

Gods and Mortals in Greek and Latin Poetry

Studies in honor of Jenny Strauss Clay

Edited by

LUCIA ATHANASSAKI, CHRISTOPHER NAPPA and ATHANASSIOS VERGADOS





ARIADNE

The Journal of the School of Philosophy of the University of Crete

Supplement Series - 2

GODS AND MORTALS IN GREEK AND LATIN POETRY

STUDIES IN HONOR OF JENNY STRAUSS CLAY

EDITED BY

LUCIA ATHANASSAKI

CHRISTOPHER NAPPA

ATHANASSIOS VERGADOS

SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY, UNIVERSITY OF CRETE

Rethymnon 2018

Cover: Museum of Royal Tombs of Aigai (Vergina).
Golden gorgoneon from the tomb of Philip II.
© Ministry of Culture and Sports

© 2018 Copyright belongs to School of Philosophy of the University of Crete,
and to the individual authors in this volume

Ariadne Supplements Supplements to *Ariadne*,
the Journal of the School of Philosophy
of the University of Crete, 2018-

Vol. 2 (2018)

ISSN 2653-9608 (ebook)

ISSN 2623-4726 (hard copy)

ISBN 978-618-82229-4-6 (ebook)

ISBN 978-618-82229-2-2 (hard copy)

1. Ancient Greek Civilization 2. Roman Civilization
3. Ancient Greek Religion 4. Roman Religion
5. Ancient Greek Literature 6. Latin Literature
7. Ancient Greek Mythology 8. Roman Mythology 9. Reception

Copy editing
mare creative service
(info@mare.gr)

Cover design
Dimitris and Ariadne Kalokyris
(dkalokiris@gmail.com)

Printing and binding
TYPOKRETA S.A. (info@kazanakis.gr)
Industrial Area, 716 01 Heraklion
tel. +030 2810 382800

GODS AND MORTALS IN GREEK AND LATIN POETRY: STUDIES IN HONOR OF JENNY STRAUSS CLAY

Preface	
Lucia Athanassaki, Dean of the School of Philosophy	7
About the Contributors	11
Introduction	
Christopher Nappa, Athanassios Vergados, and Lucia Athanassaki	15
<i>Palluit audax</i> : Horace, <i>Odes</i> 3.27	
Diane Arnson Svarlien	23
Notes on (a) mentor: A tribute to Jenny Strauss Clay	
Daniel Mendelsohn	27
Jenny Strauss Clay	
Ward W. Briggs	39
Jenny Strauss Clay, Bibliography 1969-2017	
Ward W. Briggs	52
The Partnership of Zeus and Gaia in Hesiod's <i>Theogony</i> :	
Nancy Felson	57
Choral Authority ἐν ζαθέῳ χρόνῳ: Epic, Dramatic, Pindaric and Platonic Representations of Ritual Interaction of Mortals and Immortals	
Lucia Athanassaki	81
Justice in the Flesh: Constructing Dike as a Dramatic Character in Aeschylus fr. 281a Radt	
Zoe Stamatopoulou	119
The inconsistency of Antigone: human character and divinely-sent atē in Sophocles' play	
David Kovacs	137

Hermes and Carion in Aristophanes' <i>Plutus</i> Athanasios Vergados	159
Artemis and the Perils of Divine Intimacy Thomas K. Hubbard	181
What the Cyclops Saw: Self-Knowledge in Theocritus' <i>Idylls</i> 6 and 11 Anatole Mori	205
The Role of Demeter in Theocritus, <i>Idyll</i> 7 Benjamin Jasnow	229
<i>Tui plenum</i> : Horace in the Presence of the Gods Daniel Barber	255
<i>Psychopompoi</i> in Horace's <i>Odes</i> Blanche Conger McCune	285
<i>Antiquam exquirite matrem</i> : Apollo, Ceres, and the Trojans' Search for a New Home Stephen C. Smith	301
Hercules, Hylas, and the Nymphs: Homosocial Poetics in Propertius 1.20 Christopher Nappa	323
Flora, Ovid, and Augustus John F. Miller	343
Index	359

Preface

Lucia Athanassaki
Dean of the School of Philosophy

Gods and Mortals in Greek and Latin Poetry celebrates the fascinating journey and scholarly career of Jenny Strauss Clay, a world-class scholar, an inspiring mentor, and a dear friend. The volume is the second in our new series, *Ariadne Supplements*, an open access peer-reviewed series that welcomes scholarly publications occupying the space between a journal and a book. These publications are usually Festschriften and conference publications that, like the present volume, have some thematic unity but not the kind that one expects from a book. We are delighted to be able to publish scholarly research without worrying too much about commercial issues, thanks to the support of the Ioanna Sfakianaki Fund. Ioanna Sfakianaki was a Rethymniote who died in 1997 and bequeathed all her property for the support of the Editions of the School of Philosophy. Once the inheritance cleared, about 10 years ago, this special fund gave a huge boost to the publications of our School: they have multiplied and are open access (<http://www.phl.uoc.gr/ekdoseis.php>).

This volume was originally conceived and executed by Christopher Nappa. Athanassios Vergados and I joined him in the summer of 2017, when we felt it was appropriate to submit the volume to the new series in the light of Jenny's longstanding ties with Greece and the University of Crete in particular. Jenny visited the University in the early 1990s and her support of the scholarly activities of the Department of Philology, Classics has won her many friends ever since. My acquaintance with her, however, predates her visit to Crete. Jenny loves to introduce her friends to one another and inspires them to do the same. I first met her

thanks to Daniel Mendelsohn, who organized a dinner outing at Princeton in 1989, where we had both gone to attend a conference on Homer's ancient readers. I was still a graduate student at Brown University. When I joined the faculty at the University of Virginia in 1990 on a one-year contract, I immediately found out that Jenny's house was the center of departmental social life. Thanks to her famous parties I got to know, better than I would have under different circumstances, John and Mary Miller; David and Judith Kovacs; Christopher Nappa and Stephen Smith, both graduate students at the time; and of course Andreia Clay. The following year I moved to Greece to take up a post at the University of Crete. Jenny used to visit Greece with Diskin Clay regularly in the 1960s, but had stopped coming for some years. I convinced her to visit me in Athens and Rethymnon. Our friendship became much stronger and much richer thanks to the travels we took together and which soon expanded both within and outside of Greece. I cannot visit museums or archaeological sites in Paris or Rome without thinking of Jenny, and the same is true for Mykonos and Naxos, just to mention only a few highlights in our now old and very peripatetic friendship.

As many contributors stress, the brand-name of Jenny's scholarship is scrutiny of the texts. This is certainly true, but it is also true that Jenny has always had a keen interest in material culture, ancient and modern. I have watched her scrutinizing vase paintings in museums as rigorously as she examines texts. It has been a rewarding intellectual challenge to witness her inquiring mind at work and it has been a great pleasure to enjoy her company for three decades. I deeply regret that her partner, Roger Stein, who contributed an art-historian's perspective during our museum visits, is no longer with us.

I think it is pure serendipity that the Editions Committee of the School of Philosophy decided to launch the new series at the time when this volume was completed. I am delighted with its acceptance for publication in the *Ariadne Supplements*, and I feel the need to offer warm thanks to a number of individuals:

my colleagues in the Editions Committee for their initial interest in our proposal and their final approval;

Ewen L. Bowie and John F. Miller for their help and advice concerning matters great and small;

the experts in the various fields covered by this volume who refereed anonymously the scholarly contributions;

Eleni Kotsou and Angeliki Kottaridi for their permissions to use the gold *gorgoneion* on the cover of the printed and the electronic versions;

Dimitris and Ariadne Kalokyris for the design of the cover of the new series and the volume;

Manthos Remoundos of ‘mare’ for the efficient electronic typesetting and Rosemary Tzanaki for copy-editing;

the contributors to this volume and my co-editors for their smooth collaboration;

and, of course Jenny Strauss Clay, who inspired this volume and has managed, once again, to bring all of us together.

Rethymnon 25 May 2018

About the Contributors

DIANE ARNSON SVARLIEN studied Classics and English as an undergraduate at the University of Virginia and went on to earn her doctorate in Classics from the University of Texas at Austin. She has published three volumes of verse translations of the plays of Euripides for Hackett Publishing: *Alcestis, Medea, Hippolytus* (2007); *Andromache, Hecuba, Trojan Women* (2012); and *Ion, Helen, Orestes* (2016); her next volume for Hackett will be Aristophanes' *Lysistrata, Women at the Thesmophoria, Frogs*. Her Euripides translations are widely performed, and her verse translations of Sappho, Semonides, Theocritus, Catullus, Horace, Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid have appeared in various journals and anthologies. She lives in Lexington, Kentucky.

LUCIA ATHANASSAKI is Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Crete, currently serving a four-year term as Dean of the School of Philosophy (2014-2018). She has published widely on Greek lyric and drama, focusing on politics, performance, and its artistic background. Her publications include *ᾄειδετο πᾶν τέμενος. Οι χορικές παραστάσεις και το κοινό τους στην αρχαϊκή και πρώιμη κλασική περίοδο* (Heraklion 2009), *Apolline Politics and Poetics* (jointly edited with R. P. Martin and J. F. Miller; Athens 2009), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song* (jointly edited with Ewen Bowie; Berlin 2011), and *Ο ιδιωτικός βίος στον δημόσιο λόγο στην ελληνική αρχαιότητα και τον διαφωτισμό* (jointly edited with A. Nikolaidis and D. Spatharas; Heraklion 2014). Her current main research project is on art, cult, and politics in Euripidean drama. She is also editing, jointly with Frances B. Titchener, a volume entitled *Plutarch's Cities*.

DANIEL BARBER holds the Charles W. Locke Chair in Classics at Middlesex School in Concord, Mass., where he also serves as department head. He has published articles on Horace's *Odes* and reviewed books on Latin literature for *BMCR* and *Classical Journal*. He received his BA in Classics from Cornell University and his PhD from the University of Virginia, where he wrote his dis-

sertation on the speaker and addressee in Horace's *Odes* under the direction of Jenny Strauss Clay.

WARD BRIGGS is Carolina Distinguished Professor of Classics and Louis Fry Scudder Professor of the Humanities Emeritus at the University of South Carolina. His early interest was in Virgil, but the latter part of his career has been devoted to the history of American classical scholarship with a particular emphasis on the career of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve.

NANCY FELSON is Professor Emerita of Classics at the University of Georgia, where, since 1972, she has taught Greek poetry, mythology, gender studies, and Latin poetry. Her research has involved applying tools from narratology, semiotics, pragmatics, gender studies, and linguistics to the understanding of Homeric epic, Pindar's victory odes, and Greek tragedy. *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics in Homer's Odyssey* (Princeton 1994), for example, explores the interplay between actual and hypothetical plots in the *Odyssey* and discovers how the poet uses Penelope's precarious and ambiguous situation to tease its audiences and engage them in a courtship dance. She has guest-edited two special issues of *Arethusa, Classics and Semiotic Studies* (1983) and *Poetics of Deixis* (1994). Her interest in the impact of poetry on audiences has given rise to a collaborative project that will generate an interpretive performance of Pindar's *Ninth Pythian*.

THOMAS K. HUBBARD is the James R. Dougherty, Jr. Centennial Professor of Classics at the University of Texas, Austin. He is the author of *The Pindaric Mind* (Leiden 1985), *The Mask of Comedy* (Ithaca 1991), and *The Pipes of Pan* (Ann Arbor 1998), as well as numerous articles on the full range of Greek and Roman literature; he is also editor of multiple volumes on ancient sexuality.

BENJAMIN JASNOW earned his PhD in Classics from the University of Virginia in 2014. He has been a lecturer in Classics at the University of Virginia and Skidmore College. He now teaches at the University of Missouri-Kansas City.

DAVID KOVACS was the Hugh H. Obear Professor of Classics (he recently retired) at the University of Virginia, where he had taught since 1976. He has edited and translated the eighteen plays of Euripides (plus the non-Euripidean *Rhesus*) for the Loeb Classical Library and has published three volumes discussing textual problems in Euripides and two further monographs on individual plays. He is the author of numerous articles, both text-critical and interpretative, on Aeschylus.

lus, Sophocles, Euripides, Horace, and other classical authors.

BLANCHE CONGER McCUNE received her undergraduate degree from Wheaton College and her MA and PhD in Classics from the University of Virginia, where she wrote her dissertation on mythology in Horace's *Odes* under the direction of Jenny Strauss Clay. Her published work includes articles on Latin poetry ranging from lyric to elegy to epic. She currently teaches in Classics and Great Texts at Baylor University.

DANIEL MENDELSON is an internationally bestselling author, critic, essayist and translator. He writes frequently for the *New Yorker* and *New York Review of Books* and has been a columnist for BBC Culture, *New York, Harpers*, and the *New York Times Book Review*. His most recent memoir, *An Odyssey: A Father, a Son, and an Epic*, published in 2017, was shortlisted for the Baillie Gifford Prize and named a Best Book of the Year by NPR, *Library Journal*, *Kirkus*, and *Newsday*. His other books include two memoirs, *The Lost: A Search for Six of Six Million* (2006), a winner of the National Book Critics Circle Award and the National Jewish Book Award in the U.S. and the Prix Médicis in France, and *The Elusive Embrace* (1999), a *Los Angeles Times* Best Book of the Year; two collections of essays, *How Beautiful It Is and How Easily It Can Be Broken* and *Waiting for the Barbarians: Essays from the Classics to Pop Culture*; and a translation, with commentary, of the complete poems of Constantine Cavafy. He teaches literature at Bard College.

JOHN F. MILLER is Arthur F. and Marian W. Stocker Professor of Classics at the University of Virginia. He is the author of *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets* (Cambridge, 2009), which was awarded the 2010 Charles J. Goodwin Award of Merit by the American Philological Association; *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals* (Peter Lang, 1991); and numerous articles on various Latin authors. He has also co-edited five collaborative collections on Greek and Roman literature and culture, most recently (with Jenny Strauss Clay) *Tracking Hermes, Pursuing Mercury* (Oxford, forthcoming).

ANATOLE MORI is Associate Professor of Classical Studies in the Department of Ancient Mediterranean Studies at the University of Missouri. Her work addresses the historical context of Greek poetry, and how contact with other traditions altered the literary representation of Greek identity during the early Hellenistic period. She is the author of *The Politics of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica* (Cambridge 2008), which analyzes the reshaping of heroic epic in ac-

cordance with Ptolemaic ideology. Current projects include a book-length study of the construction of female authority in Hellenistic poetry as well as extensive revisions of fourteen fragmentary historians for Brill's New Jacoby 2 (Ian Worthington, ed.). Her article, 'Archives, Innovation, and the Neomorphic Cyclops,' appeared in the 2017 issue of *Aitia* on 'The Rhetoric of Old and New in the Hellenistic Period' (<http://journals.openedition.org/aitia/1669>).

CHRISTOPHER NAPPA is Professor in the Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies at the University of Minnesota. His undergraduate degree is from the University of Texas at Austin and his MA and PhD are from the University of Virginia, where he wrote his dissertation under the direction of Jenny Strauss Clay. His work focuses on Latin poetry. He is the author of *Aspects of Catullus' Social Fiction* (Frankfurt 2001), *Reading after Actium: Vergil's Georgics, Octavian, and Rome* (Ann Arbor 2005), and *Making Men Ridiculous: Juvenal and the Anxieties of the Individual* (Ann Arbor 2018), as well as a number of articles on Latin literature.

STEPHEN C. SMITH is Senior Lecturer in Classics and coordinator of Latin and Greek instruction at the University of Minnesota. He holds a BS in mathematics from Virginia Tech and an MA and PhD in classics from the University of Virginia. He has published articles on Vergil's *Aeneid* (the subject of his dissertation) and Livy. His interests are in Augustan literature and Greek and Latin pedagogy.

ZOE STAMATOPOULOU is Associate Professor of Classics at Washington University in St. Louis. She is the author of *Hesiod and Classical Greek Poetry: Reception and Transformation in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge 2017) and of several articles on Greek literature. She holds a PhD from the University of Virginia (2008), where she wrote her dissertation under the supervision of Jenny Strauss Clay.

ATHANASSIOS VERGADOS received his PhD at the University of Virginia under the supervision of Jenny Strauss Clay. He has taught at Franklin & Marshall College and the University of Tennessee-Knoxville. From 2010 to 2012 he was a fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation at the University of Heidelberg, where he returned in 2013. Since March 2017 he has held a post as Reader in Greek at Newcastle University. He is the author of *A Commentary on the Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (Berlin 2012) as well as articles on Greek poetry.

Introduction

Christopher Nappa, Athanassios Vergados, and Lucia Athanassaki

The contributors to this volume are all old friends of the honorand. Anybody who knows Jenny Clay at all knows that she would want to be honored by people who are not only familiar with her work but who also know her well as a person. That said, this volume is meant as a surprise. Jenny's focus on gods and mortals throughout her career and her wide-ranging interests and publications in Greek and Latin poetry made the choice of topic obvious. *Gods and Mortals in Greek and Latin Poetry* is the tribute of students and colleagues to Jenny Clay for the scholarly guidance, inspiration, and friendship she has generously given to her students and colleagues over the years.

All of the contributions here speak to Jenny Clay's effectiveness as a teacher and model interpreter of the intersection between the human and divine in the poetry of Greece and Rome. In a series of acute articles on Horace's *Odes*, Clay has explored the ways in which this quintessentially Latin poet uses the imagery of the gods—especially those less emphasized in public cult, like Faunus and Mercury—and the sympotic traditions of Greek lyric to talk about issues important to the individual, especially love, age, and the place of the artist in the world.¹ One of these articles inspired Diane Arnson Svarlien's translation of *Odes* 3.27 with its use of religion and myth to comment on a personal relationship. This translation makes a fitting opening to our tribute to Jenny.

Jenny's role as teacher and mentor to students and colleagues is brought out very strongly in a reminiscence by Daniel Mendelsohn.

¹ Clay 1989-90; Clay 1993; Clay 2002; Clay 2011; Clay 2015; Clay 2016.

Jenny's friends will find more than one experience in Daniel's vivid account which will bring to mind their own similar experiences.

Ward Briggs has sketched Jenny's scholarly journey and achievement in the biography that follows and has also compiled her impressive bibliography, which will undoubtedly be out of date in the few months that separate us from the publication of this volume. The commentary on Hesiod's *Theogony* which she has undertaken jointly with Athanassios Vergados is just one example of her continuing productivity.

Jenny Clay has been a leading scholar in the study of early Greek poetry.² Her work, invariably combining illuminating analysis and thought-provoking arguments, has inspired and continues to inspire many scholars in the field. The salient characteristic of Jenny's own method, both in her publications and in class, is scrutiny of the text. Those of us who had the luck to attend her seminars have experienced many an eye-opening moment in which what was latent in the text became evident, and it is not an exaggeration to claim that works such as *The Politics of Olympus* and *Hesiod's Cosmos* have made available new paths of interpretation and have actively shaped the critical study of the *Homeric Hymns* and Hesiod respectively in the last decades. The essays collected here are a small sample of the interpretative paths that Clay's readings in Greek and Latin poetry have inspired, and they are arranged chronologically.

In 'The Partnership of Zeus and Gaia in Hesiod's *Theogony*', Nancy Felson takes her cue from Clay's work on Hesiod,³ and, continuing her own line of inquiry regarding *Th.* 126-8,⁴ she explores Gaia's 'psychology'. Although Zeus limits his own power by entering into agreements with gods of the previous generations, Felson shows that Gaia uses diplomacy too in order to accomplish her function as 'kingmaker' as she traces Gaia's change of attitude in the *Theogony*. Whereas at the beginning Gaia supports the youngest son and instigates change, and later produces a challenger for Zeus (Typhoeus), she eventually becomes his unwavering supporter by promoting his election as king with whose aid she can fulfil her role as the ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεί.

In 'Choral Authority ἐν ζαθέῳ χρόνῳ: Epic, Dramatic, Pindaric and Platonic Representations of Ritual Interactions of Mortals and Immortals',

² For a complete bibliography, see pp. 54-58.

³ Clay 2003: 26.

⁴ Felson 2011: 257-61.

Lucia Athanassaki explores the question of the origin and nature of the authority of melic choruses, focusing on the importance of the presence of gods in the life of mortals, an issue that is central in Clay's work.⁵ Athanassaki's treatment of Pindar's *Paeans* 6 and 8, the *Dithyramb* for the Athenians (fr. 75), the Parthenaic fragment 94a, of select passages from dramatic poetry (Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes), and the centrality of *choreia* for *paideia* in Plato's *Laws* shows that choral authority, namely telestic expertise and competence and, in some rare instances, omniscience, which is comparable to the omniscience poets claim, derives from the choruses' ritual interaction with gods, namely the Muses, Apollo, and Dionysus. Sympotic and choral training are homologous to each other, and Plato's treatment is shown to have important archaic hexameter and lyric antecedents.

Hesiod, a poet very dear to Jenny Clay, informs the background of Zoe Stamatopoulou's essay, 'Justice in the Flesh: Constructing Dike as a Dramatic Character in Aeschylus fr. 281a Radt'. Her chapter explores Aesch. fr. 281a Radt, in which Dike appears as a character who acts and whose role and prerogatives therefore surpass what Hesiod attributes to her in the *Works & Days*. For instance, instead of merely reporting the misdeeds of mortals, Dike is an empowered figure who, as Stamatopoulou argues, personally rewards and punishes mortals. While bearing similarities to Hesiod's presentation, Aeschylus' fragment offers a more independent and powerful deity who acts through her own agency and can even reform another god (Ares), while also providing a reinterpretation of the Titanomachy that includes Dike.

In 'The Inconsistency of Antigone: Human Character and Divinely-Sent *atē* in Sophocles' Play', David Kovacs explores the inconsistency in Antigone's behavior (between the prologue and the second episode as opposed to the fourth episode), asking why Sophocles diminishes Antigone's heroism by having her lament that she is dying before her time and will never marry. He argues that Antigone's behavior is not heroic but rather the result of divine intervention, an act of self-destruction intended to put an end to the house of Laius. Opposing the Judaeo-Christian lens through which the *Antigone* has often been read (especially the idea of martyrdom), Kovacs examines the play's theological underpinnings and argues that Antigone's death is promoted by the gods and

⁵ See also below and Clay1983: 138.

is the result of divine hostility towards the race of Labdacus which they thus wish to eradicate, in addition to punishing Creon for his refusal of burial to Polyneices.

Turning to Aristophanes, Athanassios Vergados' contribution, 'Hermes and Carion in Aristophanes' *Plutus*, explores the interaction between Hermes and the slave Carion. Their dialogue represents the reversal of the verbal strategies commonly found in a hymn, a genre that aims at establishing a relation of reciprocity between the mortal worshipper(s) and the praised deity: Hermes, the gods' servant, is a hungry god who implores his mortal counterpart to admit him into the new world order that has been established after the restoration of Plutus' eyesight, arguing on the basis of his usefulness as indicated through his several cult-titles. While the hungry Hermes has antecedents in early poetry, the dialogue with Carion encapsulates one of the play's central issues, the collapse of *charis*-based relations in a society in which everyone is rich.

Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* forms the starting-point of Thomas Hubbard's paper 'Artemis and the Perils of Divine Intimacy'. The goddess, as Hubbard argues, manipulates the male gaze, and Callimachus focalises her through the eyes of the male gods and the humans whom she manipulates. This conclusion is corroborated through a detailed survey of several myths that involve maidens in Artemis' chorus or male pursuers of such maidens.

For Anatole Mori's reading of Theocritus' *Idylls* 6 and 11, 'What the Cyclops Saw: Self-Knowledge in Theocritus' *Idylls* 6 and 11', Jenny Clay's analysis of the visual is essential for appreciating the visual epistemology of Theocritus' Cyclops *Idylls* and Polyphemus' reliability as a narrator. Mori's analysis begins by comparing the blindness of the Homeric bard, who in recompense receives special knowledge from the Muse, with the metaphorical blindness of the Cyclops in Theocritus, a blindness which (just like that of the Homeric Cyclops) is not compensated for. Mori proceeds to examine Odysseus and the Polyphemus of *Idyll* 11 as first-person narrators and concludes with the Cyclops' delusional misunderstanding of his own state. Contrasting the Homeric bard's preoccupation with the eternal and ever-lasting to the Cyclops' focus on the everyday events of his mundane existence, Mori picks up the Hesiodic idea that poetry and song have therapeutic value, to which she contrasts the case of Polyphemus who confounds several roles in himself: he is simultaneously the singer and the audience, the healer and the patient. From

Mori's analysis the Cyclops emerges as a confused narcissist, both in his evaluation of the dog's behaviour in *Idyll* 6 and in his perception of his own appearance, in a way that adumbrates his future blinding.

In the last contribution on a Greek subject, 'The Role of Demeter in Theocritus, *Idyll* 7', Benjamin Jasnow engages with Demeter, a goddess on whom Jenny Clay has written so perceptively. Jasnow revisits an old question, the extent to which Demeter, the goddess who provides the frame narrative in Theocritus' seventh *Idyll*, is integrated within the poem. Through his analysis Jasnow shows that Demeter contributes to our understanding of the pastoral world, as she combines the Coan cult realities (the foundation of the cult and the festival which provides the background for the *Idyll*) with poetic concerns, namely the learned work of Philotas and Hellenistic aesthetics. Demeter, furthermore, has metapoetic significance in *Idyll* 7 since her presence allows the poet to draw connections with other poetic genres, especially archaic *iambos* and its characteristic language, which was thought to have arisen in the context of the goddess' ritual.

The six papers on Latin authors that follow respond to Jenny Clay's keen interest in authors like Catullus, Horace, and Vergil, who wrote about humanity and the gods in ways derived from their deep reading of archaic, classical, and Hellenistic Greek poetry. Jenny has brought her mode of close reading to bear on these Latin writers too, especially in the genres of lyric, pastoral, and didactic. The Roman contributions to the present volume draw both on her modelling of reading practice—sustained scrutiny of the text as it unfolds—and some of her typical concerns: the use of the gods and myth to comment on human life and human attempts to understand the world, as well as the differing occupations and contributions of the poet and the sage in the context of both community and personal life.

In 'Psychopompoi in Horace's *Odes*', Blanche Conger McCune shows that the poet is a protégé of Mercury the psychopomp, who leads the souls of the departed to the Underworld. Mercury is both the poet's patron deity and a model for his persona as the *Mercurialis uir*. Like Mercury, Horace uses eloquence and humor to guide his addressee and his reader. The god brings the deceased to *laetae sedes*, happy places, of eternal rest, but the human poet can, through the god's patronage, guide the living to such a repose. In typically Horatian fashion, this role is used in the erotic sphere, as he and Mercury take Lyde on a poetic trip

to the Underworld as a way of persuading her to undertake an erotic relationship.

