvement" 47 f. pays little attention to Lucan's wind storms but rightly singles out 3.362–5 as "le vent César." However he is not interested in the potential for political allegory in Lucan's treatment of elements.

17 Cf. Loupiac, *op. cit.*, part 3, ch. 1, "le combat des éléments entre eux; une nature en conflit"; section 1: "L'air et les autres éléments." But he comes closest to the significance of Lucan's winds in his comment on the sandstorm (p. 148) "comme une force qui bouscule l'ordre établi, une force ... anarchique et déstabilisante."

the flood (4.74–75 *aeris atrī ... quod separat aethere terram*, 81 *caelo defusum reddidit aequor*).

Naturally Lucan brings on winds and storms as fuel for epic grandeur in books or sections which lack a major battle: so four times in the lull before the Massilian sea battle in book 3 winds enter as parallels, most significantly when Caesar compares himself to a fierce wind: *uentus ut amittit uires, nisi robore densae / occurrunt siluae, spatio diffusus inani ... / sic hostes mihi deesse nocet*, “as wind loses force, unless thick woods confront it with their timber, being scattered over empty space ... so it is harmful to me to lack enemies” (3.362–5).

Less dramatically winds are imagined blowing beneath the earth at 460 and recur in the simile of 3.469–71: *qualis rupes, quam uertice montis / abscedit impulsu uentorum adiuta uetustas*, “like a rock which sheer age, aided by the force of the winds, has hacked off from the summit of a mountain,” just as a literal wind fans the burning Roman siege tower in 501. Again when there is no immediate human conflict the poet compensates by developing Caesar’s Adriatic storm in book 5 (500–677) and Cato’s Libyan sandstorm in book 9 (445–73) to cosmic levels of destruction. The winds in Caesar’s sea-storm assail sea and sky (568–572 and 597–611), but Caesar’s Fortune is to survive and so paradoxically the sea’s *discordia* is made to help the humans in travail: 5.646 *discordia ponti / succurrit miseris*.

In Lucan’s vision *discors* and *discordia* are ubiquitous, as important in his presentation of subhuman and supernatural conflict as of human political strife. Inevitably he also applies *discors* and *discordia* to strife within the opposing armies, marking the mutinies quelled by Caesar (5.299) and Cato (9.217), just as the opposite concept *Concordia* is given cosmic significance as salvation of the confused world, although it only marks the short-lived reconciliation of Caesarian and Pompeian forces in Spain: *O rerum mixtique salus Concordia mundi / et sacer orbis amor*, 4.190–1¹⁸ (cf. *concordes ... mensas, ... iunctoque cubili* 197–99) Lucan makes the most of this glimpse of a possible return to innocence.

In contrast the adjective *discors* signals the monstrous or abnormal: portents are described in 1.589 as *quae nullo semine discors / protulerat Natura*, “what Nature in conflict begat from no seed,” and the magical utterances of Erichtho are *discordes* (6.687). There is even conflict in

18 Cf. *concordes mensas, iunctoque cubili* “their meals in harmony and common beds,” 197–99.

heaven on the morning of Pharsalus; Lucan's prophet observes the upper atmosphere blocking the sky, in fact apparently obstructing itself:

aethera seu totum *discordi obsistere caelo*
perspexitque polos (7.198–9)

or if he perceived the whole heaven obstructing the opposing sky, and saw through it the poles.

This is more than conflicting weather fronts, for Lucan continues "if men's universal intelligence had only marked the new signs of the sky seen by the expert augur, Pharsalus would have been observed all over the world." The discord that has infected the heavens has already infected the underworld, taking hold of Rome's dead heroes and radical villains:

effera Romanos agitat Discordia manes
impiaque infernam ruperunt arma quietem. (6.780–81)¹⁹

Savage Discord harries the Roman shades and impious battle broke into the calm of the underworld.

Both *di superi* and *di inferi* are roused by the *impia arma* of civil war.

Fratres and fratricide

Kin murder is *plus quam ciuilis*, worse than the slaughter of fellow-citizens. But there seem to be two traditions of kin murder that can be applied in Roman epic. The older one is the tradition originating in Hesiod's *Works and Days* in which the degenerating ages reach the last worst age of iron and the violation of all bonds: between friends, guests and hosts, husband and wife, father and son, brother and brother, master and slave (*W.D.* 182 f. to which Romans added the bond of patron and client). This "evil modern age" can be traced in Latin poetry from the song of the Parcae in Catullus 64 and Ovid's sequence of ages in *Met.* 1.100 f., but is independent of a newer Latin tradition on civil war which seems to make its first appearance in a unique passage in Lucretius. The fear of death, says the poet in book 3, threatens us along with the fear of contempt and poverty, and men turn to civil bloodshed for material profit:

19 An echo of Virgil's civil war allusion in *Georgics* 1.468: *impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula mortem*.

sanguine ciuili rem conflant diuitiasque
 conduplicant auidi, caedem caede accumulantes;
 crudeles gaudent in tristi funere fratris
 et consanguineum mensas odere timentque. (3.72–75)

They build their property from citizen blood and in their greed double their wealth, heaping slaughter on slaughter. Cruel men exult in the grim death of a brother and fear and loathe the tables of their kinsmen.

This vividly suggests the context of Sulla's proscriptions, which offered a reward to those who denounced or killed political offenders. (It is a minor interpretive issue but should we read the murder of a brother as a crime committed by the rejoicing heir, or simply one exploited as an opportunity for his greed?) Only the last line is unambiguous: men fear their kinsman's hospitality because they are likely to be poisoned (or like Thyestes be served a cannibal banquet). In Catullus and in Virgil's Tartarus²⁰ the offences against the family are not part of civil strife, but product of personal greed and malice. Of course sibling hatred existed before the Sullan proscriptions, but they were new in enabling rival brothers to victimize each other with impunity and even profit. We may compare Lucan's retrospective account of the proscriptions in book 2 with his first emphatic recall of Rome's other tradition, the founding fratricide of Remus:

fraterno primi maduerunt sanguine muri
 nec pretium tanti tellus pontusque furoris
 tunc erat: exiguum dominos commisit asylum. (95–97)

The first walls were soaked in a brother's blood, and yet the prize for such violent passion in those days was not earth and sea: the scant enclosure of the Asylum engaged its masters in battle.

Note the verbal echo of the death of Remus in 2.149–51:

nati maduere paterno
 sanguine, certatum cui ceruix caesa parentis
 cederet, in fratrum ceciderunt praemia fratres.

Sons were soaked in their fathers' blood, and competed to be the one who obtained the severed neck of their father, while brothers fell to provide rewards for brothers.

20 *Aen.* 6.608–9 *hic quibus inuisi fratres, dum uita manebat, / pulsatusue parens aut fraus innexa clienti...*, "those who hated their brothers while still in life, or beat their father or defrauded a client."

Lucan's audience were all too familiar with the blood of innocent Remus spilled on the ground, Rome's original sin, the *scelus fraternae necis* deplored by Horace in the civil war context of *Epodes* 7. The brother's quarrel, provoked when Remus mocked and leaped over Romulus' raw new walls, was avoided in Cicero's edifying history of Rome in *De re publica*, and quickly countered by Livy and Ovid's palliative explanations of Remus' death, not of course killed by his brother, but by the too hasty action of a subordinate Celer, who misinterpreted Romulus' command. Peter Wiseman's *Remus*²¹ has demonstrated the mythical and late origin of Remus, the twin who was the loser, but the actual anecdote has a wider and longer history in the murderous disputes of brothers as ancient as the first brothers, Cain and Abel. Sallust devotes the first fifteen sections of his *Iugurtha* to the family conflict between Micipsa's sons and the talented usurper Jugurtha, lingering in both Micipsa's death-speech (10.3–7) and Adherbal's pathetic protest to the Senate (14.13–15) over the wickedness of a brother attacking and killing a brother as Jugurtha had killed Micipsa.

And there may be a special subsidiary motif in Lucan's allusion to the bloodsoaked walls (1.95). This is a boundary conflict: in the better known version (Livy 1.7.2–3) Remus offends by leaping over the new walls *nouos transsiluisse muros*. While recent scholarship has explored metaphorical boundaries to explain Lucan's emphasis on the penetration and invasion of bodies by wounds,²² I note that boundary walls are prominent in the beginning and end of the epic. Scaeva, who fights to prevent the Pompeians entering through a breach of Caesar's walls at Dyrrhachium (6.174–5) *contraria pectora conto / detrudit muris et ualli summa tenentis / amputat ense manus* ..., "thrust down with a pole from the walls the opposing breasts, and slashed with his sword the

21 For a full discussion of the myth of Remus and translations of all the ancient evidence see T. P. Wiseman, *Remus*, Cambridge 1995, 10–12, 15–16, 141 and 144 "certainly the fratricide story was a myth with a meaning for the Rome of the civil wars." Wiseman suggests that an earlier version (like Livy 1.7.1) spoke only of general conflict over the brothers' competing claims, rather than individual jealousy and anger. See also J. N. Bremmer and N. M. Horsfall, 25–48 in *Roman Myth and Mythography*, *BICS* Suppl. 52, London 1987.

22 I am thinking of Shadi Bartsch's admirable *Violence in Cold Blood*, Cambridge, Mass. 1997, esp. 42 where she makes the transition from legal boundaries to the violated bounds of the human body. On this theme the classic study is Glenn R. Most, "Disiecti membra poetae: the rhetoric of dismemberment in Neronian Poetry," 391–419 in *Innovations of Antiquity*, ed. R. Hexter and D. Selden, New Haven 1992.

hands clinging to the top of the ramparts;" or compare 180–81 *ut primum cumulo crescente cadauera murum / admove solo ... (201–2) stat non fragilis pro Caesare murus / Pompeiumque tenet*, "as the heap increased the corpses made the wall level with the ground ... he stands, no brittle wall on Caesar's side, and holds back Pompey." And what is the last line of the text as we have it? Scaeva and his wall; *ubi solus apertis / obsedit muris calcantem moenia Magnum*: "when the walls were opened up and he alone beset Pompey trampling the fortifications." Pompey as the intrusive Remus daring to trespass on Caesar's possessions?

Inevitably the motif of brother-murder persisted, for example in the anonymous epigram on Maevidius' fratricide: *fratribus heu fratres, patribus concurrere natos / impia sors belli fataque saeva iubent*, "alas, the impious lot of war and savage fates order brothers to clash with brothers, and sons with fathers," (*Anth. Lat.*, 462.9–10). And it persists after Lucan with stories of brother-murder, inadvertent in Silius (*Pun.* 9.66) and deliberate in Tacitus (*Hist.* 3.51 where the greed and shamelessness of a recent fratricide is contrasted with the earlier suicide of a soldier who accidentally killed his brother.)

But we may wonder whether Lucan, writing under an emperor known to have poisoned his step-brother, might not have wanted to dilute or disguise his charges of fratricide with other forms of kin-murder: and in fact the poet seldom mentions the slaughter of a brother without adding the murder of a father, though this would have been less frequent in any battle context.

Mythology offered two paradigms for mutual brother-murder: the ultimate civil war between Eteocles and Polyneices of Thebes and the original conflict of the dragon's teeth warriors, Cadmus' *Spartoi* and their Colchian counterparts. Ovid bypasses the house of Oedipus and no Latin saga of Eteocles and Polyneices survives before Seneca's *Phoenissae*, but Ovid twice treated the battles of the Sown Men as civil war. When Cadmus tries to break up the fighting of the *Spartoi*, he is told "not to meddle with civil wars," *ne te civilibus insere bellis*, *Met.* 3.33–34. Later, in Jason's Colchian ordeal at *Met.* 7.141–2 the Sown Men again kill each other and fall in civil conflict; *terrigenae pereunt per mutua uulnera fratres / civilique cadunt acie*. Manilius groups father-murder with brother-murder in 4.82–3:

Ecce patrem nati perimunt, natosque parentes
mutuaque armati coeunt in uulnera fratres.

See sons kill their father and fathers their sons, while brothers under arms converge for mutual blows.

Lucan inherited this murderous Theban mythology, although his uncle's tragedy stopped short of the actual fraternal combat. But he resorts to the image of the Spartoi only for the loving mutual killing of the defeated Volteius and his men, a glorious suicide pact to escape the shame of defeat and captivity.

sic semine Cadmi
emicuit Dircaea cohors, ceciditque suorum
uulneribus dirum Thebanis fratribus agmen
Phasidos et campis ... terrigenae ... (4.549–53)

Just so from Cadmus' sowing the Dircaean squadron flashed forth, and the dread force of Theban brothers fell by wounds inflicted by its kin, while on the fields of the Phasis the earth begotten ...

Clearly Ovid's Sown Men are recalled by this simile.

Even in the Volteius episode Lucan groups mutual suicide pacts between brothers with father-and-son suicide pacts, and this pairing will be his constant practice. Thus when the Massilians protest against Caesar's demand for their support they declare themselves ready, if he and Pompey want war (3.312–13), to offer sympathy and shelter from civil conflict. But they presume that there are limits to civil hatred, that kinsmen will not face off: Surely "the sword hands (of Caesar's and Pompey's men) will falter at the sight of a father, and brothers in the opposing ranks will stay them from hurling a shower of spears?" (*cui non conspecto languebit dextra parente / telaque diuersi prohibebunt spargere fratres?* 3.326–7). In these lines Lucan has a separate agenda beyond representing normal decent values through impartial foreign spokesmen. For the phrases *conspecto ... parente* and *diuersi ... fratres* anticipate the crisis of Pharsalus when the whole nexus of kin-slaughter reaches its climax. So let us turn to book 7 to see just how Lucan keeps shifting into ever higher gears, exploiting the situation for maximum shock value.

Even before converging on the battlefield the future combatants are afflicted by nightmares in which the shades of their dead fathers and kinsmen loom out of the darkness—admittedly their dead ancestors, not those they are going to kill—but the cause is their guilty intent, hoping to pierce their fathers' throats and brothers' breasts (7.179–83). These sudden attacks of hallucination (*Furor*) are omens of their impending crime.

Once battle is joined Lucan concentrates his focus on family in the enemy ranks:

uidere parentes
frontibus aduersis fraternaue comminus arma. (464–5)

They saw their fathers facing them and brothers' weapons at a distance.

And when the fighting reaches Pompey's *robur*, the aristocratic elite, where brothers and fathers are to be found, *furor* and *rabies* break out (550–51). Lucan elaborates this motif with still more vicious acts and motivation at 625–30, as men compete to strike a brother and send his severed head rolling far away so that they can strip the corpse undetected, or they disfigure a father's features to prove to onlookers by their excess of rage that this victim cannot be their father. It is not enough to kill; they mutilate to hide their greed and hatred.

Once Pompey has fled, Caesar calls off his men and lets them plunder Pompey's camp (740 f.). Here Lucan begins to mix the motif of family violation with class warfare (*impia plebes* etc.) but pulls away from this rather anticlimactic source of indignation to describe guilty men reclining on the couches of (dead) brothers and fathers and suffering well-earned nightmares (7.762–4). Now the ghosts of slain citizens, young and old, shades of brother and father, harry and possess the guilty in dreams that fulfil the ominous visions before the battle (*hunc agitant totis fraterna cadauera somnis / pectore in hoc pater est* 774–6, recalling 177–80). As Hardie notes in *Epic Successors*,²³ this is an extreme case of “the epic law of impersonation and embodiment.” Each man suffers his own guilt, but Caesar suffers all the (avenging) shades—*omnes in Caesare manes*—like a guilty Orestes before he was purified, or Pentheus (who surely killed no one) and Agave. Though Caesar will reappear in Egypt in normal mental health Lucan foreshadows here the final resolution of Caesar's guilt in his assassination, when the nation's swords—or is it the swords of the senatorial *patres*, Rome's conscript fathers?²⁴—plunge into Caesar's flesh *dum patrii ueniant in uiscera Caesaris enses* (10.528). Human impiety and depravity infect the whole region of Thessaly, as they will Egypt in the poet's final condemnation of this

23 See P. R. Hardie, *The Epic Successors* 42 on demonic possession in Lucan.

24 Although a survey of Lucan's use of *patrius* finds two instances where it means specifically “belonging to the father” as opposed to ancestral or national, but no parallels for interpreting it as belonging to the <conscript> fathers. The gain in specificity supports the possibility.

treacherous kingdom in book 8, contrasted in the Libyan excursus of book 9 with the natural void of an accursed and polluted land on which men have wickedly intruded. This is Lucan's purpose as much as the glorification of Cato, which is by no means unambiguous. For ultimately civil war goes beyond individual impiety to create a ruined *oikoumene* and an empire enslaved.

Bibliography

- Bartsch, S., *Violence in Cold Blood*, Cambridge, Mass. 1997
- Bremmer, J., and Horsfall, N. M., *Roman Myth and Mythography*, *BICS*. Suppl. 52, London 1987
- Buchheit, V., *Vergil über die Sendung Roms*, Heidelberg 1963
- Fraenkel, E. D. M., *JRS* 35 (1945) 1–14 = *Kleine Beiträge* II, 1964, 1–14
- Hardie, P. R., *Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford 1986
- , *The Epic Successors of Virgil*, Cambridge 1993
- Hine, H.M., "Livy's judgment on Marius," *LCM* 3 (1978) 83–87
- Horsfall, N. M., *Virgil's Aeneid 7: A commentary*, Leiden 1998
- Jal, P., *Tite Live: Histoire Romaine XXXIII*, Paris 1979, 253–6
- Lapidge, M., "Lucan's Cosmic Dissolution," *Hermes* 107 (1979) 344–70
- , "Stoic Cosmology," in *The Stoics*, ed. John M. Rist, Berkeley 1978
- Loupiac, A., "La Poétique des Eléments dans la Pharsale de Lucain," *Latomus* 241, Brussels 1998
- Most, G. R., "Disiecti Membra Poetae: the rhetoric of dismemberment in Nero-nian poetry," 391–419 in: Hexter, R., and Selden, D., *Innovations of Antiquity*, New Haven 1992
- Norden, E., *Ennius und Vergilius: Kriegsbilder aus Roms grosser Zeit*, Berlin 1915
- Wiedemann, T., "Sallust's Jugurtha: Concord, discord and the digressions," *Greece and Rome* 40 (1993) 48–57
- Wiseman, T. P., *Remus*, Cambridge 1995

29. Statius' *Thebaid* and the Genesis of Hatred

HATRED: A mental state of revulsion from something that offends us—a dislike or feeling of ill will, intensified by the desire to harm or injure or make a speedy end of the object hated ... this applied in chief to hatred of persons by persons, at the root of which lies *the desire to destroy*. (W. L. Davidson, *Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*)

In discussing the treatment of psychology (or ethics) in Roman creative literature it is not always easy to reconcile the approach of philosophers, whose primary interest is in the reception of Hellenistic ethics and psychology, with that of literary interpreters who start, as I do, from the desire to understand the motivation of a poetic text. Previous work on Senecan tragedy and Lucan¹ has made me sceptical of claims for a primarily ethical and specifically Stoic motivation of their tragedy and epic: instead, their characterization appears to me rooted in the psychology of the poetic tradition and the ethics of a Roman cultural code that was only partly affected by Stoicism. However, even without positing a Stoic purpose, the student of Lucan and Seneca must recognize that Stoic conceptions of the human mind and human behaviour contributed to the way in which both poets retell both myth and history.