In ‘*Tui plenum*: Horace in the Presence of the Gods’, looking at Horace’s gods more generally, Daniel Barber emphasizes that just such deities, as the public divinities of state cult give way in Horatian lyric to more accessible deities—for Barber, as for McCune, Mercury is an important touchstone along with Bacchus and the Muses. With his interest in human dramas and private experience, Horace shifts focus from gods such as Apollo and Jupiter, and he replaces the grand and archaic language of official cult with ‘lyrical distillations of hymn and prayer’. Barber’s study builds on Clay’s own approach to the gods in Homer and her emphasis on the gods’ ‘mode of being present’.⁶

Alongside contributions to the study of Horace’s lyric poetry, Jenny Clay has undertaken a number of explorations of Vergil’s *Bucolics* and *Georgics*. In her studies of the *Bucolics*, she investigates the Alexandrian strategies of pastoral poetry in Vergil’s Roman Arcadia.⁷ In two important articles on Vergil’s *Georgics*, she unites her interests in the didactic strategies of Hesiod and the themes that run through her work on Horatian lyric. In the second *Georgic*, the famous *makarismos* that juxtaposes the man who knows the causes of things with the one who understands the rustic gods becomes, as Clay argues, a way not only of contrasting types of knowledge but characterizing the teaching poet himself.⁸ In her study of the old man of Tarentum in *Georgics* 4, Clay sees the gardener as an example of the artist.⁹

It is no surprise that a scholar who has written so eloquently about the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* would take up the question of poetic teaching in two of the great agricultural works in literature, Hesiod’s *Works and Days* and Vergil’s *Georgics*. But the goddess of agriculture also becomes a touchstone here for Stephen C. Smith in his essay ‘*Antiquam exquirite matrem*: Apollo, Ceres, and the Trojans’ Search for a New Home’. In his reading of the *Aeneid*, Ceres becomes a way to initiate a chain of associations of separation, loss, and reunion within Roman heroic epic. Smith takes as his point of departure the reference to Aeneas’ followers meeting at ‘the temple of abandoned Ceres’ and Servius’ terse

⁶ Clay1983: 138.

⁷ Clay1975; Clay 2009.

⁸ Clay 1976.

⁹ Clay1981.

explanation. Following, as Jenny herself would call it, the red thread that begins there, Smith traces the presence of Ceres as abandoned mother—along with other mothers left behind—through the poem until the Trojans find their proper home, just as the goddess and her daughter reunite in the myth so important from Homer onward.

Using models drawn from the Paris school of anthropological analysis of Greek mythic texts, Clay examines Catullus' mysterious poem on Attis—a Roman poem about a youth simultaneously at home in the mythology of Cybele and in the haunts of an upper-class Athenian citizen.¹⁰ The religious and mythic are pressed into service as ways of understanding a problem of individual identity and social norms. Attis frees himself from the network of social constraints that position him in relation to normative adult masculinity, but in doing so—in becoming *devoté* and servant of Cybele—he becomes unmoored from all the anchoring points of civilized identity. He is neither a man nor a woman, and he comes to name his homeland by the confused collocation 'O fatherland, my mother; o fatherland who gave birth to me'. He is outside of Greek identity and male gender, and his fate is a kind of servile madness, one that Catullus prays may never befall him or his loved ones. Catullus' Attis is consigned to a parody of life not in the urban sophistication of Athens but in the wild environment of Cybele's Ida. This poem, with its Greek settings and focus on an Athenian youth, has led many to believe it to be a translated work of Hellenistic poetry, but Clay's approach shows that it cannot be. Written in Latin, it uses the familiarly alien landscape of Greek myth to comment on a problem of Roman identity. This shows up not only in the linguistic ambiguities of Latin, fully exploited by Catullus, but also perhaps in the wild natural setting of the poem's end. The Greek unease with the liminal spaces between the civilized human world and wild nature becomes, for the Romans, positive alarm.

Such a wild space is important as one of the settings of Propertius 1.20, in which heroic myth at its most Alexandrian gives the poet a way to comment on the erotic relationship of his friend Gallus, the subject of Christopher Nappa's 'Hercules, Hylas, and the Nymphs: Heroic Myth and Homosocial Poetics in Propertius 1.20'. The myth of the loss of Hylas and Hercules' subsequent wanderings becomes a way to elevate the potential for losing an erotic relationship through negligence and

¹⁰ Clay 1995.

allows Propertius to suggest a model for understanding a relationship between two freeborn Roman men that does not require imputing loss of status to either partner.

Returning to the mythic and divine in a fully Augustan cultural context, John F. Miller looks to Ovid's Flora as a way into the Augustan religious renewal as seen through Ovid's eyes. The Alexandrian literary history, the relatively humble if popular Flora, and the politics of Augustan religion with its dynastic insistence on Venus, all come together, allowing Ovid to elevate Flora's Greek-derived Roman festival, the Floralia, by using connections to the attributes of Venus to make it a politically acceptable part of Augustan religion. Thus Miller's study of Ovid has affinities with Barber's emphasis on the more rustic Horatian divinities, while the connection to the dynastic matriarch Venus emphasizes the connections between myth, motherhood, and the founding of Rome so important to Smith's study of the *Aeneid*.

Throughout this volume, Jenny Clay's signal concerns with close reading, the power and role of the Muses, and the ways in which poetry about gods and mortals examines the experience of people in the world mark all of these contributions, from the songs of early Greece to the erudite literary craft of Alexandria and the renewed vigor of the Muses and their priests, the poets, in the emerging empire of Rome.

*Palluit audax: Horace, Odes 3.27*¹

Diane Arnson Svarlien

Night-bird, cry! Come forth, all you evil omens:
pregnant bitch, grey wolf from across the clearing,
brooding mother fox, come attend the impious;
curse their departures.

May they be forestalled by a snake that darts out 5
like a glancing arrow, and spooks their ponies.
I foresee what's coming, and I'll look out for
you, whom I care for:

at the crack of dawn, I'll awake the raven
with my prayer, that bird who foretells the future, 10
long before the rain-bringing bird can fly back
home to the swamplands.

Galatea, may you be happy always,
anywhere you go; may you not forget me;
may no bird deter you: no crow, no wayward 15
woodpecker's flight path.

¹ In her 1993 article '*Providus Auspex*: Horace, Ode 3.27', Jenny Strauss Clay brought her characteristic insight and acumen to bear on the interpretive difficulties of Horace's 'Europa Ode' (*Classical Journal* 88.2: 167-77). It is an honor to take on the challenge of translating this poem for Jenny, from whom I have learned so much.

Horace composed this poem in Sapphic stanzas, and my translation retains the original meter. St. Jerome (in his preface to the *Chronicle* of Eusebius) compared a translation to a garment that conceals the body; in the terms of this metaphor, I see the meter as the appropriate tailoring. My thanks to the editors, and to David Mankin for suggesting this poem to me.

Still, you're seeing danger ahead: Orion
 sets headlong. I know what the Adriatic's
 black waves mean. I know, even bright Iapix
 sometimes spells trouble. 20

Let them quake, our enemies' wives and children;
 let them feel the swell of the rising south wind;
 let them hear the growl of dark seas, the trembling
 strand being pounded.

So Europa blanched—when she saw the ocean 25
 treacherous and teeming with beasts—for all her
 boldness. She'd entrusted her snow-white body
 to an imposter,

swept off by a bull. She'd been picking flowers,
 weaving garlands pledged to the Nymphs. She looked out 30
 through the moonless night and saw only water
 under the starlight.

Once she'd made land—Crete, with its hundred cities!—
 she exclaimed, 'O father, I have abandoned
 goodness, loyalty, and the name of 'daughter', 35
 vanquished by madness!

Whither have I come, and from whence? A single
 death is not enough for a young girl's trespass.
 Have I truly sinned? Or am I asleep now?
 Maybe a figment 40

slipping through the dream-gate of ivory tricked me
 and I've done no wrong. Was it really better
 crossing miles of ocean? Should I have stayed there,
 picking fresh blossoms?

That young bull, whom I so adored—let someone 45
 bring him to me, I'll do my best to wound him:
 smash his horns, or strike him with iron, that cursèd,
 damnable monster!

I was brazen, leaving my home, my country.
Brazen! Why delay? Let me die this instant. 50
Hear my prayer, O gods: let me face wild lions
utterly naked.

Let me—while I'm young, while my cheeks are rosy
still, before I fade to a husk, a cinder—
while I'm lovely still, let me be the tender 55
prey of wild tigers.

I can hear the voice of my absent father:
'Ah, Europa, why put off death? This ash tree's
just the right height: hang yourself with your girdle—
good thing you brought it, 60

worthless girl! Or would you enjoy a death by
laceration? Leap from this rocky clifftop,
trust the winds! Unless you'd prefer wool-working—
you, a royal princess,

slave and concubine to barbarian masters!" 65
Thus her sad complaint. As it happened, Venus
heard it all. Her son was there, too, his bowstring
slackened. Her laughter

was a bit malicious. When she had finished
chuckling, she said, 'Stop it now. No more anger. 70
When that bull comes back and you have the chance to
shatter his horns—stop.

You don't realize you're the wife of mighty
Jupiter. Stop sobbing, and learn to manage
your good fortune. Half of the cloven world will 75
bear your name, one day.'

**Notes on (a) Mentor:
A Tribute to Jenny Strauss Clay**

Daniel Mendelsohn

It gives me great joy to write in praise of Jenny Strauss Clay, to whom, like so many others whose words are gathered in this volume—her students, her former students, her colleagues and her friends—I owe so much, as a reader and thinker and writer and, indeed, as a person. And yet it fills me with sadness to think that we are celebrating this marvelous scholar and humanist, this exemplary mentor and teacher, at a dark moment in our nation's and indeed the world's history; a moment in which so much that Jenny Clay stands for—the dignity of intellectual and artistic enquiry and creativity, respect for the beauty and integrity of language, a rigorous pursuit of truth grounded in rational and open-minded discourse—seems threatened. Still perhaps the melancholy historical context for this celebration of her will have the effect of throwing into relief the vital importance of the qualities and achievements of the woman we honor today.

That context will, inevitably, also recall some of Jenny's personal history. Much about the political scene both at home and abroad just now—not least, the rise of authoritarian vulgarians whose contempt for culture and the life of the mind is, distressingly, a large part of their appeal—is cruelly reminiscent of the ugly era whose upheavals affected Jenny's early life so strongly, buffeting and displacing her family (and here we think of her biological father, Paul Kraus, as well as of the better-known example of her father, Leo Strauss) and setting her, when she was no more than a child but already *polytropos*, 'much-turning,' on a world-wide odyssey that ultimately brought her here to us, by one twisty road after another;

peregrinations which, I sometimes can't help thinking, must have instilled in her an affinity for the literary work with which, more than any other, she is associated. I occasionally wonder whether that turbulent and peripatetic childhood gave her the fierce allegiance to texts and what they say that has marked her scholarship so deeply. When home itself is so elusive, after all, what better 'place' to inhabit than a book?

These somber reflections, at the beginning of what I promise will otherwise be happy reminiscences about Jenny as mentor, put me in mind of another great scholar, one whose extraordinary example should encourage us just now; someone who might well stand as a mentor-figure for us all. Like Jenny's fathers and too many others, this figure was a Jew of Central Europe, a literary scholar laboring in a foreign land on the greatest texts of Western Civilization at a time when that very civilization was imperiled by Fascism. I refer of course to Erich Auerbach, a figure whose unswerving faith in the relevance of the great texts of Western Culture and in the power of critical investigation to reveal the meanings of those texts—faith in what he called 'the unity of European culture,' a formulation that would, no doubt, embarrass many contemporary academics—reminds me so greatly of Jenny's intellectual outlook and commitment. But of course, if I think of Auerbach in the context of our celebration of Jenny, it also because of his connection to the *Odyssey*. Rather *polytropos* himself, Auerbach spent the wartime years in penniless exile in Istanbul, the city to which this champion of Western literature and culture had found refuge after fleeing the West; there, as a member of the Literature Faculty at the University of Istanbul, he composed his magnum opus, *Mimesis*, the first chapter of which is devoted to the *Odyssey*, as if to say that that work, above all others, represents something fundamental about the West, indeed about art.

I cannot open this book without thinking of Jenny, who first put it in my hand nearly four decades ago, after explaining to me what 'ring composition' was. It was a Spring day in 1981 and we had just read Book 19 of the *Odyssey*, which is the subject of Auerbach's chapter, which analyzes in fine detail the narrative strategies of that Book's most famous moment: the suspenseful scene in which the elderly nurse Eurycleia recognizes a tell-tale scar on the leg of the disguised Odysseus as she bathes him. This moment, as classicists will know, opens up a vertiginous series of narrative spirals, as Homer loops back first to relate the incident that resulted in the wound that became the scar—a boar hunt that took place

when the hero was a youth, visiting his trickster grandfather and some other relations—and from that point spirals even further back in time, to the moment when Odysseus got his name from that same grandfather; those loops or rings, ostensible digressions from the action—from the suspenseful scene of the bath—in fact adding immeasurably to our understanding of the hero and his nature, for of course all these digressions loop ultimately back to the meaning of the name that Odysseus received from his irritating relative, a meaning that has to do with pain, *odynê*. And yet despite the association between pain and the hero of the *Odyssey*, I had commented in class that day, the day before Jenny explained Auerbach and ring composition to me in her office, that ring composition seemed to me to be an ‘optimistic’ technique, suggesting as it does that everything is connected, ultimately. Jenny, who has better reason than most of us to know that much in life is, in fact, the result of the powerful action of random external forces, merely made one of her inscrutable faces and indulged me in my fantasy that certain kinds of narrative can connect the whole world. Then she told me to read the first chapter of *Mimesis*.

In the Fall of my third year at the University I read the *Odyssey* in Greek for the first time. By this point I was a Classics major; I’d been taking Greek since the fall of my first year, when I signed up for Professor Mikalson’s Greek 101 class along with a handful of other students. At the end of our second year we heard that a new professor, a woman, was going to be coming in the Fall; someone who, everyone was saying, was a great expert on Homer—on the *Odyssey* in particular. Clay, someone said her name was. Something about that earthen monosyllable made me visualize a stocky woman in late middle age, with perhaps a gray bun. A few of us immediately signed up for her course; one of them was David Mankin, then recently arrived as a graduate student at the University and eager to improve his Greek.

And so, on a sweltering day in late August, four of us straggled into the small classroom in Cabell Hall. A chunky glass ashtray sat on the big steel desk. Perched at the edge of the desk, a small smile on her feline face, a cigarette dangling from her lips, was the famous Homer scholar.

Jenny. She wasn’t yet out of her thirties, then; because so many other memories have overlaid that first image of her, it’s hard to summon, now, the surprise we felt on walking in the classroom. The lithe, coiled

frame, a catlike calm, the Louise Brooks bob; the cigarettes. *Jenny*. For the next year and a half, she taught me: Greek and Latin, of course, Homer and Herodotus, Horace and Catullus. But to teach is not the same as to mentor: a teacher gives you certain kinds of knowledge, but a mentor shows you how to live. After the semester had settled in a bit—but not too long into it—Jenny would occasionally have us over to her house for dinner, and it was there that she introduced me to the things that have become so much a part of my life that I can forget that I didn't know about them before I met her. Proust, for instance, the first volume of which we read aloud together during a sweltering summer when I was twenty-one, sitting on the shiny hardwood floor on opposite sides of her living room on Glendale Road, almost too hot to speak. Modern Greek poetry, particularly a poem by George Seferis that began *the first thing that God made was love*. Monteverdi's *Il Ritorno d'Ulisse in Patria*, which she'd often have playing as we came in the door, the odd Baroque combination of tinkling and plangency drifting into the tobacco-y air, emanating from a fancy Swedish stereo that you could hang on a wall like a painting, an object that, like Jon Mikalson's Mazda Miata, hinted at the fantastical possibility that a classics professor could be *cool*, while Jenny sliced limes in the kitchen for the gins-and-tonic. Food, too. I will never forget the first meal she made for me, pasta with a sauce that—miraculously to me, who had never had pasta that didn't come from a can—was not red but green, something with an Italian name that she made with leaves she had just plucked from her own garden, a small plot at the back of her house through which she would wander, snipping herbs and humming to herself like a sorceress in some old legend.

Every meal at Jenny's would end in the same way. We'd go into the living room and on the turntable of her fantastical stereo she'd place a certain LP: a plangent musical setting of a 1942 poem by George Seferis, a poem about being so far from home that one fears losing one's identity; a state that Seferis, like Odysseus and Auerbach and Jenny herself knew too well. The opening lines of this poem—'There are no asphodels, violets, or hyacinths; / so how can you talk to the dead?'—refer bitterly to the fact that none of those plants, which are the food of the dead in Homer, bloom in Pretoria, where Seferis had ended up. The music was wild, strange, alternately twanging and percussive, the singer's voice often harsh, sometimes wailing, as if in inconsolable grief. In those days, I didn't understand Modern Greek, and so the lyrics were meaningless;

but Jenny had explained the poem to us. As the record played I could hear her in the kitchen, humming and half-singing along as she fussed over the herbs for the lamb shanks in her *osso buco*. Then she would appear in the room, a gin and tonic in one hand, a cigarette in the other, and would sit at the edge of the Louis XV *fauteuil* she and Diskin had bought at Drouot in Paris when they were newlyweds—that chair in particular being an object that, over the years, has caused me to reflect on the odd poignancy of a mundane yet wrenching fact, which is that objects outlive the people who have brought them into our lives—and talk to us students as if we were grownups.

So there was that, the mentoring as well as the education: the showing us how large the world was and how various were the things it contained, not just Classics but music and food and poetry and ‘Modern’ Greece and furniture and Paris and art.

But underneath the lavishness, the generosity, the exotic sophistications acquired in a lifetime of travel, you could feel a certain rigor, as hard-edged and unyielding as a paradigm in a grammar. It was Jenny who once said to me quite casually, when I went into her office one day towards the end of her *Odyssey* course to talk about a term paper I wanted to write about a certain passage in Book 4 of the *Odyssey* in which a husband and a wife are bitterly arguing, although the bitterness is submerged, ‘Well, you can’t begin to write anything until you’ve read *everything*.’ It was a sentence I found strangely, almost erotically exciting, with its promise of scholarly rigor and difficulty; I felt that if I devoted myself to a career whose training was painful, even my mathematician father might approve of it. When I heard Jenny say this, I looked around her office, the wooden shelves neatly lined with books in Greek and Latin and French and German and Italian and English, the heavy plaster bust of an unsmiling Athena on top of one tall bookcase, a touch of humor provided by the many images and figurines of owls, which Jenny loved. She wore a silver ring on her forefinger, made from an ancient Athenian coin and designed so that you could swivel the coin around to display either the obverse or the reverse, Athena’s profile or the owl, her special animal; an object that to me, young as I was then, seemed somehow to be a symbol of Jenny herself, the many facets, the sense of possibilities beneath the surface, if only you looked hard enough. *You can’t begin to write anything until you’ve read everything*. I heard that sentence as I looked around the office and I swallowed and said, OK.

Although I couldn't know it then, since I knew little about Jenny's family or personal history at the time, that sentence betrayed the presence of a certain intellectual inheritance as unmistakably as the shape of an eyebrow or the curve of a jawline can be the expressions of genes passed on from generation to generation. The intellectual DNA in this case, the penchant for rigor, was an inheritance of course from her father, Leo Strauss, who had grown up in Germany and was a product of the particularly rigorous philological training for which that country was famous, and which produced so many great scholars, including of course Erich Auerbach himself; and beyond that from Strauss's teacher, a philosopher called Cassirer; and beyond that from Cassirer's teacher, a man named Cohen, a famous interpreter of the works of the German philosopher Kant. These chains of relationships between students and their professors—or, as the Germans, with their combination of sentimentality and reverence for intellectual authority, rightly call such intellectual mentors, *Doktorväter*, 'doctor-fathers'—loops back in time as purposefully as the ever-narrowing limbs of a family tree, a lineage of study and scholarship, of intellectual tastes and idiosyncrasies that expresses itself, just as real bloodlines do, in resemblances that persist from generation to generation. It is humbling to think that so many of those of us who are celebrating Jenny Strauss Clay in this volume—her students, past and present—are, because of Jenny, the heirs of that distinguished lineage, as our students now will be, too.

Jenny's teaching of me has never stopped. A few years ago I was leading a freshman seminar on the *Odyssey* at Bard; as we were finishing our discussion of the *apologoi*, Odysseus's narration of his famous adventures in Books 9-12, a few of the students were arguing vehemently that, as in *The Wizard of Oz*, the hero's adventures were a fantasy: in this case, a string of lies conveniently invented by Odysseus. As evidence for this, they adduced (as some others had before them, to be sure, although they didn't know it) the strong parallels between incidents that we know to have happened to Odysseus (because the poet of the *Odyssey* tells us) and those that he narrates. Some of these likenesses are well known: the way in which, for instance, Odysseus' encounter with the Laestrygonians, the creepy princess and hideous queen and cannibal king, is a 'nightmare version' (as one of my students put it) of his real-life encounter with the

Phaeacians: the charming princess Nausikaa, the shrewd and magnanimous queen, the kindly king. But I was especially struck by my students' insistence that the Circe is nothing more than a fantasy based on Calypso. My strongest student that year had actually compiled a list, which he read aloud in class that afternoon:

Similarities between Calypso and Circe, he began:

Both on isolated islands with animals and lush flora.

Both are lovers of Odysseus.

Both offer Odysseus assistance upon departure.

Both are nymphs.

Both possess supernatural capabilities.

Both are descended from Titans (Circe through Helios from Hyperion, and Calypso from Atlas).

Both of their names begin with K in Greek.

Calypso is derived from the word for 'conceal,' while

Circe from the word 'encircle.' So both names relate to captivity and/or enclosure.

Hermes plays a role in the encounters with both. He appears in Book 5 to demand that Calypso release Odysseus. He appears during Book 10 when Odysseus arrives on Circe's island to protect Odysseus from her power to change men into animals.

I was impressed by the student's efforts, and we had an interesting discussion about the ramifications of his ideas—a discussion during which I greeted his theory with a question that, I like to think, Jenny might have asked: even if it is true, what would be the point? Where does it get us?

Still, I made a mental note to call Jenny that evening and see what she thought. When I got her on the phone, I retailed the points the students had made earlier that day.

'So basically,' I said, 'their core idea is that all of the *apologoi* are inventions fabricated by Odysseus but based on things we know happened to him. The assumption is that the best storytellers are like the best liars: there's always a grain of truth in the tale.'

Jenny exhaled slowly into the receiver.

'Yeeeah,' she said.

I knew what those drawn-out vowels portended, and so I waited.

Then she said, 'It's a fun idea. But in the end, how could you *prove* it?'

I hadn't been her student for thirty years, but I was still accustomed to deferring to her, especially when it came to the *Odyssey*. I was about to let the matter go when something occurred to me.

'Well,' I said, 'that cuts both ways, doesn't it?'

She made a little interrogative sound. 'Mmmm?'

I said, 'How could you prove that he *didn't* make it all up?'

She made a noise on the other end of the phone and then we started talking about other things. There was a crisis at the University; once again, the Humanities were under fire.

A few days later, Jenny called me back.

'You know,' she began, 'with all that *meshugas* about Sullivan, I forgot to make the obvious objection.'

'To what?' I said.

'The thing about the *apologoi* being completely made up, about Circe and Calypso.'

'Ah,' I said, recalling the feeling of satisfaction I'd had at the time about having stumped her.

Mmmm, she purred. 'But if that's true, what do you do with 8.447?'

'8.447?' I repeated, stupidly.

'*Yeeah*. When Odysseus is stowing away the gifts he's received from the Phaeacians, prior to his return home, the poet says that he seals the chest 'with an intricate knot that he learned from the lady Circe'.'

She paused and then said, 'And that's Homer talking, not Odysseus.'

'Oh,' I said after a second. 'Okay. So much for that bright idea!'

She made a soft noise on the other end of the line. 'You just have to read more closely,' she said. 'The text will always give you the answers.'

This lesson, and so much else, I have had from Jenny Clay, who more than any other figure has shaped me, prodding me in the direction of what is worthy, gently dissuading me from some of my more harebrained ideas, from bad readings of Homer to the 'optimistic' notion I entertained all those years ago, inspired by Homer's ring composition, that everything in the world, like the narrative of the *Odyssey* itself, is ingeniously, charmingly connected.

So I am happy to join the others whose contributions to these pages constitute the best celebration of Jenny Strauss Clay the mentor. But what about Mentor himself, to whom the title of my remarks slyly refers? Here I fear I must disappoint the reader of this text. For—as my anecdote about Circe and Calypso suggests—the best way to honor Jenny Strauss Clay is to employ her own rigorous methods in thinking about literature, however disappointing the results may be for our pet theories; and the fact is that Mentor—or, I should say, Athena disguised as Mentor—isn't that great of a mentor in the *Odyssey*, when you come right down to it. Yes, 'he' appears every now and then and steers young Telemachus in the right direction, but those rare occasions hardly justify the title of 'mentor' in our sense of the word. The truth is that the text to which the English word 'mentor' owes its powerful meaning is not the *Odyssey* at all, but another, much later text; and I will end this little essay about my history of Jenny and her influence on me with a few words about that text—a digression that will, I hope, be forgiven because it has something to do with education and mentoring and certain other things I have mentioned here.

The work in question is one of the earliest examples of what today we call 'fan fiction.' The fan in question was a seventeenth-century French churchman and theologian called François de Salignac de La Mothe-Fénelon, who in 1699 published an 'educational' novel called *Les aventures de Télémaque*, 'The Adventures of Telemachus.' In it, the author ingeniously expands upon Telemachus's adventures in Books 3 and 4 of the *Odyssey*, adding further episodes meant to serve as vehicles for the ethical instruction—on the proper regulation of pleasure, on the moral value of painful suffering, and so forth—of a Christian prince: the prince in this case being Louis XIV's grandson, for whom Fénelon originally wrote these tales. The episodes that Fénelon invents in *Les Aventures de Télémaque* playfully echo and mimic episodes and motifs found in the *Odyssey*, in a way that is clearly intended to bring a knowing pleasure to readers familiar with Homer's poem. There are shipwrecks on strange islands, a long encounter with Calypso, run-ins with strangers both kindly and hostile, and above all a faithful and patient teacher and guide in the person of Mentor (or rather, again, Athena disguised as Mentor), who is far more present in this French adaptation of the *Odyssey* than she/he is in the *Odyssey* itself.

And indeed, the fact is that the word ‘Mentor’ entered the European consciousness and vocabulary as powerfully as it did because of the remarkable success of Fénelon’s book. An instant bestseller, *Les aventures de Télémaque* was soon the most widely read book in France and one of the most popular books in all of Europe. Its anti-authoritarian stance, which angered Louis (and indeed got Fénelon exiled), and its endorsement of universal brotherhood endeared it to the great minds of the Enlightenment, from Voltaire and Rousseau to Thomas Jefferson himself, who professed himself a great admirer of this French adaptation of Homer.

The appeal of *Les Aventures de Télémaque* spread far beyond the West; like Odysseus himself, you might say, Fénelon’s playful text ‘wandered greatly and knew the minds of many men.’ It was, for instance, one of the first Western European works to achieve significant popularity farther east, into the Levant and beyond, with translations in Arabic, Bulgarian, Romanian, Armenian, Kurdish, Georgian, and Albanian (among many other languages) in wide circulation by the early 19th century. But it was particularly in the realm of the Ottoman Sultan that Fénelon’s masterpiece found favor, and indeed no other work of Western literature was as popular during the nineteenth century. By all accounts, the greatest translation of Fénelon’s adaptation of Homer was made in the late 1850s by no less a personage than the Grand Vizier, a distinguished statesman called Yûsuf Kâmil Pasha. A poet of some note, Kâmil Pasha gave a remarkable literary polish to his translation of Fénelon’s classical French prose; like the original, it soon became an enormous bestseller in its own right.

It is, perhaps, a cruel irony that the Grand Vizier to the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire should be far more celebrated for his literary efforts than for his political achievements. But as we know, history is full of ironies; whether they be cruel depends, I suppose, on whether or not you are an optimist. Yousûf Kâmil Pasha died in 1876, a wealthy man esteemed for the acts of charity to which he devoted his last years. Now it happens that one of the beneficiaries of the many bequests that he made was Istanbul University, into the possession of whose faculty the large house Kâmil Pasha had shared with his wife eventually passed. At first a science building, it went through several incarnations as the decades passed, and eventually the site became the home of the literature faculty of Istanbul University—and, therefore, the house in which Erich Auerbach wrote his masterpiece, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality*

in Western Literature, a book that begins by analyzing the—I will insist—optimistic narrative technique known as ring composition; the most famous example of which, thanks to *Mimesis*, is a passage to be found in Book 19 of Homer's *Odyssey*, a passage we do well to think of as we think about Jenny Strauss Clay and the life and career we celebrate here, a passage about the long and improbable story of a scar, the wound from childhood that fades but never disappears; a painful tale which is of course also the story of how our story's hero came to be heroic.

Jenny Strauss Clay

Ward W. Briggs

Jenny Clay is one of the leading classical scholars of her day. Her stature has been recognized with grants, distinguished professorships, and the presidency of both CAMWS and the APA. Her publications are distinguished by her close attention to text, to the traditions of language, and the breadth of her expertise. Moreover, despite her decades in Charlottesville, she is the most international of American classicists: she has enjoyed more honors in more non-English-speaking nations than all but a very small percentage of our guild. She has quietly been a pioneer for equality of opportunity for women, though she had no particular wish to be so, who in fact came from a tradition of intellectual rigor and investigation of the intellectual and artistic development of the ancient world in which the women in her immediate family were lettered and accomplished intellectuals. Her life has featured a complicated family tree, a struggle first to get to America and then to become known on her own as a scholar despite being in the shadow of her brilliant and distinguished husband. This ambition, industry, and breadth of knowledge may derive in large part from growing up in the household of one of the most important political philosophers of the twentieth century, but it may also derive from her biological parents, who have until recently been obscure.

Leo Strauss was born 20 September 1899 in Kirchhain, in Hessen-Nassau, a province of Prussia. His family was in the farm supply and livestock business, and they kept an orthodox but not strictly observant household. Leo's grandfather Meyer Strauss (1835-1919) left the business

to his brother and to his son, Hugo Strauss (1869-1942), who married Jenny David, the mother of Leo and daughter Bettina. After her death, Hugo married Johanna 'Hanna' Lumnitz (1885-1942). Hugo managed to survive the early years of the war and died of natural causes in 1942, but shortly afterwards Hanna was deported to Sobibor, where she soon died.

Leo attended the Kirchhain Volksschule and the Protestant Rektoratsschule, then the Gymnasium Philippinum in Marburg in 1912, graduating in 1917. In Marburg he roomed with followers of the eminent German-Jewish philosopher Hermann Cohen (1842-1918), a founder of the Marburg School of Neo-Kantianism. Shortly after graduation, Leo entered the German Army, serving from July 1917 until a month after the signing of the Armistice in November 1918. Following his war service, he enrolled at the University of Hamburg where another Marburg student of Cohen, Ernst Cassirer (1874-1945), was among the philosophical eminences and became Strauss's *Doktorvater*. Strauss received his doctorate in 1921 with a dissertation on the philosophy of German idealist Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi (1743-1819). He travelled to Marburg to hear lectures by the existential phenomenologist Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) and to Freiburg to hear the phenomenologist Edmund Husserl (1859-1938). Through his work in the German Zionist movement, Strauss came into contact with numerous intellectuals, including his closest friend, Jacob Klein (1899-1978); Leo Löwenthal (1900-93); Walter Benjamin (1892-1940); Hannah Arendt (1906-75); the editor of Maimonides, Shlomo Pines (1908-90); and the dedicatee of his first book, Franz Rosenzweig (1886-1929). These relationships with his German friends continued, mostly by correspondence, once Strauss reached America. Many of the letters can be found in his *Gesammelte Schriften*.

One of his most important friends for our story was Eliezer Paul Kraus (1904-44), a Czech-born Jewish Arabist who graduated with honors from the Deutsches Humanistisches Gymnasium in Prag-Smichov and studied at the Charles University in Prague, which at that time was divided into a Czech and a German university. Prague was then one of Europe's liveliest linguistic and literary centers, but as a Jew, Kraus was welcomed by neither Germans nor Czechs, and like the many other Czech Jews of his time this sense of isolation led him to join the energetic Zionist movement in Prague. He moved to a kibbutz in Palestine in 1925 and married (briefly) Hadassa Mednitzky. Hadassa gave birth to a

daughter, Ilana, whom she had actually conceived with Shlomo Pines, while married to Kraus. Organized political movements did not suit Kraus's temperament, and he found no intellectual stimulation on the kibbutz. He moved to Jerusalem in 1926 to study at the then-new Hebrew University and also take courses at the American School of Oriental Research. He pursued his studies during visits to Lebanon, Istanbul, Cairo, and at the École Française Orientale in Damascus. In 1929 he moved to Berlin, where he completed his doctoral degree in Semitics with a dissertation (1929) titled 'Altbabylonische Briefe aus der Vorderasiatische Abteilung des Preussische Stadts Museum'.

At Berlin, Kraus became friends with the Orientalist and historian of science Julius Ruska (1867-1949), who hired him as his assistant at the Forschungsinstitut für Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften. His habits of work became legendary at the Institute, and after three years he was hired as a *Privatdozent* in Semitic languages and Islamic studies at Berlin. With Ruska he directed the dissertation of Bettina Strauss, sister of Leo, 'Das Giftbuch des Šānāq' (1935), which dealt with medieval Arab poisons and their antidotes. In 1933, the administration of the university began to fire Jews. Kraus's disillusion with Zionism did not lead him to follow several of his Institute colleagues to Palestine, but he went instead to Paris with the help of the Catholic Islamist Louis Massignon (1883-1962). Kraus taught for three years at the École Pratique des Hautes Études, with support of grants from the Caisse Nationale des Sciences for the first two years. Under the influence of Massignon, Kraus used the philological training he had received at Berlin to investigate the Greek roots of scientific thought in the Arab and Islamic worlds, as a means to a greater understanding of their development. He worked intensely over long periods to the exclusion not only of non-philological or historical sources, but also to the exclusion of any kind of social life. His expertise and energy made him a perfect candidate for any of several chairs, particularly in Paris, where Kraus had received a *licence ès-lettres* in March of 1935 and submitted thesis topics for his *doctorat*.

But Kraus was not a French citizen and could not have a permanent position at the University. When he received an offer of a position at Hebrew University in Jerusalem for 1936 and 1937, Kraus declined, remembering his unhappy experiences there ten years earlier. Instead, in 1936 he accepted a chair at the Egyptian University in Cairo. At the end of the year, 30 December 1936, he married Bettina Strauss in Cairo; she

had been working as a radiologist at the Hôpital de la Communauté Israélite in Alexandria.

Meanwhile, Leo Strauss had hoped to make his *Habilitation* in Frankfurt under the theologian and anti-Nazi Paul Tillich, but he was refused. He had a research position at the Institut für Jüdische Wissenschaft in Berlin where he collaborated on an edition of the founder of modern Jewish philosophy Moses Mendelsohn (1729-86). Many members of the Institute were attempting to emigrate to Palestine in hope of fleeing the Nazis. These included Strauss's friends Rosenzweig, Gershom Scholem (1897-1982), Shlomo Pines, and Martin Buber (1878-1965), who left his directorship of the Central Office for Jewish Adult Education in Frankfurt. Others, like Kurt von Fritz (1900-85), not a Jew but who refused to swear allegiance to Hitler and was fired from Rostock in 1935, made for England. Strauss had received a Rockefeller Grant in 1932 to study in Paris and subsequently in England. In 1937 Shlomo Pines arrived. In Berlin Strauss met, and subsequently married in Paris, a widow, Marie ('Miriam') Bernsohn (1900-85), whose husband, Walter Petry, a cultural journalist, had died in a bicycle accident. Later Strauss adopted Miriam's young son Thomas. Once in England, Strauss's English was good enough for him to work seriously on Thomas Hobbes. The German-born David Daube (1909-99), an in-law of Strauss and an expert on ancient law then working on a doctorate at Cambridge, found him a temporary position at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, in 1935.

In 1937, with letters of support from the British political theorist Harold Laski (1893-1950) and the Jewish historian Salo Baron (1895-1989) of Columbia, Strauss crossed the Atlantic to serve as Research Fellow in the History Department at Columbia University. In the next year, he secured a permanent position at the New School in New York City, a private research institution in Greenwich Village, established in 1933 to support scholars who had fled the fascists in Italy or the Nazis in Germany. Thus it was dubbed the 'University in Exile' and was known for synthesizing American and European philosophy. In addition to Strauss, Max Wertheimer (1880-1943), the founder of Gestalt psychology, was also on the faculty, later to be joined by such eminences as Hannah Arendt (1906-75) and Hans Jonas (1903-93). Supporters at Columbia of the School included the social psychoanalyst Erich Fromm (1900-80) and the great classicist von Fritz.

Meanwhile, Paul Kraus visited a number of universities and in 1939 returned to the Hebrew University to find a very much more liberal university than he had previously encountered. He realized what he had lost by not accepting a position there in 1936. Finding no permanent employment beyond Cairo, and with France out of the question after 1938, Kraus maintained his rigorous research at Cairo in the midst of considerable turmoil, not only in Europe but on campus. He taught medieval Arab philosophy and completed his *Platon chez les Arabes* and a second volume of *al-Rāzi*, but was told that neither could be published because of wartime paper shortages.

On 13 January 1942, Bettina Strauss Kraus gave birth to a daughter named Jenny Ann in Cairo, but Bettina died ten days after the delivery. Paul Kraus lost his typist, his editor, his research assistant, and his dearest friend in a land where he had few friends. Incapable of caring for an infant and crippled by deep depression at the loss of his wife, he sent baby Jenny to Kibbutz Ma'aleh ha-Hamishah outside Jerusalem. He plunged into work, receiving election to the Institut d'Égypte in 1942. He began to develop a theory that challenged current biblical studies and developed a metrical theory to prove that early readings of the Hebrew Bible were composed in a meter similar to ancient Arabic poetry. This led to the conclusion that biblical texts were more contemporaneous with their events than previously thought. The theory was well received in Lebanon, but when Kraus lectured on his theory in Jerusalem in September 1943, hoping for a position at the university in proximity to his daughter, he was met with consternation and resistance. He himself recognized that the theory was flawed, perhaps fatally so, and no position was offered. He even became estranged from former friends.

On a return trip to Jerusalem in 1944, Kraus married Dorothée Metlitzki. With no prospects in Palestine, he returned to Cairo and his position at what was now known as King Faud University. His wife stayed in Jerusalem due to a medical condition. Turmoil at the University reached a critical stage and, when the government changed in October 1944, Kraus was informed that he would not be retained on the faculty. These were depressing events but the war was clearly coming to a close and many of his friends, like Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss, had found homes and jobs in New York. The end of the war would open all sorts of new possibilities for him, but he felt the demolition of his theory meant the destruction of his career. Kraus's depression returned: he was by

turns elated and depressed. Finally unable to cope, on October 12, 1944, Kraus hanged himself in the bathroom of his apartment in Cairo, part of which he rented to the brothers Albert and Cecil Hourani. Subsequently his family in Czechoslovakia was wiped out by the Nazis except for one sister who survived Theresienstadt.¹

His daughter Jenny Ann was now two years old, an orphan tended by others on the kibbutz where she had spent the bulk of her first two years. After the war, Leo and Miriam were eager to adopt her if she could only get to New York. They tried to contact people who were leaving Palestine for America in hopes they could bring their niece with them. In 1947, the wife of a colleague at the New School agreed to bring Jenny to America. Jenny was five years of age and spoke German and Hebrew, but no English. Since her father had been Czech, she travelled under a Czech passport. The journey, which Jenny describes as 'harrowing, scary, horrible,' took them from Jerusalem to Cairo to Rome, London, and Newfoundland before arriving in New York. Leo and his wife Miriam lived in the Riverdale section of the Bronx.

In 1948, the family moved to the University of Chicago where Leo had been hired by Robert M. Hutchins (1899-1977), and he subsequently was the first holder of the Hutchins Chair. The Strausses lived in Hyde Park; they never owned a house, drove a car, or flew in an airplane. Brother Tom went to College at the University of Chicago, entering at the age of 16, and was active in the theater scene there (the Compass Players, Tonight at 8:30) which also drew Mike Nichols, Severn Darden, and Alan Arkin, later of the Second City crowd. In Chicago, Jenny, like many children of University of Chicago professors, went to John Dewey's University of Chicago Laboratory School, which he had founded in 1896 to implement the theories of his work, *The School and Society* (1899). The curriculum focused on critical thinking and problem solving, but Dewey also believed that students should learn how things were made, so Jenny and her classmates went to ice cream factories, steel mills, and stockyards. Physical education was also a part of the school, and boys and girls were trained in the same sports (Jenny recalls girls in supervised boxing matches). One day when Jenny was in the third grade, her teacher called Miriam into her office to say that Jenny's academic performance

¹ Dorothee subsequently married a Russian Egyptologist, who later died. She then married J. J. Finkelstein, a Sumerologist at Berkeley, who subsequently divorced her and one month later died of a heart attack. Finally Dorothee found a job teaching English at Yale.

was superior, but that 'Jenny is not very popular.' Miriam replied, 'We don't want Jenny to be *popular*.'

In 1955 Leo was invited to teach at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and in order to travel with the family, Jenny was obliged to surrender her Czech passport and become a naturalized American citizen.

Jenny took up Greek in her teen years, being initially taught the language by philosopher Allan Bloom (1930-92). She graduated from the Lab School at 16. Nearly all of her classmates were looking to go to elite colleges in the East. Jenny indeed had an interview with Swarthmore in which she was told, 'We'll take care of you.' She didn't want to be taken care of, so she went west to Reed College in Portland, Oregon, where there were no specific majors and lots of interesting faculty and students. Poets like James Dickey, Thom Gunn, and Seamus Heaney were visiting professors at various times. Among the student body were the children of luminaries such as the film director Otto Preminger; the heir of the B. Altman department store; and Jenny's roommate, Catherine Halban, daughter of the French physicist Hans von Halban (1908-64), who had contributed to the Manhattan Project. Catherine's father subsequently married Aline Rothschild, who later married Isaiah Berlin.

Reed was well known for its rigor, the free structure of its curriculum, and the Bohemian styles of even the wealthiest students; many of them did not make it to graduation. The cutoff point was generally the junior-year exams which tested how well the students had kept up with their assignments over three years. Well-off students studiously tried to look as poor as possible. They wore peasant outfits which many made themselves, while Yvonne Altman gave everyone a cashmere sweater for Christmas. A Sheraton Hotel heir formed his own commune and one day composed a stew of garlic, tomato sauce and ... dog food.

Diskin William Thomas Clay (1938-2014) had come from an old (relative to Nevada) Reno family. His grandfather had been attorney general for the state. Born in Fresno, California, he was a junior at Reed in Jenny's freshman year (1958). After graduating in 1960, Diskin received a Fulbright Award to study Medieval French and Classics in France for a year. Jenny, an 18-year-old junior, packed up and went with him. Their first stop was La Louisianne, the hotel in Paris where much of *Last Tango in Paris* would be filmed twelve years later. After a few weeks they moved to Montpellier and then to Aix-en-Provence where they stayed at Le Château-Noir, the seventeenth-century hunting lodge where Cézanne

spent his summers. The Fulbright Commission, however, required Diskin to go to Poitiers, but Jenny stayed in Aix, to Diskin's discomfort.

On their return to America Jenny resumed her studies at Reed and Diskin enrolled as a graduate student at the University of Washington and received an M.A. in Classics in 1963. After graduating from Reed in 1962, Jenny moved home to the University of Chicago where she received an M.A. in Greek and French in 1964. A year earlier, Diskin came from Washington, where he had just received an M.A., to Chicago to propose to Jenny. He made an appointment to meet privately with Leo. Jenny and Miriam were sent out of the house while the two men met. Leo asked Diskin if he had read Thucydides. Diskin replied yes, and the two discussed the Greek historian for three hours, after which Leo gave his unstinting blessing to the union. Diskin dedicated his first book, on Lucretius, to his father-in-law.

Following their marriage in 1963, the couple spent their honeymoon at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. They had a tiny car and an apartment; as a result, they learned Modern Greek and met luminaries like George Seferis (1900-71). They would continue to go to Greece almost every summer where they encountered Odysseus Elytis (1911-96), Nikos Kavvadias (1910-75), and Stratis Eleftheriades-Tériade (1897-1984). On their return from the American School, Jenny joined Diskin in Seattle. She applied to the graduate school in Classics, but from the outset she was at pains to prove that she was a serious student, as opposed to a wife taking courses because her husband was there, and she had to be clearly better than anyone else. In 1966 Diskin was named assistant professor of Classics at Reed, so with Jenny's coursework completed (as she thought), the couple moved to Portland. She commuted to Seattle and passed all of her qualifying exams, which were eight hours long and lasted for two days, with high marks, while teaching Latin and French at Marylhurst College, a Catholic girls college in Portland. By 1967 she was prepared to write a dissertation on Homer, just as Diskin was completing his book on Lucretius' translation of Greek philosophy. She had hoped to work on Homer with William F. Wyatt, Jr. (1932-2011), although some faculty expressed the opinion that she would not be capable of mastering the immense Homeric bibliography. Unfortunately for Jenny, Wyatt left in 1967 for Brown. Before she could begin formal work on her dissertation, it was discovered that she was one credit shy of the doctoral course requirement. Fortunately, Antony

Raubitschek (1912-99) was visiting professor at Washington in 1967 and was teaching a course on Solon which met once a week. Jenny flew to Seattle once a week from Portland for the fall term of 1967 to complete the one-credit requirement. Despite the unwarranted qualms of the faculty about her working on Homer, she began work on her dissertation, 'The Voices of the Gods: Divine Speeches in the *Odyssey*', under the epigraphist Colin N. Edmonson (1928-88).

In 1969 Strauss was on the same coast as his daughter, teaching for a year at Claremont McKenna College (then Claremont Men's College) outside Los Angeles, California. On Christmas Eve of that year, Diskin received a phone call from the Dean at Reed telling him that his contract would not be renewed. The suspicion was that his colleagues were intimidated by the frequency and quality of his publications. Fortunately, his publication record helped him immediately secure a number of job offers, but he settled on a junior fellowship for 1969-70 at the Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington, D.C., then under the leadership of Bernard M. W. Knox (1914-2010). The couple moved back east and so did Leo and Miriam, when Leo was named Scott Buchanan Distinguished Scholar in Residence at St. John's College in Annapolis, his final academic appointment, just 30 miles from his daughter.

Jenny, now pregnant, completed her dissertation and flew from Washington to Seattle to defend in April 1970. Diskin received an appointment at Haverford in that year, and the couple moved again, to the Philadelphia suburbs.

On November 16, 1970, Andreia Clay was born in Haverford, and Jenny divided her time between the demands of new motherhood and, to supplement their income, an instructor position teaching French and occasionally Latin. Tragedy struck when Leo died in Annapolis on October 18, 1973 at the age of 74. His beloved Psalm 114 was read at his funeral. After his burial in Annapolis, memorial meetings were organized by students, friends, and colleagues at institutions of higher learning across the country (Strauss 1997: 6). Jenny had begun to publish in 1969, and the first of her numerous scholarly contributions to Homeric studies appeared next, in *Hermes* 1972 and 1974.

In 1975 Diskin was hired by the Johns Hopkins University with the proviso that Jenny would be offered a half-time position as an adjunct assistant professor of Classics. In 1976 Jenny produced substantial articles in *AJP* on the beginning of the *Odyssey* and in *Philologus* on the end of

the second *Georgic*. The relationship with Diskin, which had had its ups and downs even before their marriage, began to collapse. While still fulfilling her teaching responsibilities at the Hopkins, Jenny moved from Baltimore back to Haverford with Andreia. She and Diskin divorced in 1977, and Jenny was named a junior fellow at the Center for Hellenic Studies for the next year. Bernard Knox, as kindly as he was learned, allowed Jenny to stay through the summer of 1979. Bryan Reardon (1928-2009) had just come to the University of California, Irvine, early in the year and was building a department that already included Ted Brunner and Luci Berkowitz, who were managing the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Reardon had two positions to hire, one a tenure-track slot and one a temporary lectureship. The tenure-track slot went to Dana F. Sutton, while Jenny got the lectureship.

At the 1979 meeting of the APA in Boston, Jenny had 18 interviews and in order that Andreia could be near her father, chose an appointment as an assistant professor at the University of Virginia, only the second woman hired by the Classics Department there. The University rewarded her with Sesquicentennial research grants in 1981, and again in 1984, 1986, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1996-97, and 2005. Her first book, *The Wrath of Athena*, appeared in 1983 (Princeton). Throughout the '80s she continued to publish on Sappho and Hesiod (*Philologus* 1980), Virgil (*Arethusa* 1981), Homer (*Classical Journal* 1981-82, 1985; *AJP* 1982, 1984), and Hesiod (*GRBS* 1984, 1988). In 1984-85 her work was recognized by an NEH Independent Research Grant.

In the midst of all this academic activity, the outside world cruelly intervened in 1985 when Jenny's mother Miriam, who had moved to Charlottesville to be near her daughter, died on April 29.

Jenny was promoted to associate professor later in that year and continued to publish work on Archilochus (*QUCC* 1986), Hesiod (*TAPhA* 1988; *GRBS* 1988), Horace 1.9 (*CW* 1989-90) and the Greek hymns (*Metis* 1987), culminating in *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns* (Princeton 1989). In 1990 she was promoted to full professor (from 2006, William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor of Classics).

Her friend William M. Calder III, well versed as few are in the biographies of scholars, wisely said, 'After a certain point in a scholar's life, biography becomes bibliography.' We can take the year of her promotion

to professor as a kind of watershed. From 1990 her life becomes far less dramatic as it becomes far more productive and is most easily, if tiresomely, told in lists.

Of the making of books there was no end: She edited *Locke's Questions Concerning the Law of Nature* with Robert Horwitz and Diskin Clay (1990) and produced a special issue of *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* entitled *Mega Nepios: Il destinatario nell'epos didascalico. The Addressee in Didactic Epic* (1993). A decade later came *Hesiod's Cosmos* (2003) and later *Homer's Trojan Theater* (2011). She is currently engaged in a long-term collaborative project (with Courtney Evans and Ben Jasnow), 'Mapping the Catalogue of Ships'. Her bibliography since 1990 yields more than 50 articles on authors from Homer to Horace, along with dozens of incisive informed reviews.

Her research has been rewarded with grants including a Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst Study Visit Research Grant (1992), an NEH Summer Research Grant (1992), an Onassis Foundation Fellowship (1999), an American Academy in Berlin fellowship (2012, declined), and a Humboldt Foundation Preis (2012-13).

In the Straussian tradition she is truly an international scholar who has enjoyed visiting professorships at Duke (1988-89), the American Academy in Rome (1991), and L'École des Hautes Études (1996). She was scholar-in-residence at the American Academy in Rome (1997); Whitehead Professor, American School of Classical Studies at Athens (1999-2000); lecturer at L'École Normale Supérieure (Lyon) (2008); and Sackler Fellow, Tel Aviv University (2016).

It would be all too easy for someone so in demand elsewhere to neglect her local duties, but her efforts in service of the profession, both nationally and in Charlottesville, have been significant. She has held major positions in the American Philological Association/Society for Classical Studies, serving on the Nominating Committee (1990-93; 2015-18) and the Committee on Professional Matters (2003-06), and as Vice President for Research (1997-2001) and ultimately President (2006-07). Following her presidency she served as APA delegate to ACLS (2008-11) and the Advisory Committee for *L'Année philologique* (from 2015).

She has been an active member of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, serving as President (2003-04), receiving an *ovatio* in 2009, and serving on the Finance Committee (from 2012).

She has served on the editorial board of *Classical Journal* (1991-98),

and is the Greco-Roman editor for *Religious Studies Review* (from 2008). Her counsel has been sought for the Admissions and Fellowships Committee of the American School at Athens (2001-03) and as a jury member for the Loeb Classical Library Foundation (2002-05) and the American Academy in Berlin (from 2013). She served on the Executive Committee of the American School at Athens (2008-11), was a Senior Fellow at the University of Virginia Society of Fellows (2003-16), and of course is a member of the Advisory Committee of the Leo Strauss Center (from 2008).