I

This discussion focuses on Statius' *Thebaid*, a work written a generation after Seneca and Lucan and clearly reflecting their influence. Statius himself came from a different milieu from that of the Annaei, more Hellenic, and at the same time more concerned with professional technique and the literariness of poetry. Yet the single extended study of his epic in English, Vessey's *Statius and the 'Thebaid'*, identifies the poem as a Stoic epic. Vessey bases this claim on very little argument beyond the eschatology of a fated sequence of events (*fatorum series*) that entailed each suc-

1 See Fantham, *Seneca's 'Troades': a Literary Introduction, Text and Commentary*, Princeton 1982, and *Lucan: 'De Bello Civili'* 2, Cambridge 1992.

cessive disaster.² But a far more distinctive aspect of Stoic doctrine is its psychology. Passions dominate Statius' poems and fuel each new phase of its action, but is their representation Stoic? The Stoics believed that the soul had a single nature. In its most extreme form, Stoic theory argued that passion in the soul afflicted and destroyed its reason, in turn infecting the reason of others and blighting its environment. Hence, a truly Stoic epic would surely have to represent all passions as destructive both of the psyche and of the society in which they are harboured.

In contrast, Greek popular morality, as reflected in tragedy and in the ethical writings of Aristotle, accepted the loyalties and enmities of communities, clans and other groups, and singled out only the extreme and isolated passion of an Ajax or a Medea for condemnation. To understand how hatred functioned in Greek tragedy, one must consider the language used to describe the passion and the gestures and behaviour associated with it, invoking the incidental judgements of chorus and on-lookers and matching them against the views of the origin and social function of hatred found in oratory and popular ethical texts. For Aristotle, emotions such as anger and hatred could be 'reasonable', warranted by certain types of provocation and useful in ensuring the defence of innocence and punishment of evil. Socrates (or Plato who recreated him) may have been the only major thinker who did not tolerate the negative passions of anger, envy, vengeance and hatred as useful forces in certain circumstances of the life of man and society.

Let us ask first where hatred belongs in the chart of the emotions. Aristotle recognizes it as a passion distinct from anger and envy, but treats anger as the dominant passion.³ Cicero's advocate Antonius in

2 Vessey's over-schematization is criticized both by Ahl 1986, 2810, and Feeney 1991, 338 n. 38. Billerbeck too 1986 finds few traces of Stoicism in Statius, and even her Stoic interpretation of Menoeceus must be disputed (see n. 54 below).

3 See Arist. *E.N.* 2.5, 1105b21–3: 'by *pathē* I mean appetite, anger, fear, confidence, envy, joy, affection, *hatred*, longing, emulation, pity...' In 1107 a 9–11, he mentions 'emotions whose very name connotes baseness, e.g. spite, shamelessness, envy.' Does this extend to hatred? Cf. also *Rhet.* 2.4. 1381 b 30 ff.: the nature of enmity (*echthra*) and hating (*misos*) is evident from the opposites [of what has been said about friendship (*philia*)]. Anger, spite and slander are productive of enmity. Now anger comes from what affects a person directly, but enmity also from what is not directed against himself: for if we suppose someone to be a certain kind of person, we hate him. And anger is always directed at individuals, while hate is directed also at types ... anger is accompanied by pain, but hate is not accompanied by pain: for the angry person is himself pained, the one who hates is not. One who is angry might feel pity when much has befall-

De oratore groups together hatred, anger and envy—though *invidia* is something more than envy—and ventures that *invidia* ('ill-will') is perhaps the strongest of all emotions.⁴ Given the concern with anger in both the philosophical and the rhetorical tradition founded by Aristotle, I hoped that analyses of anger in the *Rhetoric* or *Nicomachean Ethics* might cast incidental light on hatred and help me to understand how the philosophical tradition distinguished between the two levels or modes of passion. What these *pathē* have in common is ill-will directed at an individual; where they differ seems to be in motivation, duration and degree. Can one feel anger without hatred? Surely. Can one feel hatred without anger? Perhaps not: we will see that hatred is often defined as anger grown chronic. What other causes of hatred are there besides anger? Ancient texts often explained hatred as arising from other passions, such as envy and fear, so that it came to be included by the Stoics among secondary passions, 'that have [the dominant passion] as their reference.'⁵ What circumstances or relationships foster hatred? Different passages in the expository texts touch on these questions without offering explicit or consistent answers.⁶

Alongside these psychological questions were more important ethical issues, many of them raised in the dispute between radical Stoic thought and Aristotle's successors in the Peripatetic school who believed there could be such a thing as reasonable and even useful emotions. For the Stoics all emotions were 'unreasonable', that is, *pathē* in the strong sense of sicknesses or disturbances of the reason. It will greatly affect the representation of hatred in Roman literature that Stoicism, the predominant school of philosophy at Rome, saw any degree of anger as a

en, but one who hates under no circumstance; for the former wants the one he is angry with to suffer in his turn, the latter wants [the detested class of persons] not to exist.' (trans. Kennedy)

4 See *De oratore* 2.206, starting with the antithesis of love and hatred, but associating anger and envy with hatred: ('love') *amor* ('hatred') *odium* ('anger') *iracundia* ('envy') *invidia*. *Invidia* itself is paired with 'pity' (*misericordia*), because these two emotions are the basis of the final denunciation or appeal in Roman judicial oratory. See also 2.208 'if you were to exaggerate whatever is ruinous or harmful to the audience (jury), it creates hatred; but if you build up something harmful to good citizens or to those whom one should least harm, then even if no such bitter hatred is stirred up, it arouses a hostility not unlike ill-will (*invidia*) or hatred.'

5 See Stobaeus 2.88, 8 ff., = LS 65 A.

6 See nn. 3–4 above and nn. 9, 10 and text to n. 45 below.

mental sickness, to be inhibited even on the battlefield or when one faced the raping of one's wife or murder of one's child.

But if the Romans knew and repeated the Stoic doctrine, they found it difficult to apply consistently. Thus, Cicero closely associates his rather perfunctory account of hatred in the Stoicizing *Tusculan Disputations*⁷ with the issue whether anger is a prerequisite for successful combat—in battle or the arena. He denies that anger had a role to play in the just retributive killings by Roman heroes known to his audience through Ennian epic or the *fabula Praetexta*: but, in at least one case, the text he cites and his own characterization weaken Cicero's ethical claims.⁸

Seneca, focusing in *De ira* on Stoic values in a civilian context, also comments more than once on the undesirable nature of hatred, but is even more concerned with the non-moral problems of being hated.⁹ Seneca's personal situation and temperament fully explain why he was less concerned in his moral essays with the evil of hating than with being hated.¹⁰ The additional factor in his own life was the correlation

7 See *Tusc.* 4.21, where it is a desire (*libido*) and defined as anger grown chronic (*ira inueterata*).

8 That of Lucius Brutus, *Tusc.* 4.50. In *Tusc.* 4.21 hatred is grouped with anger, explosiveness, enmity, strife (*ira, excandescētia, inimicitia, discordia*), as a form of passionate desire; but the same passage contrasts raw instantaneous anger with hatred, as anger inured by time (*ira inueterata*); and makes a further distinction between hatred and *discordia*, which is applied to an even more bitter and deep-felt form of ill-will. But Cicero's correct Stoic position in theory should be contrasted with his contemporaneous political advocacy of just hatred and rejection of ethical wisdom (*sapientia*) when liberty is at stake in e.g. *Phil.* 13.6 and 16 'we feel hate and fight in anger, arms cannot be wrenched from our hands ... we would rather suffer the worst hardships than be slaves.'

9 In *De ira*, books 1–2, Seneca argues at length against the usefulness of anger in battle (1.12–13). On hatred, he adds these points: the good man does not hate (1.14) and must punish without feeling hatred (1.15); the loathsome features of enmity are incurable once it has hardened from anger into hatred (3.41); hatred is implacable (3.42) and ends in evil delight in the enemy's suffering (3.43). *Ep.* 14 (10–11) and 105 expand Seneca's arguments on the relationship between hatred and the fear and envy felt towards (and sometimes by) those in power.

10 On the reciprocity of hatred and other negative emotions, see e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 14.10: 'according to the old proverb, we must avoid three things: hatred, envy and contempt; but we have to beware that the fear of envy [being envied] carries us away into contempt [being despised].' *Ep.* 105.3 elaborates the hazards of being feared by slave or citizen, and the inevitable fear that comes from knowing one is feared.

between hatred and power. Living at the mercy of a capricious emperor, Seneca himself enjoyed sufficient power and wealth to provoke others' fear and envy. Thus, he was vulnerable to the emperor's hatred for his wealth or his political opposition to imperial decision, but scarcely less vulnerable to the envy of the powerless for the same wealth and his deceptive appearance of power.

Lucretius' Epicurean account of the development of society had incorporated the cycle of power, envy, fear and, by implication, hatred, into his account of the rise and fall of absolute rulers.¹¹ But when Seneca came to write his tragedies, such as *Thyestes* or the incomplete *Phoenissae*, which influenced Statius' *Thebaid*, he was less concerned with the hatred felt by oppressed subjects than with a more extreme form of hatred, based on the contest of equals or near-equals for absolute power. As a poet, he subordinates the legitimate loathing felt towards a tyrant to the unnatural horror of enmity between close kin. Certainly, when Seneca's Eteocles speaks of hatred as the corollary of royal power (*Phoen.* 654–7, cited in text to n. 29 below), he is thinking of the fear-driven hatred of his subjects. But Seneca shows us that power, the desire for power, drives Eteocles' own brand of hatred: although Eteocles (like Atreus) enjoys sole power at the expense of his exiled brother, his passionate enmity will not be satisfied by any extreme of revenge, and is scarcely ended by the death of its object. This is a hatred so deep it can only be resolved by the death of *the hater*.

Seneca is important as the first surviving moralist to experience at close hand the relationship between power and hatred under the principate: he had lived under two tyrants (Caligula, Nero) and been exiled and recalled by the gullible Claudius, who was manipulated by unscrupulous wives and freedmen. After him, other, less political, figures such as Plutarch and Epictetus would also study the patterns of power, jealousy and fear. Hence their work, and that of other imperial authors of this age, renews and develops discussion of the origins of hatred from the other passions that are felt by both the weak and the strong.

But no explicit and extended treatment of hatred and its causes has survived from the periods of Classical Greek and Roman poetry. How then can the modern reader reconstruct this or any other aspect of an-

11 Cf. *Lucr.* 5.1120–51, especially the role of envy (1125–32) and fear (1140) in the murderous deposition of kings by the common people, because 'whatever is too greatly feared, is trampled with glee' (*cupide conculatur nimis ante metutum*, 1140).

cient psychology? Before applying English terms such as ‘hatred’ or ‘enmity’ to gloss the speech or action of ancient epic or drama, he or she must take into account the different semantic ranges of the Latin and Greek terms that together cover the spectrum of passion, and examine the range of patterns of behaviour associated by the texts with these terms. It is then possible to move cautiously forward from the influential Greek versions of the relevant myths to the representation of these passions in the analogous sections of Roman drama and epic.

Thus, my approach to Statius’ Theban epic is based on a multiple approach to those Greek tragedies in which hatred seems to be a driving force. The Sophoclean tragedies and Euripides’ *Medea* provide both precedents and points of comparison for the power-mad peer hatred of the Theban brothers in Euripides’ *Phoenissae*, the late tragedy which seems to have been a model for both Seneca’s and Statius’ account of the sons of Oedipus.

After outlining what can be learnt from the related Greek and Roman tragedies in the first part of this chapter, we are ready to consider Statius’ own genre. I preface the case-study of hatred in the *Thebaid* with some comments on the role of this passion in the *Aeneid*, which deeply influenced the architecture of Statius’ war epic and his representation of both human and superhuman embodiments of hatred.

II

The tragic tradition

Since one of the difficulties in recognizing hatred or enmity arises from what psychologists call denial—the shame felt by scrupulous men at admitting to themselves and others that they feel enmity or are acting from hatred, rather than from moral indignation or a desire to redress injustice—there may be an additional advantage in returning to Greek tragedy. Although the rhetorical texts of both Greece and Rome display uninhibited hatred, scholars of Greek epic and tragedy have stressed the overt acknowledgement of hatred as a distinctive feature of Greek heroic culture. Stanford tells us, commenting on Sophocles’ *Ajax*, that ‘in heroic Greece it was considered a virtue to hate enemies’;¹² and Dover (1974, 181–2) asserts that ‘Athenians took enmity much more

12 Stanford 1963, 224, commenting on 1336. See also his Appendix F on anger and related terms.

for granted ... it was not the Athenian custom to disguise hatred.' Whether we regard the overt hatred expressed by Sophocles' *Electra* or *Ajax* or *Philoctetes* as 'heroic' or 'Athenian', there is no doubt that, as Blundell (1989) has shown, preoccupation with enemies, with enmity and the reciprocity of hatred, is a powerful force in Sophoclean tragedy, perhaps even more dominant than in the surviving Euripidean corpus. As is implied by Blundell's title, *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies*, such hatreds are usually the corollary of loyalties, whether to friends or community. The language of hatred in *Ajax* or *Medea* is closely intertwined with the dramatization of the ethics of friendship (*philia*): thus, the passion is presented in terms that allow the hater to represent his hatred as 'reasonable'. Gill has argued cogently that, where the hatred involved is so unnatural that it seems unreasonable even to the hater, a special kind of explanation must be supplied in the form of a curse, or guilt-induced madness, that may be personified by a Fury or Furies. A *Medea* about to kill her children or an *Eteocles* resolved to kill his own brother will go as far as she or he can to render this (essentially self-destructive) enmity intelligible in terms of social rights and wrongs. But, ultimately, the division of the hater's own personality, and the externalization of his passion, become a necessary strategy for warranting the action that passion demands.¹³

Lexically, three main roots in Greek cover the range of emotions from routine distaste through aversion to loathing and from routine political opposition or rivalry to murderous hatred. Although they overlap, each root has its own range of usage. In both prose and verse, *echthros*, *echthairein* and *apechthanesthai* ('enemy', 'hate', 'be hated') denote the second category of enmity, the emotion felt towards tyrants, competitors and obstacles to a dominant life-goal. Blundell (1989, 37, 39) notes that 'enmity may range from a passionate hatred to blunt acknowledgement of conflicting interests.' Thus, the axiom of Bias of Priene cited by Aristotle *Rhet.* 1389 b 23–5, 'always love as if you were going to hate and hate as if going to love,' recognizes that this kind of enmity will be terminated by self-interest such as the uniting of former rivals against a common enemy. In domestic and foreign politics alike, such enmity is regular and reversible and something less than we understand by hatred.

13 See Gill 1990, 25–8, on *Eteocles* in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* and *Medea*; and Gill 1983, 1987 for a more detailed analysis of the *Medea*-monologue discussed below.

Similarly, the verbs *misein* and poetic *stugein*, with their cognates, cover a range of distaste from the trivial to the obsessive. *Misein* ('hate') serves for Aristotle as the opposite to *philein* ('like', 'love'), positive and negative emotion defined in part by the categories of persons who are the objects of the affect. As *philein/philia* are felt towards our own—family, friends, fellow-citizens—so *misein/misos* are used for aversion and fear felt towards the other—women, foreigners, helots. Such aversion can be trivial: the corpus of Euripidean fragments is saturated with non-significant uses of *misein* to register lack of sympathy or disapproval for groups, or their behaviour.¹⁴ Such hackneyed phrases would seem to mean little more than a child's petulant 'I hate broccoli', and contribute nothing to understanding hatred as a passion. Yet the same vocabulary is used to voice Hippolytus' pathological horror of women. What distinguishes the singular passion of his misogyny in the extant play is not a different lexicon but the combination of this with other features that we shall find significant in tragic and epic haters. Thus, confronted by the nurse, he begins with a conventional expression of aversion; but, as her purpose is made clear, this turns to loathing, and he curses her and her sex with a hatred that he himself conceives as insatiable.¹⁵ This aversion to an alien class of persons is an entirely different form of hatred from the enmity of the brothers in *Phoenissae*, but the difference is clearly shown by the lexicon of the two plays. *Phoenissae* is marked by the recurrence of *echthros* (also the noun *echthra*, 'enmity', 374) with no instance of *misein* cognates, and one isolated incidence of *stugein* ('hate')—to which we shall return—in 1.700 lines.

The size of the Euripidean corpus, and the comprehensiveness of modern computer search, allow the reader to observe general lexical patterns of this type; for the actual behaviour of those who hate, we should look to both Sophocles and Euripides. The most persistent carriers of hatred, Ajax, Electra, Philoctetes, are proud figures humiliated and powerless, and it is powerlessness to obtain revenge that has nourished their hatred. But this is not the whole story. In Sophocles' *Ajax*, the dominant Agamemnon hates Ajax more brutally, even after his

14 See e.g. Eur. fr. 528.1, *Erechtheus* fr. 50.30 'I hate women who choose their children's lives before honour', fr. 886.1; 905.1, 'I hate a sophist who is not wise in his own case.'

15 Contrast *Hipp.* 639, 'I hate a clever woman', with 664–6, 'be damned: I will never be sated with hating women, even if someone claims I say it always and incessantly: for they too are always evil.'

death, than Ajax's rival and peer, Odysseus. The fullest demonstration of the psychology and ethics of hatred is given by the debate between Odysseus and Agamemnon over the body of Ajax. Here the 'proper circumstances for hatred and enmity' are defined, and a criterion emerges for measuring extreme hatred that will be used more than once by Seneca and by Statius in the *Thebaid*: extreme hatred pursues the hated one even in death and violates the ordinances of the gods to satisfy its passion. When Agamemnon is led by hatred of Ajax to refuse burial to his old enemy and gloat over his power to harm the corpse, it is Odysseus who argues that to deny the dead hero burial harms not Ajax but justice and the laws of the gods (*Ajax* 1331–45). Besides debating the ethical issues here, Sophocles is also portraying the different moral natures of Ajax's two enemies. The rival Odysseus abandons enmity for pity at Ajax's madness and observes the moral law of respect for the dead; but the brutal Agamemnon is moved only by Ajax's previous impotent enmity to the Atreidae, and seizes on his power as commander-in-chief to exploit his hatred without restraint.

In the Theban myth, as told by Sophocles and Statius, the offence of Creon is materially the same as that intended by Agamemnon; but in *Antigone* Creon acts from the bitterness and insecurity of a new tyrant without authority rather than from personal enmity. A mixture of fear and pride drives him to extend his punishment of the dead traitor to anyone who gives him burial. He had seen Antigone as a welcome bride for his son until her defiance turned his fear to hatred, intensified by jealousy of his son's love when Haemon tries to support her action; it is then that he calls her *misos* ('hated one') to Haemon's face (*Ant.* 760). In the *Thebaid*, as we shall see, Creon's denial of burial will be both a product and a source of hatred: the act that renews the conflict after the death of the brother-enemies. But, throughout the epic, burial and treatment of the dead constitute a locus for the exercise of love or hatred, and a testing of the ethical limits of enmity. It is for this reason that I have put particular emphasis on the issue of hatred in the last scene of the *Ajax*.