Never breathless from this national and international service to the profession, she was director of graduate study for the Classics Department at the University of Virginia (1989-93, 2001-04, 2007-16) in which role her maternal instincts complemented her wise and learned advice. She chaired the department from 1993 to 1999. In that period, she oversaw the inauguration of the first Gildersleeve professor of Classics, Edward Courtney, despite the Virginia General Assembly's wish to give the chair to George Mason University. The Classics Department newsletter, *Vox Classica*, developed under her watch, as did the Summer Latin Institute and the Distinguished Major Program. She moved the department to larger offices on the fourth floor of New Cabell Hall and hosted the 1998 meeting of CAMWS.

She has of course along the way trained some outstanding scholars. Her most eminent undergraduate is certainly Daniel Mendelsohn, who has written of her fondly in describing his not entirely comfortable college experiences. She has directed the dissertations of many students who have subsequently made their mark in the profession: David Mankin, Christopher Nappa, Kathryn Stoddard, Daniel Holmes, Athanassios Vergados, Zoe Stamatopoulou, Timothy Brelinski, Daniel Barber, Thomas Garvey, Georgia Sermamoglou-Soulmaidi, Benjamin Jasnow, Blanche Conger McCune, Courtney Evans, and Hilary Boussein. These fine students will accompany her many other achievements as Jenny Clay's lasting legacy to the world of classical scholarship and intellectual history.

A NOTE ON SOURCES

I have not used many footnotes because most of the information in this article has come from three extensive interviews with the subject, her *curriculum vitae*, interviews with colleagues, and personal knowledge. Jenny supplied some information about her biological parents, but the bulk of my information on them comes directly from Joel Kraemer's extensive article. I hope I have not done him or his groundbreaking work any injustice. Most people know of Leo Strauss, and I have avoided any lengthy discussion of his work simply because of restrictions on time and space. To properly represent his works and works on him would expand the bibliography beyond the capacity of this volume. I am grateful to all who have helped in this account of Jenny's remarkable career and am most of all in debt, as are we all, to the subject herself.

- Bloom, A. 1974. 'Leo Strauss September 20, 1899-October 18, 1973', *Political Theory* 2.4: 372-92.
- Kraemer, J. L. 1999. 'The Death of an Orientalist: Paul Kraus from Prague to Cairo', in M. Kramer, ed., *The Jewish Discovery of Islam: Studies in Honor of Bernard Lewis*. Tel Aviv. 181-223.
- Lewy, H. 1945. 'À la mémoire de Paul Kraus', *Revue du Caire* 85: 132-34.
- Mendelsohn, D. 1999. *The Elusive Embrace: Desire and the Riddle of Identity*. New York.
- Obermayer, H. P. 2008. 'Kurt von Fritz and Ernest Kapp at Columbia University: A Reconstruction according to the Files', *CW* 101.2: 211-49.
- Strauss, L. 1997. *Jewish Philosophy and the Crisis of Modernity* (ed. K. H. Green). Albany.

Jenny Strauss Clay: Bibliography 1969-2017

compiled by Ward Briggs

- 'Suggestions for the Teaching of Latin Composition', *Proceedings of the Northwest Conference on Foreign Languages* 29 (1969) 171-72.
- 'The *Planktai* and *Moly*: Divine Naming and Knowing in Homer', *Hermes* 100 (1972) 127-32.
- 'Demas and Aude: The Nature of Divine Transformation in Homer', *Hermes* 102 (1974) 129-36.
- 'Damoetas' Riddle and the Structure of Vergil's Third Eclogue', *Philologus* 119 (1975) 59-64.
- 'The Argument of the End of Vergil's Second *Georgic*', *Philologus* 120 (1976) 232-45.
- 'The Beginning of the *Odyssey*', *AJP* 97 (1976) 313-26.
- 'Goat Island: *Odyssey* 9.116-141', *CQ* 30 (1980) 261-64.
- 'Sappho's Hesperus and Hesiod's Dawn', *Philologus* 124 (1980) 302-05.
- 'The Old Man in the Garden: *Georgics* 4.116-148', *Arethusa* 14 (1981) 57-65.
- 'Immortal and Ageless Forever', *CJ* 77 (1981-82) 112-17.
- 'Ἀκρὰ Γυρέων: Geography, Allegory and Allusion (Archilochus 105 West)', *AJP* 103 (1982) 201-04.
- The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton, 1983. (Reprinted by Rowman and Littlefield, 1996.)
- 'The Hecate of the *Theogony*', *GRBS* 24 (1984) 27-38.
- 'Homeric ἀχρεῖον', *AJP* 105 (1984) 73-76.
- 'Aeolia, or Under the Sign of the Circle', *CJ* 80 (1985) 289-93.
- 'Archilochus and Gyges: An Interpretation of Frag. 23 West', *QUCC* 24 (1986) 7-17.
- 'Hermes' δαίς by the Alpheus', *Métis* 2 (1987) 221-34.
- 'What the Muses Sang: *Theogony* 1-115', *GRBS* 29 (1988) 323-33.
- The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Poems*. Princeton, 1989. (Reprinted by Duckworth, 2005.)
- 'Ode I. 9: Horace's September Song', *CW* 83 (1989-1990) 102-05.
- Locke's Questions Concerning the Law of Nature*. Co-edited with R. Horwitz and D. Clay. Ithaca, 1990.

- 'Pindar's Twelfth *Pythian*: Reed and Bronze', *AJP* 113 (1992) 519-25.
- 'The Education of Perses: From MEGA NEPIOS to DION GENOS and Back', *MD* 31 (1993) 23-33.
- 'The Generation of Monsters in Hesiod', *CP* 88 (1993) 105-16.
- '*Providus auspex*: Horace, Ode 3.27', *CJ* 88 (1993) 167-77.
- 'Sappho 55 (Voigt): Going, Going, Gone', *Electronic Antiquity* 1 (1993).
- 'The Plot of the Lysistrata and the Hostages of Line 244', *Electronic Antiquity* 1 (1994).
- Mega Nepios: Il Destinatario nell'epos didascalico. The Addressee in Didactic Epic*. Special issue of *MD* 31 (1993), co-edited with A. Schiesaro and P. Mitsis. Pisa, 1994.
- 'The Dais of Death', *TAPA* 124 (1994) 35-40.
- 'Sex, Drugs and ... Poetry', in S. Oberhelman, V. Kelly, and R. Golsan, eds., *Epic and Epoch: Essays on the Interpretation and History of a Genre*. Lubbock, 1994. 40-48.
- 'Tendenz and Olympian Propaganda in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*', in J. Solomon, ed., *Apollo: Origins and Influence*. Tucson, 1994. 23-36.
- 'Agamemnon's Stance', *Philologus* 139 (1995) 72-75.
- 'Catullus' Attis and the Black Hunter', *QUCC* 50 (1995) 143-55.
- 'Literary Crockery: Review Article', *Arion* 3, 2-3 (1995-96) 274-91.
- 'Fusing the Boundaries: Apollo and Dionysos at Delphi', *Métis* 11 (1996) 83-100.
- 'The New Simonides and Homer's *Hemitheoi*', *Arethusa* 29 (1996) 243-45.
- 'The Homeric Hymns', in B. Powell and I. Morris, eds., *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden, 1997. 489-507.
- 'Η συγχώνευση των ορίων· Ο Απόλλων και ο Διόνυσος στους Δελφούς', in J.-Th. Papademetriou, ed., *Πρακτικά. Πρώτο πανελλήνιο και διεθνές συνέδριο αρχαίας ελληνικής φιλολογίας, 23-26 Μαΐου 1994* = *Acta: First Panhellenic and International Conference on Ancient Greek Literature. 23-26 May 1994*. Athens, 1997. 261-72.
- '*Iliad* 24.649 and the Semantics of κερτομέω', *CQ* 49 (1999) 618-21.
- 'Pindar's Sympotic *Epinicia*', *QUCC* 62 (1999) 25-34.
- 'A Ram among the Sheep: Some Notes on Odysseus in the *Iliad*', in J. N. Kazazis and A. Rengakos, eds., *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*. Stuttgart, 1999. 363-67.
- 'The Whip and Will of Zeus', *Literary Imagination* 1 (1999) 40-60.

- 'The New Simonides and Homer's ἡμίθεοι', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider, eds., *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Oxford, 2001. 182-84.
- 'Dying is Hard to Do', *Colby Quarterly* 38 (2002) 7-16.
- 'Odyssean Animadversions', in F. Montanari, ed., *Omero: Tre Mille Anni Dopo*. Rome, 2002. 73-83.
- 'Rowing for Athens', in J. F. Miller, K. S. Myers, and C. Damon, eds., *Vertis in Usum: Festschrift in Honor of Edward Courtney*. Leipzig, 2002. 271-276.
- 'Sweet Folly: Horace Odes 4.12 and the Evocation of Vergil', in M. Paschalis, ed., *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*. Rethymnon, 2002. 129-40.
- Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Translation of C. Calame, 'Deictic Ambiguity and Auto-Referentiality: Some Examples from Greek Poetry', in N. Rubin, ed., *The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar and Other Lyric*. Special number of *Arethusa* 37 (2004) 415-43.
- 'The Beginning and End of the Catalogue of Women and its Relation to Hesiod', in R. Hunter, ed., *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*. Cambridge, 2005. 25-34.
- 'Art, Nature and the Gods in the Chariot Race of *Iliad* Ψ', in M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis, eds., *Ἄθλα και ἐπαθλα στα Ομηρικά ἔπη: από τα Πρακτικά του 1^{ου} Συνεδρίου για την Οδύσσεια (15-19 Σεπτεμβρίου 2004) = Contests and Rewards in the Homeric Epics: Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium on the Odyssey (15-19 September 2004)*. Ithaca, Greece, 2007. 69-76.
- 'Hesiod's Rhetorical Art', in I. Worthington, ed., *Blackwell's Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Malden, Mass., 2007. 447-57.
- 'Homer's Trojan Theater: Presidential Address', *TAPA* 137 (2007) 233-252.
- 'Archilochos, the Lover', in S. Katsarou-Tzeveleki, D. Katsonopoulou, and I. Petropoulos, eds., *Πάρος II. Ο Αρχίλοχος και η εποχή του. Πρακτικά Β' Διεθνούς επιστημονικού συνεδρίου αρχαιολογίας Πάρου και Κυκλάδων, Παροικία Πάρου, 7-9 Οκτωβρίου 2005 = Paros II. Archilochus and his Age: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades, Paroikia, Paros, 7-9 October 2005*. Athens, 2008. 115-21.
- 'Sarpédon: Aristos Heroon', *Gaia* 12 (2008-09) 15-27.

- 'Hesiod's *Works and Days*: Tracing the Path to Arete', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis, eds., *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*. Leiden, 2009. 71-90.
- 'How to be a Hero: The Case of Sarpedon', in E. Karamalengou and E. Makrygianni, eds., *Αντιφίλησις: Studies on Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Literature and Culture in Honour of John-Theophanes Papademetriou*. Stuttgart, 2009. 30-38.
- 'The Silence of the Pythia', in L. Athanassaki, R. P. Martin, and J. F. Miller, eds., *Apollo: Politics and Poetics*. Athens, 2009. 5-16.
- 'Golden Age', in M. Gagarin, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 2010) 3: 319-21.
- Homer's Trojan Theater*. Cambridge, 2011. (www.homerstrojantheater.org)
- 'The Homeric Hymns as Genre', in A. Faulkner, ed., *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretive Essays*. Oxford, 2011. 232-52.
- 'Horace and Lesbian Lyric', in G. Davis, ed., *Blackwell's Companion to Horace*. Malden, Mass., 2011. 128-46.
- Articles in M. Finkelberg, ed., *The Homer Encyclopedia* (Malden, Mass., 2011): 'Daimon', 'Divine Apparatus', 'Hebe', 'Herakles', 'Heroic Age', 'Iris', 'Phemios', 'Zeus'.
- 'Eclogue 4.28: Where's the Miracle?', *Vergilius* 55 (2009) 13-15.
- 'Olympians 1-3: A Song Cycle?', in L. Athanassaki and E. L. Bowie, eds., *Archaic and Classical Choral Song*. Berlin, 2011. 337-45.
- 'Theology and Religion in the Homeric Hymns', in R. Bouchon, P. Brillet-Dubois, and N. Le Meur-Weissman, eds., *Hymnes de la Grèce antique. Approches littéraires et historiques. Actes du colloque international de Lyon, 19-21 Juin 2008*. Lyon, 2012. 315-22.
- 'The Hittite Song of Emergence and the *Theogony*' (with A. Gilan), *Philologus* 158 (2014) 1-9.
- '*Iliad* 1. 282-84 and Nestor's Rhetoric of Compromise', *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 67 (2014) 987-93.
- 'Justice in the *Theogony* or 'The Lady Vanishes', in M. Christopoulos and M. Paizi-Apostopoulou, eds., *Έγκλημα και τιμωρία στην ομηρική και αρχαϊκή ποίηση: από τα πρακτικά του IB' διεθνούς συνεδρίου για την Οδύσσεια, Ιθάκη, 3-7 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013 = Crime and Punishment in Homeric and Archaic Epic: Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium on the Odyssey, Ithaca, September 3-7, 2013*. Ithaca, Greece, 2014. 355-66.

- 'Commencing Cosmogony and the Rhetoric of Poetic Authority', in P. Derron, ed., *Cosmologies et Cosmogonies dans la littérature antique. Huit exposés suivis de discussions et d'un épilogue*. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 61. Vandoeuvres, 2015. 105-47.
- 'Horace C. 1.11: Wintry Thoughts on a Winter's Day ... and a Hint of Spring', *Philologus* 159 (2015) 112-17.
- 'Homer's Epigraph: *Iliad* 7.87-91', *Philologus* 160 (2016) 185-96.
- 'Horace et le frère cadet d'Apollon', in B. Delignon, N. Le Meur, and O. Thévenaz, eds., *La poésie lyrique dans la cité antique: Les Odes d'Horace au miroir de la lyrique grecque archaïque*. Paris, 2016. 285-93.
- 'How to Construct a Sympotic Space with Words', in V. Cazzato and A. Lardinois, eds., *The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song*. Leiden, 2016. 204-16.
- 'The Justice of Zeus in the Theogony?', in J. J. Clauss, M. Cuypers, and A. Kahane, eds., *The Gods of Greek Hexameter Poetry: From the Archaic Age to Late Antiquity and Beyond*. Stuttgart, 2016. 21-31.
- 'Visualizing Divinity: The Reception of the Homeric Hymns in Greek Vase Painting', in A. Faulkner, A. Vergados, and A. Schwab, eds., *The Reception of the Homeric Hymns*. Oxford, 2016. 29-51.
- Co-editor (with I. Malkin and Y. Tzifopoulos). *Panhellenes at Methone: Graphê at Late Geometric and Protoarchaic Methone (ca 700 BCE)*. Berlin, 2017.

The Partnership of Zeus and Gaia in Hesiod's *Theogony*¹

Nancy Felson

In this essay I focus on Gaia's motivations in the course of Hesiod's *Theogony*. My study of Gaia takes off from a sentence in Jenny Strauss Clay's *Hesiod's Cosmos*, p. 26, where she writes:

Some have found the behavior of Gaia, as Hesiod describes it, paradoxical if not incomprehensible ... But her role as kingmaker among the gods and orchestrator of succession is perfectly consistent, and an understanding of her motivation is crucial to the *Theogony*.

I build, as well, on my own previous work in 'The Children of Zeus,'² where I set forth in a preliminary way the connection between the two sequential purpose clauses of lines 126-28, Gaia's regular epithet (πελώρη), and the prominent yet under-examined role that Gaia plays in the Succession myth. Based on my reading of these clauses, in conjunction with the repeated ascription of planning verbs and nouns to Gaia, I assign a 'psychology' to her character.

Gaia is a 'schemer', a prototype for her granddaughter Metis, whose name means 'Cunning Schemer'.³ Gaia's role in determining the plot-

¹ I am indebted to several colleagues for reading earlier drafts of this essay and suggesting useful improvements, in particular the co-editors (Lucia Athanassaki, Christopher Nappa, Athanassios Vergados), Seth Schein, Carolyn Dewald, Alex Loney, and Zoe Stamatopoulou, and to Alex Moskowitz and Sam O'Donnell for editorial and research assistance. Errors and infelicities are my own.

² Felson 2011, especially 257-61.

³ In Felson 1994: 5-6 I use 'schemer' as a quasi-technical narratological term to describe the goddess Athena, right hand of the poet; on 6 and 128-29 I assign some degree of agency to planning characters like Penelope *periphron* and Odysseus *polymētis/polytropos*.

line of the *Theogony's* Succession far exceeds the importance that most scholars have observed.⁴ In my consideration of Gaia's centrality, I acknowledge that Zeus is the star of the story that culminates in his election as king of the gods,⁵ but argue that, by the time that Gaia endorses him, Zeus is ready to incorporate and internalize Metis/μήτις and indeed to become 'μητίετα Ζεύς'. Because of her intrinsic commitment to terrestrial stability, Gaia will embrace him; to get Gaia to that point, the poem had to build a quest for such stability into her character from the start.

Syntagms from syntax, and the construction of Gaia's character

One finding of narratological interest is the fact that a syntactic feature, such as a purpose clause, can provide the initial entry for a chain of events or syntagm. Thus Gaia's desire to produce a stable seat for the immortal gods is gleaned primarily from reading the contents of the second purpose clause in a certain way, and linking it to her choice to give birth to Ouranos equal to herself. A second observation has to do with the role of an external audience (including readers such as myself) to construct a coherent character by connecting dispersed plot elements into a coherent whole. Drawing on R. Barthes and M. Bal, I apply this interpretive strategy in the case of Penelope (Felson 1994: 126-27):

Characters in Homeric epic do not unfold to an audience in an orderly, linear fashion; audiences, as they listen, reconstruct stories and reorder their developments. The proper name encourages the projection of an accomplished and singular named character onto previous textual elements that lead to the construction of that character. (126)

⁴ At several critical moments in Zeus's ascent, Gaia (alone or together with Ouranos) helps or obstructs him, thus determining his outcome. Zeus's rise to power depends upon Gaia's eventual acceptance of his kingship interaction. Gaia champions Zeus, after he defeats Typhaon, because his supremacy assures her own stability and the stability of the cosmos.

⁵ According to Lamberton 1988: 72-77, Gaia's stratagems and advice (sometimes in conjunction with Sky's) are 'crucial at every turn in Zeus's ascendancy to power: in tricking Cronus to swallow a stone instead of the infant Zeus (cf. 471, 475, and 494); in Zeus's liberating the Hundred-Handers as a means to Olympian victory over the Titans (cf. 626); in urging the Olympians to make Zeus king and lord (884); in advising Zeus to swallow Metis (891 and 892). Earth also kept the Cyclopes' thunder and lightning hidden before Zeus freed his uncles (505)'. According to Scully 2015, Zeus is named 62 times in the poem, more than any other character; second is Gaia (51 times), then Ouranos (34 times), then Nux (16 times).

In presenting Penelope, Homer includes isolated and descriptive 'character indicators'. Dispersed as these are throughout the text, they can nevertheless be brought together by an interpreter today, as they must have been in Homer's time by members of his live audiences, into an illusion of fullness. When listeners, ancient or modern, thus 'concoct' Penelope's character, this activity involves making sense of her psychologically in all her complexity. (126) Defined as a technical term, psychologizing means taking a character's figuration in a text as though it were real and as though it existed in a stable and unchanging, if fictive, ontology. Interpreters who speculate about the psychological viability of a fictional character and make inferences about that character's psyche from clues in the text can be said to 'psychologize'. (127)

*

The *Theogony* uses several strategies to bolster its own endorsement of Zeus as the one who will establish and maintain lasting order. Aside from explicit statements of praise, the poem uses a 'double time frame' that intersperses a synchronic present ('now-time') with a diachronic, unfolding narrative (from then to now; 'story-time'). Having Zeus in the narrative frame and intermittently occupy the position to which he aspires, affirms the permanence of his supremacy. Two additional narrative ploys, in story-time, coax Hesiod's audience to view Zeus's victory as the only desirable outcome: 1) when aligned with his male predecessors Kronos and Ouranos, Zeus appears uniquely suited for the position he already (now) holds,⁶ and 2) the poem avoids focalizing Zeus's actions through the consciousness of any of his adversaries (with the possible exception of Gaia). The first ploy has been well examined; the second, less so.

ZEUS: Distinctive Features

Zeus's strategy for becoming king of gods and men 'reiterates the first two episodes of the succession myth, but with a difference; in giving

⁶ Many scholars have written on Zeus's uniqueness, compared to Kronos and Ouranos, showing how, during his ascension, his actions echo those of his predecessors but with a difference that enables him, and him alone, to establish a new kind of just rule. Useful, as a starting place, is the Introduction in Brown 1953, which sets out parallels and differences in the sequential narrative structures of the three generations, and, more recently, Muellner 1996.

birth to Athena, he appropriates the female function of procreation; and in swallowing Metis, he permanently incorporates into himself the feminine principle of guile (*metis*) that had hitherto been the instrument of generational change.⁷ Amidst the many similarities, Zeus stands out as more enlightened than his predecessors, though not by any means an unflawed or non-violent leader.⁸ Whereas Ouranos repressed his offspring in Gaia's womb and Kronos swallowed his children (with the exception of the youngest) as each emerged from Rhea's womb, Zeus cleverly swallows Metis, pregnant with Athena, *before* she conceives their second offspring, and he allows the birth of Athena to happen.

Zeus's use of violent force resembles the behavior of Ouranos and Kronos (and later that of Typhaon). He could appropriately be designated as δεινός, especially if he were focalized either by Kronos, whom he unseats, or by the challengers he thwarts. Nevertheless, though his actions during his ascent might earn him that designation, Hesiod refrains from placing him in the category of dreaded, terrifying monsters.

As often observed, Zeus combines two distinct roles in the Succession Myth: oppressive 'father' and unruly 'youngest son'. The descriptor ὀπλότερος is regularly collated in the poem with δεινός to mark an offspring as a threat to familial, civic, and/or cosmic order. Indeed, Zeus does create havoc for his father, once at birth and again in the Titanomachy. He also thwarts all the challengers to his authority, including Gaia's last and youngest offspring, Typhaon.

Let us explore the semantics of the term that Hesiod applies to other disruptors of cosmic, civic, or familial order (but not to Zeus), δεινός,⁹

⁷ Clay 2003: 28.

⁸ Scully 2016: 6-7 provides an overview of the traits Zeus shares with his father and grandfather. Pucci 1992: 48 gives a full interpretation of the father/son relation in Lacanian terms; he reads oracles as the expression of the Father's voice—proleptically intimating the son's transgression, and analyzes the absence of that voice in the Succession Myth of the *Theogony*. It is fascinating that the unfathered Zeus becomes the quintessential father of gods and men.

⁹ The adjective δεινός derives from **dFeido*, 'to fear', according to Chantraine 1999. An active adjective, it never means 'fearing'. Its cognates in Armenian and Sanskrit mean 'to hate' and Sanskrit has a noun, *dveṣṭi*, meaning 'persecution', 'hatred'. Related is Lat. *dirus*, 'horrible'.

Typhaon combines the δεινός attribute of the hybrid offspring of Phorkys and Ceto and of the superlatively δεινότερος Kronos and Hundred-Handers. Against Typhaon, Zeus releases his μένος, as he had in his struggle vs. the Titans (cp. 853 and 687). Zeus thereby contains or restricts the qualities that the monstrous offspring embodies and, in a sense, purges these qualities from himself. This may suggest that, once he defeats his 'doublet' Typhaon, Zeus is no longer a menace to stability and order but reliably its defender, as if he has eliminated, or at least imprisoned, an unruly and unpredictable part of himself.

'dreaded', 'fearsome', 'inciting fear in'. Forms of δεινός occur 22 times in the *Theogony*, a disproportionate six for the offspring of Ceto and Phorcys (299, 307, 320, 324, 334, and 769); twice for Typhaon, a terrible dragon (825: δεινοῖο δράκοντος) and terrible monster (856: δεινοῖο πελώρου). The hybrid monster brood of Phorcys and Ceto culminates in the youngest, a 'dread serpent' (δεινὸς ὄφις) that guards the all-golden apples in the hidden places of the dark earth at its limits (333-36). All of these children are a menace to the human race (though not necessarily to their parents). As such, they become obstacles for heroes like Heracles, Bellerophon, and Theseus to overcome and thereby prove their heroism and win acclaim.

The *Theogony* designates several rebellious, disobedient sons, a few of them hybrids as well, as δεινός or δεινότατοι παίδων at birth, often in connection with verbs like τέκομαι and ἐκγίγνομαι and nouns such as τέκνα.¹⁰ The epithet δεινός, especially in the superlative and in collocation with 'youngest', describes several sons who threaten to overthrow their fathers (or whoever holds power): Kronos (135); the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers (155) (youngest and most hated sons of Ouranos and Gaia); and Typhaon (825 and 856) (youngest son of Gaia and Tartaros). The very existence of such a son triggers apprehension in the father, often accompanied by an explicit prophecy that his son will displace him.¹¹ Occasionally the poem uses the dative (of interest) to identify the entity affected, usually the parent or king (i.e. the established power). Whether the poet collocates δεινός or δεινότατοι παίδων with a formula like 'having an overbearing heart' or 'having overbearing manhood', an elaborate description of bodily excess (100 arms, 50 heads, etc.), or a piling-up of three or four adjectives indicating huge size and great power, the epithet reliably marks an entity as menacing and causing fear in a person (or thing) who is the target of the emotion, in whom the child invokes a δεινός response.

In two cases, those of Kronos and the Hundred-Handers, the superlative combines with a verb of hatred to indicate intergenerational male competition: the zero-sum Oedipal theme. The vigor or excess of

¹⁰ This emphasis on lineage is no surprise in a poem that builds its meaning from genealogies. Intergenerational hostility may begin with the son or with the father, each motivated by the perception of his competitor as excessively manly and vigorous, excessively large and mighty, or excessively arrogant.

¹¹ Most 2006: 15, n. 8.

either father or son is sufficient to trigger such hatred. Kronos hated his vigorous father Ouranos (138: θαλερόν δ' ἤχθηρε τοκῆα) and the Cyclopes and the Hundred-Handers were hated by their sire Ouranos from the start (155: ἤχθοντο). These two passages, with their verbal echoes, provide a kind of frame that sets Kronos off from his older siblings and lumps him instead with the two broods of monstrous hybrids.