I return now to Euripides, using the fully drawn figure of Medea to illustrate how Euripides represents hatred and the hater, before moving to the Theban brothers of the *Phoenissae*. We think of *Medea* as a revenge play, and in both Euripides and Seneca one may choose to stress anger and resentment (*orgē/cholos*; *ira/dolor/furor*) rather than hatred itself, but the figure of Medea, like Electra, shows how a woman's powerlessness has turned anger into hatred. For want of resolution in

violence, the thwarted passions of these women develop an almost toxic condition, made more incurable by the external compulsion to conceal them. Thus, Medea's anger cannot be brought to an end: it is *duskata-paustos* (109).¹⁶

Medea's language also exemplifies how the hater's emotion spill over from their direct object (Jason) to self-hatred and hatred of those who should be dear: she calls both herself (113) and her children (36, 117) 'hateful' (*stugeros*). Her passion is expressed in curses, the most violent verbal manifestation of hatred, comparable to a murderous attack. Indeed, in tragedy and epic the curse is not just an effect of passion: it is a cause and vehicle of destruction. When Medea cries out, 'let the whole family perish' (πᾶς δόμος ἔρροι, *Med.* 114)—a curse also used by Eteocles to express his hatred at *Phoen.* 624—the curse itself goes into action: in this mythic world it is, paradoxically, both an admission of impotence and a potent, unstoppable force.¹⁷

In the presence of the man she hates, Medea will neither address him nor refer to him by name: indeed, she treats him as not there, referring to him in the third person (for instance, 'speaking to a bad man/husband', *kakou pros andros*, 498). Typically, the hated enemy is referred to only as 'this person' (*hode/hēde*); or by the relationship that he has betrayed: 'but I hate my husband' (ἀλλ' ἐμὸν πόσιν / μισῶ, 310–11). When Medea does name Jason, it is to Aegeus, the outsider, as she simulates the reasoned indignation of a person wronged ('Jason wrongs me, having suffered no harm from me', 692) and, more blatantly, when she has established a rhetoric enmity (cf. 734; 'my enemies', ἐχθρούς τοὺς ἐμούς, 767; 'harsh to enemies and kind to friends', βαρεῖαν ἐχθροῖς καὶ φίλοιςιν εὐμενῇ, 809) to lend justification to her intent: 'after throwing the whole family of Jason into confusion I shall leave this land' (795).

Jason likewise refuses to name her; in a movement to be repeated in many other plays, he can only convey his bitter passion by echoing her own denunciation and crediting his own emotions to all men and gods: 'O loathed creature, O most hated woman, to gods and me and to the whole race of men' (1323–4). Only in their final exchange is hatred

16 Cf. 93–5, 117–20, 195–200 and the chorus' allusion to incurable (*dusiatos*) anger and insatiable (*akorestā*) grudging (635).

17 In the same way, it was believed that the hateful words of *iambi* such as those of Archilochus had the power to destroy, and legend ascribed to his poems the deaths of Lycambes and his daughters. See Lefkowitz 1981, 27: the theme is explored in Elliott 1960.

made explicit face to face: 'the gods know your despicable nature.' 'Hate on! I loathe your bitter utterance.'¹⁸ This direct sensory revulsion, like other allusions to physical aspects of the hated person, is a psychologically acute insight: the hater loathes the sight and sound of those she hates. During the action Medea's passionate hatred has developed from sullen silence to voicing her desire for revenge (767), and then to increasingly obsessive concern with her enemies. The audience is shown how the thought of their gloating mockery drives her on to each destructive act and to the climactic internal conflict of her great monologue (1021–80).

In fact, Medea's speech of decision to kill her children is not strictly a monologue, and Gill (1987, 25–8), in a comparison between the parallel scenes of Euripides' and Seneca's *Medea*-plays, stresses the 'other-related character of the concerns' that fuel her inner conflict in Euripides. Despite the uncertainties caused by varying scholarly excision of parts of this text, it remains the complex speech of a complex person, unable to reconcile her role as mother and avenger, or to dissociate herself completely from the avenging anger (*thumos*). Even the moment of self-address can be seen as part of her sequence of responses to the other people of her world, her husband and her children (ibid. 30–1).

In contrast, the Medea of Seneca's play seems to stand outside herself; Gill notes the features of apostrophe to her passions (909, 916 etc.), and of a self-consciousness that casts self-description in narrative form, employing the third person (910, 927, 948 etc.). He shows how Seneca has subordinated the conflict between maternal and avenging impulses to a sharper clash, between moral and immoral responses, and has marked Medea's determined immorality (*scelus*, 923, 932 etc.) and her 'akratic' acknowledgment of a force that she does not wholly accept. After the onset of madness (958), Medea acts out the infanticide that she has conceived in sanity, finding a resolution between her sense of guilt and her willed immorality by reinterpreting the infanticide as both her crime and her self-punishment, to fuse her moral and immoral responses to the situation (Gill (1987), 31–6).

For the present argument, it is important to amplify Gill's helpful analysis of the Senecan scene, starting from Medea's first words addressed to her *animus* (*thumos*) as itself maddened: 'why do you delay, my spirit ... you are still in love, mad spirit' (*quid anime cessas? ... /*

18 *Med.* 1373–4. I follow most modern editors in adopting Weil's emendation *στύγει* (imperative) for *στυγεί* ('you are hated').

amas adhuc furiose).¹⁹ She is already conscious of her madness (*furor*) at 909, and of the divorce from her own *animus* in 917–19: ‘my fierce spirit has, deep within itself, decided on something or other, but does not yet dare to confess it to itself’ (*nescioquid ferox / decrevit animus intus et nondum sibi / audet fateri*). The strain of her mental disintegration, conveyed by her image of the storm-tossed sea (939–44), leads to a last resurgence of human tenderness, before *dolor* and *odium* (grief and hatred) take control (952) in the form of her old Erinyes, the consequence of her fratricide. ‘Grief grows up again and hatred boils; the old Fury looks again for my unwilling hand [or action]. Anger, I follow where you lead’ (*rursus increscit dolor / et feruet odium, repetit inuitam manum / antiqua Erinyes – ira, quo ducis sequor*, 952–4). Now her madness takes the form of hallucination (958–69), only remitted briefly when she strikes her first child (969–71), but reviving with the second killing (976–7, 982–7). Thus, Seneca sees the passion of hatred as the last step before madness, and depends upon this madness to explain the fact of unnatural crime.

This pointed sequence of hatred, madness and murder is strangely paralleled, twice over, in Seneca’s *Hercules Furens*. Instead of Lussa, the personification that interrupts Eurpides’ drama to bring on Hercules’ dementia,²⁰ Seneca presents the hero’s madness and its cause in two phases. First, Juno in the prologue stressed the intensity of her hatred: ‘my hatred will not pass away so easily: my violent spirit will urge on undying anger’ (27–8), and, ‘Anger, go on, go on and crush him as he dares great deeds: confront him, tear him to shreds with your own hands: why do you delegate such great hatred?’ (75–7).²¹ As part of her rising passion she invokes ‘Crime, Impiety, Delusion and Madness ever armed against itself’ (98) to destroy him, and calls on the Erinyes (‘handmaids of Pluto’, *famulae Ditis*, 100). Both she and they must first become crazed in order to madden Hercules, and she reproaches

19 Sen. *Med.* 895–7, accepting Bentley’s masculine *furiose* (‘mad’, ‘frenzied’) in 897 (with Leo, Zwierlein and most recent editors) over *furiosa*, the common reading of the MSS.

20 Euripides inserts at *Her.* 823–73 a dialogue between Iris and Lussa, in which Lussa describes how she will cause Hercules’ homicidal madness, employing the first person singular, ‘I will first kill his children’ (865), to affirm her responsibility.

21 *non sic abibunt odia: uiuaces aget / uiolentus iras animus* (27–8) ... *perge ira, perge et magna meditantem opprime, / congregere, manibus ipsa dilacera tuis: quid tanta mandas odia?* (75–7)

herself for failing to reach this madness ('What, not yet mad?', 109). Later, despite an apparent change of plan,²² she declares outright that she will direct the maddened Hercules' weapons to complete his crime (118–20).

The link between hatred and madness, madness and crime is renewed when her threats are enacted by Hercules' dreadful insanity. Delusions set in at 939, but he does not speak of the Erinyes until 982–6. As in Medea's case, this leads immediately into the language of hatred, as he turns on (his own) children: 'see how the offspring of the hated tyrant cowers, the abominable brood! This hand will soon restore you to your [dead] father.'²³

In both Senecan dramas, the expression of hatred precipitates or signals the madness that commits the tragic crime. We can see the passion as the internal force that Seneca's figures apostrophize, or again as an external force, which in Hercules' case is represented both by the half-allegorical Juno of the prologue and by the Erinyes who appear to both hero and goddess. This changed representation of passion, in its equation of hatred with madness, as in its equation of crime with madness, is certainly compatible with Stoic thought.

Euripides' portrayal of the mutual hatred of the Theban brothers in the *Phoenissae* follows the pattern of his *Medea*, and again supplies fruitful comparisons for their treatment in both Seneca and Statius. Although Euripides puts the brothers' only stage encounter early (446–637), they are represented in narrative, though the speeches of the two messengers, before (1217–77) and after (1336–1446) the fatal combat. A preliminary scene between Polyneices and Jocasta comments on the nature and origin of the brothers' passions. While Polyneices includes himself with his brother, seeing the worst aspect of their hatred in their kinship itself,²⁴ Jocasta first passes judgement on his hatred alone, ascribing it to the ousted brother's envy (539–40), then includes Eteocles in her reproaches: the folly of two men contending for a single prize is the most hateful of evils (580).

22 On the ambiguities of these lines and the disputed text in 108–9 (*nobis/uobis, furis/furit*) and 112 (*uota mutantur mea / odia mutantur mea*), see Fitch 1987, 153–5.

23 *ecce proles regis inimici latet / nefandum semen; inuiso patri / haec dextra iam uos reddet* (H.F. 987–9).

24 'How dreadful is enmity, mother, between kindred and dear ones' (374).

Once Eteocles has entered, the brothers communicate only through Jocasta. Neither names the other. To Eteocles, Polyneices is 'this man'. He addresses him only when ordering him to leave, which he does four times.²⁵ As Polyneices calls on the gods for justice, Eteocles breaks in 'they loathe you' (606, the only instance of *stugein* in the play), and the dialogue reaches the final stage. At the high point—a stalemate like the last encounter of the *Medea*—Eteocles answers Polyneices' threat to kill him by acknowledging the passion ('desire', *erōs*, 622) of his own murderous intent,²⁶ and cursing the whole family (624). Before their next (off-stage) encounter, Eteocles will extend his hatred beyond death, prohibiting the burial of his (still-living) brother and imposing this decree upon Creon; even so, his passion spills over into mistrust and abuse of both Creon and Teiresias.

The patterns that we saw in *Medea* are confirmed in the messenger speeches. When Eteocles proclaims the single combat to the armies, he wears his public face and speaks of his brother by name and as kinsman; there is neither abuse nor accusation. Polyneices is equally correct and—for once—praises his brother's speech (1237). But when the messenger calls Jocasta to intervene, she never doubts that they will fight to the death, and that she and Antigone must perish over the bodies.

In the narrative of the combat (1357–1426), each brother symmetrically appeals to the warrior goddess (Hera, Athene) to help him kill his brother, acknowledging the relationship he will violate (1363–6, 1373–6). They fight without quarter, like wild boars;²⁷ as Eteocles strips the armour from his wounded brother, Polyneices exploits his feigned helplessness to strike a deadly blow. Only after his brother's death does Polyneices forget his hatred and speak with pity, recalling the tragic coincidence of *philia* and *echthra* which he lamented at 374: 'Mother, he became my enemy but he was once dear' (*philos*, 1446).

Besides the expression of hatred in word and action, Euripides calls on several symbols of hatred that Statius will use repeatedly to articulate the violent passions of the *Thebaid*. We might note the allusion to the

25 'This man' (*hōde*), 451, 511, 514, 523. Polyneices uses the same form at 473, 479, 481 and 487. Eteocles uses the second person for the first time at 593, then at 604, 613 and 636.

26 Compare hatred as 'desire' (*libido*) in Cic. *Tusc.* 4.21, n. 7 above.

27 *Phoen.* 1371–2, echoed by *Theb.* 11.524–35. Euripides also compares the brothers to twin beasts (1298) and lions fighting in their lair (1573).

gorgon as symbol of the hated enemy's face,²⁸ on the Homeric similes of animal hatred (1298, 1380, 1573–4), and the association of the final combat with Ares and Hades (1576).

Seneca's setting of the confrontation scene is more oblique, avoiding direct exchanges between the brothers even to the end. Both brothers are present from the beginning but Jocasta speaks to each in turn; as in Euripides, neither brother names the other and Eteocles addresses Polyneices only to order him into exile (652, repeated at 662).

What is conspicuous is how Seneca again holds back the language of direct hatred until the last phase, substituting vocabulary of moral condemnation such as 'crime, evil, guilty' (*scelus, nefas, nocens*). The noun *odium*, the only Latin equivalent of 'hatred', is reserved for Eteocles' final self-assertion: for him (even more than in Euripides) power is all. 'He who fears to be hated does not want to be king: the god who created the universe produced those two evils, kingship and hatred, together: I think it is the mark of a mighty king to suppress even men's hatred.'²⁹ We do not know how this unfinished play would have continued or reached its climax, but the climax of the present text is the yoking of hatred with the prize of kingship.³⁰

28 'Stop your dreadful glare and gasps of anger. / You are not looking at the throat-severed head / of a gorgon, but looking at your brother who has come. / And you as well; turn your face to your brother / Polyneices', Jocasta to the brothers, *Phoen.* 454–8, tr. Craik. For the gorgon face as symbol of the enemy, including enemy kinsmen, see Fantham, 'Lucan's Medusa Excursus,' *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 29 (1992), 95–119, here 101–2.

29 *regnare non uult, esse qui inuisus timet. / simul ista mundi conditor posuit deus / odium atque regnum: regis hoc magni reor / odia ipsa premere* (654–7).

30 This restriction of its use is also true of Seneca's other hateful brother, Atreus. The word *odium/odia* is held back until the climax of his premeditation of the crime (*Thy.* 323, 329) when he declares it is mission to carry on active hatred. *Odium* serves as a leitmotif on two more occasions: in the deception scene at 493–4 and 511, and when Thyestes learns of his children's murder: 'is this how you lay down your hatred? (*sic ponis odia?*) Yet I beg my brother for their burial which can be granted without cancelling your crime or hatred (*odium*)' (1025–8).

III The epic tradition

If Statius absorbed from Euripides and Seneca the characterization of his hateful brothers, the Theban tragedies are not the sole source of the role played by hatred in his epic. It is from his revered Virgil that he developed the whole infernal and supernatural apparatus of the war—hatred and conflict.³¹ In this connection, Virgil's book 7 is the most influential, as peaceful people are driven to war by the cumulative evil generated by Allecto at Juno's command. Juno herself is the main vehicle of hatred in the *Aeneid*, marked by three of the thirteen instances of *odium/odia*;³² and it is she who invokes Allecto, the loathed deity whom even her own kinsmen abhor, because Allecto can send loyal brothers to arms against each other and pervert families with hatred.³³ Besides Juno and Allecto, only evil men hate or are hated: the tyrants Pygmalion (1.361) and Mezentius (10.692, 853, 905), the demagogue Drances (11.122) and the lying Sinon, who first claims to have become hated for defending the dead Palamedes, then falsely swears 'let it be right to hate the Greeks!' (*sit fas odisse uiros*, 2.158). Dido's curse, like that of Oedipus in *Thebaid*, imposes hatred between others, in this case, the enmity in war of her descendants against those of Aeneas (4.623). Turnus, Aeneas' other great adversary, vents his passion in fighting and begins his last day of life implacable with burning passion,³⁴ but ends it begging Aeneas to 'carry hatred no further'.³⁵

31 For the multiplicity of influences on Statius, compare Feeney 1991, 344 n. 107: 'Statius has two mighty progenitors, Vergil and Ovid, together with two god-fathers, Seneca and Lucan, and a grandfather, Homer.'

32 1.668; 5.786; 7.298. To her the Trojans are 'the loathed race' (*gens / stirps inuisa*, 1.28; 7.293).

33 See *Aen.* 7.571, 'loathed deity' (*inuisum numen*); 327, 'even her father Pluto and her sisters hate her' (*odit et ipse pater Pluton, odere sorores*); 336–7, 'you can make brothers who are united by love go armed into battle and destroy homes with hatred' (*tu potes unanimos armare in proelia fratres / atque odii uersare domos*). As both Whitman 1987 and Rieks 1989, 33–7, have shown, Virgil's Furies, e.g. Discordia (6.280), are only extensions of the bad *pathē* (*ira, furor, dolor*) whose destructive effects Virgil reconrds more literally throughout *Aen.* Virgil's Juno is clearly a major influence on the representation of Juno in Seneca's *H.F.*, discussed in text to nn. 21–3 above: it is Allecto that underlies Juno's invocation of the *famulae Ditis* in *H.F.* 100.

34 'Spontaneously, he burns implacably, and rouses his spirit' (*ultro implacabilis ardet / attollitque animos*, 12.3). Cf. 12.9 'Turnus' violence swells up' (*gliscit uiolentia*

Of course, Virgil represents many forms of passion close to hatred, such as blood-lust and rage, through terms for anger and madness (*ira*, *rabies* and *furor*), by epithets, and more indirectly by speech and behaviour such as we have seen in tragedy. But he sets the pattern that will be observed by Senecan tragedy and Statian epic, reserving the single name of hatred for significant and climactic moments. We should note too how rare is a speaker's overt declaration of hatred, as opposed to the poet's own interpretation of his warriors and contenders. Virgil imposed a decorum on his heroes that might yield instant fury or indignation, but was sparing in suggesting personal animosity. And he put those who hated their brothers among the damned in Tartarus.³⁶

But Statius' Thebans were neither Roman ancestors, nor 'heroes' in our modern sense, whose behaviour had to meet a certain level of nobility.³⁷ The only inhibition upon his display of hostility between warriors or armies was the need to reserve a climactic level of animosity for the inborn and curse-begotten hatred of the sons of Oedipus. The epic announces its theme as 'alternate kingship fought over with impious hatred' (*alternaque regna profanis / descertata odiis*, 1.2), and devotes its opening movement to demonstrating the genesis of Statius' 'more than civil war' in the three realms of gods and men and underworld deities. Even before the first book is out, we may feel that Statius' war against Thebes

Turno); while *implacabilis*, like its synonym *implacidus* ('rough', 'ungentle'), stressed the incurable and unrelenting aspect of hatred, the verb *gliscere* ('swells') conveys the tumid growth of hatred or blood-lust seen as *libido* ('desire'). Both words are used by Statius in imitation of Virgil: see *implacabilis ardor* ('implacable passion'), *Theb.* 1.440, and n. 60 below on *gliscere*.

35 *ulterius ne tendere odiis* (12.938). Does Aeneas feel hatred, or is this only the bias of Turnus, interpreting his enemy in his own terms? Aeneas' state of mind in this final act of killing is the key to the most important modern disputes over Virgil's ethical and political viewpoint: see Galinsky 1988 and Putnam 1990, esp. 18–19. Putnam usefully correlates the psychology of anger in Virgil and Senecan tragedy; see also Fowler, ch. 1, sect. 4; Wright, ch. 9; Gill, ch. 11, sect. 4.

36 *Aen.* 6.608: 'here were those who hated their brothers while they were alive' (*hic quibus inuisi fratres dum uita manebat*).

37 A reader has reminded me that the figures of Lucan's *Civil War* were also Romans and ancestors of the poet's generation; but, in their vulnerability to hatred and other passion, they are clearly to be contrasted with the Republican ancestors. Only Cato is shown as free from selfish passion, but Lucan's own rhetoric makes even Cato's patriotic *uirtus* ('courage') alarmingly passionate.

is the most over-determined conflict in antiquity—except perhaps the start-up mechanisms of Eumolpus' *Bellum civile*.³⁸

I would like to focus on two dimensions of hatred and related passions in the *Thebaid*. The first concerns the diverse strands of passion which Statius feeds into his war narrative, as he strategically distributes surges of anger, blood-lust and hatred through the action up to and beyond the deadly combat of the brothers. The second is the relationship between hatred and supernaturally induced madness, *furor*, that we have already seen in Seneca's criminal protagonists and Virgil's counter-heroes, and the degree of responsibility attributed by Statius to those driven by *furor*.