When focalized by his father or by Gaia during the Titanomachy and the Typhaonomachy, Zeus is clearly a threat to cosmic order. In fact, until his negotiation, in direct speech, with the Cyclopes (643-63), Zeus is not a gentle figure at all. He is brutal to Typhaon, Gaia's youngest son (*Theog.* 819-68), who was excessively strong and noisy and 'would have come to reign over mortals and immortals, had not the father of men and gods been quick to perceive it' (836-38). He conquers this potential usurper, having lashed him with strokes, and then 'he hurled him, a maimed wreck, and huge Earth groaned'. Zeus is harsh as well to the unborn son of Metis (894-900), his own seed, whose depiction as 'having an over-lively spirit' (898: ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντα; cf. ὑπέρβιον ἦτορ ἔχοντας at 139 for the Cyclopes and βίην ὑπέροπλον ἔχοντες at 670 for the Hundred-Handers) marks him as a potential usurper, confirming the prophecy Zeus receives from Gaia and Ouranos that a son is destined to be born from Metis as a king of gods and men (897).¹² And yet, even though, within the story pattern, Zeus replicates many of the actions of his forebears and of his would-be displacers, Hesiod carefully represses this feature of his personality when he fashions Zeus as the hero of the Succession Myth.¹³

One circumstance Zeus shares with his predecessors is the absence of a paternal figure that will limit his youthful vigor. Ouranos has no father at all, ever. His relation with Gaia, his mother and bed-partner (133: εὐνηθεῖσα), is intimately dyadic, not triangular: no third term curbs his exercise of power or deprives him, as the male child, of full access to his mother. After engendering three sets of offspring—the Titans, the Cyclopes, and the Hundred-Handers, Ouranos reverses creation by pressing

¹² Zeus is ungentle to the four sons of Klymene and Iapetos, his cousins, who are also potential threats to his kingship. He undermines the hubristic Menoitios and especially Prometheus, who challenged his authority over humans—as if he and not Zeus were the far-seeing king (514) and the father of men and of the gods (542).

¹³ Cf. the contrast between ἥπιος and δεινός in the Tartaros section: Hypnos has one trait, Thanatos the other. The poem never uses ἥπιος for Zeus, as it does for Nereus, Old Man of the Sea, who is 'infallible and gentle' (235: νημερτῆς τε καὶ ἥπιος) and 'knows just and gentle plans' (236: δίκαια καὶ ἥπια δῆνεα οἶδεν).

all of them (or perhaps just some) back into Gaia's womb.¹⁴ In this way, he not only disregards the integrity of Gaia's corporeal boundaries but also challenges Gaia's fundamental procreative role.

Kronos answers his mother's appeal for assistance in avenging Ouranos's evil deed. He alone of his siblings volunteers to undertake the task of castrating and thereby disempowering their father, using Gaia's implement and executing her plan. In colluding with his mother, Kronos becomes a son with no father capable of limiting him. For a time, Kronos reigns, unfettered by laws or conventions. But when Rhea, whom he has sexually overpowered (453: *δηθηείσα*), bears her six children, Kronos (in the absence of the function of the father) swallows each offspring at birth. By this repeated obliterating act, he transforms his own body into an infertile womb. To rescue Zeus, their last and youngest son, Rhea (following her parents' counsel) dupes Kronos into swallowing the swaddled stone as a substitute for the infant Zeus. This forces Kronos to regurgitate first the stone (a surrogate for Zeus) and then Zeus's five older siblings. Kronos's violence against his offspring disqualifies him—in the eyes of Zeus and his Olympian siblings and importantly of Gaia—as an authoritative and reliable king and father.

Zeus is the last one in his lineage to grow to manhood in the absence of a father. He learns, as Muellner puts it, 'metonymically' from the errors of his male forebears (Muellner 1996: 52-93). When, at puberty, he returns to the plains of Thessaly, he challenges Kronos's power in a ten-year struggle that has several phases.¹⁵ Once he is vanquished in the Titanomachy and is relegated to Tartaros with the other Titans, Kronos has no possibility of remaining king, no legitimate claim to kingship. Moreover, he can never re-claim Gaia's once cherished allegiance.

Kronos's absence from the upper world puts Zeus, for the second time, in the same fatherless position as his two male precursors. Who will save him from a tyrant's lawlessness and unbridled desire? This is one fundamental problem in the *Theogony*: can anyone limit the power of the victorious son? The cosmos seems to *require* an answer to this question before there can be cosmic stability. One answer is to 'andro-

¹⁴ Though the pronoun *ὅσσοι* at *Theog.* 154-56 could refer to all the children, it more likely designates only the children who are most dreaded: Kronos, the Cyclopes, and the Hundred-Handers (*ὅσσοι γὰρ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο, | δεινότατοι παίδων, σφετέρῃ δ' ἤχθοντο τοκῇ | ἐξ ἀρχῆς*).

¹⁵ Mondi 1984 sees the poem as combining the individual *aristeia* of Zeus against Typhaon with the communal battle between two generations in the Titanomachy.

gynize' Zeus, turning him into μητίετα Ζεύς. In a way, Zeus limits his own power whenever he enters into an agreement with other deities, many of which belong to earlier generations (e.g. Styx and her children, Hecate, the Hundred-Handers, the Cyclopes). In this way, Zeus shares with them power and honors, and at the same time secures everyone's compliance with his rule.

Hesiod's poem excludes the focalization of nearly all of Zeus's adversaries, from Kronos to the unborn son.¹⁶ It is pointedly silent as to how Kronos views his serial regurgitation of his Olympian offspring, his defeat in the Titanomachy, and his subsequent exile to Tartaros with his Titan allies, where he is imprisoned under the surveillance of the Hundred-Handers. It never represents Typhaon's view, much less that of the unborn son. As we shall see, the *Theogony* does not exclude but in fact features Gaia's changing perspective on Zeus.

*

GAIA'S STORY

Gaia's eventual endorsement is an additional, yet crucial, indicator of Zeus's fitness for the role of kingship. She is indeed 'kingmaker among the gods and orchestrator of succession' in the *Theogony* (Clay 27), but in what ways? To understand Gaia's motivations as a major character, I shall track her story as it unfolds, examining Zeus's accession to kingship as focalized by Gaia. Gaia perceives her male partner as someone who will tame her unbridled female exuberance, which expresses itself in the production of unruly, often monstrous offspring and in her frequent epithet, (Γαῖα) πελώρη. As an efficacious and deliberate planner, she seeks and highly values the everlasting stability of her domain, the earth, and, more broadly, of the entire cosmos. Her expectation that a partner will assure that stability explains why, after Ouranos enrages her, she champions a series of male figures who serially disappoint her and why the ecological effects of the Titanomachy push her to give birth to Typhaon.

An early passage describing Gaia when she comes into being illuminates her association with terrestrial stability, an association assigned to

¹⁶ Prometheus is an exception: the text assigns him direct discourse, wherein he expresses his perspective on Zeus's aggressive acts.

her proleptically at birth and one that she will grow into as time moves forward (see p. 76 below):

A. 116-19

ἦ τοι μὲν πρότιστα Χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαί' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεῖ,¹⁷
 ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου,
 Τάρταρά τ' ἠερόεντα μυχῶ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης ...

Chaos, you know, first of all came into being, but next
broad-breasted Earth the ever-unshakable seat of all
the immortals, who hold the peaks of snowy Olympus,
 and murky Tartaros in the recesses of the broad-pathed earth ...

Here Gaia is what she will be in her final state, at the end of the narrative, after Zeus's victory, namely, the ever-unshakable seat for all the gods. The use of πάντων resonates with the frequent association of Gaia with πᾶς-compounds, as in the opening lines of her *Homeric Hymn* (XXX):

γαῖαν **παμμήτειραν** αἰέσομαι, ἠυθέμεθλον,
 πρεσβίστην, ἣ φέρβει ἐπὶ χθονὶ **πάνθ'** ὅπόσ' ἐστίν,
 ἡμὲν ὅσα χθόνα διὰν ἐπέρχεται ἡδ' ὅσα πόντον
 ἡδ' ὅσα πωτῶνται, τάδε φέρβεται ἐκ σέθεν ὄλβου.

Earth I shall sing, **mother of all**, deep-rooted
 oldest, who nourishes **all** that exists on the earth,
 whatever goes upon the shining land, whatever moves in the sea,
 whatever flies, all these are nourished by your bounty.

Tr. Shelmerdine (adapted)

Shortly after she emerges, Gaia deliberately produces Ouranos equal to herself. Her purpose is two-fold:

¹⁷ Cf. West 1966 ad loc. for the possibility that 118 (ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου, 'of all the immortals who possess the peaks of snowy Olympus'), which was unknown to Plato and Aristotle, is spurious. Whether we atheticize 118 as spurious or simply follow West in taking Τάρταρα as a neuter plural nominative and thus as the third natural entity to come into being, we need not read any discrepancy between the gods for whom Gaia is an ever-unshakable seat and the blessed gods of 126-28. For a different reading of the gods in 118-19, see Judet de La Combe 2010: 178.

B. 126-28

Γαῖα δέ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐγείνατο ἴσον ἑαυτῇ
 Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόενθ', ἵνα μιν περὶ πάντα ἔέργοι,¹⁸
 (first purpose clause)

ὄφρ' εἴη μακάρεσσι θεοῖς ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ.
 (second purpose clause)

Gaia first produced, equal to herself,
 starry Sky (Ouranos), that he might delimit her round on all sides,
 (first)

so that the blessed gods might have an ever-unshakable seat.
 (one translation)

or:

so that she might be an ever-unshakable seat for the blessed gods.
 (alternative translation)

The subject of the optative εἴη in the second purpose clause of passage B is left open. Scholars have translated it variously, most as Ouranos, a few as Gaia. Those who choose Ouranos have to explain the discrepancy between designating Ouranos as the 'ever-unshakable seat/ of all ...' eleven lines after using the same formula, in the same metrical position, for broad-breasted Gaia (117). Those few who choose Gaia as the subject of εἴη have to justify a change of subject from the first to the second purpose clause, which some see as impossible.¹⁹

The issues are admirably set forth in Judet de La Combe's 2010 essay dedicated to these two passages of the *Theogony*. Despite the ingenuity of his arguments for a continuity of subject, the parallels he cites from Homeric epic do not bolster his position, and in the end I find myself

¹⁸ Although both optative verbs make sense, I join Clay 2003: 15, n. 11, Solmsen 1954 and others in preferring πᾶσαν ἔέργοι over πάντα καλύπτοι. Contra: Most 2006 ad loc.

¹⁹ Judet de La Combe 2010: 171 bases his choice of Ouranos on formulaic comparisons (171) and on the application of the same localized formula to Olympos (*Od.* 6.41-46). The passages he cites on continuity of subject in consecutive purpose clauses—specifically, *Il.* 3.163-66 (Priam addressing Helen) and *Il.* 15.31-32 (Zeus addressing Hera)—do not support his position: in both purpose clauses a speaker addresses a 'you' who is co-present. Under such circumstances, continuity of subject would be natural. In our passage B, however, both verbs are 3rd person singular, so that discontinuity is more natural, or at least more acceptable. Moreover, Judet de La Combe's examples of ἵνα in proximity to ὄφρα are not formulaic in any strict or even liberal sense. On criteria for identifying and classifying Homeric formulae, see espec. Russo 2011.

unconvinced. For one thing, he uses the elaborate description of Mt. Olympos in *Od.* 6.41-46 as an argument for the appropriateness of applying ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ to Ouranos in 128:

ἡ μὲν ἄρ' ὥς εἰποῦς' ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη
 Οὔλυμπόνδ', ὅθι φασὶ θεῶν ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
 ἔμμεναι. οὐτ' ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρῳ
 δεύεται οὔτε χιὼν ἐπιπίλνεται ...

So speaking, the grey-eyed Athene went up
 to Olympos, where they say is the ever-unshakable seat of the gods.
 Neither is it shaken by winds nor ever is it dampened by rain
 Nor does snow fall upon it ... (*Od.* 6.41-44)

The passage vividly depicts the steadfast endurance of Mt. Olympos by making it impervious to the elements (winds, rain, snow). But Olympos is not Ouranos, despite their occasional confusion in Homeric epic.²⁰ The other passages Judet de La Combe cites simply call Olympos the seat (ἔδος) of the gods without ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ and without elaboration. I conclude that taking Ouranos/*ouranos* as the subject of εἶη in 128 has no support from Homeric passages.²¹

Two alternatives to this common reading of the second purpose clause (128) are appealing. Either works as the ground for my interpretation of Gaia's partnership with Zeus, and in fact I welcome both, together. The first opts for an impersonal construction, while the second makes Gaia the subject of εἶη.²²

1) εἰμί + the dative μακάρεσσι θεοῖς²³

This usage is attested in Homeric epic, e.g. at *Od.* 4.583-84, where ἴν' introduces a purpose clause:

²⁰ Purves 2011 provides an overview of the depiction of Olympos in Homer, most commonly as a mountain and at times conflated with Ouranos; she draws on Sale 1984. See also West 1966 ad loc. In Hesiod, Olympos is often a snowy mountain, occasionally collocated and thus paired with Ouranos but not identical with it.

²¹ West 1966 ad loc. favors taking Ouranos as subject, but does not make a strong case.

²² This was proposed by Welcker 1865: 113 in his edition of the *Theogony*. Most 2006 takes Gaia as the subject of εἶη and translates accordingly.

²³ Cf. Smyth 1476 on the dative of possession with εἰμί as a special case of dative of interest.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατέπαυσα θεῶν χόλον αἰὲν ἔόντων,
χεῦ' Ἀγαμέμνονι τύμβον, ἵν' ἄσβεστον κλέος εἴῃ.

But when I had stopped the anger of the gods who exist forever,
he poured a tomb for Agamemnon, so that *he* might have
undying glory.

We can then translate the controversial second purpose clause in Passage B as follows: 'so that the blessed gods might have an ever-unshakable seat.'

2) Gaia as the subject of εἴῃ

The second alternative is to take the main verb, ἐγείνατο (126), with Gaia as its subject, as introducing both sequential clauses. The second, after ὄφρ', provides a fuller explanation for why Gaia gave birth to Ouranos. If Gaia is the subject of εἴῃ, the translation is: 'so that she might be an ever-unshakable seat for the blessed gods.' By Gaia's reckoning, such unshakability *requires* a male partner who will not only delimit and restrain her but also use planning and cunning to prevent future ecological calamities, which would undermine terrestrial (as well as cosmic) stability.

My foray into the interpretation of Passage B leads me to conclude that Hesiod has chosen to leave the subject of εἴῃ open. In both readings ('so that there may be...' and 'so that she may be...'), Gaia (as a mythological figure pre-dating the poem, or as the poem fashions her) has the utmost concern for terrestrial and hence cosmic sustainability.

Curiously, a passage from the *Cypria*, quoted by the A and D scholia on Homer *Il.* 1.5 as evidence for the last of three interpretations of Διὸς βουλή ('the plan of Zeus'), attests to Zeus's allegiance to Gaia as a reason for planning the Trojan War, an event that occurs much later in mythological chronology:

There was [a time] when countless races on earth were wandering
[...] the expanse of deep-breasted earth (αἴης).
And Zeus took pity when he saw it, and in his shrewd mind
he decided †to relieve earth (παμβώτορα γαῖαν) of men,
[namely,] to fan the great strife of the Trojan war
in order to empty the burden of death. And the heroes in Troy
were being killed, and the plan of Zeus was being accomplished.²⁴

²⁴ The myth appears in Stasinus, the author of the *Cypria* (fr. 1 Bernabé = fr. 1 West). The scholia equate the plan of Zeus to the plan of Thetis, saying:

Zeus's attempt to relieve Gaia's distress at the burden of over-population underscores his ongoing concern for her well-being, long after the cosmogonic struggles are resolved.

Gaia's intrinsic desire for the blessed gods to have, or for her to be an ever-unshakable seat makes her the central figure of a Gaia story, which we can reconstruct by gathering her scattered actions and plans into a cohesive narrative that is intricately intertwined with the story of the ascendancy of Zeus. Tracking the Gaia story helps us answer the familiar question: what distinguishes Zeus from his predecessors Kronos and Ouranos and from potential successors, in particular, Typhaon and Metis's unborn son.

Gaia's pivotal role as 'kingmaker among the gods and orchestrator of succession' requires purposefulness and diplomacy.²⁵ I focus on (1) her rationale for desiring a male partner, (2) her changing perspective on candidates for that position, and (3) her final decision to champion and align herself with Zeus. I give much weight to the explanation, in the second purpose clause, as to why she produced Ouranos equal to herself, and to the fact that she is broad-breasted and stable from the moment she appears (117: Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεῖ).

Gaia's plans emerge at critical moments in the narrative, to be eventually complemented (and in a way supplanted) by Metis's plans, which are to become, in time, the plans of μητίετα Ζεὺς.²⁶ First, Gaia contrives (160: ἐπεφράσσατο) an evil deceit in retribution for Ouranos's evil deed, the repeated hiding in the Earth of (all or some of) their children, a deed in which he delights but which causes her to groan:

... ἦ δ' ἐντὸς **στοναχίζετο Γαῖα πελώρη**
 στεينوμένη· δολίην δὲ κακὴν ἐπεφράσσατο τέχνην.
 αἶψα δὲ ποιήσασα γένος πολιοῦ ἀδάμαντος
 τεῦξε μέγα δρέπανον καὶ ἐπέφραδε παισὶ φίλοισιν· (159-62)

These are the stories about the plan of Zeus found in the later poets. But we say, in agreement with the opinion of Aristarchus and Aristophanes, that it is the plan of Thetis, who, [Homer] says below (1.508), begged Zeus to avenge the dishonor of her son, as the summary establishes in the beginning of the poem.

(Thanks to William R. Beck, private communication, for permission to use his unpublished translation of these passages.)

²⁵ Cf. Robert 1905, reprinted in Heitsch 1966: 180-93.

²⁶ For Scully 2015: 33, the quality of *metis* changes as the universe evolves, so that Zeus's *metis*, unlike Kronos's, will be straight rather than crooked.

But huge Earth groaned within, for she was
constricted, and she devised a tricky, evil stratagem.
At once she created an offspring of gray adamant,
and she fashioned a big sickle and showed it to her own
children.

Next, in response to Kronos's sequential swallowing of their grand-children and to Rhea's anguished plea for help, Gaia and Ouranos devise another intricate plan (471: μήτιν συμφράσασθαι).²⁷ Here Gaia joins Ouranos in turning against their youngest son, even though Kronos had once been her hero. They advise Rhea to give Kronos a great stone, wrapped in swaddling clothes (485-86), to swallow in place of the infant Zeus. Kronos, deceived by Gaia's very clever suggestions (494: πολυφραδέεσσι), swallows the emetic stone and, in the course of the year (493: ἐπιπλομένων δ' ἐνιαυτῶν—i.e. after a nine-month gestation) he regurgitates all of his children, in reverse order, making Zeus (who, alone of his siblings, has escaped Kronos's swallowing at birth), symbolically, the first-born. Rhea then transports her child, unnoticed, to Crete, where Gaia receives him, hides him in a cave in the earth,²⁸ and raises him to manhood.

When Zeus returns from Crete at the peak of youth, he initiates an intergenerational war, the Titanomachy. The Kronos-led Titans and the Zeus-led Olympians are locked in a stalemate until Zeus, by Gaia's commands (626: Γαίης φραδομοσύνησιν²⁹), releases the Hundred-Handers from their prison in Tartaros and persuades them to join the Olympian cause. With the help of these powerful hybrid creatures, designated earlier as δεινότατοι παίδων (155), the Olympians vanquish the Titans and imprison them within Tartaros, for their new allies to guard. Although Zeus used violent forces to win the battle, adding monstrosity to his team's effort, he somehow escaped becoming monstrous himself!

²⁷ Rhea wants to punish Kronos not only for swallowing their children as each was born, but also for his earlier castration of their father (471-73).

²⁸ The description of the cave as 'beneath the crevices of sacred earth' (484: ζαθέης ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης) invokes Gaia's domain.

²⁹ Cf. the isometric formula of 884: Γαίης φραδομοσύνησιν Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν.

In its second phase, beginning at 670, the war suddenly becomes ecologically menacing, in a manner clearly unanticipated by Gaia when she recommended that Zeus secure the Hundred-Handers as his allies.

...ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα φερέσβιος ἐσμαράγιζε
 καιομένη, λάκε δ' ἀμφὶ πυρὶ μεγάλ' ἄσπετος ὕλη.
 ἔξεε δὲ χθών πᾶσα καὶ Ὀκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα
 πόντος τ' ἀτρύγετος.

All around, the whole **earth** (γαῖα) **roared** as it burned,
 and all around the great immense forest **crackled**;
 the **whole earth** (χθών) **boiled**, and the streams of Ocean
 and the barren sea. (693-96)

The poem presents this devastation in searing detail, with an emphasis on sounds and, in a simile, on the collapse of Earth and Sky into an earlier, undifferentiated state:³⁰

καῦμα δὲ θεσπέσιον κάτεχεν Χάος· εἴσατο δ' ἅντα
 ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν ἢ δ' οὔασι ὄσσαν ἀκοῦσαι
 αὐτως, ὥς εἰ Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὑπερθε
 πῖλνατο· τοῖος γάρ κε μέγας ὑπὸ δοῦπος ὀρώρει
 τῆς μὲν ἐρειπομένης, τοῦ δ' ὑψόθεν ἐξεριπόντος·
 τόσος δοῦπος ἔγεντο θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνιόντων.

A prodigious conflagration took possession of Chasm; and
 to look upon it with eyes and to hear its sound with ears, it seemed
 just as when Earth and broad Sky approached
 from above: for this was the kind of great sound that would rise up
 as she was pressed down and as he pressed her down from on high—
 so great a sound was produced as the gods ran together in strife.
 (700-05)

³⁰ On the difficult simile at 702-705, cf. Most 2006: 59, n. 38, who sees the simile as an analogy 'not to some cataclysmic collapse of the sky onto the earth, but instead to the primordial sexual union between Sky and Earth'.

The intergenerational violence undermines cosmic stability in the Sky, the Sea, and the Ocean and causes the earth again to roar in anguish. Gaia's response to the prolonged war echoes her earlier distress at Ouranos's evil deed of keeping their children within her womb (cf. 159: στοναχίζετο Γαῖα πελώρη);³¹ but now the distress is on a larger scale. Even though Zeus initiated the Titanomachy following her command, his execution of the war has undermined Gaia's confidence in him. And so she turns against Zeus as she had earlier against Kronos.

At this stage, Gaia's reaction is less entirely personal, less tied to her own domain, though the conflagration of γαῖα and the boiling of χθών contribute to her distress. She has evolved to become a guardian of cosmic stability! She is enraged not only at the assault on the earth but also at the reversal of the evolution of the cosmos, as indicated in the simile quoted above, 'as if Earth and wide Heaven above were colliding.'

Precisely this new desperation motivates Gaia to produce Typhaon as the next potential king over a tumultuous cosmos. In answer to a Titanomachy that spirals out of control, Gaia exercises her only weapon, her reproductive power. In union with Tartaros she gives birth to her youngest and last offspring—the monstrous Typhaon. This demonic figure from the underworld, a hybrid designated as 'youngest' and as 'most dreaded of the children,' is prophesied to one day become king of the gods:

καί νύ κεν ἔπλετο ἔργον ἀμήχανον ἥματι κείνῳ
καί κεν ὃ γε θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἄναξεν,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὁξὺ νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.

³¹ In similar language huge earth groans when Typhaon falls to the ground:

ποσσί δ' ὕπ' ἀθανάτοισι μέγας πελεμίζετ' Ὀλυμπος
ὀρνυμένοιο ἀνακτος: ἐπεστενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα.

Great Olympus was shaken beneath the immortal feet
of the charging lord, and the earth groaned in response. (842-43)

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ μιν δάμασεν πληγῇσιν ἰμάσσας,
ἦριπτε γυιωθεῖς, στενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη.

But when Zeus had defeated him and lashed him with strokes,
maimed, he was hurled down, and huge earth groaned. (857-58)

Each of the three moments of Gaia groaning indicates her immediate bodily reaction to an ecological affront, to be followed by a new course of action.

And on that very day an intractable deed would have been accomplished, and he would have ruled over mortals and immortals, if the father of men and of gods had not taken sharp notice.
(836-38)

In choosing to mate with Tartaros and to give birth to Typhaon, Gaia is retaliating for the devastation from the Titanomachy.³² Typhaon combines the roles of potential usurper with monster-to-be-overcome. Her decision to bear him indicates that her confidence in Zeus has reached a nadir; or perhaps (it is hard to tell) she is giving Zeus one last chance to prove that he does deserve her approval.

Zeus's victory over Typhaon, in a battle with ecological repercussions reminiscent of the impact of the Titanomachy, puts an end to Gaia's production of monstrous offspring and thus curtails her indiscriminate and destabilizing birthing. He not only completes his own *aristeia* in his heroic defeat of Typhaon in one-to-one combat; he also eliminates Gaia's propensity, or perhaps her will, to procreate irresponsibly ever again. Moreover, his treatment of Typhaon replicates what Ouranos did to the Cyclopes and Hundred-Handers, but instead of regarding it as an evil thing, the poem treats it as heroic.

Although the devastation of the earth during the Titanomachy is echoed and even elaborated in the Typhonomachy (853-68), Zeus's defeat of Typhaon has an altogether different effect on Gaia: she (mysteriously) resumes her support of him. Granted, both of these sequential conflagrations destabilize Gaia/γαῖα/χθών, so that she is not, or there is not, an 'ever-unshakable seat'. Nonetheless, when Zeus eliminates the last serious contender for the throne, his victory *changes* Gaia, who from now on gives him unqualified, unwavering support. Although Gaia, unlike Tiamat, survives with her body intact, she sacrifices her procreative function when she supports Zeus's assumption of the kingship.³³ And as Zeus begins to restore cosmic

³² Blaise 1992 argues against taking the Typhaon episode as spurious. Instead, he sees the coupling of Gaia and Tartaros through golden Aphrodite (821-22) as germane to the foremost theme of the *Theogony*, since the episode provides an opportunity for integrating the alterity of Tartaros, an entity not produced by Gaia, into the new cosmic order.

³³ Gaia's survival as an entity in the *Theogony* (and in Greek mythology in general) is in stark contrast to her counterpart, Tiamat. Both primordial females give birth to unruly or noisy offspring; both are eventually supplanted by a young male ruler (Zeus, Marduk). But whereas Marduk, once he defeats Tiamat, splits her into two parts and renders her inert, Zeus does no such thing to Gaia. In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Hera, and not Gaia, gives birth to dreaded Typhaon as a plague

order, he is fulfilling the very role that she once envisioned for Ouranos.

The defeat of Typhaon, when focalized by Gaia, tames her unpredictable side, something she herself intended from the start. By subsequently endorsing Zeus's kingship (884-85), Gaia selects him (over Ouranos, Kronos, and Typhaon) as the one who will fulfill the second purpose clause of 128. Only he is up to that task.

In the *Theogony* and other archaic texts, πελώριος or πελώρη, 'monstrous', 'huge' (LSJ), is a frequent epithet for Gaia/gaia and for the chthonic hybrids she produces or with whom she associates.³⁴ Epithet + noun often occur at line end in the nominative (159, 173, 479, 821, 858), thrice in the nominative in other line-positions (505, 731, 861), and once in the genitive singular (731: πελώρης ἔσχατα γαίης). It appears once as a noun, πέλωρον, referring to Typhaon (856: ἐπρεσε θεσπεσίας κεφαλὰς δεινοῖο πελώρου, 'he burned all the dreaded monster's unspeakable heads'). At 179 the epithet is transferred from Gaia to her implement for castrating Ouranos: δεξιτερῇ δὲ πελώριον ἔλλαβεν ἄρπην. It is also used to describe serpents and other monsters (e.g. 295, 299, 845)³⁵ and is especially prominent in the episode of the Typhaonomachy, with three occurrences: 821, 858, and 861. These are the last instances of Γαῖα (or γαῖα) πελώρη.³⁶

to men, after praying to the Titans in Tartaros and lashing the earth with a strong hand (*Hymn Ap.* 334-52). Hera is punishing Zeus for giving birth to Athena apart from her, after her parthenogenetic birth of the cripple Hephaistos.

For comparisons between the two creation epics, and in particular between Gaia and Tiamat, the primordial mother in the Babylonian creation epic, *Enuma Elish*, see (West 1966) 25-30 and 379-83, Penglase 1994: 103-104 and 189-90, Walcot 1966: 27-54, Watkins 1995: 448-59 and Scully 2015: 55-63.

³⁴ Lamberton 1988: 72-73 calls the characteristically Hesiodic epithet *pelōr* 'the key to the characterization of Gaia'. It tends to describe gaia when a personified Earth is implied—in roughly one fifth of the instances. 'Aside from Gaia, adjectival forms describe the snake portion of Ekhidna and the sickle used to castrate Ouranos.' In Homer and in Hesiod, according to Lamberton, *pelōr* and its derivatives straddle several semantic fields largely distinct in English: 'that which is pelorios may be simply "huge" or it may be properly "monstrous" or again "prodigious". ... In Hesiod ... the pelor group is never used for things that are simply large.'

³⁵ Cf. Blaise 1992, Ballabriga 1990, and Clay 1993 on Gaia's motivation for giving birth to Typhaon. Most 2006 argues that the birth gives Zeus a chance at individual *aristeia*. From Gaia's perspective, only disappointment with her protégé Zeus would motivate her to sleep with Tartaros and engender such a monstrous rival for the throne as Typhaon.

³⁶ Gaia is prophetic in part because of her huge size, which suggests her ready presence at events. Yet as a character in story-time, she has limited foresight. Cf. Felson 2004 and 2009 on the limits of Apollo's foresight in Pindar's *Ninth Pythian*, where Chiron is amused at the innocence of the god of prophecy, and also in the *Hymn Ap.*, where Apollo is situated within story-time.

Was Gaia 'aware' of the monstrous tendencies in herself that needed a male figure in order that she might be an ever-unshakable seat, or that there might be such a seat? Did she produce Typhaon, the quintessential monster, after lying in love with Tartaros *in order that* he would rule over mortals and immortals (837: καὶ κεν ὃ γε θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἄναξεν), or was this birth purely an act of vengeance against Zeus? Did she want to undermine Zeus, or did she intend to give him a final opportunity to demonstrate his *menos*, energy, and to tame her? These important interpretive questions deserve our consideration even if we find no definitive answers.

Gaia finally accepts Zeus's reign as the best single pathway toward establishing an ἔδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ for the blessed gods. She understands that he is not δεινότατος παίδων and that his way of vanquishing or disarming his opponents is unique. E.g. he allows for the stormy winds to be released when he defeats and relocates Typhaon, whom he thus contains but does not fully obliterate, in contrast to Kronos and Ouranos, who do obliterate certain of their adversarial offspring. After his election, Gaia again gives Zeus counsel; as a result, he swallows the pregnant Metis but allows Athena to be born even while obstructing the conception of the menacing, unruly son. Gaia favors Zeus's new kind of justice.

In the Titanomachy and again in the Typhonomachy, Zeus comes close to wreaking permanent (ecological) havoc on earth, but in the end, Gaia remains alive and participatory, though stripped (it seems) of her reproductive powers once Zeus defeats Typhaon. Ultimately, Gaia is stabilized with boundaries and borders set by Zeus. Her position as counselor is supplanted by Metis, the other great 'planner' and 'deviser,' and her granddaughter through her Titan mother, Tethys, and Titan father, Oceanos. Like Gaia, Metis is not 'dispatched' and made inert: she becomes part of the living, breathing cosmos, yet is contained (in her case, literally) within Zeus's body. And Gaia herself, unlike Babylonian Tiamat, becomes the permanent champion of order: not only did she participate in the evolving cosmos all along; it is she who makes the decisive move toward electing Zeus as king. Her steady and reliable support of Zeus's kingship can only happen after Zeus has eliminated her last and perhaps most violent offspring, the monstrous Typhaon.

Gaia, then, drives the narrative of the Succession Myth in Hesiod's *Theogony*. As a major character, she evolves in tandem with Zeus, whose reliable champion she eventually becomes. Gaia grows into the role that the poem assigns her (proleptically) at birth:

ἦ τοι μὲν πρώτιστα Χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
 Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
ἀθανάτων, οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου,
 Τάρταρά τ' ἠερόεντα μυχῶ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης ...

In truth, first of all Chasm came into being, but next
 broad-breasted Earth, the ever-unshakable seat of
the immortals, who hold the peaks of snowy Olympos,
 and murky Tartaros in the recesses of the broad-pathed earth ...
 (116-19)

Gaia has two distinct yet conflicting dispositions or tendencies: on the one hand, she is unpredictable and vindictive, and has a propensity for producing unruly offspring from her womb; on the other, she craves stability and is an advocate for the ordering of the universe. Lines 126-28 identify Gaia's desire for *stability* as the fundamental motivation for her earliest procreative act and for her later advocacies. This value motivates her production of Ouranos equal to herself (126-28) in her first attempt to achieve cosmic stability, which she does believe she can provide only with a male partner. In the end, Zeus is the god who will fill the role that Gaia originally intended for Ouranos. Zeus, in other words, will become Gaia's final 'partner'.

CONCLUSION

As a character in story-time, Gaia is not clairvoyant, despite her well-attested prophetic powers.³⁷ Thus, the series of male descendants that she champions repeatedly disappoint her. Finally, at 884, confident at last of his ability to keep the world, and her domain, secure and safe, she endorses the evolved Zeus. To mark Gaia's serial advocacies, culminating in the support of Zeus, Hesiod employs the formula 'by the plans of Gaia' (Γαίης φραδμοσύνησιν). The recurrence of such a phrase indicates her agency, which is reinforced by her primacy at the beginning of cosmogony and by her identification as, and her deliberate quest for there to be, a ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ. Indeed, only with Zeus at the helm can Gaia fulfill her destiny: to become what she was called at birth (118).

³⁷ Gaia and her female descendants together comprise a female presence in the evolved cosmos, as Arthur (Katz) 1983 points out in her analysis of the metonymic relations between female entities, in contrast to the metaphoric relations for male gods. In general, goddesses interact cooperatively rather than competitively and tend to accept Zeus-rule, with occasional resistance.

Zeus in his quest for a sustainable kingship over gods and men needs Gaia's wholehearted and irreversible support and secures it once he defeats Typhaon. She has come to recognize that he alone among the male figures in her lineage can contain her unruliness (embodied by Typhaon) and thus bring about a permanently stable seat for the blessed Olympian gods.

The poem is dedicated to supporting Zeus over his predecessors and potential displacers; it also supports male dominance over female rule. Within the constraints from both of these explicit concerns, Hesiod keeps Gaia in play as a partner to Zeus, a seat of prophetic wisdom for others, and an ancestress of Metis, who, as 'Cunning Strategist', manifests some of her grandmother's traits and indeed freely imparts to Zeus the clever counsel she 'inherited' from her grandmother. Once Zeus swallows her, he incorporates her traits into his expanded, in some sense androgynous self. Curiously, Zeus's swallowing of Metis affirms Gaia rather than offending and outraging her. Moreover, there is enough room in the cosmos for an evolved Gaia, who will produce no more monsters or hybrids, to co-exist with an evolved and androgynous Zeus.³⁸

M. Arthur (Katz)'s analysis of the metonymic relation between female entities, in contrast to the metaphoric relation for male gods, creates space for the coexistence of Zeus with an evolved Gaia, who will produce no more monsters or hybrids to undermine cosmic stability and will enjoy her own function as adviser transferred to (or at least shared with) Metis.³⁹

Gaia's active and deliberate approval of Zeus and the advice she offers him along his path to power are by no means incidental or tangential. Her advice reaches its full and final expression once Zeus swallows, and thus incorporates into his expanded, in some sense androgynous body, Metis, an entity who 'inherits' clever counsel from her grandmother.

Typhaon's defeat changes Gaia, as if a violent part of her selfhood has been expunged. From an unpredictable producer of fearsome monsters, she becomes the catalyst for Zeus's kingship. Her newly *reliable* advocacy of Zeus becomes institutionalized when all the Olympians urge Zeus to rule over the immortals by her plans (884-85). Those who would have opposed her counsel to enthrone him have already been banished to Tartaros, indefinitely bound and restricted, and in some cases even assigned tasks to keep them out of trouble. At this point, the community of gods on Mt.

³⁸ On the offspring (Athena and her unborn brother) of Zeus and Metis as potential disrupters of order, see Felson 2011.

Olympos coalesces; Zeus, who had earlier engaged in a reciprocal exchange with the Cyclopes, continues to use his cunning and his persuasive skills to attain stability, and continues to rely (as μητίετα Ζεύς) on the permanently incorporated, Gaia-like Metis. Zeus's ascendancy was not the only possible outcome of the Succession Story, even though the time frame guaranteed such an outcome. Indications of the possibility that he could be overthrown in turn appear, often as counterfactuals, up to the point when, by the plans of Gaia, the gods elect Zeus their king. By that time, the cosmic order is relatively fixed and relatively unshakable.

In conclusion, Hesiod, the narrative voice of the *Theogony*, channeling the song of the Muses,³⁹ endorses Gaia's assessment of Zeus as a leader who differs in kind from his male predecessors and who is the only one capable of sustaining an ever-unshakable foundation for gods and (implicitly) for men and the entire cosmos. Zeus, having matured, has the power, the physical strength, and the intelligence and cunning not to overstep his bounds by abusing his power and thus violating what Gaia, having evolved, considers most sacred. Gaia traditions antedated Hesiod's refashioning of her in his poem celebrating Zeus. Quite possibly, what I am detecting through this focus on Gaia's story and Gaia's motivations is a *surplus* that survives Hesiod's refashioning efforts. It is as if Hesiod, so male-centered, so allegiant to Zeus-rule and to the transfer of political power from old to new, from female to male, from raw and primitive and violent to sophisticated and political, makes a concession to Gaia, leaving traces of her agency in Zeus's rise to kingship. Through the deliberateness of the double purpose clauses of 126-28 in conjunction with φραδ-language, Hesiod's *Theogony* gives us a Gaia whose commitment to sustainability endures through time.

³⁹ On the poet's self-presentation as a 'uniquely gifted poet, with a special relationship with the Muses', see Solmsen 1954: 1-16.

References

- Arthur (Katz), M. 1983. 'The Dream of a World without Women: Poetics and the Circles of Order in the *Theogony* Proem', *Arethusa* 16 (1): 97-116.
- Ballabriga, A. 1990. 'Le dernier adversaire de Zeus: Le mythe de Typhon dans l'épopée grecque archaïque', *RHR* 207: 3-30.
- Blaise, F. 1992. 'L'épisode de Typhée dans La Théogone d'Hésiode (v. 820-855): la stabilisation du monde', *REG* 105: 349-70.
- Brown, N. 1953. *Theogony*. 1st ed. New York and London.
- Chantraine, P. 1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. Paris.
- Clay, J. S. 1993. 'The Generation of Monsters in Hesiod', *CP* 88: 105-16.
- Clay, J. S. 2003. *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge and New York.
- Felson, N. 1994. *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics*. Princeton.
- Felson, N. 2004. 'The Poetic Effects of Deixis in Pindar's Ninth *Pythian* Ode', *Arethusa* 37: 365-89.
- Felson, N. 2009. 'Epinician Apollo in Story Time: *Pythian* 9, *Olympian* 6 and *Pythian* 3', in L. Athanassaki, V. Karasmanis, R. Martin and J. Miller, eds. *Apolline Politics and Poetics*. Athens. 149-68.
- Felson, N. 2011. 'Children of Zeus in the Homeric Hymns: Generational Succession', in A. Faulkner, ed., *The Homeric Hymns*. Oxford. 257-83.
- Heitsch, E., ed. 1966. *Hesiod (Wege der Forschung 44)*. Darmstadt.
- Judet de LaCombe, P. 2010. 'Hesiod, *Th.* 117 and 128: Formula and the Text's Temporality', in P. Mitsis and C. Tsagalis, eds., *Allusion, Authority, and Truth: Critical Perspectives on Greek Poetic and Rhetorical Praxis*. Berlin. 169-85.
- Lamberton, R. 1988. *Hesiod*. New Haven and London.
- Mondi, R. 1984. 'The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod's *Theogony*'. *GRBS* 25: 325-44.
- Most, G. W. 2006. *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Muellner, L. 1996. *The Anger of Achilles: Mēnis in Greek Epic*. Ithaca and London.
- Penglase, C. 1994. *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia: Parallels and Influences in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod*. London.

- Pucci, P. 1992. *Oedipus and the Fabrication of the Father: Oedipus Tyrannus in Modern Criticism and Philosophy*. Baltimore.
- Purves, A. C. 2011. 'Olympos', in M. Finkelberg, ed. *The Homer Encyclopedia*. Oxford. 600-601.
- Robert, C. 1905. 'Zu Hesiods Theogonie', in *Mélanges Nicole. Recueil de mémoires de philologie classique et d'archéologie offerts à Jules Nicole, professeur à l'Université de Genève, à l'occasion du XXXe anniversaire de son professorat*. Geneva. 153-74.
- Russo, J. 2011. 'Formula', in M. Finkelberg, ed. *The Homer Encyclopedia I*. Malden, Mass. 296-98.
- Sale, W. M. 1984. 'Homeric Olympus and its Formulae', *AJP* 105.1: 1-28.
- Scully, S. 2015. *Hesiod's Theogony: From Near Eastern Creation Myths to Paradise Lost*. Oxford.
- Shelmerdine, S. 1995. *The Homeric Hymns*. Newburyport, Mass.
- Solmsen, F. 1954. 'The Gift of Speech in Homer and Hesiod', *TAPA* 85: 1-15.
- Walcot, P. 1966. *Hesiod and the Near East*. Cardiff.
- Watkins, C. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford.
- Welcker, F. G. 1865. *Die Hesiodische Theogonie*. Elberfeld.
- West, M. L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford.

Choral Authority ἐν ζαθέῳ χρόνῳ: Epic, Dramatic, Pindaric and Platonic Representations of Ritual Interaction of Mortals and Immortals*

Lucia Athanassaki

Do choruses sing with authority on cultic occasions? Can they credibly lay claim to the titles μάντις and προφάτας that we sometimes find in first-person statements? Authoritative first-person statements are ordinarily considered the *sphragis* of the poet, whose poetic authority derives

* A shorter version of this paper was first presented at the Research Seminar of the Institute of Classical Studies in 2011. Warmest thanks to the participants in the stimulating discussion that followed and in particular to G. B. D'Alessio, A.-E. Peponi, R. M. Martin and Chris Carey, whom I also thank for the invitation, especially since after a discussion we had at the 'Authorship and Authority' conference at Yale it was clear to him that we did not see eye to eye in this matter. For stimulating feedback I also thank audiences at Delphi where oral versions were given at seminars for Swiss (2013) and Czech and Slovenian (2014) teachers of Ancient Greek. Many thanks to Ian C. Rutherford for reminding me of Apollo's role as a *chorēgos* of mortal choruses in the *Homerica Hymn to Apollo*, and to Ewen Bowie, Sophie Marianne Bocksberger, and an anonymous referee for their helpful comments and suggestions on this version.

I chose to offer this paper for the volume in honor of Jenny Strauss Clay because it features together the Muses, Apollo and Dionysus, deities that she has long thought and written about, but who also have a contemporary personal significance. Jenny and I have often visited Apollo's sanctuary and the Museum in Delphi together and have shared ideas about this enchanting company. As I say in the Preface, I first met her at Princeton in 1989, thanks to Daniel Mendelsohn who organized a dinner outing, but I got to know her well later, in the happy year I taught at the University of Virginia (1990-91). We have since kept in close touch, have travelled together a lot, and have spent time in Dionysiac and Apolline contexts. In addition to Delphi, there are three other places where Jenny is constantly in my mind any time I am there: Rome, Paris and Mykonos. The most momentous of all those fun travels and activities was undoubtedly our first trip to Mykonos in late May 1996.

¹ That was also my assumption in my early work on Pindar's epinicians, which however was a literary study of the inscribed persona that did not take into account the performative aspect; see Athanassaki 1990 with references to earlier bibliography. As Eva Stehle has rightly insisted time and again, however, in performance the first-person is that of the performer: see most recently Stehle 2017: 14-17. Differently: D'Alessio 1994, Kurke 2006 and more recently Carey 2017 and Marinis 2018.

from the Muse.¹ From Homer onward poets appeal to the Muses to impart their omniscience to them. The attribution of first-person authoritative statements to the poet, however, becomes much less straightforward in performance and even more so in choral performance. Pindar's *Sixth Paean* is a case in point:

- Πρὸς Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς σε, χρυσέ]α (1)
 κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ,
 λίσσομαι Χαρίτεσ-
 σίν τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτῃ,
 ἐν ζαθέῳ με δέξαι χρόνῳ (5)
 ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν
 ὕδατι γὰρ ἐπὶ χαλκοπύλῳ
 ψόφον αἰῶν Κασταλίας
 ὀρφανὸν ἀνδρῶν χορεύσιος ἦλθον
 ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν ἄ[λ]έξων (10)
 τεοῖσιν ἐμαῖς τε τιμ[α]ῖς·
 ἦτορι δὲ φίλῳ παῖς ἄτε ματέρι κεδνᾷ
 πειθόμενος κατέβαν στεφάνων
 καὶ θαλιᾷν τροφὸν ἄλσος Ἀ-
 πόλλωνος, τόθι Λατοῖδαν (15)
 θαμινὰ Δελφῶν κόραι
 χθονὸς ὀμφαλὸν παρὰ σκιάεντα μελπ[ό]μεναι
 ποδὶ κροτέο[ντι γὰν θο]ῶ
 [desunt vv. 19-49]
 καὶ πόθεν ἀθαν[άτων ἔρις ἄ]ρξατο. (50)
 ταῦτα θεοῖσι [μ]έν
 πιθεῖν σοφοῦ[ς] δυνατόν,
 βροτοῖσιν δ' ἀμάχανο[ν εὐ]ρέμεν
 ἀλλὰ παρθένοι γάρ, ἴσθ' ὅτ[ι], Μο[ῖ]σαι,
 πάντα, κε[λ]αι]νεφεῖ σὺν (55)
 πατρὶ Μναμοσ[ύν]α τε
 τοῦτον ἔσχετ[ε τεθ]' μόν,
 κλῦτε νῦν ἔρα[ται] δέ μο[ι] ~ ~ ~
 γλῶσσα μέλιτος ἄφρον γλυκὺν [
 ἀγῶνα Λοξία{ } καταβάντ' εὐρὺν (60)
 ἐν θεῶν ξενίᾳ.²

² The Pindaric quotations are taken from Maehler's edition, the translations are those of Race, occasionally modified.

In the name of Olympian Zeus, I beseech you, golden Pytho famous for seers, with the Graces and Aphrodite, welcome me in this holy time, the tuneful prophet of the Pierians. For having heard, by the water from the bronze gates, the murmur of Castalia devoid of men's dancing, I have come to ward off helplessness from your kinsmen and from my own honors. For in heeding my own heart, as a child obeys a dear mother, I have come to Apollo's precinct, nurse of crowns and feasts, where the maidens of Delphi often sing to Leto's son at the shady navel of the earth and beat the ground with a rapid foot...

[ll. 19-49 missing]

and as to whence the immortals strife began, it is possible for the gods to entrust that to wise men but mortals have no way to find it. But, virgin Muses, because you know all things—along with your father of the dark clouds and Mnemosyne you have that privilege—hear me now. My tongue longs (to sing?) the sweet essence of honey...having come to the broad gathering for Loxias in the guest-feast of the gods.

In performance the authoritative first-person statement 'ἰοίδιμον Περίδων προφάταν' can designate the poet only if we imagine Pindar singing this paean. If we imagine, however, Bacchylides singing solo Pindar's *Sixth Paean* in Delphi, he would be the 'tuneful prophet of the Muses' in that particular performance. In this scenario those in the audience who were familiar with Pindar's song or mannerism would probably recognize that Bacchylides was singing a song composed by Pindar. Yet for the duration of that hypothetical performance, Bacchylides would embody the inscribed authoritative persona. This is also true when the performer is a chorus. A Delphian, an Aeginetan or any other chorus would embody the persona of the 'prophet of the Muses' in performance.³ If Pindar was the leader of the chorus, he would share with the choreuts the collective authoritative persona. I shall come back to the authoritative persona in performance in the

³ I agree with Stehle 1997:15, who points out that in the course of the performance 'what mattered was not whether the performers had put together the text but the fact they affirmed it by speaking the words in public.' See also Stehle 2017.

last section of this paper.

My purpose is not to revive the old debate on the *persona loquens* and mode of performance.⁴ Taking my lead from recent stimulating scholarship on *choreia*, I wish to explore a related, but different question.⁵ I shall ask if melic choruses were thought to have the authority which the poets sometimes make them claim in performance and, if they did, what the origin and nature of choral authority was. I shall argue that, like poets, choruses were believed to have authority too, which they derived from their interaction with gods. The evidence that I shall adduce shows that, unlike poets, melic choruses did not ordinarily claim divine omniscience, but as a rule cultic and telestic authority, i.e. the knowledge and competence to perform correctly the appropriate worshipping acts on cultic occasions.⁶ I shall also discuss briefly Pindar's *Eighth Paean*, which is an exception to this rule: the *Eighth Paean* is a rare piece of evidence showing that gods were thought of imparting their omniscience not only to poets, but to choruses as well. I shall argue, moreover, that a belief in choral authority is explicitly articulated in the *Laws* by Plato, who invests choral authority with both mastery of truth and expertise in cultic etiquette.

The following discussion begins with Plato's account of choral authority in the *Laws* and traces it back to select epic, dramatic and melic representations of interaction of mortals with immortals on cultic occasions. Specifically, Plato's account of the interaction of mortals with immortals will be read against representations in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Euripides' *Heracles* and *Bacchae*, Aristophanes' *Frogs*, Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, and Pindar's *Eighth Paean* (fr. 52i), the first *Partheneion* (fr. 94a), his *Dithyramb for the Athenians* (fr. 75), and his *Sixth Paean* (fr. 52f).

I. Plato's *Laws*: the origin and nature of choral authority

In the *Laws* (653e-654b) the Athenian states that the gods appointed Apollo, the Muses and Dionysus as the mortals' fellow-celebrants and fellow-choreuts, and equates *choreia* with *paideia* which originates from

⁴ For the debate see Lefkowitz 1988, Heath 1988, Burnett 1989, Carey 1989, Heath and Lefkowitz 1991, Carey 1991, Morgan 1993, D'Alessio 1994, Nagy 1994, and Lefkowitz 1995. For the identity of the speaker in the *Sixth Paean* see Kurke 2006 who, following D'Alessio 1994 and others, opts for the poet. For Pindaric poetic authority see now Maslov 2015: 178-212. Maslov's study came to my attention after this paper was completed. I have therefore been unable to integrate here several important points that bear indirectly on my thesis.

⁵ Kurke 2013, Peponi 2009, Peponi 2013a, Peponi 2013b, and Prauscello 2014.

⁶ For modern accounts of the ritual and power see Kowalzig 2007: 44-52 with references.

Apollo and the Muses:

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ. Καλῶς τοίνυν. τούτων γὰρ δὴ τῶν ὀρθῶς τεθραμμένων ἡδονῶν καὶ λυπῶν παιδείων οὐσῶν χαλᾷται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ διαφθείρεται κατὰ πολλὰ ἐν τῷ βίῳ, θεοὶ (d.) δὲ οἰκτίραντες τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπίπονον πεφυκὸς γένος, ἀναπαύλας τε αὐτοῖς τῶν πόνων ἐτάξαντο τὰς τῶν ἐορτῶν ἀμοιβὰς τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ Μούσας Ἀπόλλωνά τε μουσηγέτην καὶ Διόνυσον συνεορταστὰς ἔδοσαν, ἵν' ἐπανορθῶνται, τὰς τε τροφὰς γενομένας ἐν ταῖς ἐορταῖς μετὰ θεῶν. ὅρᾱν ἃ χρὴ πότερον ἀληθῆς ἡμῖν κατὰ φύσιν ὁ λόγος ὑμνεῖται τὰ νῦν, ἢ πῶς. φησὶν δὲ τὸ νέον ἅπαν ὥς ἔπος εἰπεῖν τοῖς τε σώμασι καὶ ταῖς φωναῖς ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν οὐ δύνασθαι, (e.) κινεῖσθαι δὲ αἰεὶ ζητεῖν καὶ φθέγγεσθαι, τὰ μὲν ἀλλόμενα καὶ σκιρτῶντα, οἶον ὀρχούμενα μεθ' ἡδονῆς καὶ προσπαίζοντα, τὰ δὲ φθειγγόμενα πάσας φωνάς. τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα ζῶα οὐκ ἔχειν αἴσθησιν τῶν ἐν ταῖς κινήσεσιν τάξεων οὐδὲ ἀταξιῶν, οἷς δὴ ῥυθμὸς ὄνομα καὶ ἀρμονία· ἡμῖν δὲ οὐς (654a.) εἶπομεν τοὺς θεοὺς συγχορευτὰς δεδόσθαι, τούτους εἶναι καὶ τοὺς δεδωκότας τὴν ἔνρυσθμόν τε καὶ ἐναρμόνιον αἴσθησιν μεθ' ἡδονῆς, ἥ δὴ κινεῖν τε ἡμᾶς καὶ χορηγεῖν ἡμῶν τούτους, ᾧδαίς τε καὶ ὀρχήσεσιν ἀλλήλοις συνεύροντας, χοροὺς τε ὠνομακέναι παρὰ τὸ τῆς χαρᾶς ἔμφυτον ὄνομα. πρῶτον δὲ τοῦτο ἀποδεξώμεθα; θῶμεν παιδείαν εἶναι πρῶτην διὰ Μουσῶν τε καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος, ἢ πῶς;

ΚΛΕΙΝΙΑΣ. Οὕτως.