There can be no doubt about the importance of human hatred as a driving force in the *Thebaid*; in Vessey's analysis of the humours of the leading mortals, he assigns bitterness and hatred to Oedipus, tyranny (but also hatred) to Eteocles, vengeance and envy to Polyneices, and anger to Tydeus.³⁹

But hatred and kindred passion animate the gods above even before the appearance of Oedipus and his hateful sons. The grievous anger of Bacchus (11) and the work of savage Juno (12) precede the first human reference, namely that to the unrestrained anger of Tydeus (1.41). At 50, Oedipus in rage at his sons' treatment invokes the Dirae, and Tisiphone in particular, and in 88 the action passes to the infernal realm, and to Tisiphone, the personification of vengefulness.⁴⁰ With Tisiphone, Statius comes very near to allegory, portraying her in the first full characterizing description (*notatio*) of the epic: her conventional head-snakes, arms and blazing torch enhanced by the iron glare (*ferrea lux*) of her eyes and her flesh bloated with pus and venom.⁴¹ From the poi-

38 Note that the crowd of personifications in Petronius' travesty of civil war epic (*Satyricon* 119–24) presupposes that divine personification of evil and hatred were already a feature of epic a generation before Statius.

39 Vessey (1974), 66. This is borne out by the blazons of their shields and helmets in *Thebaid* 4. To Polyneices' Sphinx and Tydeus' Mars (111), add Hippomedon's representation of the Furies at the wedding night of the Danaids (133).

40 Statius calls her *debita uindex*, 'the due avenger' (1.80), just as Virgil calls her the Avenger in *Aen.* 6.570.

41 1.103–13. Here the reader should recall Seneca's *notatio* of Anger at *De ira* 2.35.5. He compares the face of an angry man to 'infernal monsters girded with serpents and with fiery breath, just as the most loathsome goddesses of the underworld emerge to stir up wars and spread discord among nations and tear apart peace' and leads on to what seems to be an inaccurate quotation of *Aen.* 8.702–3, describing Bellona and Discordia. The face of anger is that of

son of her instigation spring the passions of the brothers: fury, envy at the other's success, and fear, the parent of hatred:

Immediately passions are stirred beneath the brother's breasts, and their inherited madness takes over their hearts, and envy distressed by good fortune and fear, the begetter of hate. *From this source* comes the savage love of ruling, and the violation of their turns, and ambition intolerant of the second claim, and the sweeter charm of one man standing at the peak of power, and strife the companion of divided rule. (*Thebaid* 1.123–30)

What is this *furor*? Schetter's extended discussion is refined by Venini.⁴² They agree in the range of *furor*, which covers noble madness, such as prophetic inspiration and heroic self-dedication (*deuotio*), as well as routine blood-lust in battle and frenzied rage or hatred.⁴³ They agree that, in Statius, it is possession by a supernatural being that renders the crazed person out of control (*inops animi*); but Venini, at least, argues that Statius always makes clear the natural propensity of the human agent for the passion and the actions performed in a state of *furor*. Thus, the brothers' behaviour following the lines which we have discussed is the immediate outcome of Tisiphone's infection, but is also generated by their natures. As Oedipus' declares, 'the young men's spirit will not be slow to follow: you will recognize the pledge of my paternity' (1.86–7).

In 1.127 Statius connects the list of passions to specific behaviour with *inde* ('from this source'), an ambiguity designed to blur the distinction between Tisiphone and the bad *pathē* as cause of the hostile actions. Here, the raw emotions are realized in terms of the power-struggle, the

a Fury. Hence Vessey 1982, 574, calls Tisiphone 'a *figura* of hatred and madness'. Whitman 1987, 46–6, 55–7, cites both the Senecan *notatio* and the early books of *Theb.* as examples of 'allegorical tendencies' rather than outright allegory, while Rieks 1989, 25–37, speaks without qualification of the allegorization of these evil *pathē* in both Seneca and the poetic tradition before and after Virgil.

42 Schetter 1960; Venini 1964, 201–13. On madness in general in Statius, see Hershkovitz 1994, 1995. Feeney 1991, 348, notes that Statius leads from the personified passions into a 'naturalistic account of the brothers' discord' but misses the importance of the political, power-focused, language that follows.

43 For the link between *furor* and hatred, cf. with 1.126–7, 5.74–5, 'everywhere fierce hatred and *Furor* and discord reclined even in the very bed'. *Furor* is closely associated with hatred of the brothers at 7.515, 525; 11.329, 382, 440, 538–9, and (*post mortem*!) 12.444; with the hatred of Creon at 12.593 and 660. Elsewhere, it most commonly denotes the lust to kill, whether general or specific.

obsession with undivided rule, that the poets Seneca and Lucan recognized in Euripides' *Phoenissae*.⁴⁴ But note that Statius provides psychological motivation for hatred in the emotions of fear and envy (which Seneca and Plutarch also present as the source of human hatred).⁴⁵ For, despite Statius' wording, both *invidia*, the painful jealousy of Polyneices, and *metus*, the fear felt by the tyrannical Eteocles, are to be seen as causes of hatred. Alongside these three negative passions, he adds the evil passions of desire for power (*regendi saeuus amor*) and, matching Eteocles' fear, Polyneices' fretful hope (*spes anxia*, 1.322).⁴⁶

But when the poet intervenes in person, rebuking the brothers for their anger (1.155–6), he adds a further motivation besides Oedipus' curse and its infernal agent: the very palace and crown of Thebes are polluted and create hatred, because they have been 'bought at the cost of dreadful frenzy' (*furiisque immanibus emptum*, 1.162–4). The discord and physical separation of the brothers enable Statius to multiply the scene of the action: while his council of the gods gives prominence to Juno's hatred of Thebes (256), on earth Polyneices has travelled through a hurricane to reach the porch of Adrastus' palace at Argos. Here, his first act will be to fight with the unknown Tydeus who tries to share his shelter, in mutual and eager hatred (*alacres odio*, 425, cf. 441).

At this point, one could protest that the fight for a shelter in a palace porch may be a fine symbol of Polyneices' greed for sole tenancy of the throne, but the anger of Polyneices and Tydeus, though *furor* (1.438), is not hatred. It is quickly dispelled and yields to an equally passionate friendship that will be the most positive aspect of Polyneices' character. What the episode does contribute is Tydeus himself, a man driven by anger and so a new source of hating, who will constantly provoke others to warfare and ultimately break the bounds of human decency in victory over an enemy warrior who has not offended against him or the code of

44 Cf. 1.150–1, 'naked power drove the brothers to arms' (*nuda potestas / armauit fratres*).

45 Sen. *Ep.* 14.14–16; 105.10–14; Plutarch, 'How to Profit from your Enemies,' *Moralia* 86b–92a.

46 The last is developed more fully in a new analysis of Polyneices' passions in 2.318–20: 'resentment and crazed anger consumed his heart, and the most grievous passion inflicted on mortal cares, hope long delayed' (*exedere animum dolor iraque demens / et qua non grauior mortalibus addita curis / spes, ubi longa uenit*).

battle. The implacable passion⁴⁷ of the two newcomers, whose hatred violates the calm of Adrastus' sleep (1.440–1), is there to mark their future careers, and to foreshadow the course of the epic, not to describe the relationship between them. But, by this point half-way through his first book, Statius has set the scene with the forces of hatred in Argos as well as in Thebes, and on Olympus as well as in the infernal realm. It is as though hatred has run mad in the epic, passing beyond the predictable confines of personal grievance to become a self-proliferating infection beyond control.⁴⁸

Thus, the second book introduces new forces for hatred. We meet, in sequence, Laius, driven from Hades to haunt his grandson;⁴⁹ Eteocles, roused by Laius from sleep to war-lust; Polyneices, torn by resentment, anger and hope (318–20); and Tydeus, who arrives as a provocative envoy to Eteocles, and receives a tyrant's answer. The failure of Eteocles' ambush on the returning envoy serves to renew anger in both Thebes and Argos. Book 3 opens with the accusations and suicide of Maeon, Eteocles' first tyrannical denial of burial (85–98) and the mourning of the bereaved Thebans. In this scene, as in Aletes' brief secondary narrative of the slaying of Niobe's children (3.195–7), mourning is given its rhetorical function of generating *invidia* ('envy' or 'resentment'), the hatred of those who have suffered against men seen as the cause of suffering.⁵⁰

Twice, in book 3 before the expedition sets out, and in book 7 after the funeral games for Archemorus, Statius constructs a similar sequence that moves from Jupiter's initiative to Mars and his retinue and to the impact of Mars on both warring forces.⁵¹ Mars' role as an embodiment of war-lust, the bloodthirsty charioteer associated with northern Thra-

47 *Implacabilis ardor* (440), a phrase that echoes Turnus' mood in *Aen.* 12.3; see n. 34 above.

48 If passion is inherently beyond control within the person, Statius is true to Stoic doctrine in representing it as infecting the body politic and even (by association, *sumpatheia*) nature itself.

49 This is modelled on the prologue to Sen. *Thy.*, in which Tantalus is driven by a speaking Fury to approach his grandson's palace and infect it against his will.

50 Cf. 3.214–15, 'these things the old men said and greatly exaggerated the wickedness of Eteocles, calling him cruel and unspeakable, and declaring he would be punished for it', with Cicero's model account in *De oratore* 2.201 of how Antonius roused the *invidia* ('resentment') of the bereaved families against the commander responsible for their kinsmen's deaths.

51 On Mars' two levels of being, as allegory and as anthropomorphic Olympian, see Feeney 1991, 367–74.

cian tribes and a personified retinue of terror and panic, originated in the *Iliad* and persists in the *Aeneid*.⁵² Thus, Virgil's divine craftsman Vulcan actually separates Mars from the national gods of Rome at Actium in the description of the shield of Aeneas, and sets him between the two naval forces with the Dirae, Discordia and Bellona (8.700–3). Later, Turnus enraged is compared to Mars with his escort of Dread, Anger and Treachery (*Formido, Irae, Insidiaeque*, 12.332–6). Lucan echoed Virgil's more cautious use, evoking Mars only in the climactic simile that compares Caesar's violence in battle at Pharsalus to the god himself (7.567–73).⁵³

Statius' Mars is both allegorized and dramatized from the beginning; but there is an escalation in personnel or in hostility from Jupiter's first initiative in book 3 to the renewal of desire for war in book 7. In book 3, Mars is sent to disturb the inclinations of men for peace so that they will loathe safety (231), and this is shown in parallel action on earth. At one level, Tydeus passes through the Peloponnese, inflaming the communities with hatred of Thebes (3.338), and Statius dilates on the resentment and anger and passion for war that he provokes. At the other level, it is Mars who excites men's hearts, filling them with love of himself. He drives his chariot attended by Fury, Anger, Panic and Rumour, and, while his charioteer lashes Rumour to spread true and false tales, the god himself, filled with hate (*infestus*), belabours her with his spear (3.420–31). In the seventh book, Mars appears in two instalments: first in an almost allegorical tableau at the shrine which he inhabits, surrounded by his retinue of hate-related abstractions, Assault and Wickedness and blood-red Anger, Fear, Treachery, Discord, Threats, most grim Valour (*uirtus*) and gleeful Frenzy and armed Death;⁵⁴ then in action, sending Panic ahead from the Isthmus

52 *Il.* 4.439–40; 5.89off.; 13.299 ff.; *Aen.* 12.332–6.

53 Such a mythological simile is rare in Lucan, but is anticipated by the somewhat apologetic comparison of the preparations of the two Roman armies before Pharsalus to the gods arming before the gigantomachy (7.144–50).

54 Most sinister and significant is the juxtaposition of *uirtus* and *Furor*. Although Billerbeck 1986, 3143–4, argues for the Stoic conception of *uirtus* as inspiring the self-dedication of Menoeceus in book 10, Ahl 1986, 2848, 2900, more persuasively, argues for Statius' negative interpretation of both *uirtus* and the Menoeceus episode: 'one's *uirtus* is measured by one's ability to destroy'. As Feeney 1991, 383–5, shows, *uirtus*, 'death-besotted valour', will prove kin to *Furor* in the suicide of Amphiaras and the death-scene of Tydeus (cf. 9.6, discussed below), as well as the *deuotio* of Menoeceus. It is not Stoic *uirtus* but a very dif-

to outdo Rumour and provoke men and animals alike to violence (7.105–9).

Parallel but completely independent is Tisiphone's appearance at 7.466–9; her mission is restricted to the sons of Oedipus. Given the brothers' mutual hatred, it is sufficient that she fills each with thoughts of his brother enemy, and both of them with the thought of Oedipus, while Oedipus himself, roused from his confinement, renews his appeal to the Furies.⁵⁵

Thus, two sources of supernatural provocation are operating in counterpoint, and, throughout the epic, Mars' provocation of blood-lust (*furor* and *ira*) will act as a warm-up for the climactic intervention of Tisiphone. Their effects consistently coincide with the difference between the honest battle of ordinary mortals and malevolent, dehumanizing hatred. Indeed, for all her vivid personification and purposive actions, Tisiphone should be identified with the *furor* she implants in guilty men, that is, with hatred.⁵⁶

Statius' seventh book, then, shares the function of Virgil's seventh, but motivates his outbreak of hostilities with both Olympian war-lust and infernal hatred. When Tisiphone's infusion of hatred suffers a setback from Jocasta, whose reproaches to Polyneices shame him and his army,⁵⁷ Tydeus serves his structural purpose as a force for conflict. Full of just anger, he reminds the army of their ambushed comrades, and Polyneices of the risk of entering Thebes under safe conduct from a treaty-breaker. As a climax, he renews hostility in Polyneices with the suggestion that he will put himself in the power of his brother's hatred (*possessum odiis*, 551). The thought of hatred begets hatred.

When the army decides again for war, the Fury seizes her opportunity to play Allecto, and in Virgilian mode causes the first bloodshed by

ferent quality that animates these heroes: Stoic redefinition of *uirtus* as a moral constancy or endurance left it open to moralists to condemn the brute military valour that traditional epic still called by the same name.

55 'Tisiphone, shaking her twin snakes, runs wild in both camps; she hurls brother against brother, and father against both: he [Oedipus] aroused, wanders far from his inner retreat at home, appeals to the Furies and asks to have his eyes back' (*it geminum excutiens anguem et bachatur utrisque / Tisiphone castris; fratrem huic, fratrem ingerit illi, / aut utrique patrem: procul ille penatibus imis / excitus implorat furias oculosque reposcit*).

56 See Feeney 1991, 346–56, and Venini 1970, on 11.84 and 414.

57 Statius almost schematically marks the barometer at 7.531, 'instantly anger dwindles'.

provoking the sacred tame tigers of Bacchus to attack the Argive warriors. Once Aconteus has wounded them, and is in turn killed by a priest of Bacchus, all hope of parley is dismissed, and a chaotic battle breaks out. Each of these stages has been marked by the language of anger and the revived force of Mars (7.562–704).

Feeney's important discussion has brought out how Statius colours even the relations of other beings outside Thebes with hostile motives, with hatred, jealousy and rage. This is fully displayed at the opening of book 8, when Dis, angry that Amphiaraus has been engulfed by the earth and intruded upon the Underworld, protests at the violation of his grim neutrality, his 'restless calm' and his liberty to 'loathe the daylight' (8.44–5).⁵⁸ Hating his brother Jove, and grieving at his unequal share of Persephone's year (63–4), he is himself an analogue for the sons of Oedipus.⁵⁹ Now—for the second time—Tisiphone is sent back to earth to produce a new kind of evil that will amaze him and provoke her sisters' envy.

Thus, in this proem to the next phase of the epic (book 8–12) the prospectus is set by Dis, and by the forces of malevolence. The brothers' combat is to be the 'first omens of his hatred' (*nostrique haec omina sunt prima odii*, 69–70), preceded by the cannibal savagery of Tydeus, and the hubris of Capaneus.

Before the brothers' final duel, only one episode will express the full force of hatred. This is the death of Tydeus. Once Enyo renews the fighting, book 8 is devoted to Tydeus' *aristeia*. When Tydeus confronts and aims at Eteocles, Tisiphone prevents the great moment that could have ended the war. She deflects Tydeus' spear-cast to reserve Eteocles for combat with his abominable brother (687). And it is Tisiphone who sends Tydeus' own war-lust over the brink into inhuman hatred. When he is wounded by Melanippus and tries to retaliate, he precipitates his own death from loss of blood by the sheer violence of his spear-cast, and is dragged from the combat. First, the excess of hate in his character spills over into self-hate; repudiating burial and loathing the body that has merely retarded his fighting spirit, he asks only for the head of his

58 *quid me otia maesta / saeuus et implacitam prohibet perferre quietem / amissumque odisse diem?* But Statius does everything to assimilate Hades' position to that of Polyneices, as he asks, 'which brother has inflicted these battles on me? ... the third lot has cast me down defeated the mighty vault of heaven' (36, 38–9).

59 Feeney 1991, 350–2; he also notes the same brother-rivalry in Virtus' appeal to Menoeceus (385).

enemy. As he gloats over the severed head, maddened with anger and joy, he swells with lust.⁶⁰ Yet Statius gives his word that Tydeus' hatred would have been content to gaze at his decapitated enemy. It is again Tisiphone who demands worse.⁶¹ Statius postpones the horror—so that Pallas herself recoils from her protégé as she sees him suck his enemy's blood and gnaw his brain.

This grisly climax leads to one of Statius' most telling phrases. Tydeus has violated the laws of hatred, *fas odii* (9.4). Even the utterly ruthless Mars, intent on the work of slaughter, turns away, offended by Tydeus' valour (*uirtus*), and steers away his frightened team, while Eteocles compares him to a wild beast, whose naked hatred (*nuda odia*) does not need weapons. Is Statius simply recognizing a limit on hatred, as recent critics suggest,⁶² or is he establishing a new standard, a new absolute for hatred? Normal battle-lust observes the code in treatment of the dead, but when hatred is truly intense, every code is violated. Hatred itself is *nefas*.

There had been no personal enmity between Tydeus and Melanippus, not even an angry exchange of Homeric taunts. Melanippus' offence began five minutes before his death, but Tydeus hates him because his spear-cast was both furtive and fatal to the champion who could never have been defeated face to face. Surely Statius, like Virgil, has pointedly limited his attribution of hatred to evil creatures and flawed or wicked men?

In the last two books, Statius must achieve a climax of fraternal hatred and show how—against all hope—hatred renews itself and proliferates like a hydra head. It will not cease until Creon dies forty lines before the epic's close.

How can the poet convey the horror of the brothers' mutual loathing after so much anger and bloodshed? He redoubles the supernatural

60 The verb *gliscere* ('swell'), limited in Statius to description of passion, whether battle-lust or hatred (see n. 34 above): it is used in its physical sense only to describe the swollen skin of Tisiphone (1.107). With 8.755, cf. 9.871, the boldness of Parthenopaeus and 12.635, the battle-lust of the Athenians (at 3.73, where the MSS are divided between *gliscis* / *gestis* ('you swell'/'you desire'), the former may be the correct term for Eteocles' lust for power).

61 'The unhappy man was satisfied; but avenging Tisiphone demands more' (*infelix contentus erat: plus exigit ultrix* / *Tisiphone*, 8.757–8).

62 Dewar 1991, 59, defines this as 'the limits placed on *odium* by *fas*', and quotes Lactantius, 'hatred should end with death'. Feeney 1991, 360, speaks of 'the poem's clearest example of the Ovidian bounds of definition.'

intervention: Tisiphone's great speech (11.76–112) is a key to Statius' interpretation of evil and the Furies' role as embodiment of human evil. The brothers' natures were always prone to hatred (*Theb.* 1.86–7); now the Furies are to assimilate themselves to the brothers' passion and to fulfil it in mutual murder.⁶³ Tisiphone and Megaera each dog their own fighter like insidious seconds: Statius lists the forces struggling to prevent the abominable duel—the common people, Jocasta, Antigone, even Oedipus, and, for Polyneices, Adrastus. Jupiter himself averts his eyes and orders the gods to hold aloof.

As the brothers face each other, their words reflect their loathing: confrontation in battle is the only kind of law and compact possible to them (11.390). At this 'vast war of a single womb', all the gods of proper war, Mars, Virtus, Bellona and Pallas with her gorgon—the face of war-rage in so much ancient epic⁶⁴—flee, leaving the field to the Stygian sisters, and the Theban ghosts (410–15).

The combat itself follows the Euripidean contours. At its heat, men can see only the anger and incandescent hatred blazing through the brothers' helmets: they fight like wild boars, and, charged with hatred by the Furies, no longer need the Furies to drive them. The dying Polyneices powers his last failing thrust with *odium* (566); Eteocles' last words threaten to sue for his kingdom before the court of Hades and his last act is to fall so as to crush his brother's body (573).

One positive counter-force Statius did reserve for this crisis. Although piety could not overcome hatred in the sons, their father is softened: Oedipus acknowledges the victory of Nature in his own tears for his sons (607).

This passage is perhaps the best key to the problem of human responsibility: here Oedipus claims that it was frenzy (*furor*) and an Erinys who provoked his curse:

quisnam fuit ille deorum
qui stetit orantem iuxta praereptaque uerba
dictavit fati? Furor illa et mouit Erinys

63 'Let us fit ourselves to their hatred and to their clashing arms' (11.100–1). For the trans., see Venini 1970, on 11.100; for the evolution of the Furies to represent 'every evil of which human beings are capable', Feeney 1991, 376–7.

64 Cf. Euripides' symbolic use of the gorgon for the face of the hated brother in *Phoen.* 456–7, n. 28 above.

et pater et genetrix et regna oculique cadentes.
nil ego.

(11.617–21)

Which of the gods was it who stood by me as I prayed and dictated to the Fates the words snatched from me? It was Frenzy and the Erinyes, and my father and mother and the kingdom and my gouged-out eyes: I did nothing.

But if we scrutinize Statius' opening account in detail, the assignment of responsibility is more complex. After describing the avenging Furies (*dirae scelerum*) in Oedipus' breast (1.52) Statius gives him speech. He calls on Tisiphone, 'often accustomed to my invocation' (*multum mihi consueta uocari*),⁶⁵ to give her support to his perverted prayer, 'if it is worthy and what you yourself would suggest to me in my frenzy' (*si digna precor, quaeque ipsa furenti / subiceres*, 1.73–4). This becomes even stronger in his final appeal: 'grant me the evil I would long to see' (*da ... quod cupiam uidisse nefas*, 85–6), words that seem finally to weigh the balance of responsibility towards Oedipus. Whatever the weight of past crimes, known and involuntary, that have formed his nature, the present Oedipus wills the evil of hatred between his sons, and Statius makes his responsibility overt.⁶⁶ Thus, his denial after the event in 11.621 ff. would seem no more convincing than Agamemnon's denial in *Iliad* 19.86–8 on which it is modelled: 'it is not I that am to blame, but Zeus and Destiny and the sky-borne Erinyes: they all put a savage frenzy (*atē*) into my mind at the assembly.'

The reader's first reaction is to see Oedipus as deceiving himself in this speech of remorse. But a return to the lines introducing Oedipus' first appearance (1.52 ff.) shows that Oedipus' mind was already possessed by the Furies when he called upon them to fulfil the curse on his sons. Ultimately, it is a false distinction to assign responsibility by separating the human agent from the personified passion that informs his acts.⁶⁷

65 1.58. Statius recalls this in 11.105, where Tisiphone confirms that Oedipus has constantly invoked the Furies.

66 Cf. Ahl 1986, 'by the end of the prayer he has most certainly taken upon himself the guilt of wishing for their destruction ... reverting to primitive hatred and vengeance.'

67 I owe this reinterpretation to Anna Wilson's clear-headed arguments during the discussion following the paper at the Exeter conference on the passions. In mythic terms, Oedipus must have been in the Furies' power from the moment that he killed his (unidentified) father at the crossroads.

Despite the apparent return of human tenderness, Oedipus cannot shed his guilt, which revives his anger and turns into the very Statian form of self-hate and attempted suicide. As he again invokes the Furies (631), it is left to Antigone to restrain him, while Jocasta stabs herself.

IV All passion spent?

The brothers are dead, but hatred lives on, and is now transmitted to Creon with his assumption of the throne. This supernatural motivation enhances his natural motive of bitterness at the futile death of Menoeceus, and he turns first on Oedipus, then on the body of Polyneices. Antigone speaks for Statius in associating Creon's actions with the contamination of the Theban throne: 'are you turning against him *from hatred and the power of kingship?*' (11.724).

The theme of hatred has become more frequent, just when we might expect it to fade out. Fittingly applied to the refusal of the wood of Eteocles' funeral pyre to burn his brother ('here are the brothers once more ... their obstinate hatred lives on, it lives!'),⁶⁸ it is more contrived in the ironic portrayal of the competition between Argia and Antigone to claim credit for burying Polyneices ('so great their cries of conflict you would think it anger or hatred between them,' 12.461–3). The Argive women themselves appeal to Theseus on the grounds that war and former hatred have ended between their cities: 'yes, we have been at war, but the hatred has lapsed and grim death has buried our anger' (12.573–4). But hatred still lives in Creon's Thebes, and Theseus' response to their appeal from the altar of Clemency must be another war, however just, and more speeches of denunciation.

In the last battle against Creon, Theseus claims that Nature and all the gods are on his side, whereas Creon is led on by Poenae and the Furies (12.645–6). Isolated by the loathing of both armies (*hinc atque hinc odia*, 758–9), Creon challenges Theseus and dies by Theseus' spear. Only now that all the male royalty of Thebes have perished can hatred end and give way to the mourning that ends the epic.

68 *ecce iterum fratres ... uiuunt improba odia, uiuunt* (12.423, 441).

This is the course of Vessey's Stoic epic, with its fated sequence of events (*fatorum series*), incurring each successive disaster. We have seen that its psychology and moral causality can be called Stoic, or perhaps post-Stoic, to the extent that the evil of the epic derives from human passion run amok. But it is difficult to recognize either the Stoic or any other philosophical system in an action so dominated by destructive forces. It is surely in conflict with any Stoic conception of deity that Statius shows passion poetically unleashed among the superhuman beings, both Olympian and infernal, and goes so far in extending the allegorical intervention of god or daemon against men.⁶⁹

To the extent that Statius' portrayal of men is compatible with Stoic psychology, and that both the poet and the Stoics stop short of continuous allegory in their treatment of gods and daemonic beings, this is surely because post-Virgilian epic and later Stoicism are separate but equal representatives of pagan thought in their time, before the fourth century and the Christian psychological allegory of Prudentius.

Let us return to seeing Statius in his own terms. His epic presents a world in which human hatred is the central proliferating power of evil that only piety and clemency can bring to an end. The characterization of the *Thebaid* may be grotesquely negative, more black than white; but its point of view is both moral and retributive, leaving the world to those who punish the guilty without animosity and deal with their neighbours unmoved by envy, anger, fear or the hatred which they generate.

Bibliography

- Ahl, F. M., "Statius *Thebaid*: A Reconsideration", W. Haase and H. Temporini (edd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2.36.5, Berlin and New York 1986, 2803–912.
- Billerbeck, M., "Stoizismus in der römischen Epik der neronischen und flavischen Zeit", W. Haase and H. Temporini (edd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2.36.5, Berlin and New York 1986, 3116–51.
- Dewar, M., *Statius 'Thebaid'* 9, Oxford 1991.

69 Recent critics have been more cautious than Whitman 1987 and Rieks 1989 in asserting the Stoic use of allegory and its influence on subsequent epic and tragedy. Neither the Epidrome of the etymologizing Annaeus Cornutus (see Most 1989) nor the allegorizing of the non-Stoic Pseudo-Heraclitus should be read as evidence for systematic Stoic allegorization of gods and supernatural beings, still less for their allegorical interpretation of Homer (Long 1992).

- Elliott, R. C., *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*, Princeton 1960.
- Feeney, D. J., *The Gods in Epic*, Oxford 1991.
- Fitch, J. G. (ed.), *Seneca: 'Hercules Furens'*, Ithaca, NY 1987.
- Galinsky, K., "The Anger of Aeneas", *American Journal of Philology* 109 (1988) 321–48.
- Gill, C., "Did Chrysippus understand Medea?", *Phronesis* 28 (1983) 136–49.
- Gill, C., "The Character–Personality Distinction", C. B. R. Pelling (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, Oxford 1990, 1–30.
- Hershkowitz, D., "Sexuality and Madness in Statius' *Thebaid*", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 33 (1994) 123–47.
- Hershkowitz, D., Patterns of Madness in Statius' *Thebaid*, *JRS* 85 (1995) 52–64.
- Lefkowitz, M., *Lives of Greek Poets*, Baltimore 1981.
- Long, A. A., "Stoic Readings of Homer", R. D. Lamberton and J. J. Keaney (edd.), *Homer's Ancient Readers*, Princeton 1992.
- Most, G. W., "Cornutus and Stoic Allegoresis", W. Haase and H. Temporini (edd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2.35.3, Berlin and New York 1989, 2015–65.
- Putnam, M., C. J., "Anger, Blindness and Insight in Virgil's *Aeneid*", M. C. Nussbaum (ed.), *The Poetics of Therapy: Hellenistic Ethics in its Rhetorical and Literary Context* (= *Apeiron* 23.4), Edmonton 1990.
- Rieks, R., *Affekte und Strukturen: Pathos als eni Form und Wirkprinzip von Vergils Aeneis*, Zetemata 86, München 1989.
- Schetter, W., *Untersuchungen zur epischen Kunst bei Statius*, Wiesbaden 1960.
- Stanford, W. B. (ed.), *Sophocles: 'Ajax'*, London 1963.
- Venini, P., "Furor e Psicologia nella *Tebaide* di Stazio", *Athenaeum* 42 (1964) 201–13.
- Venini, P. (ed.), *P. Papinii Statii 'Thebaidos' Liber 11*, Florence 1970.
- Vessey, D., *Statius and the 'Thebaid'*, Cambridge 1974.
- Whitman, J., *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient Medieval Technique*, Oxford 1987.

30. The Perils of Prophecy: Statius' Amphiaraus and His Literary Antecedents

When Cicero looked back under Caesar's domination to his unhappy role in the Civil War, he compared himself, as a man of foresight and an actual Augur, to Amphiaraus, quoting from an unnamed tragedy: like Amphiaraus he had offered himself, *prudens et sciens / ad pestem ante oculos positam*.¹ In Statius' *Thebaid*, emulation of the *Aeneid*, and in particular of the events leading up to the outbreak of war in *Aeneid* 7, contribute to the greater complexity of Amphiaraus' character and actions, but Statius maintains his traditional persona as one of the two virtuous leaders in the gruesome tale of *Seven Against Thebes*. Although Adrastus too is honourable, in Statius as in the Greek tradition,² the myth itself required that he should give way to the pressure of his son-in-law and the other more power-hungry leaders. And Adrastus does not only fall short of heroism by showing his weakness as a leader, but also because it is his role to survive. He cannot compare with Am-

1 The quotation is perhaps from Accius' *Eriphyle*, cf. *Trag.* 145 (2nd ed., 250, 3rd ed., 296). Amphiaraus is both devout and honest, and a loyal ally of Adrastus throughout the Greek tradition: compare Aeschylus *Th.* 609–12, in which even Eteocles speaks of him as self-controlled, just, good, pious, and a great prophet: σῶφρων δίκαιος ἀγαθὸς εὐσεβὴς ἀνὴρ / μέγας προφήτης. The same passage contrasts his associates as “unholy and loud-mouthed”, and foretells his death by engulphment.

2 For the early Greek tradition on Amphiaraus see Gantz 1993, 2.506–15, and the detailed analysis of evolution from saga to surviving texts of Bener 1945. Bener shows how Amphiaraus is associated with the power of prophecy and death by engulphment, and his character is favourably assessed from *Odyssey* 15.245–7 through Pindar *O.* 6.12, (cf. *N.* 9.13–4, for his receipt of evil omens against the expedition) to Aeschylus *Th.* 571–2 and Euripides *Ph.* 171 and 1109, also *Supp.* 157. This version of his prophecy, developed to include his foreknowledge of his own death (cf. Bener 1945, 35), persists in the Hellenistic tradition, cf. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.6.2–4 and 3.6.8; Diod. 4.65; Hyginus *Fabulae* 73 (based on Euripides' *Alcmaeon*; Bener 1945, 28). But even Bener's diligence can only reconstruct a Greek narrative of the omen taking at Argos from Statius' own text (Bener 1945, 22–3). I am most grateful to Valéry Berlincourt for making Bener's work available to me.

phiarus in tragic grandeur, since he does not have to face the knowledge of his own certain death: this ordeal is peculiar to Amphiarus, first identified in *Theb.* 1.42 (*laurigeri subitos an uatis hiatus?*) by the extraordinary mode of his death, but also by his prophetic status. It is his foreknowledge that makes him a tragic hero, and the manner in which he acquires and tries to control this knowledge which Statius emphasizes in the scenes I wish to discuss.

Aeschylus had played down the myth of Eriphyle's treachery in the *Seven Against Thebes*,³ and Statius will do the same. Although Amphiarus is brought into the epic action through the history of the fatal necklace, coveted by the *coniunx perituri uatis* (2.299, cf. 299–305), Statius deliberately subordinates the motif of domestic treachery so as to give full importance to Amphiarus' moment of truth at the taking of the auspices at Argos. I would like to consider first three aspects of this episode in relation to the epic tradition of his Greek and Roman predecessors: the forms of divination practiced by Melampus and Amphiarus; the nature of the portent sent to them by the gods; and the reaction of both prophet and poet to human foreknowledge of evil destiny.⁴

Five forms of divination were known at Rome, shared between the *disciplina etrusca* as practiced by the *haruspices* and the *auspicia* of Roman augurs. As Cicero lists them in *De divinatione* 2.49, the *haruspices* conducted three kinds of divination: extispicy, by examining the entrails of a sacrificial victim, especially the liver: healthy entrails would convey divine blessing on an enterprise such as joining battle on the coming day, and diseased or distorted entrails warn against it; to this he adds the study of *fulgura* and of *ostenta*. The other two forms of divination were the functions of the augurs, and concerned the behaviour of birds, either the *tripudium* of caged fowls, or the formal taking of auspices to observe the flight and song of prescribed birds, which were classed as either *alites praepetes*, whose flight signified divine consent or refusal by its position and direction, or *oscines*, indicating divine will through their song (from *os* + *canere*). Before a commander left Rome on cam-

3 On the myth modified by Aeschylus' pro-Theban orientation see Hutchinson 1985, 132–3: Aeschylus does not include the tale of Eriphyle's betrayal reported in *Odyssey* 15.245–7, which comes to dominate the tale of Amphiarus' death and Alcmaeon's revenge in Sophocles' *Eriphyle* and Euripides' *Alcmaeon*.

4 Strangely there do not seem to have been any discussions since the lucid and quite detailed analysis of Vessey 1973, 153–9. Besides his pages I have found Burck 1979, 300–51 and Snijders' commentary most useful.

paign or joined battle, his augurs took the auspices from a consecrated position by designating a portion of the sky in which to observe omens. (Whatever went unnoticed or occurred outside the specified area was not significant.) Birds flying from the left (right in Greece) were favourable, from the right (left in Greece) unfavourable; and with these *omina impetratiua*, even vultures might be an excellent omen, provided they appeared in the appropriate part of the sky.

The gods might also send omens unasked, *omina oblatiua*, such as a thunderbolt from a clear sky, or some other celestial portent such as a lunar eclipse, or prodigious births, which would require expiation by sacrifices and acts of ritual supplication.⁵ The fullest epic presentation of such prophetic material before Statius is found in the first books of Lucan, himself an augur, and much admired by Statius. But Lucan is outlining the preliminaries of an undeclared civil war, so there can be no question of any man taking formal auspices. His narrative begins with a mass of terrestrial and celestial portents, many of them echoing Virgil's first *Georgic* and prose historians who cited portents of divine displeasure either at the outbreak of war or before Caesar's death.⁶ The *haruspex* Arruns, called to expiate them, orders supplications and a sacrifice, which is subordinated to a horrendous description of the victim's distorted entrails,⁷ the nearest precedent to the first phase of Amphiarus and Melampus' divination at Argos, as described by Statius. But since Lucan's civil war begins with flight, rather than a military campaign, there is no occasion for the taking of auspices at Rome: instead he offers the astronomical prophecy of Nigidius Figulus and the raving of a clairvoyant woman.

When Tydeus returns victorious from the ambush which Eteocles has set in violation of his embassy, and Jupiter has unleashed Mars, king Adrastus is long troubled by doubt whether he should authorize war (*daret armis iura*, 3.444) or rein in his people's anger (*an frena teneret / irarum*, 445–6). At last he resolves to proceed by “setting in action the minds of seers and divine rituals prophetic of truth” (*uatum mentes ac prouida ueri / sacra mouere deum*, 3.450–1). Amphiarus is charged with

5 I refer here and below to the authority of Linderski 1986, 2146–296 in *ANRW* 2.16.3.

6 Rambaud 1985, 375–88 traces many of the portents not in Roman sources to those described in Dio Cassius after Pharsalus.

7 This is probably influenced by Manto's description of the vicious entrails in Seneca's *Oedipus*.

the auspices, but Statius has added his grandfather Melampus, to work along with him. Why do we need Melampus? Not for the ritual itself, but perhaps to add different kinds of authority to the coming scene. What is gained is firstly a link with the previous generation of Argonauts, secondly authentication of what Amphiaraus will see and describe (both men are presented as genuinely inspired by Apollo); lastly, seen in terms of dramatic dialogue, Amphiaraus needs someone to whom he can speak freely while he is trying to keep the secret of his own and his allies' terrible destiny. First, the prophets test divine consent for action in the entrails of sacrificial sheep (there has been no report of the sacrifice) and find blotchy hearts that prohibit action (*negant*, 458). Notwithstanding, they decide to continue by taking the auspices and "seek omens from the open sky."