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ. Οὐκοῦν ὁ μὲν ἀπαιδευτὸς ἀχόρευτος ἡμῖν ἔσται, τὸν (b.) δὲ πεπαιδευμένον ἱκανῶς κεχορευκὸτα θετέον;

ΚΛΕΙΝΙΑΣ. τί μήν;⁷

(Plato, *Laws* 653e-654b)

ATHENIAN. Very good. Now these forms of education, which consist in right discipline in pleasures and pains, grow slack and weakened to a great extent [653d] in the course of men's lives; so the gods, in pity for the human race thus born to misery, have ordained the feasts of thanksgiving as periods of respite from their troubles; and they have granted them as companions in their feasts the Muses and Apollo the master of music, and

⁷ The Platonic quotations are taken from Burnet's edition, the translations are those of Bury modified.

Dionysus, that they may at least set right again their modes of discipline by associating in their feasts with gods. We must consider, then, whether the account that is harped on nowadays is true to nature. What it says is that, almost without exception, every young creature is incapable of keeping either its body or its tongue quiet, [653e] and is always striving to move and to cry, leaping and skipping and delighting in dances and games, and uttering, also, noises of every description. Now, whereas all other creatures are devoid of any perception of the various kinds of order and disorder in movement (which we term rhythm and harmony), to men the very gods, who were given, as we said, to be our fellows in the dance, have granted the pleasurable perception of rhythm and harmony, whereby they cause us to move [654a] and lead our choruses, linking us one with another by means of songs and dances; and to the choruses they have given its name from the ‘cheer’ implanted therein. Shall we accept this account to begin with, and postulate that education owes its origin to Apollo and the Muses?

CLEINIAS. Yes.

ATHENIAN. Shall we assume that the uneducated man is without choral training, [654b] and the educated man fully chorally trained?

CLEINIAS. Certainly.

In this passage Plato thinks of the festivals as the occasions where the association of mortals with the Muses, Apollo and Dionysus offers the opportunity to set right the correct discipline in pleasures and pains. In other words, the main purpose of the association of mortals with immortals is *paideia*, as becomes clear in the conclusion the two intelocutors reach: ὁ μὲν ἀπαίδευτος ἀχόρευτος ἡμῖν ἔσται, τὸν δὲ πεπαιδευμένον ἱκανῶς κεχορευκότα θετέον; It is worth noting that in this particular account the instruction of mortals by the Muses and

⁸ The unmediated interaction of mortals and immortals is an aetiological account, for elsewhere in the *Laws* there is mention of human intermediaries, as for instance in Book 2 (656c) or in Book 7 (816bd), where the mortal *nomophylax* plays an important role in choral training, which is similar to the one that the *hēgemōn tou Dionysou* plays in the symposium. Cf. Kurke 2013, who correlates this passage with the puppet imagery mainly in Book One, but also in Book Seven as well as some passages in the *Timaeus*, and argues in favor of a highly regulated instruction (146): ‘... it is perhaps relevant that the relation of the puppet to the puppet master is necessarily a mimetic one:

Apollo is totally unmediated by mortal teachers.⁸ Mortal choreuts are here represented as having the same unmediated relationship with Apollo and the Muses as Homer and Hesiod and all other masters of truth claimed for themselves. Yet the context of interaction of human choreuts with the gods is different from the contexts of the poets' interaction with the Muses. Unlike the Homeric Muse whose location is left vague and the Hesiodic Muses who visit the poet in his haunt on Mt. Helicon, the context of human and divine interaction envisaged in the *Laws* is the festival. The gods interact with mortals at sacred places and times. The designation of Apollo, the Muses and Dionysus as fellow-choreuts (συγχορευταί), chorus-leaders (χορηγοί), and fellow-celebrants (συνεορτασταί), suggests that they are imagined as being present on these festive occasions, guiding the minds, the voices, the steps, and the actions of mortals.

It comes as no surprise that a little later the choruses who are guided by the gods and perform in their imagined presence are said to sing and dance truthful and authoritative songs:

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ. Πρῶτον μὲν τοίνυν ὁ Μουσῶν χορὸς ὁ παιδικὸς ὀρθότατ' ἂν εἰσίοι πρῶτος τὰ τοιαῦτα εἰς τὸ μέσον ἄσόμενος ἀπάσῃ σπουδῇ καὶ ὅλῃ τῇ πόλει, δεῦτερος δὲ ὁ μέχρι τριάκοντα ἑτῶν, τὸν τε Παιᾶνα ἐπικαλούμενος μάρτυρα τῶν λεγομένων ἀληθείας πέρι καὶ τοῖς νέοις ἴλεων μετὰ πειθοῦς γίγνεσθαι ἐπευχόμενος. δεῖ δὲ δὴ καὶ ἔτι τρίτους τοὺς ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἔτη μέχρι τῶν ἐξήκοντα γεγονότας ἄδειν τοὺς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα—οὐ γὰρ ἔτι δυνατοὶ φέρειν ὥδās—μυθολόγους περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἡθῶν διὰ θείας φήμης καταλελειφθαι.

(Plato, *Laws* 664cd)

ATHENIAN: First, then, the right order of procedure will be for the Muses' chorus of children to come forward first into the middle to sing these things with the utmost vigor and before the whole city; second will come the chorus of those under

to move the puppet, the puppet master must make the same motions himself, only more subtly. This offers us a concrete image to think the kinship or attraction of like to like. Thus just as the Chorus of fixed stars circles endlessly in the heavens, human beings—each of us a puppet suspended from his 'companion star'—circle below in the city's dances, which simultaneously rectify our internal revolutions of nous even as they unite all the citizens in ordered harmony." (ibid 146).

thirty, invoking Apollo Paian as witness of the truth of what is said and uttering a persuasive prayer that he be propitious to the youth.⁹ [664d] The next singers will be the third chorus, of those over thirty and under sixty; and lastly, there are left those who, being no longer able to uplift the song, shall handle the same moral themes in stories that have divine authority.

The chorus instructed by Apollo will invoke their divine teacher to witness the truthfulness of their song (τόν τε Παιᾶνα ἐπικαλούμενος μάρτυρα τῶν λεγομένων ἀληθείας πέρι).¹⁰ Evidently this chorus, who derive their authority directly from Apollo, their συγχορευτής and χορηγός, will make an assertion familiar to Plato's audience from Homer onward. The Athenian represents the Apolline chorus as a master of truth, thus attributing to the chorus the kind of authority that we normally associate with the poets. It is worth noting that the chorus' prayer must not only be truthful, but it must convince the god to be propitious to the youth.¹¹ How and why can the chorus persuade the god to be propitious? The Athenian does not offer an explanation, but he must have the '*do ut des*' principle in mind. Like sacrifice, choral performance is an offering whose purpose is to delight the gods and secure their benevolence and their willingness to grant the wishes of mortals. Plato's emphasis here is on content, namely the truthfulness and the rhetorical effectiveness of the choral song dance. Although Plato does not comment on the artistic competence of this chorus, it is reasonable to assume that the chorus who have the opportunity to dance with Apollo are expected to produce a perfect audiovisual show. If this is so, the Apolline chorus' performance will be authoritative in every respect. Its authority derives from their divine συγχορευτής and is rooted in cultic practice.¹²

Plato's focus is on the educational advantage of Apollo's and the Muses' *chorēgia* for the young, namely the enactment of *aretē*, but he of-

⁹ Contrary to the *communis opinio*, I construe μετὰ πειθοῦς with ἐπευχόμενος. The alternative (ἵλεων μετὰ πειθοῦς) yields a less satisfactory meaning: see for instance Bury's translation 'praying him of his grace to persuade the youth' which does not explain why Apollo needs to persuade the youth, or Meyer 2015 'praying that he grace the youth with persuasion' restricts unnecessarily the meaning of ἵλεων. I assume that the chorus prays to Apollo to be propitious in every respect.

¹⁰ For Apollo as a guarantor of truth see Calame 2013: 95.

¹¹ For this meaning see above n. 9.

¹² It is worth noting that those over sixty who can no longer sing and dance will tell stories that have divine authority too.

fers us a glimpse into Dionysus' contribution as fellow-celebrant (συνεορταστής). In this case, Plato mentions the human intermediaries between the god and mortal celebrants, the νομοθέτης and the ἡγεμὼν τοῦ Διονύσου who must be over sixty years old and have the authority to prescribe proper sympotic ritual:

671 (a.) ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ. καὶ ὅπερ ὁ λόγος ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἐβουλήθη, τὴν τῷ τοῦ Διονύσου χορῷ βοήθειαν ἐπιδείξει καλῶς λεγομένην, εἰς δύνανται εἴρηκεν σκοπώμεθα δὴ εἰ τοῦθ' οὕτω γέγονεν. Θορυβῶδης μὲν που ὁ σύλλογος ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐξ ἀνάγκης προϊούσης τῆς πόσεως ἐπὶ μᾶλλον αἰεὶ συμβαίνει γιγνόμενος, ὅπερ ὑπεθέμεθα κατ' ἀρχὰς ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι γίγνεσθαι περὶ τῶν νῦν (b.) λεγομένων. ΚΛΕΙΝΙΑΣ. Ἀνάγκη.

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ. Πᾶς δέ γε αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ κουφότερος αἴρεται καὶ γέγηθέν τε καὶ παρρησίας ἐμπίμπλαται καὶ ἀνηκουστίας ἐν τῷ τοιοῦτῳ τῶν πέλας, ἄρχων δ' ἰκανὸς ἀξιοῖ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων γεγονέναι.

ΚΛΕΙΝΙΑΣ. Τί μήν;

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ. Οὐκοῦν ἔφαμεν, ὅταν γίγνηται ταῦτα, καθάπερ τινὰ σίδηρον τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν πινόντων διαπύρους γιγνομένας μαλθακωτέρας γίγνεσθαι καὶ νεωτέρας, ὥστε εὐαγῶγους (c.) συμβαίνειν τῷ δυναμένῳ τε καὶ ἐπισταμένῳ παιδεύειν τε καὶ πλάττειν, καθάπερ ὅτ' ἦσαν νέαι; τοῦτον δ' εἶναι τὸν πλάστην τὸν αὐτὸν ὥσπερ τότε, τὸν ἀγαθὸν νομοθέτην, οὗ νόμους εἶναι δεῖ συμποτικούς, δυναμένους τὸν εὖελπιν καὶ θαρραλέον ἐκείνον γιγνόμενον καὶ ἀναισχυντότερον τοῦ δέοντος, καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλοντα τάξιν καὶ τὸ κατὰ μέρος σιγῆς καὶ λόγου καὶ πόσεως καὶ μουσικῆς ὑπομένειν, ἐθέλειν ποιεῖν πάντα τούτοις τάναντία, καὶ εἰσιόντι τῷ μὴ καλῷ θάρρει (d.) τὸν κάλλιστον διαμαχόμενον φόβον εἰσπέμπειν οἴους τ' εἶναι μετὰ δίκης, ὃν αἰδῶ τε καὶ αἰσχύνην θεῖον φόβον ὠνομάκαμεν;

ΚΛΕΙΝΙΑΣ. Ἔστιν ταῦτα.

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ. Τούτων δέ γε τῶν νόμων εἶναι νομοφύλακας καὶ συνδημιουργοὺς αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἀθορύβους καὶ νήφοντας τῶν μὴ νηφόντων στρατηγούς, ὧν δὴ χωρὶς μέθης διαμάχεσθαι δεινότερον ἢ πολεμίοις εἶναι μὴ μετὰ ἀρχόντων ἀθορύβων, καὶ τὸν αὖ μὴ δυνάμενον ἐθέλειν πείθεσθαι τούτοις καὶ τοῖς (e.) ἡγεμόσιν τοῖς τοῦ Διονύσου, τοῖς ὑπὲρ ἐξήκοντα ἔτη γεγονόσιν, ἴσην καὶ μείζω

τὴν αἰσχύνῃν φέρειν ἢ τὸν τοῖς τοῦ Ἄρεως ἀπειθοῦντα ἄρχουσιν.
ΚΛΕΙΝΙΑΣ. Ὅρθῳς.

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ. Οὐκοῦν εἴ γε εἴη τοιαύτη μὲν μέθη, τοιαύτη δὲ
παιδιά, μὴ οὐκ ὠφελῆθέντες ἂν οἱ τοιοῦτοι συμπόται καὶ μᾶλλον
φίλοι ἢ πρότερον ἀπαλλάττοντο ἀλλήλων, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ τὰ
νῦν ἐχθροί, κατὰ νόμους δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν συνουσίαν συγγενόμενοι
καὶ ἀκολουθήσαντες, ὅποτε ἀφηγοῖντο οἱ νήφοντες τοῖς μὴ
νήφουσιν;

(Plato, *Laws* 671a-e)

ATHENIAN. The primary intention of our argument, which was to demonstrate that our defence of the Dionysiac chorus was justifiable, has now been carried out to the best of our ability. Let us consider if that is really so. Such a gathering inevitably tends, as the drinking proceeds, to grow ever more and more uproarious; and in the case of the present day gatherings that is, as we said at the outset, an inevitable result.

CLEINIAS. Inevitable.

ATHENIAN. Everyone is uplifted above his normal self, and is merry and bubbles over with loquacious audacity himself, while turning a deaf ear to his neighbors, and regards himself as competent to rule both himself and everyone else.

CLEINIAS. To be sure.

ATHENIAN. And did we not say that when this takes place, the souls of the drinkers turn softer, like iron, through being heated, and younger too; whence they become ductile, just as when they were young, in the hands of the man who has the skill and the ability to train and mould them. And now, even as then, the man who is to mould them is the good legislator; he must lay down banqueting laws, able to control that banqueter who becomes confident and bold and unduly shameless, and unwilling to submit to the proper limits of silence and speech, of drinking and of music, making him consent to do in all ways the opposite,— laws able also, with the aid of justice, to fight against the entrance of such ignoble audacity, by bringing in that most noble fear which we have named 'modesty' and 'shame.'

CLEINIAS. That is so.

ATHENIAN. And as law-wardens of these laws and cooperators

therewith, there must be sober and sedate men to act as commanders over the un-sober; for to fight drunkenness without these would be a more formidable task than to fight enemies without sedate leaders. Any man who refuses willingly to obey these men and the officers of Dionysus (who are over sixty years of age) shall incur as much disgrace as the man who disobeys the officers of Ares, and even more.

CLEINIAS. Quite right.

ATHENIAN. If such was the character of the drinking and of the recreation, would not such fellow-drinkers be the better for it, and part from one another better friends than before, instead of enemies, as now? For they would be guided by laws in all their intercourse, and would listen to the directions given to the un-sober by the sober.

The duty of the legislator will be to establish drinking laws (νόμους συμποτικών) and to decide the right proportion of silence, speech, drinking and singing (τὸ κατὰ μέρος σιγῆς καὶ λόγου καὶ πόσεως καὶ μούσης). The duty of the *nomophylakes* or *hēgemones* of Dionysus is to oversee the observation of the instituted ritual and the proper conduct of fellow-drinkers, which should be characterized by modesty and shame (αἰδώς and αἰσχύνῃ). As in the case of the three choruses, the authority of the legislator and the drinking ritual he prescribes derive ultimately from Dionysus συνεορταστής.

Lucia Prauscello has drawn attention to the assimilation of the educative processes of sympotic and choral training in terms of diction and imagery already in Book 1:¹³

ΚΛΕΙΝΙΑΣ. συμποσίου δὲ ὀρθῶς παιδαγωγηθέντος τί μέγα ἰδιώταις ἢ τῇ πόλει γίγναιτ' ἄν;

ΑΘ. Τί δέ; παιδὸς ἑνὸς ἢ καὶ χοροῦ παιδαγωγηθέντος κατὰ τρόπον ἑνός, τί μέγα τῇ πόλει φαίμεν ἂν γίγνεσθαι; ἢ τοῦτο οὕτως ἐρωτηθέντες εἵπομεν ἂν ὡς ἑνὸς μὲν βραχύ τι τῇ πόλει γίγναιτ' ἂν ὄφελος, εἰ δ' ὅλως ἐρωτᾷς παιδείαν τῶν παιδευθέντων τί μέγα τὴν πόλιν ὀνήνησιν, οὐ χαλεπὸν εἰπεῖν ὅτι παιδευθέντες μὲν εὖ γίγναιτ' ἂν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί, γενόμενοι δὲ τοιοῦτοι τὰ τε ἄλλα

¹³ Prauscello 2014: 112.

πράττοιεν καλῶς, ἔτι δὲ κἄν νικῶεν τοὺς πολεμίους μαχόμενοι. παιδεία μὲν οὖν φέρει καὶ νίκη, νίκη δ' ἐνίστε ἀπαιδευσίαν πολλοὶ γὰρ ὕβριστότεροι διὰ πολέμων νίκας γενόμενοι μυρίων ἄλλων κακῶν δι' ὕβριν ἐνεπλήσθησαν, καὶ παιδεία μὲν οὐδεπώποτε γέγονεν Καδμεία, νῖκαι δὲ ἀνθρώποις πολλαὶ δὴ τοιαῦται γεγόνασιν τε καὶ ἔσονται.

(Plato, *Laws* 641bc)

CLEINIAS. But what solid advantage would accrue [641b] either to individuals or to a State from the right regulation of a wine-party?

ATHENIAN. Well, what great gain should we say would accrue to the State from the right control of one single child or even of one band of children? To the question thus put to us we should reply that the State would benefit but little from one; if, however, you are putting a general question as to what solid advantage the State gains from the education of the educated, then it is quite simple to reply that well-educated men will prove good men, and being good they will conquer their foes in battle, [641c] besides acting nobly in other ways. Thus, while education brings also victory, victory sometimes brings lack of education for men have often grown more insolent because of victory in war, and through their insolence they have become filled with countless other vices; and whereas education has never yet proved to be 'Cadmeian,' the victories which men win in war often have been, and will be, 'Cadmeian.'

In Book 2 the account of the Muses, Apollo and Dionysus as fellow-choreuts and fellow-celebrants offers an explanation and a justification of the close association of sympotic and choral training in the passage from Book 1 cited above: the city will profit from citizens who have been educated by the gods how to sing and dance truthful stories, how to worship the gods properly, and how to enjoy themselves decorously at their symposia.

Plato's account of the Muses, Apollo and Dionysus as συγχορευταὶ and συνεορτασταὶ in the *Laws* illustrates the divine origin and nature of choral authority. Choral authority derives from the mortals' unmediated access to divine instruction in cultic, ritual and ethical matters. The

reason for the choruses' unmediated access to divine instruction must be related to Plato's well-known objections to poets and traditional performances. We have seen that in the *Laws* choral authority is simultaneously the ability to sing true stories and expertise in cultic etiquette. The select epic, dramatic and melic representations to which we may now turn indicate that Plato elaborates and theorizes on ideas that were already widespread.

II. Apollo as συγχορευτής and συνεορταστής in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*

Apollo, the far-shooter, is not a god who mingles easily with mortals.¹⁴ As a rule, he is represented as the leader of the immortal chorus of the Muses (μουσαγέτας).¹⁵ In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, however, he is represented as a συγχορευτής and a συνεορταστής of mortals in the prototypical sacrifice and song-dance performance in his honor.

Τοὺς δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων
ξείνοι, τοὶ Κνωσὸν πολυδένδρεον ἀμφινέμεσθε (475)

τὸ πρὶν, ἀτὰρ νῦν οὐκ ἔθ' ὑπότροποι αὐτίς ἔσεσθε
ἔς τε πόλιν ἐρατὴν καὶ δώματα καλὰ ἕκαστος
ἔς τε φίλας ἀλόχους, ἀλλ' ἐνθάδε πίονα νηὸν
ἔξετ' ἐμὸν πολλοῖσι τετιμένον ἀνθρώποισιν
εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ Διὸς υἱός, Ἀπόλλων δ' εὖχομαι εἶναι, (480)

ὑμέας δ' ἥγαγον ἐνθάδ' ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης
οὐ τι κακὰ φρονέων, ἀλλ' ἐνθάδε πίονα νηὸν
ἔξετ' ἐμὸν πᾶσιν μάλα τίμιον ἀνθρώποισι,
βουλὰς τ' ἀθανάτων εἰδήσετε, τῶν ἰότητι
αἰεὶ τιμήσεσθε διαμπερὲς ἥματα πάντα. (485)

ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἴπω πείθεσθε τάχιστα·
ἰστία μὲν πρῶτον κάθετον λύσαντε βοείας,
νῆα δ' ἔπειτα θοὴν ἂν ἐπ' ἠπείρου ἐρύσασθε,
ἐκ δὲ κτήμαθ' ἔλεσθε καὶ ἔντεα νηὸς ἔϊσας,
καὶ βωμὸν ποιήσατ' ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης, (490)

¹⁴ For Apollo's distance from mortals, see also Kakridis 2009.

¹⁵ In the *Laws* Plato keeps the designation *mousagetes* even when he represents Apollo as the leader of the Second chorus of Magnesia, which indicates that that role had become an integral part of his identity.

πῦρ ἐπικαίοντες ἐπὶ τ' ἄλφιστα λευκὰ θύοντες·
 εὐχεσθαι δὴ ἔπειτα παριστάμενοι περὶ βωμόν.
 ὥς μὲν ἐγὼ τὸ πρῶτον ἐν ἡεροειδέϊ πόντῳ
 εἰδόμενος δελφίνι θεῆς ἐπὶ νηὸς ὄρουσα,
 ὥς ἐμοὶ εὐχεσθαι δελφινίῳ· αὐτὰρ ὁ βωμὸς (495)
 αὐτὸς δέλφειος καὶ ἐπόψιος ἔσσεται αἰεὶ.
 δειπνήσαι τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα θεῇ παρὰ νηϊ μελαίνῃ,
 καὶ σπεῖσαι μακάρεσσι θεοῖς οἱ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν σίτοιο μελίφρονος ἐξ ἔρον ἦσθε,
 ἔρχεσθαι θ' ἄμ' ἐμοὶ καὶ ἱππαιήον' αἰεῖδιν (500)
 εἰς ὃ κε χῶρον ἵκησθον ἴν' ἔξετε πίονα νηόν.
 [...]

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο
 βάν ρ' ἔμεν ἦρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων
 φόρμιγγ' ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔχων ἐρατὸν κιθαρίζων (515)
 καλὰ καὶ ὕψι βιβιάς· οἱ δὲ ῥήσσοντες ἔποντο
 Κρήτες πρὸς Πυθῶ καὶ ἱππαιήον' αἰεδον,
 οἱοί τε Κρητῶν παιήονες οἱσὶ τε Μοῦσα
 ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔθηκε θεὰ μελίγηρυν ἀοιδήν.
 ἄκμητοι δὲ λόφον προσέβαν ποσὶν, αἶψα δ' ἴκοντο (520)
 Παρνησὸν καὶ χῶρον ἐπήρατον ἔνθ' ἄρ' ἔμελλεν
 οἰκῆσιν πολλοῖσι τετιμένους ἀνθρώποισι·
 δεῖξε δ' ἄγων ἄδυτον ζάθεον καὶ πίονα νηόν.¹⁶

(*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 474-501, 513-23)

Then far-working Apollo answered them and said: [475]
 'Strangers who once dwelt about wooded Cnossos but now shall
 return no more each to his loved city and fair house and dear
 wife; here shall you keep my rich temple that is honored by
 many men. [480] I am the son of Zeus; Apollo is my name: but
 you I brought here over the wide gulf of the sea, meaning you
 no hurt; nay, here you shall keep my rich temple that is greatly
 honored among men, and you shall know the plans of the death-
 less gods, and by their will [485] you shall be honored continually
 for all time. And now come, make haste and do as I say. First
 loose the sheets and lower the sail, and then draw the swift ship

¹⁶ The Greek quotation and the English translation are taken from Evelyn-White's edition.

up upon the land. Take out your goods and the gear of the straight ship, [490] and make an altar upon the beach of the sea: light fire upon it and make an offering of white meal. Next, stand side by side around the altar and pray: and in as much as at the first on the hazy sea I sprang upon the swift ship in the form of a dolphin, [495] pray to me as Apollo Delphinus; also the altar itself shall be called Delphinus and overlooking forever. Afterwards, sup beside your dark ship and pour an offering to the blessed gods who dwell on Olympus. But when you have put away craving for sweet food, [500] come with me singing the hymn *Ie Paean* (Hail, Healer!), until you come to the place where you shall keep my rich temple.'

[...]

Then they took their meal by the swift, black ship, and poured an offering to the blessed gods who dwell on Olympus. And when they had put away craving for drink and food, they started out with the lord Apollo, the son of Zeus, to lead them, [515] holding a lyre in his hands, and playing sweetly as he stepped high and featly. So the Cretans followed him to Pytho, marching in time as they chanted the *Ie Paean* after the manner of the Cretan paean-singers and of those in whose hearts the heavenly Muse has put sweet-voiced song. [520] With tireless feet they approached the ridge and straightway came to Parnassus and the lovely place where they were to dwell honored by many men. There Apollo brought them and showed them his most holy sanctuary and rich temple.