Wearing fillets and olive branches they climb Perseus' hill at sunrise, and Amphiaraus prays to Jupiter, citing with the ritual *nam tu* the god's inspiration of birds with foreknowledge, so as to convey to men from heaven the causes of events. But it seems that Statius wants to combine both Greek and Roman elements in his person: as Greek prophet he is inspired by Apollo, but as Augur, he is the *consiliarius* of Jupiter.⁸ Not content with addressing Jupiter (471–4, 481–96), he exalts divination by bird-omens above a catalogue of seven alternative sources of oracular inspiration, listed in allusive Hellenistic fashion.⁹ Thus although he is

8 Cf. Linderski 1986, 2206, citing Cic. *De leg.* 3.43. The augur must understand *Ioui Optimo maximo se consiliarium atque administrum datum ut sibi eos quos in auspicio esse iusserit, caelique partes sibi esse traditas e quibus saepe opem rei publicae ferre possit.*

9 The seven oracular sources seem to be chosen for diversity of method and geography. Besides the three Apolline oracles discussed in the next note, Amphiaraus includes the Libyan Ammon and shrine of Apis (*Niliacum pecus*) at Alexandria, the age-old oracle of Zeus in the oak-groves of Dodona, and an unparalleled nocturnal cult of Pan from Pisa. Commentators offer little help, but the *accola Pisae* (3.479) reappears as *incola Pisae* among the Arcadian followers of Amphiaraus in 4.238, suggesting that this last example may have been chosen as a local cult of the speaker himself. Statius' selection prompts the question whether he was consciously including the oldest oracles, such as might have predated Troy, or combining ancient and modern. Parke 1967, 67 points out that in Herodotus 1.47 the sixth-century Croesus consults Delphi, Dodona, Branchidae and the oracle of Ammon at Siwa. Branchidae was suppressed by the Persians and revived by Alexander, and other oracles rose and fell; thus Lane Fox 1985, part 1, ch. 5 reports evidence for oracular activity during the first and second centuries of our era in six of the cult places listed by Statius

and considers himself as priest of Apollo, Amphiaraus dismisses as inferior Apollo's oracles at Delphi itself (*Cirrha*, 474; cf. 455), at Didyma (here evoked antonomastically by the name of the local hero and founder of Branchidae, Branchus son of Apollo) and in Lycia.¹⁰ Following the formal *legis dictio* he gives Jupiter clear instructions:

... nos Argolicae primordia pugnae
uenturumque sinas caelo praenosce laborem.
Si datur et duris sedet haec sententia Parcis
soluere Echionias Lernaeva cuspide portas,
signa feras laeuusque tones; tunc omnis in astris
consonet arcana uolucris bona murmura lingua.
Si prohibes, hic nocte moras dextrisque profundum
alitibus praetexe diem.

(Stat. *Theb.* 3.489–96)

Grant us to know the beginnings of Argive battle and the hardships ahead. If the Parcae are resolved to break down the gates of Thebes with the spears of Lerna, give us as a signal thunder on the left, *but* if you deny this, impose delays now and frame the light of day with birds on the right.

His address seems traditional enough, although the recognizable Virgilian phrases are enhanced with learned Hellenistic figures and periphrases such as *nectere moras* and *praetexere diem* (495).¹¹ But Statius supplements the Olympians of Amphiaraus' direct speech, even Jupiter, by adding to his narrative *plura ignotaque numina*, mysterious unknown deities, and invoking the dark mystery of the universe. This is Flavian epic and Roman ritual cannot escape the fashionable infection of magic.

(the Apis shrine is mentioned by Pausanias and Dio Chrysotom), but nothing associated with Pan or Arcadia.

In her paper at the Groningen meeting Annette Baertsch cited Luc. 6.425–30 (listing Delos, Delphi and Dodona, besides non-oracular divination) as Statius' model for these exclusions. He offers a similar negative listing at *Theb.* 4.410–4.

- 10 The *Lyciae* ... *sortes* of 3.477 deliberately recall Aeneas' famous words at *Aen.* 4.346 echoed parodically by Dido at 377 *nunc augur Apollo, / nunc Lyciae sortes*. The shrine of Lycian Apollo at Patara was the only non-Greek oracle also consulted by the Greeks.
- 11 Note the Virgilian *pernicibus alis* (471; = *Aen.* 4.180), *si datur et sedet* (491; cf. *Aen.* 7.368), etc. But epithets like *Lycaonius* and *Niliacus* (once in Ovid; common in Lucan) are post-Augustan, and may derive from lost Hellenistic poetry.

As each prophet surveys his region of the fading stars,¹² it is Melampus who reports that no favourable bird (*auguriis melior*) is flying or uttering benevolent omens (*placabile planxerit omen*), neither Apollo's raven, nor Jupiter's eagle, nor Athena's owl (502–8).¹³ Instead vultures, hawks and carrion birds (*dirae uolucres*, *striges* and the *bubo*)¹⁴ occupy the heavens. Worse, they are tearing their faces and driving away the favourable winds with their moaning and plucking their feathery breasts. Amphiaraus (*ille sub haec*) admits that despite his expertise acquired on the expedition of the Argo, he has never seen such evil omens. But this is only the prologue. As with Arruns' grim forecast in Luc. 1.635 *sed uenient maiora metu*, reinforced by the poet's own *sed maiora premunt* (1.674), Statius has worse to come: Melampus' *sed maiora parantur*¹⁵ introduces the portent that symbolizes and predicts the disastrous outcome of the expedition against Thebes.

This set-piece echoes a long epic tradition. Amphiaraus calls Melampus' attention to the new phenomenon: an uncountable number of swans have adopted a formation in the high heaven, which must signify Thebes (*has rere in imagine Thebas*) since they are maintaining a fixed circle like a city rampart in the sky (524–30). Now comes a stronger band, seven fierce eagles, which the augur sees as the Argive princes (533). They assail the throng of swans, but he now sees an unexpected reversal (*cernis inexpecto rorantes sanguine uentos?*, 536) and construes it as divine anger overthrowing the victors. Without offering any physical explanation of the birds' destruction Amphiaraus systematically enumerates what Statius' readers can identify as the special mode of death of each of the seven leaders—though not in chronological order.

... Quae saeua repente
uictores agitat leto Iouis ira sinistri?
Hic excelsa petens subita face solus inarsit
summisitque animos, illum uestigia adortum
maiorum uolucrum tenerae deponitis alae.
Hic hosti implicitus pariter ruit, hunc fuga retro
uoluit agens sociae linquentem fata cateruae.

12 Snijders compares with *partiti sidera* a later reference to Amphiaraus' augury, *Thiodamanta quicum ipse arcana deorum / partiri et uisas uni sociare solebat / Amphiaraus aues* (8.279–80).

13 Snijders notes Statius' echo in 502 of Luc. 7.363 *compressum limite caeli*.

14 *Strix* and *bubo* are combined in Sen. *Med.* 733, Luc. 6.689. Snijders adds that Pliny *Nat.* 10.38 calls the *bubo maxime abominatus publicis auspiciis*.

15 So too 9.865 *forsan maiora supersunt / ingressis*.

Hic nimbo glomeratus obit, hic praepete uiua
 pascitur inmortiens; spargit caua nubila sanguis.
 Quid furtim inlacrimas? Illum, uenerande Melampu,
 qui cadit, agnosco.

(Stat. *Theb.* 3.537–47)

But what savage anger of hostile Jupiter suddenly harries the victors with death? This one seeks the lofty heights alone and suddenly catches fire, and surrenders his spirit. Another, attempting the path of greater birds, his wings suddenly let fall. This one falls equally entangled with his foes, another flight drives away abandoning the fate of his followers. This one perishes swept up by a thunder cloud, this eagle feeds on a living bird as it dies, and the blood spatters the hollow clouds. Why are you stealthily weeping, reverend Melampus? I recognize the one who is sinking to earth.

(This is the moment when Amphiaraus foresees his own death, but its undeniable pathos is enhanced by its literary model: *hunc ego flumineae deformis truncus harena / qui iacet agnosco* (Luc. 1.685–6). His words echo the prophetic vision of Pompey's death which brings the omens of Lucan's first book to their climax. While the seer himself affirms the identity of swans and eagles, he leaves up to the intuition of his associate Melampus and the literary memory of his readers the application of the *dira signa* of Jupiter's anger to the deaths awaiting each individual.¹⁶)

Terrified at this *certa imago*, and bitterly regretting that they have intruded on the assemblies (*concilia*) of birds and thrust their minds upon a sky that already had spoken through the entrails to forbid them, the prophets now paradoxically loathe the gods who have answered their solicitations: *auditique odere deos* (551). But let us suspend their anguish while we trace the traditions behind Statius' omen.

First of all such omens is the μέγα σῆμα reported by Odysseus in *Iliad* 2.299–329, when a serpent kills eight nestlings in their nest and their helpless mother as well, but Jupiter (after the event) turns the serpent to stone. Odysseus recalls Calchas' interpretation, which we know to be correct at least as far as it goes; the siege of Troy has already lasted nine years, but he promises victory in the tenth. He does not, however, decode the petrification of the serpents. Homer's Calchas is honest and genuinely inspired here as in *Iliad* 1, and Statius' language shows he is

16 Commentators explained *dira* as *Dei ira*. The reference to *Iouis ira sinistri* (538) identifies this portent as a dread omen like the portents of *Aen.* 4.453 and the *triste augurium* of 5.7 explained by Servius Auctus as *dirae, dira signa*. Linderski 1986, 2235 compares Festus 316–7 L *quinque genera signorum observant augures publici; ex caelo, ex auibus, ex tripudiis, ex quadrupedibus, ex diris*.

recalling not just Homer, but also Ovid's retelling of the portent and its interpretation in *Met.* 12.13–9. There Calchas is *ueri prouidus augur* (cf. *Theb.* 3.450–1 *prouida ueri / sacra mouere deum*), and correctly infers the ten years of siege, before the moment when the serpent is turned into stone.¹⁷ Similarly in *Odyssey* 15, Zeus sends a δεισιδής ὄρνις for Telemachus, an eagle who successfully carries off a goose, and flies off to the right. This Helen convincingly interprets as Odysseus slaying the suitors.¹⁸

Remembering his Homer, Virgil offers two omens at the beginning and end of his epic, as well as the lying tale of Sinon incorporating the supposed dishonesty of Calchas. But the two omens have differing status. When the disguised Venus urges Aeneas (*Aen.* 1.393–400) to look up to the sky and see the twelve swans pursued by an eagle, which come safely to land, she guarantees the safe landing of his comrades, which we experience soon after. Each of these portents not only occurs, but is reported by the prophet figure, an element required in Roman augury.¹⁹ But the most complex omen in the *Aeneid* is one that takes place, but is both sent with misleading intent and falsely interpreted—something which seems to have met little theological curiosity from commentators. In *Aen.* 12.245–56 Juturna furthers Juno's designs by sending the Italians an omen *alto signum caelo*: the sacred bird (eagle?) carries a crowd of shore birds, then glides over to the water and grasps a swan in its talon; but then in an unexpected reversal the routed seabirds turn around and force the eagle to drop the swan, as they drive it away into the clouds.²⁰ The augur Tolumnius does not so much report the

17 In *De div.* 2.62–3 Cicero translates and discusses the Homeric passages but criticizes the *coniectura* of Calchas for interpreting only the number of years of the siege and leaving the petrification of the serpent unexplained. This may be a traditional criticism since Ovid apparently “corrects” Homer by omitting the weak element in Calchas’ divination.

18 Juhnke 1972, 83–6, *die Vogelschau*, offers no precedent from Homer for the actual omen, but misguidedly seeks a model for Capaneus’ abuse of Amphiaras in the dispute over the omen of *Iliad* 12.200–10 between Polydamas and Hector: in my judgement the difference of moral stature and motive between the warriors rejecting the omen in the two poems makes it most unlikely that Statius had *Iliad* 12.210–55 in mind.

19 See Linderski 1986, 2206–7: just as the report by the augur’s assistant was a binding omen even if the assistant lied, so whatever the augur himself reported was binding, even if it had not occurred.

20 Grassman-Fischer 1966, 96–9 notes that this portent is formed by analogy with Venus’ swan portent in book 1; Virgil also echoes with the mistaken response of

omen as offer his *coniectura*, reading the forecast that the Italians desire, in which the eagle is Aeneas the greedy pirate, while they themselves are the successful seabirds.²¹ The swan is not identified. It is the formal features of this false omen which Statius has adapted for his divinely sent and correctly interpreted portent.

And he was not alone. Silius too has an augural episode before the battle of Ticinum in book 4, in which two Carthaginian augurs, Liger and Bogus, give opposed readings of a bird omen. If Silius composed his brief scene before Statius, Statius has nothing to learn from him. The omen combines two traditional motifs. First a hawk scoops from the high point of the sun's course onto a flock of doves, and harries them until Jove's eagle comes from the east and drives the hawk away; then it scoops down towards young Scipio and squawks three times, touching his helmet before soaring back to the stars. This is both Roman, in its evocation of Livy on Tarquinius Priscus, and epic, going back through Virgil to Homer. Liger interprets both components correctly, reading the sixteen doves as the sixteen years that Hannibal would lay waste to Italy, but warning that Jupiter's bird denied him the possibility of victory, confirming instead young Scipio's future as conqueror of Libya. Bogus first attempts a positive reading, in which the mauled doves are the children of Venus' son Aeneas, then, like Tolumnius, hurls his spear against the enemy: although it falls short, it kills its man and inaugurates the battle of Ticinum.

Now we are ready to pass from Statius' omens to the poet's interpretative editorializing of these events. In his prayer to Jupiter before making his observation Amphiaraus speculates about the sources of the birds' clairvoyance, and like Virgil's speculation about the inspiration of the bee community in *Georgics* 4 and Lucan's theorizing about the inspiration given to or through Apollo at Delphi,²² he offers a choice of hypotheses. The oddity is that he addresses them to Jupiter himself:

the Rutuli, deceived by Juno's non-prophetic portent, the misreading by the Trojans of the portent of Laocoon's awful death in book 2.

- 21 *Aen.* 12.257–60 *augurium Rutuli clamore salutant / expediuntque manus primusque Tolumnius auger* “hoc erat hoc, uotis,” inquit, “quod saepe petui”. He does not narrate, but interprets what he has seen (261–4): *o miseri, quos improbus aduena bello / territat, inualidas ut auis, et litora uestra / ui populat, petet ille fugam penitusque profundo uela dabit*.
- 22 *Geor.* 4.149–50, 219–27; *Luc.* 5.86–95. As Snijders points out, Lucan represents Apollo of Delphi in 93–6 *forsan ... totius pars magna Iouis Cirrhaea per antra / exit* as a medium for a part of Jupiter's divine inspiration.

... superae seu conditor aulae
 sic dedit effusum chaos in noua semina texens,
 seu quia mutatae nostraque ab origine uersis
 corporibus subiere notos, seu purior axis
 amotumque nefas et rarum insistere terris
 uera docent: tibi, summe sator terraeque deumque,
 scire licet: nos Argolicae primordia pugnae
 uenturumque sinas caelo praenosse laborem.

(Stat. *Theb.* 3.483–90)

whether the creator of the heavenly court made it so when he wove chaos into new seeds, or because they have been transformed from human bodies, or because their circumstances, flying in a purer atmosphere, with evil more remote, and seldom alighting on earth, all teach them truth, thou, god, knowest.²³ Grant us to know the openings of the Argive conflict and foresee from heaven the coming hardships.²⁴

These Ovidian aitiologies²⁵ are doubly awkward, in a context where unquestioning faith is required, and in view of the addressee; since Jupiter is addressed at 481 and 488, one must ask what other being was this *superae conditor aulae* (483)?

After the dreadful omens have been set out, Statius raises a more fundamental question, comparable to Lucan's protests at the portents threatening Rome at the beginning of his second book: there Lucan had reviewed the alternatives of a providential *parens* (Nature or Jupiter) controlling an immutable fate (2.7–11) or random Epicurean materialism (12–3), before begging for man to be spared the pain of foreknowledge: *sit subitum quodcumque paras: sit caeca future / mens hominum fati; liceat sperare timenti* (2.14–5).

Just so in the aftermath of the portents Statius protests, not at the gods for giving knowledge, but at man's insatiable desire to know the

23 Compare the views given by Cicero to the believing Quintus at *De div.* 1.120 *eademque efficit in auibis diuina mens, ut tum huc illuc uolent alites, tum in hac tum in illac parte se occultent, tum a dextra tum a sinistra parte canant oscines*, and Cicero's own sceptical reaction, *De div.* 2.80 *quae est igitur natura quae uolucris passim huc et illuc uagantes efficiat ut significant aliquid et tum uetant agere, tum iubeant aut cantu aut uolatu? Cur alite aliis a laeua aliis a dextra datum est auibis ut ratum auspicium facere possint?*

24 But this last phrase also permits interpretation as "the hardships coming from heaven".

25 Both the notion of a god creating life from the first elements of chaos, and the purity of the birds guaranteed by their remoteness from earth echoes motifs in Ovid *Met.* 1.21 and 1.75–81.

future.²⁶ Again the poet's question receives alternative answers, though the idea of foreknowledge as a spontaneous gift of the gods is quickly passed over for the alternative of human insatiability, impatient of resting in peace when it has been won (*et parto non umquam stare quieti*, 554). It is this human greed for knowledge and thirst for action which has driven men to consult entrails and the language of birds, the motions of stars and moon and evil witchcraft.²⁷ Echoing Ovid's account of human decline, Statius argues that primitive men, whether of the golden age or children of rocks and trees, were content to clear the forests and farm the soil. For them, it was evil to know the future: *quid crastina uolueret aetas / scire nefas homini*.²⁸ It is us, pitiable modern men, who probe the gods, giving rise to fear and anger, crime and treachery and no restraint on men's prayers.

And yet it is not human desire to know the future which causes the troubles of Amphiaraus. The Argives and many of their leaders do not want the unhappy foreknowledge of divine intent, but a favourable divine authorization for their own desires. As interpreter of the gods,²⁹ Amphiaraus has performed the first half of his task by reading the signs correctly. But he cannot complete the task by conveying the divine message both truly and convincingly to his Argive audience, because they are fated to disbelieve and override it; he will be torn between the human urge to persuade and his recognition that they cannot be persuaded. The peace-loving prophet casts off his robes and fillets and hides in his house, silent, like Virgil's Calchas, but for twelve, not ten whole days (*superum clausus negat acta fateri ... bis senos premit ora dies*, 572, 574; cf. *Aen.* 2.126–7 *bis quinos silet ille dies tectusque recusat*

26 Cf. *fati praeoscere cursus* in Luc. 6.423.

27 Desire for knowledge can be presumptuous even when it is only for the causes of present events: cf. Seneca's preface to *N.Q.* 3, where he sees himself as uprooting causes/origins (*eruere causas*), and Lucan's presentation of Caesar's curiosity about the sources of the Nile so long hidden (10.190, cf. 235). We should not take Acoreus' statement that it is right for him to tell as validating Caesar's greed for knowledge.

28 For *scire nefas* compare Hor. *Carm.* 1.11.3 and Luc. 1.127.

29 On augurs as interpreters of the gods cf. Cic. *De div.* 1.12, 1.116, 2.63. But Latin *interpres* is not parallel to Greek *prophetes* (introduced by Pindar, and applied to Amphiaraus himself at Aeschylus *Th.* 611), since, according to Ernout-Meillet 1959, 1.571–2, the primary meaning of *interpres* is secular, of an agent or intermediary in business.

/ *prodere uoce sua* ... etc.).³⁰ And from now on the most prominent model for Statius' action will be the *Aeneid*, and the misguided folly not of the Trojans ignoring Laocoon's warning, but of the Italian rush to war in book 7. When the Argives, driven by Mars, pour from the countryside and ancient towns and abandon their homes, stripping the mouldering arms and armour from the walls and preparing for war (*Theb.* 3.568–91), they exceed the impatience of Virgil's Italians, as Statius anticipates here the final Latin preparations for war, which occur only after the symbolic declaration, when Juno breaks open the Gates in *Aeneid* 7.623–40. The keynote of the Argive war-lust, like that of the Italians in *Aeneid* 7, is *fremere*, first applied actively to the thought of Theban war-preparations that besets Amphiarus (*absentes fremunt sub pectore Thebae*, 569), then to the provocative commands of Jupiter (*et iam suprema Tonantis / iussa fremunt*, 576), from which this concept of roaring or shouting for war is transferred to the newly armed Argive people, to be repeated three times in 25 lines: *bella animis, bella ore fremunt* (593), *turba ducum uulgique frementis* (606) and *laetum fremit, adsensuque furem / implet Achaea manus* (618–9).³¹ At the moment of climax Statius also transfers his own motif of intrusion from the prophet's sense of intrusion upon divine plans (*inrumpere*, 549, 634) to the physical onrush of the citizens who burst into Argos to beset the king demanding war: *inrumpere Argos, maestique ad limina regis / bella animis, bella ore fremunt, it clamor ad auras* (592–3).

But it is Amphiarus, not king Adrastus, who suffers the brunt of abuse and insult. Although the function of Latinus as *mora belli* in *Aeneid* 7 is shared between Statius' king and prophet, it is Amphiarus whose doors are beset by Capaneus, the *contemptor superum*,³² urging on the

30 I am grateful to Helen Lovatt for drawing my attention to the parallel with Maeon, himself a *uates* (2.692, 3.82), doomed not to be believed by his fellows, and able to resist the tyrannical Eteocles only with the silence of suicide (3.83–4). (See Maguire 1995 on political suicide in the Flavian epicists.)

31 See Traina s.v. *fremere* in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 2.460–1, and note *Aen.* 7.389 (*Amata*); 460 (the enraged Turnus); 590 (the churning reefs in the sea-simile); 638 (the war horse champing at the bit); and 787 (the Chimaera depicted on Turnus' helmet). As Snijders notes, *fremere* also marks the Latins' rejection of the truce at 12.371.

32 Capaneus here replaces Tydeus in the earlier Greek tradition: no doubt Statius feels Tydeus has already established a strong personality in his epic, and is seeking to add some characterization to Capaneus before his hubristic death in book 10. Here Capaneus combines the war-lust of Turnus (with *ingenti Martis amore* Snijders compares *Aen.* 7.550 *insani Mauortis amore*) with the blasphemy of Me-

mob, as Turnus incites the crowd at *Aen.* 7.583–4: *ilicet infandum cuncti contra omina bellum / contra fata deum ... poscunt*.³³ Statius' Capaneus is an interesting synthesis, combining traits of Aeschylus' Capaneus with features derived from his Parthenopaeus and Tydeus, and from Virgil's Mezentius. Without waiting to hear the prophet, Capaneus rejects all prophecy with contempt, boasting that he trusts only in his manhood and his sword (*uirtus mihi numen et ensis / quem teneo*, 615–6).³⁴ In contrast with Aeschylus' Amphiarus, who is given the unique speech reported by the messenger's otherwise visual narrative,³⁵ the prophet in Statius' epic does not advance moral prohibitions against the act of invasion, but the ruin threatened by divine omens (*ingentis portenta ruinae*, 640). Like Aeschylus' prophet he is able to rebut any accusations of cowardice,³⁶ since he already knows how he will die, and it will not be in human combat (*alio mihi debita fato / summa dies, uetitumque dari mortalibus armis*, 623–4). Yet he is reluctant to reveal coming woes to the crowd and calls it *nefas* to warn Capaneus in advance. Given belief in predestination, it is illogical for the prophet to see his own warnings as in any way able to thwart destiny. Since Capaneus is fated to die on the walls of Thebes, scaling the siege ladder and challenging Jupiter, he

zentius (*Aen.* 7.648) and to some extent the crude jeering of Virgil's Drances. But, as Snijders notes, the characterization is traditional, going back to Aeschylus *Th.* 420–7 and Euripides *Ph.* 1171–2, *Supp.* 496–7. Capaneus' brutal inhumanity is stressed by Statius' comparison with a subhuman Centaur (cf. *Aen.* 7.674–6) or giant. Juhnke 1972, 83–6 rightly sees the influence of Virgil's *Aeneid* 7 and 11 on this confrontation, but is again misled by the context; although it is Turnus who wants to attack and Drances who protests, the morality of Amphiarus excludes any parallel between his response to Capaneus and Drances' attack on Turnus: if anything, it is Amphiarus who must defend himself against accusation of hypocrisy and cowardice.

33 Statius' urgent epanalepsis of *bella* in 593–4 copies Virgil's repetition of *contra* in 7.583–4.

34 Cf. Parthenopaeus' deification of his weapon in Aeschylus *Th.* 529–30, and Mezentius' in *Aen.* 10.773–4 *dextra mihi deus et telum quem missile libro / nunc adsint*. Capaneus' contempt for omens and for Apollo in 611–4 is only slightly less blasphemous than the outspoken defiance of Zeus by Aeschylus' Capaneus (423–6).

35 Cf. Aeschylus *Th.* 580–9, where Amphiarus denounces to Polyneices the attack on his fatherland and people, and foretells his own death and burial in Theban soil.

36 In Aeschylus it is Tydeus who accuses Amphiarus of ἀψυχία (377–94) when he refuses to authorize crossing the Ismenos.

not only must not, but cannot, heed the warning. It is not so much *nefas* to warn him, as it is impossible.

So it falls to Amphiaraus to take on further roles: he becomes the true priest and prophet Laocoon (*Aen.* 242 *o miseri; quae tanta insania ciues?*) and the poet Lucan (1.8 *quis furor, o ciues, quae tanta licentia ferri?*). From his opening protest at the people's folly and indifference to the peace of their families and community (*quo, miseri, fatis superisque obstantibus / arma quo rapitis?*) he turns back to the omens. If they have no respect for omens and are ready to override them, why did they force him to trespass on the councils of the gods (*superum inrumpere coetus*, 634) when he could have been spared the painful foreknowledge of their fate and his own? He calls the universe and the speech of birds and Apollo himself to witness that he has never before been shown such portents of mass destruction. His appeal to the crowd to throw down their weapons (*proicite arma manu*, 643) recalls another voice of wisdom from the *Aeneid*, and the cry of Anchises to the unborn soul of Caesar (*proice tela manu, sanguis meus*, *Aen.* 6.835) and is equally doomed—that is, fated—to frustration. It is only the realization that he cannot avert predestined fate that silences Amphiaraus: he knows that they will go to war, and his last word is *ibimus* (647).³⁷ This is both a pointed echo and a calculated modulation of the last words of Aeschylus' prophet on the banks of the Ismenus: *μαχώμεθ'*, "let us fight, then!" (*Th.* 589). Amphiaraus uses the future indicative because he knows that they will launch this doomed expedition. Capaneus has no new arguments³⁸ except to blaspheme against fate, substituting human will-power for divine: in battle he will be the prophet (*illic augur ego*) who guarantees victory. His abuse is backed by the frenzied shouting of

37 Was Statius remembering Homer at the same time that he "corrected" Aeschylus? As Hutchinson points out (*ad. Th.* 589), Sarpedon's last word before he enters the battle in which he will die is *ἵσμεν* (*Iliad* 12.328). I thank Piet Schrijvers for reminding me of the important Horatian precedents for both the beginning and end of this speech: in the Civil War *Epod.* 7.1–2 *quo, quo scelesti nitis? aut cur dexteris / aptantur enses conditi?* (with the explanation in the *acerba fata* of Rome), and in *Carm.* 2.17.8–10 to Maecenas, sharing his resolve to face (the astronomical predictions of) death: *ille dies utramque / ducet ruinam. non ego perfidum / dixi sacramentum. ibimus, ibimus, utcumque praecedes.*

38 But note how the abuse of Capaneus at 648 *tuus o furor auguret uni / ista tibi* takes up Amphiaraus' words in 628 *unique tibi tacet noster Apollo*: Snijders compares Turnus' retort to Drances, *Aen.* 11.399 *capiti cane talia, demens / Dardanio rebusque tuis.*

the crowd, and Amphiaraus, like Latinus overwhelmed by his people's war-lust, withdraws.

As Virgil precedes Latinus' collapse and withdrawal³⁹ with the simile of the wild waves breaking on the reefs to assail the lone rock, so Statius marks the end of this encounter with a formal simile comparing the passions of the crowd to a swollen mountain torrent breaking through the dykes and sweeping away fields, flocks and men until it meets a hill high enough to obstruct it (3.671–6): but there is no equivalent to the hill: only night, which adjourns the conflict between the leaders.⁴⁰ After all Amphiaraus is only one of several princes, not the king of Argos: there remains the decision of Adrastus, and for this Statius applies the quieter personal pressure of his daughter Argia. The final verdict on Amphiaraus comes when he is shown among the parade of princes at 4.187–95, and here too Statius incorporates the myth of domestic treachery into the larger fate of cities. As the prophet knew his doom, but Atropos herself forced arms upon him, so his wicked wife knows the golden chain will be the death of him (*hoc aurum uati fata exitiale monebant / Argolico; scit et ipsa – nefas* 4.192–3) and gladly exchanges his life for plundered adornment.

I referred earlier to the role played by Amphiaraus and by king Latinus in Virgil as *mora belli*. This idiom does not occur in Statius' narrative here, but both the use of *mora belli* to describe a person and the literary device of deferral, constructing incidents and digressions to delay desired action have recently been brought to the front in interpreting Latin epic. It is Seneca the Elder who reports in his second *Suasoria* that in his youth the declaimer Porcius Latro urged on the Spartans at Thermopylae with the words *si nihil aliud, erimus certe belli mora* (*Suas.* 2.19) and was imitated in epic verse by a pupil who coined the words *belli mora concidit Hector*. He reports that Virgil in turn was inspired by this to write *quicquid ad aduersae cessatum est moenia Troiae / Hectoris*

39 Cf. *Aen.* 7.583–5 *ilicet infandum cuncti contra omina bellum / contra fata deum peruerso numine poscunt. / certatim regis circumstant tecta Latini*; the simile of 586–90 (note *fremunt*, 590) introducing the moment when folly can no longer be resisted (591–4); and Juno's intervention at 620 to eliminate Latinus' last attempt to delay the act of war.

40 The Virgilian paradox that Latinus does not match the resistance of the rock, his analogue in the simile, is eliminated by Statius, who uses the onset of night to rescue the prophet. But Statius has not forgotten Virgil's simile of rock and stormy sea. As Helen Lovatt pointed out to me, the raging sea and resistant rock are postponed and recalled with variations at the opening of book 4 (24–31).

Aeneaque manu uictoria Graium / haesit (11.288–30).⁴¹ Old Seneca could have added Virgil's passing description of Abas in 10.428 as *pugnae nodusque moramque*. The conceit was adapted by Lucan, for whom Crassus served merely as *medius belli mora* (1.100) postponing to his death the inevitable conflict of Pompey and Caesar. Indeed Lucan's Caesar repeatedly chafes at the bit, from his impatience with the *moras ... belli* at the moment of crossing the Rubicon (to invade his homeland Italy as Polyneices crossed the Ismenus to invade Thebes) to other delays before battle at 5.410, 7.249 and 7.377.

Ten years ago Jamie Masters advanced a powerful argument that Lucan himself, as he wrote, was fighting his own reluctance to progress with his aggressive poem of civil war. How far does this apply to Statius, and to the role of Amphiaraus? We saw that Adrastus himself wondered whether he should rein in his people's anger: when Adrastus consults Jupiter, he invites him, if he is forbidding the expedition, to demonstrate it with contrary omens (*necte moras, dextrisque profundum / altibus praetexe diem*, 495–6). It is of course Capaneus who voices impatience with Amphiaraus (*quid uota uirum meliora moraris?*, 651; cf. *proferre diem*, 666), while the prophet insists that it is the god who stands in their way: *deus ecce furentibus obstat*. It is his knowledge of fate that ends his attempts at resistance, whereas Adrastus, trying in vain to sooth his daughter into accepting delay, speaks only from a human point of view: *neu sint dispendia iustae / dura morae* (3.718–9). The *mora* is over and book 4 opens by replacing delay with military action: *tandem miseris data copia belli* (4.4). But with Statius delay is not an expression of personal aversion from his war narrative: it is simply a compositional device to prolong and elaborate the complexities of his narrative.

Bibliography

- Burck, E., "Die Thebais des Statius", in id. (ed.), *Das römische Epos*, Darmstadt 1979, 300–51.
 Gantz, T., *Early Greek Myth. A Guide tot he Literary and Artistic Sources*, Baltimore 1993.

41 Seneca actually misquotes Virgil, who wrote *quidquid apud durae cessatum est*. The statement occurs in the speech of Diomedes reported to the Latin council by Venulus, and according to Seneca Messala criticized Virgil for completing the line with *et in decimum uestigia rettulit annum*.

- Grassmann-Fischer, B., *Die Prodigien in Vergils Aeneis*, Munich 1966.
- Juhnke, H., *Homerisches in römischer Epik flavischer Zeit*, Munich 1972.
- Lane Fox, R., *Pagans and Christians*, New York 1985.
- Linderski, J., "The augural law", *ANRW* II.16.3 (1986), 2146–296.
- McGuire, D. T. jr., "History compressed: The Roman names of Silius' Cannae episode", *Latomus* 54, 1995, 110–8.
- Parke, H. W., *The Greek Oracles*, London 1967.
- Rambaud, M., "Presages et procuratie au livre I de la Pharsale (v. 522–638)", in D. Porte and J.-P. Neraudau (edd.), *Hommages a Henri le Bonniec. Res sacrae*, Paris 1985, 375–88.
- Vessey, D. W. T. C., *Statius and the Thebaid*, Cambridge 1973.

31. *Chironis exemplum* : On Teachers and Surrogate Fathers in *Achilleid* and *Silvae*¹

If Statius studied in his own father's school, he will have been well-read not only in Homer but in Greek poetry from Pindar to Hellenistic epic and other genres. So one of his early memories may have been the moment in Apollonius when Chiron comes down from Mount Pelion to the shore to send off his pupil Jason, dipping his feet (human feet, not hooves) in the sea foam, waving his broad hand and repeatedly bidding the Argonauts a safe and trouble-free return (νόστον ἐπευφήμησεν ἄπηρέα νισσομένοισιν); with him came Chariclo holding up the infant Achilles to display him to his father on shipboard (*Arg.* 1.553–8). Archaic Greek tradition knew two versions of Achilles' upbringing: in one Peleus and Thetis reared him together as a young child, bringing him to Chiron only as a young lad for advanced education; in the other Thetis left Peleus, and she alone brought the infant to Chiron to rear.² Naturally this version was more in keeping with the focus of Statius' *Achilleid*, which moves from Thetis' fears of the Greek expedition to her counter-measure of hiding Achilles on Scyros. In general—given the ancient fascination with adolescent boys—the imagination of poets was kindled by the young hero's preparation for manhood rather than by his infancy. Different Greek traditions had included among the disciplines taught by Chiron medicine (since Homer), *mousike* (poetry sung to the lyre), astronomy, and the physical arts of hunting and combat along with the moral precepts of the Hesiodic *Chironos Hypotheke*. All these recur in Statius' complementary narratives of Achilles' education, which would remain favourite reading in Late Antiquity and the

-
- 1 This paper was presented in most enjoyable circumstances at the Statius workshop organised by Kathleen Coleman in April 1998. I greatly appreciate the stimulus provided by the many excellent papers and helpful comments from the audience. [On this article and 23 above, see now Alan Cameron's comprehensive study of the traditions about Achilles' upbringing by Chiron, 'Young Achilles in the Roman world,' *JRS* 99 (2009) 1–22.]
 - 2 Cf. K. Friis Johansen, 'Achill bei Chiron', 181–205 in *Dragma: Festschrift M. P. Nilsson* (1939).

Middle Ages.³ Statius' influence is surely apparent, despite Manacorda's demurrals, in nine of the eleven scenes embossed on the great fourth-century *Missorium* from Kaiseraugst. Six of these show Achilles' childhood with Chiron: as Thetis hands over the baby; as Chiron feeds the toddler with animal entrails; as he lets the little Achilles ride on his back; as he teaches the growing boy to read; and to play the lyre (Achilles is shown displaying reluctance); and finally at the moment when he restores the grown lad to Thetis.⁴

To his Latin predecessors Statius owed the image of Horace's 13th Epode, where Chiron warns his now grown pupil of his fate at Troy and urges him to relieve his sadness with wine and song: *uino cantuque ... / deformis aegrimoniae dulcibus alloquiis*. And to Ovid, a strange account of the death of Chiron in the *Fasti*. In this anachronistic and homoerotic legend drawn from Antisthenes via Eratosthenes' *Katasterisms* or the scholia to Aratus, Herakles came to visit Chiron out of love for young Achilles, but while they were flirting, a poisoned arrow was accidentally knocked out of Herakles' quiver and pierced Chiron's foot. It could not kill Chiron, since he was immortal, but the pain was so terrible that he wished for death. In Ovid's account, which eliminates the homoerotic purpose of Herakles' visit, both Chiron himself and Achilles admire Herakles' club and lionskin, but it is Chiron who clumsily causes his own wounding with the arrow, and is subsequently rewarded for his piety with catasterism to become the constellation Centauros.

Statius, so close to Ovid in command of language, word play and ironic or playful tone, inherits from Ovid's death of Chiron two aspects that I wish to emphasize in my reading of his presentation of Chiron as educator and father figure. The first element is Chiron's own human and humane nature, the second the love which Achilles bears him. We saw that Apollonius presented Chiron as more man than horse: indeed there is no allusion to any equine aspect of the old teacher. As Ian Brookes has shown in a recent study⁵ Ovid too introduces his Chiron as *iustus ... senex, Philyreius heros*, human, though not mortal. He uses only human body words like hand and foot: but while Statius follows him in

3 Zoya Pavlovskis' article 'The Education of Achilles as treated in the Literature of Late Antiquity,' *Parola del Passato* (1982) 281–97, makes Statius her starting point.

4 On this great late antique platter see M. A. Manacorda, *La Paideia di Achille*, Rome 1971, 45–51. See now Kossatz Deitzmann, *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologicum Graecum*, Geneva 1987, 1.2 s.v. Achilles, and s.v. Chiron.

5 'The death of Chiron: Ovid *Fasti* 5.379–414,' *CQ* 44 (1994) 444–450.

doing so, he also surreptitiously inserts hints of Chiron's other, horsey nature. For Achilles' love of Chiron, we should compare Ovid *Fasti* 5.407–12 in full:

stabat, ut ante patrem, lacrimis perfusus Achilles
 sic flendus Peleus, si moreretur, erat
 saepe manus aegras manibus fingebat amicis
 morum, quos fecit, praemia doctor habet.
 oscula saepe dedit, dixit quoque saepe iacenti
 'Vive, precor, nec me, care, relinque, pater!'

As Thetis approaches Thessaly in three supernatural strides (or swimming strokes, according to Dilke) across the sea, we see Chiron's *domus ardua* (openly called a cave by Ovid)⁶ presented to us as the former site of Thetis' wedding feast, a work half of nature and half of handiwork *pars exhausta manu* (108), still bearing signs of the bridal couches where the gods were once guests. Inside, Chiron's *stabula* are contrasted with those of his bestial and unruly brothers: his weapons bear no human bloodstains, there are no logs of drinking vessels broken in the wedding brawl with the Lapiths, but harmless quivers and animal hides from his past hunting days. Even this innocent pastime is now past for Chiron, who goes unarmed, concerned only to select the right healing herbs for the sick⁷ and to display the heroes of old with the lyre to his foster-child (116–18).

This evocation of epic poetry is important to Statius, who returns to it with the significant variant *laudum semina* at 188–9 below and 2.89. Chiron's chosen task in playing and teaching the lyre to Achilles, his foster-child, is to display or even praise (*monstrare* is ἐπιδεικνύναι) epic heroes (κλέα ἀνδρῶν): he is both an epic poet and teacher of succeeding poets.

As Thetis approaches, Chiron is waiting at the doorway for Achilles to return from the hunt, cooking the dinner and warming the home with a generous fire, more like a wife or mother perhaps than a father. But at the sight of Thetis he impulsively bursts through the woods, making the plain thud once more with the old familiar sound of his

6 So also, as Dilke points out in his useful edition of *Achilleid*, in *Met.* 11.229 and 235 f., and *Sen. Tro.* 831 *montis exesi ... antro*. *Conubialis* too derives from Ovid, *Heroides* 6.41.

7 Reading the Lucretian form *animantibus*; Dilke compares *Silv.* 3.2.61, *Theb.* 1.501, 3.552, 11.465 and 12.503 *animantibus aegris*.

hoof (the Virgilian tag *ungula campo*⁸ suddenly recalling his horsey nature). Greeting her, he bends his forelegs to escort her under his humble roof (like Evander with Aeneas) as he warns her of the cave. But like some upper-class mother who has unexpectedly dropped in on her son's housemaster at school, Thetis greets him with reproaches for letting Achilles (*mea pignora*)⁹ out of his sight.

Chiron answers her pretence of alarming dreams and ritual instructions from Proteus (*Carpathius uates*)¹⁰ by urging her to reclaim her son. Diplomatically he remarks that Achilles' extraordinary talents must have provoked divine jealousy: his premature development (*uis festina*) augurs some future greatness. This is, of course, what every parent longs to hear, but it is also something Statius' readers know to be true: at the same time the proof of it as given by Chiron is that the boy is out of control. He used to obey Chiron and stay close to the cave, but now he ranges all over Pelion itself, Ossa and Thessaly¹¹ raiding the centaurs who often protest to Chiron that he plunders their homes, rustles their cattle and chases them over land and stream. Chiron is recalling his Apollonian experience of seeing Theseus and Herakles (157) when he falls silent because the boy has arrived home, covered in sweat and dust, handsome despite his physical effort, as if he were Apollo returning from hunting to take up the lyre.

It is part of Statius' foreshadowing that Achilles has killed a lioness and carried back her cubs, and is followed by a loyal Patroclus.¹² Impulsively he tosses down the cubs at the sight of his mother, and hugs her—he is now as tall as her and quite bulky—then washes in the nearby stream. Chiron grooms him, stroking his breast and shoulders, then offers Thetis food and wine before fetching down his lyre. As in *Iliad* 9, as in Horace *Epodes* 13, the music of the lyre brings comfort *solantia curas* (186). After tuning its strings (*expertas pollice chordas*) he passes it to Achilles.

8 From *Aen.* 8.596, itself a variant on Ennius.

9 The poetic idiom for a child is doubly appropriate since Achilles has been entrusted to Chiron like a pledge or hostage.

10 Again from Ovid's account of the violent wooing of Thetis by Peleus, at *Met.* 11.249, but indirectly from *Georgics* 4.387 *est in Carpathio Neptuni gurgite uates*.

11 But for *Thessaliae* Dilke reads *Pharsaliae*, perhaps rightly.

12 Dilke notes that Patroclus is also Achilles' companion in the cave at Val. Fl. 1.407 f.

The proof of Chiron's teaching is Achilles' choice of song; the mighty stimulus of his glory (*immania laudum / semina*). The double meaning of *laudes*, as both praise and the achievements that earn praise, lends extra force to *laudum semina*, which can be both genitive of respect—the seeds consist of glorious deeds—and of origin; the epic achievements which Achilles sings are seeds of his own emulation and achievement. It is too late for Thetis to avoid Athens as a possible stimulus to her son's heroic military urges¹³ (202–3 *laudumque daturi Cecropidae stimulus*): he has already been indoctrinated. What Achilles recounts is pre-Homeric epic; tales of the few renowned heroes from the generation before the Trojan war: how Hercules met the demands of his step-mother, how Pollux slew Amycus in the boxing match, how Theseus strangled the Minotaur, and finally the tale of his parents' marriage.

But a very different proof of Chiron's mentorship (if I may mix my metonymies) and demonstration that the future hero is still partly a child, is the affection with which Achilles snuggles up to sleep in Chiron's arms (human again), preferring the familiar breast even with his mother at hand.

As narrator, then, in his own person, Statius depicts Chiron as having reared a potentially unmanageable hero, but one who loves him and has learnt from him good manners, music and heroic ideals. But the grown Achilles himself gives a very different account of Chiron's upbringing when he answers Diomedes' questions about his unusual childhood: 'what seeds of glory did Chiron display to you, what paths to manly courage, and by what arts did he help you to develop your physical and moral development?' *quae solitus laudum tibi pandere semina Chiron / uirtutisque aditus, quas membra augere per artes, / quas animum?* (2.91–3). Achilles replies in almost exclusively physical terms, including among *sua facta* all the ordeals which Chiron imposed on him, to develop his hardihood and courage.

This begins with a diet of lion's flesh and marrow from freshly killed wolves.¹⁴ The most probable inspiration for Statius' extended account

13 But if Statius is alluding to Attic poetry—Solonian elegy or tragedy, it is of course too early, and a sophisticated anachronism.

14 Perhaps, then, he killed the lioness of book 1 out of sheer hunger? On this animal diet as the source of courage and strength, see D. S. Robertson, 'The Food of Achilles,' *CR* 54 (1940) 177–80. Robertson compares other accounts of his special diet: the marrows of lions and bears (Schol. *Iliad* 16.36) or boars and bears (Apollodorus 3.13.6, with Frazer's note citing the beliefs of other cultures that such food gave heroic strength). He also draws special attention to *seima-*

here is Pindar *Nemean* 3.43–64. Pindar reports how Achilles at the age of six brandished a hunting spear, was as swift as the wind, and killed lions and boars in battle. So in Statius Chiron accustomed Achilles to the separate ordeals and skills of hunting: struggling to keep up with the centaur as he strode through the wilderness, facing wild beasts, without fear of tumbling rocks and silent forests. Achilles learnt to handle arrows and hunting spears, exposing his skin to heat and cold and sleeping on bare rock beside his teacher. All this, though set in the wild, corresponds to the Roman idea of the good commander, like Catiline,¹⁵ Caesar or Lucan's Cato, who served alongside his men, sleeping on the ground and indifferent to heat and cold. And if Achilles boasts that he had learned to hunt from the age of twelve, overtaking swift deer and horses in following the cast of his own spears, this was not just the mythical tradition of Achilles' youthful skills,¹⁶ it was also good Roman practice.¹⁷

Achilles hunted on foot, but Chiron himself would serve as his mount (116 *in sua terga leuabat*) when the boy was tired—a scene shown on the great dish of Kaiseraugst. He claims it was a source of pride to him to carry out Chiron's orders, crossing new-frozen rivers without breaking the ice, and boasts that Chiron would not let him hunt mere does and lynxes; he had to rouse bears from their dens (123), and provoke wild boars, lions and tigers freshly delivered of their cubs.¹⁸ Here then the pupil's own account converges with the

nimis in Statius 2.100, relating it to Pindar *Nem.* 3.48–9, where Achilles drags panting (*asthmainonta*) corpses to the Centaur: panting, he suggests, because primitives thought blood or flesh taken from a living being the best magic. There was an ancient derivation of the name Achilles from privative *a-* and either *chil* or *cheil*, fed without vegetables or without sucking.

15 Cf Sall. *Cat.* 5.3.

16 In Pindar *Nem.* 3.51 f. Achilles was so superior in speed (πόσσι γὰρ κράτεσκε) that he could kill stags without the help of hounds or nets: cf. Catullus 64.340–1 *qui persaepe uago uictor certamine cursus / flammea praeuertet celeris uestigia curuae*.

17 Cf. C. M. A. Green, 'Did the Romans Hunt?,' *Classical Antiquity* 15.2 (1996) 223–60.

18 Achilles' hunting of the larger wild beasts is a favourite with the visual arts; cf. Kossatz-Deitzmann, 'Achilles,' *LIMC* 1.2. n. 64–72 and the episodes apparently derived from this section of the *Achilleid* illustrated from the silver plate of Kaiseraugst (n. 68 wild boar, n. 81 corpses of boar and lion). It is not clear to me why Manacorda (cited n. 4 above) is so sure that Statius was not the inspiration of these scenes, nine of which are referred to or narrated in Statius' poem.

poet's previous narrative—and with Pindar too. Chiron seemed gentle enough when we met him in book 1, but according to Achilles the Centaur was eager to see him blooded and would examine his weapons before honouring him with a kiss.

Sandwiched between wilderness survival training and wild beast hunting, Achilles includes his preparation for human combat with the local militia. But this combat was extraordinarily diverse:

iamque et ad ensiferos uicina pube tumultus
 aptabar, nec me ulla feri Mauortis imago
 praeteriit. didici quo Paeones arma rotatu,
 quo Macetae sua gaesa citent ... (129–32)

Why was he taught to wield the scimitars and poles, scythes, bows and slings of strange Northern peoples like Sarmatians and Getes, even tribes only known in Roman times?¹⁹ Why has Statius anachronistically included skill in handling these strange weapons of barbarians, so fundamentally gladiatorial and alien to Greek values? The answer may lie again in Pindar, who at *Nemean* 3.60–3 has Chiron train him to resist Lycians, Phrygians and Dardanians and fight in close combat with spear-wielding Ethiopians (ἐγχέσφοροις ἐπιμείξας / Αἰθιοπέσσι χεῖρας). There is no Pindaric model or starting point, however, when Achilles reports his commando training in long jump and rock climbing, fending off huge boulders and entering burning cottages, or halting runaway chariot teams while himself on foot. Finally, when he elaborates over seven lines (429–36) his ordeal withstanding the full spate of the Sperchius' swollen current full of rocks and logs, Achilles' climactic example serves to foreshadow the grown warrior's Iliadic combat with Scamander and Simois.²⁰

Traditionally Chiron's instructions to Achilles were not just tests of courage but moral teachings of justice and reverence for gods and parents. Through Achilles Statius reflects chiefly the thirst for honour through these ordeals, the *pudor* that drove him to embrace *labores* (151–3) for the glory of achievement before so great a witness. Chiron it is whom Achilles honours as *tanto ... teste*. Only after these heroics does Statius return to a civilian education, deprecating as mere play the traditional Greek skills that form the closure of his narrative: *discus*,

19 The Balearic slinger at least (134) was unknown to the Homeric or archaic Greek world.

20 The last feat is clearly designed to foreshadow Achilles' battle with the rivers in *Iliad* 20.

wrestling and boxing²¹ seemed to young Achilles no more strenuous than the *mousike* of epic which we saw him celebrate after dinner with Thetis (157–8) *Apollineo ... fila sonantia plectro / cum quaterem, priscosque virum mirarer honores*.

In last place Achilles briefly adds Chiron's traditional expertise in medicine (159–163) and justice—the justice Chiron himself had imposed in legislating for the people of Pelion and disciplining his fellow centaurs. The brevity is balanced by our previous experience of Chiron's upbringing and perhaps tailored to the mentality of the raw young hero so early in his career.

But I chose Chiron largely as a symbolic bridge between Statius' mythical poetry and his own social world: he is quoted four times in the *Silvae*, always in relation to Achilles and in his role as foster-father and educator. This was a role that meant a lot to Statius, whose own father had served as such an educator: in fact the most honorific reference occurs in his lament for his father, when he compares him to Mentor, Phoenix and finally Chiron:

non tibi certassent iuuenilia fingere corda
Mento et indomiti Phoenix moderator alumni
quique tubas acres lituosque audire uolentem
Aeaciden alio frangebatur carmine Chiron. (5.3.193–6)

Chiron's skill lay in moulding young men's hearts, but particularly in breaking in the untameable foster-son enamoured of calls to battle with the different music of poetry.

The two earliest allusions in the *Silvae* come in the epithalamium of Stella, where the stress is on Peleus' impatience when he and Chiron waited for the approach of his bride Thetis, and at 1.4.93–4 where Chiron is quoted as a source of healing herbs. It is at 2.1.88 f. in the lament for the *puer delicatus* of Atedius Melior that Chiron stands for the beloved foster-father, as Statius flatteringly illustrates love for a surrogate father when first the mild Chiron displaces Peleus in the heart of young Achilles, then Phoenix sticks loyally to his glorious nursling. There as in that other lament for a dead *delicatus*, 2.6, Statius has had to make the strongest case for an intense bond between master and favourite slave—or ex-slave. But as Harm van Dam has shown us, Statius is not subtle here: he illustrates his message of the greater love felt by

21 These too were represented in ancient art: cf. Kossatz-Deitzmann, 'Achilles,' n. 75 discuss, n. 77–79 boxing.

adults for adoptive children from three Greek and two Roman surrogate fathers, and one foster-mother of each culture—he will touch indirectly on Hypsipyle in his comparison of the child to Opheltes. We shall see that it is a two-way comparison, introduced by his claim of the parent's greater love for a foster-child, *interius nova saepe adscitaeque serpunt / pignora conexis: natos ... elegisse iuuat* (86–88): but the exempla are designed to stress the child's greater love for a foster-parent.

I have laboured this point because the relationship between a child and its foster-father was important to Statius, not only as a component in the praise and consolation he owed to his friends and patrons, but in two of his own relationships; in valuing his own father's life as a teacher and caregiver of pupils away from their families and in his own aborted paternal care for the infant who died so young. Statius had a stepdaughter but no son—indeed it seems far too many of our writers in this age were childless—some perhaps from choice, but a Seneca or Pliny the Younger despite repeated marriages. So we may see in Chiron and Achilles symbols of the childless writer's longing to be loved as a father, as well as his sadness for a child he never had.

It is more relevant to the *Silvae* than to Chiron, to ask whether there was a qualitative difference between the relationships of Atedius and Flavius Ursus with their *delicati* and again between both relationships and that of Statius with his *puer*. Harm van Dam has demonstrated how Statius was closer and able to speak more freely and knowledgably to Atedius than to Ursus, who seems on the whole rather easily consoled for the loss of one Philetos by the prospect of another.²² But how should we distinguish between the tone and language of Statius' third-party consolations and his lament for his own dead child? Lament for *aoroi*, the prematurely dead, is limited by the little they have been able to achieve, unless the mourner fills the poem with all the symbols of fulfilment and maturity that were foreclosed by death.²³ And Statius' lament was unfinished at his own death. Does its poignancy simply derive from the infancy of the little child, or does it reflect what was a different and more heartfelt relationship?

22 *Alium tibi fata Philetos, forsan et ipse dabit*. It is difficult to believe that Statius was not echoing the end of Corydon's grief for Alexis in *Ed. 3 iuuenies alium ... Alexim*.

23 Compare the terms in which the death of Astyanax is mourned by Hecuba in Euripides' *Trojan Women* and (in advance of his presence) by Andromache in Seneca's related tragedy (see Fantham, 'Andromache's Child,' n. 22 in this volume).

Two features common to all three poems suggest the poet's uneasy awareness of artificiality in the paternal love he predicates of his wealthy friends and even himself. In lamenting the *pueri* of his friends he uses the rhetorical trope of the rejected alternative, defining and excluding either inferiority in the nature of the child or in the relationship between child and quasi-parent. He is much obsessed with the child's honest birth: cf. 2.1.72–77 'you were not involved in the hurly-burly of the barbarian slavemarket, you did not associate as an infant with Egyptian bargains, or saucily entice a master by spouting artificial witticisms and practiced sayings, and finally procure one. Here was your home, here your origin, both your parents had long been dear to your master's household and manumitted to achieve your happiness, so that you need not bemoan your parentage.' In 2.6.38–40 the repudiated alternative is effeminacy: 'you did not have effeminate beauty and soft grace of feature like those bidden by criminal violence done to their body to pass out of their sex.' To Atedius he protests the sincerity of his paternal love at 2.1.84–88: 'close blood or a child descended from the dynasty does not create every affinity; often new and adopted bonds attach themselves to those linked by kin. It is a necessity to beget children, but a pleasure to choose them.'²⁴ Less at ease with Ursus, Statius finds it safer to praise the dead youth's affection, *pius, amore fideque has meritum lacrimas*. For Philetos his status in service of Ursus was welcome and sweet: *tuum cui dulce uolenti / seruitium* (15–16).²⁵

It would be reassuring if Statius did not employ the same tropes to lament his own adopted child, but they do recur; we expect him to acknowledge that he was not the child's natural father (5.5.10–12) *non de stirpe quidem, nec qui mea nomina ferret / oraque*; on the other hand the insistence on the child's homebred origin does the poet less credit: compare 66–70 'I did not love some chattering pet bought from an Egyptian trading ship, an infant trained in abuse typical of the Nile, wanton

24 *Natos genuisse necesse est elegisse iuuat*. But does the necessity refer to something beyond the father's control, or simply a requirement of the *paterfamilias* to prolong his family descent?

25 Here the poet's use of *seruitium* takes advantage of its emotional connotations in love-elegy; *dulce seruitium* recalls the whole complex of *seruitium amoris* alternative with the more familiar *militia amoris* of Ovid *Am.* 1.9. See on this theme P. Murgatroyd 'Servitium amoris and the Roman Elegists,' *Latomus* 40 (1981) 589–606.

in tongue and wit: this child was mine, I say.²⁶ The reduplication—here of *meus*, in 2.1 of *hic, hinc*—comes too easily. And when he apostrophizes the child it is only to claim that he manumitted him: *libertatemque sub ipsis / uberibus tibi, parue, dedi* (73–4).

It is not that I doubt Statius' genuine grief, but rather that the poet, preoccupied with Roman insistence on both blood and statues, and professionally occupied in consoling others for these artificial assumed relationships (cf. 5.5.40–43), seems to be questioning his own emotion. Sincerity is not the issue: how could it be? We have all found our emotions betrayed by the hackneyed nature of declarations of love or sympathy in condolence. Rather Statius' language seems to reflect his self-doubt.

But as he approaches the end of the surviving poem (some lines before his intended closure)—Statius' self-doubt resolves itself in the immediacy of 70–2, 'I saw him born and cherished him with a birth-song, and thrust into him the breath of life for which he wailed', and 80–83. It was, he claims, Statius who gave the newborn the life-giving blow that activated his lungs. Indeed the last fractured lines recall his attempts to comfort the baby, and help him learn to walk and talk; here we come closest to the reality of fatherhood.²⁷ For Statius the fondest relationship he knew, and could evoke, was that of surrogate or foster-father, the role that he had seen his own father perform—the role of a Chiron.

26 For the negative formulation and anadiplosis cf. *Silv* 5.5.66–70 *non ego mercatus Pharia de puppe loquaces / delicias doctumque sui conuicia Nili / infantem lingua nimium salibusque proteruum / dilexi: meus ille, meus, tellure cadentem / aspexi*, with 2.1.72–76 *non te barbaricae uersabat turbo catastae, nec mixtus Phariis uenalis mercibus infans / compositosque sales meditataque uerba locutus / quaesisti lasciuus erum ... / hic domus, hinc ortus*.

27 70–73 *tellure cadentem / aspexi atque unctum genitali carmine foui / poscentemque nouas tremulis ululatibus auras / inserui uitae*. In 81–85 he recalls the little child's playfulness *cui uerba sonosque / monstraui questusque et uulnera caeca resoluens / reptantemque solo demissus ad oscula dextra / erexi, blandoque sinu iam iamque cadentes / exsopire genas dulcesque accersere somnos*.