Apollo gives the Cretan sailors and priests-to-be a set of cultic instructions: to build an altar, to sacrifice, to pray to him as Apollo Delphinus, to make libation to the other gods, and finally to sing paeans. The Cretans do as the god orders, but when time comes for singing the paean, Apollo comes to them and places himself at the head of their chorus, whom he leads, playing his lyre, from the shore to his sanctuary on Mt. Parnassus (ἦρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων/ φόρμιγγ' ἐν χεῖρεσσιν ἔχων ἐρατὸν κιθαρίζων/καλὰ καὶ ὕψι βιβάς, 514-16).¹⁷

Thus in the prototypical rite in his honor on the way to his Pythian

¹⁷ For the significance of Apollo's choice of Cretan priests, see Clay 1989: 74-94.

sanctuary mortals receive unmediated cultic instructions and choral guidance from Apollo, who is represented as a fellow-celebrant, fellow-choreut and *chorēgos*.¹⁸ The thematic similarity between this representation and Plato's account in the *Laws* suggests that in portraying the gods as συγχορευταί and συνεορτασταί Plato may have had the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* in mind.¹⁹

III. Dramatic representations of gods as fellow-choreuts and fellow-celebrants

This section offers a brief survey of selected representations of gods as συγχορευταί and συνεορτασταί in tragedy and comedy. Since tragedy stages the limits of human knowledge and the consequences of ignorance and errors of judgement, the authority of choral pronouncements concerning future events will be examined both within and outside the dramatic reality.²⁰ In other words, tragic choruses are, as a rule, as ignorant as the other *dramatis personae*, despite their occasional claims to the opposite. For the purposes of my discussion, I shall examine the cultic merits their authoritative statements would have, if they were pronounced in non-dramatic contexts.

(i) The chorus of the Muses as fellow-choreuts in Euripides' *Heracles*

In the Second Stasimon of Euripides' *Heracles* the chorus cast themselves as eternal choreuts who, despite their advanced age, still sing and dance and hope never to cease singing of the Muses who have made them dance (αἶ μ' ἐχόρευσαν, 686):

οὐ πάύσομαι τὰς Χάριτας
ταῖς Μούσαισιν συγκαταμει-
γνύς, ἡδίσταν συζυγίαν.
μὴ ζῶην μετ' ἄμουσίας,
αἰεὶ δ' ἐν στεφάνοισιν εἶην·

675

¹⁸ For Apollo as leader of the Cretan chorus, see also Nagy 2009.

¹⁹ For the reception of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* in Athens, see Nagy 2011. Lonsdale 1994/95: 34-37 touches briefly on the affinities between the hymn and a couple of passages in Plato's *Laws*, but only in relation to the divine performance on Olympus (182-206) and the festival on Delos (146-76). As Sophie Bocksberger points out to me, these ideas may have been more widespread than our evidence allows us to establish. In such a case Plato could of course have in mind many other accounts that have not survived.

²⁰ For some important points of contact between melic and tragic choruses, see Bacon 1994/95. For the Chorus' awareness of their ritual authority in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*, see Kavoulaki 2011.

ἔτι τοι γέρων ἀοιδὸς
 κελαδῶ Μναμοσύναν,
 ἔτι τὰν Ἡρακλέους
 καλλίνικον ἀεῖδω
 παρά τε Βρόμιον οἶνοδόταν
 παρά τε χέλνους ἐπτατόνου
 μολπὰν καὶ Λίβυν αὐλόν.
 οὔπω καταπαύσομεν
 Μούσας αἱ μ' ἐχόρευσαν.
 παιᾶνα μὲν Δηλιάδες
 <ναῶν> ὕμνοῦσ' ἀμφὶ πύλας
 τὸν Λατοῦς εὐπαιδα γόνον,
 εἰλίσσουσαι καλλίχοροι·
 παιᾶνας δ' ἐπὶ σοῖς μελάθροις
 κύκνος ὥς γέρων ἀοιδὸς
 πολιᾶν ἐκ γενύων
 κελαδήσω·
 τὸ γὰρ εὔ
 τοῖς ὕμνοισιν ὑπάρχει.²¹

(Euripides, *Heracles* 673-96)

I shall not cease mingling the Graces and the Muses, a union most sweet. May I never live a Museless life! Ever may I go garlanded! Old singer that I am I still sing the praise of Mnemosyne, still hymn Heracles' glorious victory in company with Bacchus giver of wine, in company with the song of the seven-stringed tortoise shell and the Libyan pipe. Never shall I check the Muses who have made me dance! A paean about their temple gates the maidens of Delos sing to the fair son of Leto, weaving their lovely dance steps. And paeans about your house I, an aged singer, swan-like from my hoary throat shall pour forth. For the power of right is in my hymns.

What is the precise meaning of the choral assertion 'we will never cease to worship the Muses *who made me dance*' (685-86)?²² I suggest that their assertion can be better understood if interpreted in the light

²¹ The Greek quotation and the English translation are taken from Kovacs' edition.

²² For Euripides' predilection for χορεύω in a causative sense, see Bond 1981: 243 ad 686. Yossi's translation (Τις Μούσες δεν εγκαταλείπω/που με δεχτήκαν στον χορό τους ['I do not abandon

of the gods as fellow-choreuts in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and the *Laws*. In other words, in the *Heracles* the elders think of themselves as disciples of the Muses, very much in the way that the Cretan sailors are in effect the disciples of Apollo, who leads their dance in the archetypal performance of the paeon in the *Homeric Hymn*. This interpretation is supported by the parallelism of this chorus' song-dance with the Deliades' song-dance through the *παιᾶνα μέν/παιᾶνας δέ* construction in lines 687 and 691 respectively.²³ Through the parallelism of their performance with the *choreia* of the Deliades, the archetypal dancers of Apollo, the old men allude to the divine origin and quality of their song-dance.²⁴

Prauscello, who also reads the Euripidean stasimon against Plato's *Laws*, argues that Plato echoes it in 666ac and offers the attractive suggestion that the Euripidean choral ode indicates that Dionysus and Apollo were already 'fellow-choreuts' with each other (*συγχορευταί*), and this within the cultic landscape of the Athenian polis.²⁵ Through the deliberate echo of a passage where Apollo and Dionysus are represented as fellow-choreuts, Prauscello continues, Plato by-passes the musical heritage of the New Dithyramb and bridges the gap between Dionysus and Apollo by exploiting Athenian cult practices.²⁶

(ii) Dionysus *συγχορευτής* in Euripides' *Bacchae*

Considerations of space do not allow thorough discussion of Dionysus as fellow-celebrant and choreut in the *Bacchae*. I therefore restrict myself to drawing attention to two passages that are relevant to our discussion, namely Dionysus' announcement of his imminent participation in the Bacchic chorus on Cithaeron and the chorus' authoritative statement, 'all the earth will dance' (114):

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ

ἐγὼ δὲ βάκχαις, ἐς Κιθαιρῶνος πτυχὰς
ἐλθὼν ἵν' εἰσί, συμμετασχίσω χορῶν.

the Muses who accepted me in their chorus) indicates that she understands the causative χορεύω along similar lines (Yosi 2009: 101).

²³ Parry 1965: 371. Henrichs 1996.

²⁴ Parry 1965: 371.

²⁵ Prauscello 2014: 172.

²⁶ Prauscello 2014: 173.

(Euripides, *Bacchae* 62-63)

For my part I will go to the glens of Cithaeron, where the bacchantes are, and take part with them in their dances.

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ὦ Σεμέλας τροφοὶ Θῆ- (105)

βαι, στεφανοῦσθε κισσῶ·

βρύετε βρύετε χλοήρει

μίλακι καλλικάρπῳ

καὶ καταβακχιοῦσθε δρυὸς

ἢ ἐλάτας κλάδοισι, (110)

στικτῶν τ' ἐνδυτὰ νεβρίδων

στέφετε λευκοτρίχων πλοκάμων

μαλλοῖς· ἀμφὶ δὲ νάρθηκας ὕβριστὰς

όσιοῦσθ'· αὐτίκα γὰρ πᾶσα χορεύσει,

Βρόμιος εὐτ' ἂν ἄγῃ θιάσους (115)

εἰς ὄρος εἰς ὄρος, ἔνθα μένει

θηλυγενῆς ὄχλος

ἀφ' ἱστών παρὰ κερκίδων τ'

οἰστρηθεὶς Διονύσῳ.

(Euripides, *Bacchae* 105-119)

O Thebes that nurtured Semele, be crowned with ivy! Abound, abound in the green bryony with its lovely berries, be consecrated as bacchant with boughs of oak or fir, and deck your dappled fawn skin garments with white strands of wool! Wrap the violent bacchic wand in holiness! Forthwith the whole land shall dance, when Bromios leads the worshipful bands to the mountain, to the mountain, where there rests the throng of women, driven by Dionysus in madness from their looms and shuttles.

In this self-referential statement the chorus pronounce a number of cultic instructions and predict that all the earth will join in the Dionysiac choruses. As is typical of dramatic choruses, they are wrong with regard to the turn of events within the dramatic reality. The play does not end with choral celebrations all over the earth. Outside the dramatic reality, however, this is a truthful statement. The audience of the play knows that the chorus are right; Dionysiac cult has prevailed. As a cultic statement, therefore, the prediction

of the triumph of Dionysiac choruses is undoubtedly authoritative.

(iii) Iacchus as συγχορευτής in Aristophanes' *Frogs*

The Aristophanic chorus of mystae in the *Frogs* offers a picture of choral ritual authority very similar to that of the *Bacchae*:

Χο. Ἰαχχ' ὦ πολυτίμητ' ἐν ἔδραις ἐνθάδε ναίων, (323-24)

Ἰαχχ' ὦ Ἰακχε, (325)

ἐλθὲ τόνδ' ἀνὰ λειμῶνα χορεύσων

όσίους εἰς θιασώτας,

πολύκαρπον μὲν τινάσσω

περὶ κρατὶ σῶ βρύοντα

στέφανον μύρτων, θρασεῖ δ' ἐγκατακρούων (330)

ποδὶ τὴν ἀκόλαστον

φιλοπαίγμονα τιμῇ,

χαρίτων πλεῖστον ἔχουσιν μέρος, ἀγνήν, (333-34)

ἱερὰν όσίοις μύσταϊς χορεῖαν.

[...]

Χο. ἐγείρων φλογέας λαμπάδας ἐν χερσὶ προσήκεις, (340)

Ἰαχχ' ὦ Ἰακχε,

νυκτέρου τελετῆς φωσφόρος ἀστήρ.

φλογὶ φέγγεται δὲ λειμῶν· (343-44)

γόνυ πάλλεται γερόντων·

ἀποσειόνται δὲ λύπας (345)

χρονίους τ' ἐτών παλαιῶν ἐνιαυτοὺς

ἱερᾶς ὑπὸ τιμῆς (348-49)

σὺ δὲ λαμπάδι φέγγων (350)

προβάδην ἔξαγ' ἐπ' ἀνθηρὸν ἔλειον

δάπεδον χοροποιόν, μάκαρ, ἥβην.²⁷

(Aristophanes, *Frogs* 323-34, 340-52)

Iacchus, dwelling exalted here in your abode, Iacchus, Iacchus, come to this meadow to dance with your reverent followers, brandishing about your brow a fruitful, a burgeoning garland of myrtle, and stamping with bold foot in our licentious, fun-loving worship, that is richly endowed by the Graces, a dance pure and holy to pious initiates.

²⁷ The Greek quotations and the English translations are taken from Jeffrey Henderson's edition.

[...]

Awaken blazing torches, tossing them in your hands, Iacchus, Iacchus, brilliant star of our nighttime rite! Lo, the meadow's ablaze with flame, and old men's knees are aleap as they shed their cares and the long-drawn seasons of ancient years, owing to your worship. Now illuminate with torchlight and lead forth to blooming meadowland our dancing youth, o blest one!

There are many similarities in language and imagery between this ritual account and Euripides' account in the *Bacchae*.²⁸ There are also intriguing affinities between the Aristophanic account and Plato's view of the gods as fellow-choreuts and celebrants.

The description of Iacchus as a fellow-choreut is rich in ritual detail: the god wears a garland of myrtle and leads the chorus with vigorous step brandishing blazing torches in his hands. Once the envisaged *choreia* has been described, the human leader of the chorus pronounces ritual instructions which, after a solemn introduction, take on a comic twist:

ΚΟ. εὐφημεῖν χρή κάξιστασθαι τοῖς ἡμετέροισι χοροῖσιν, (353-54)
 ὅστις ἄπειρος τοιῶνδε λόγων ἢ γνῶμην μὴ καθαρεύει, (355)
 ἢ γενναίων ὄργια Μουσῶν μήτ' εἶδεν μήτ' ἐχόρευσεν,
 μηδὲ Κρατίνου τοῦ ταυροφάγου γλώττης Βακχεῖ' ἐτελέσθη,
 ἢ βωμολόχοις ἔπεσιν χαίρει μὴ 'ν καιρῷ τοῦτο ποιούντων.
 [...]

(Aristophanes, *Frogs* 353-58)

All speak fair, and the following shall stand apart from our dances: whoever is not familiar with such utterances as this, or harbors unclean attitudes, or has never beheld or danced in the rites of the first-class Muses nor been initiated in the Bacchic rites of the bull-eating Cratinus' language, or enjoys clownish words from those who deliver them at the wrong time...

The chorus' description of Iacchus' dance and the Coryphaeus' ritual

²⁸ See Stanford 1958: 102-16 passim; Dover 1993: 210 (ad 156), 236 (ad 327, 328) and passim. For the similarities between this passage and the dance of Dionysus in the *Antigone* 1146-52, where Dionysus is called Iacchus (1152), see Henrichs 1994: 77-78.

instructions enables Aristophanes' audience to visualize the choral and cultic experience of the *mystae*. It is worth noting that both the chorus and the Coryphaeus perform and pronounce ritual instructions in the imagined presence of the god. The relationship between Iacchus and the Coryphaeus in the *Frogs* is analogous to the relationship between Dionysus the *συνεορταστής* and the mortal *νομοθέτης* and the *ἡγεμὼν Διονύσου* in Plato's *Laws*.

(iv) The mantic authority of the Sophoclean chorus in *Oedipus Tyrannus*

We may now turn to the chorus of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* who, despite their ignorance, claim mantic authority:

εἵπερ ἐγὼ μάντις εἰ-
 μὴ καὶ κατὰ γνώμαν ἴδρις,
 οὐ τὸν Ὀλυμπον ἀπείρων,
 ὦ Κιθαιρών, οὐκ ἔση τὰν αὔριον
 πανσέληνον μὴ οὐ σέ γε καὶ πατριώταν Οἰδίου 1090
 καὶ τροφὸν καὶ ματέρ' αὔξειν,
 καὶ χορεύεσθαι πρὸς ἡ-
 μῶν ὡς ἐπήρα φέροντα
 τοῖς ἐμοῖς τυράννοις. 1095
 ἰήιε Φοῖβε, σοὶ δὲ
 ταῦτ' ἀρέστ' εἶη.
 τίς σε, τέκνον, τίς σ' ἔτι-
 κτε τᾶν μακραιώνων ἄρα
 Πανὸς ὀρεσσιβάτα πα- 1100
 τρὸς πελασθεῖς; ἢ σέ γ' εὐνάτειρά τις
 Λοξίου; τῷ γὰρ πλάκες ἀγρόνομοι πᾶσαι φίλαι·
 εἴθ' ὁ Κυλλάνας ἀνάσσω,ν,
 εἴθ' ὁ Βακχεῖος θεὸς ναίων ἐπ' ἄκρων ὀρέων <σ> εὐ- 1105
 ρημα δέξαιτ' ἔκ του
 Νυμφᾶν ἐλικωπιδων, αἴς
 πλεῖστα συμπαίζει.²⁹

(Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 1086-1108)

²⁹ The Greek quotation and the English translation are taken from Hugh Lloyd-Jones' edition.

If I am a prophet and wise in my judgment, O Cithaeron, you shall not fail to know that tomorrow's full moon exalts you as the fellow-native and nurse and mother of Oedipus, and that you are honoured by us with dances, as doing kindness to our princes. O Phoebus to whom men cry out, may these things prove agreeable to you! Who, who among those who live long bore you, with Pan who roves the mountains as your father? Or was it some bedfellow of Loxias? For the mountain pastures are all dear to him. Or was it the lord of Cyllene, or the Bacchic god dwelling on the mountain tops that received you as a lucky find from one of the black-eyed Nymphs, with whom he often plays?

Before discussing choral authority here, it is worth quoting Richard Jebb's observation concerning this song-dance and its dramatic function: 'it holds the place of the third στάσιμον, but it has the character of a 'dance-song' or ὑπόρχημα, a melody of livelier movement, expressing joyous excitement. The process of discovery now approaches its final phase. The substitution of a hyporcheme for a regular stasimon has here a two-fold dramatic convenience. It shortens the interval of suspense; and it prepares a more forcible contrast.'³⁰

The chorus' joyful outburst certainly prepares a forcible contrast: the revelation that Cithaeron is Oedipus' *patriōtas* will bring neither joy to the king nor the institution of the choral celebrations that the chorus envisage. If we understand the chorus' self-designation as *mantis* as a claim to mantic omniscience, this is clearly an unjustified claim. But is it conceivable that this can be an authoritative statement under different circumstances?

In a now classic study Albert Henrichs demonstrated that through self-referentiality tragic choruses preserve their self-awareness as choral dancers and exist 'simultaneously inside the dramatic realm of the play and outside of it in the political and cultic realm of the here and now.'³¹ If we look at this song-dance independently of the plot, if for a moment we consider this chorus as choreuts in the political and cultic realm of the time of the performance of the play, we gain a different perspective

³⁰ Jebb 1893: 115 ad 1086-1109. See also Swift 2010: 81-92 who *inter alia* draws attention to the paeanic elements of this song-dance.

³¹ Henrichs 1994/95: 70.

on the kind of authority they claim. All that this chorus predict is the institution of a cult in honor of Cithaeron, who nourished and preserved the life of their king.³² Under different circumstances the introduction of a cult would be the expected course of action. Some in Sophocles' Athenian audience would remember, for instance, that the institution of the cult of Pan, whom the chorus mentions here (1100-1) was fairly new. It was introduced right after the battle of Marathon for the god's help to the Athenians against the Persians.³³ In this respect, the Sophoclean chorus' claim expertise in cultic and ritual etiquette. We have seen that in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* the god offers his Cretan priests not only choral but cultic instruction as well. It is precisely cultic expertise that the Sophoclean chorus could claim in a non-dramatic context. Within the dramatic reality, of course, their assumption that they will be asked to honor Cithaeron with song-dances is obviously wrong. They will not have the chance to celebrate Cithaeron, because the realization that it is Oedipus' *patriōtas* will bring disaster, not joy.

It is now time to discuss the authority of Pindaric choruses who worship the gods in the *hic et nunc* of the cultic occasions.

IV. Pindaric representations of choral authority

(i) The telestic authority of the chorus in Pindar fr. 94a.

Like the chorus in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the chorus performing fr. 94a claims mantic authority:

ρη[...]χο[]εῖς (1)
 αιτι[...]σαλ[.....].[.....]
 δεῖ δεσμὸς [...]οσ[....]θειδισερ[.]
 .φ.ενᾶ κ[αρ]δίᾳ
 μάντις ὥς τελέσσω (5)

ἱεραπόλος· τιμαὶ
 δὲ βροτοῖσι κεκριμέναι·

³² For this chorus' prediction of his future dance see Henrichs 1994/95: 70-73.

³³ For the introduction of Pan's cult in Athens after the battle of Marathon, see Herodotus 6. 105-106, Parker 1996: 163-68, Petrakos 1995. For the introduction of new cults in 5th-century Athens, including the cult of Pan, see Garland 1992.

παντὶ δ' ἐπὶ φθόνος ἀνδρὶ κεῖται
 ἀρετᾶς, ὁ δὲ μηδὲν ἔχων ὑπὸ σι-
 γᾷ μελαίνα κᾶρα κέκρυπται. (10)
 φιλέων δ' ἄν εὐχοίμαν
 Κρονίδαις ἐπ' Αἰολάδᾳ {τε}
 καὶ γένει εὐτυχίαν τετάσθαι
 ὁμαλὸν χρόνον ἀθάναται δὲ βροτοῖς
 ἀμέραι, σῶμα δ' ἐστὶ θνατόν. (15)
 ἀλλ' ὅτινι μὴ λιπότε-
 κνος σφαλῇ πάμπαν οἶκος βιαί-
 α δαμείς ἀνάγκᾳ,
 ζῶει κάματον προφυγῶν ἀνια-
 ρόν τὸ γὰρ πρὶν γενέ- (20)
 [σθαι]

(Pindar, fr. 94a 1-21)

bond must...heart that I may fulfill as a prophet-priest. Various honors have been allotted to mortals. But upon every man lies envy for his achievement, while he who has nothing hides his head under black silence. In friendship would I pray to the children of Kronos to extend success upon Aeoladas and his race for unbroken time. Humans have immortal days, but their body is mortal. But he, whose house does not fail of children and is not completely overwhelmed by the force of necessity, lives free from painful toil, for before having been born...

The mantic authority this chorus claim has to do with the authoritative performance of a rite, as is evident from the verb τελέσω, but the nature of the rite is unclear. The rite could be the choral song-dance *per se* that would accompany a sacrifice. At line 11 the chorus mention their prayer to the gods for the success of Aeoladas and his *genos*. Aeoladas or some other member of his family would evidently make a sacrifice to thank the god(s) for his achievement. It is also possible that the chorus' reference is to some other ritual act in which they might be expected to engage in addition to their song-dance.

Our text is too fragmentary to allow certainty, but the gnomic statement τιμαὶ δὲ βροτοῖσι κεκριμένα could be a bridge recapping what the chorus just said and leading to the praise of Aeoladas. If this statement

refers to choral activity, the *Sixth Paean* would offer a parallel (ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν ἀ[λ]έξων/ τεοῖσιν ἑμαῖς τε τιμ[α]ῖς, 10-11).³⁴ As in the case of the *Sixth Paean*, the τιμαί that this chorus expects are unclear.

The masculine participle φιλέων at line 11 shows that this is a male chorus.³⁵ The occasion of performance is unclear, as is its relation to the Daphnephoric 94b, except of course that both song-dances are composed for the same family. From the point of view of choral authority, this is yet another instance of ritual authority, as is clear from the phrase μάντις ὡς τελέσσω ἱεραπόλος.

- (ii) The mantic authority of the chorus in Pindar's *Dithyramb for the Athenians* (fr. 75)

Pindar's dithyramb for the Athenians is the closest example to Plato's account of the gods as fellow-choreuts and fellow-celebrants that I have found:

Δεῦτ' ἐν χορόν, Ὀλύμπιοι,
ἐπὶ τε κλυτὰν πέμπετε χάριν, θεοί,
πολύβατον οἷ τ' ἄστεος ὀμφαλὸν θυόεντ'
ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς Ἀθάναις
οἰχνεῖτε πανδαίδαλόν τ' εὐκλέ' ἀγοράν (5)

ἰοδέτων λάχετε στεφάνων τᾶν τ' ἑαρι-
δρόπων ἀοιδᾶν, (6)

Διόθεν τέ με σὺν ἀγλαΐᾳ
ἴδετε πορευθέντ' ἀοιδᾶν δεύτερον
ἐπὶ τὸν κισσοδαῖ θεόν,
τὸν Βρόμιον, τὸν Ἐριβόαν τε βροτοὶ καέομεν, (10)
γόνον ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων μελπόμεν<οι>
γυναικῶν τε Καδμεϊᾶν {Σεμέλην}.

ἐναργέα τ' ἔμ' ὥτε μάντιν οὐ λανθάνει.
φοινικοεάνων ὁπότ' οἰχθέντος Ὠρᾶν θαλάμου
εὖοδμον ἐπάγοισιν ἔαρ φυτὰ νεκτάρεια. (15)
τότε βάλλεται, τότ' ἐπ' ἀμβρόταν χθόν' ἔραται
ἰὼν φόβαι, ῥόδα τε κόμαισι μείγνυται,
ἄχεϊ τ' ὀμφαῖ μελέων σὺν αὐλοῖς,
οἰχνεῖ τε Σεμέλαν ἐλικάμπυκα χοροί.

³⁴ The nature of *timai* that the Paeanic chorus envisages is also unclear, but they must be privileges related to the Theoxenia; see Rutherford 2001: 308. Cf. Kurke 2006 *passim*.

³⁵ William Race points out fr. 94a should not be classified as a partheneion (Race 1997: 321).

(Pindar, *Dithyramb* 4, fr. 75, 1-19)

Come to the chorus, Olympians, and send over it glorious grace, you gods who are coming to the city's crowded, incense-rich navel in holy Athens and to the glorious, richly adorned agora. Receive wreaths of plaited violets and the songs plucked in springtime, and look upon me with favor as I proceed from Zeus with splendor of songs secondly to that ivy-knowing god, whom we mortals call Bromios and Eriboas as we sing of the offspring of the highest of fathers and of Cadmeian women. Like a seer, I do not fail to notice the clear signs, when, as the chamber of the purple-robed Horai is opened, the nectar-bearing flowers bring in the sweet-smelling spring. Then, then, upon the immortal earth are cast the lovely tresses of violets, and roses are fitted to hair and voices of songs echo to the accompaniment of pipes and choruses come to Semele of the circling headband.

The majority of scholars think that this dithyramb was composed for performance at the City Dionysia.³⁶ Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood advanced the attractive hypothesis that the occasion of this song-dance was the *xenismos* of Dionysus Eleuthereus:

I submit that it is likely that this dithyramb was performed at the rite of *xenismos* at the *eschara* in the Agora, in the city Dionysia, that this is the dithyramb sung by a chorus approaching the altar during the sacrifice, since this dithyramb is processional.³⁷

In this rite, Dionysus was the honorand and the twelve gods were guests.³⁸ The Pindaric chorus' requests to the gods show that they imagine their performance in their presence. At line 8 the chorus ask the gods to look upon them with favor (ἴδετε). This is the same request that the chorus performing the *Fourteenth Olympian* make to the Charites in whose presence they imagine their performance.³⁹ But the dithyrambic chorus take a step further. They invite the gods to come and join in their dance. The opening invitation δεῦρ' ἐν χορόνῳ, as well as the use of the same verb,

³⁶ See now Neer and Kurke 2014 with references to previous scholarship. For the mantic 'I' in this song see also Maslov 2015: 197-200.

³⁷ Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 96.

³⁸ Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 95.

³⁹ For the performance of the chorus in the imagined presence of the Charites in the *Fourteenth Olympian*, see Athanassaki 2003 and 2009a: 103-7 and 114-22.

οἰχνεῖτε and οἰχνεῖ, to describe both the movement of the gods to the *pandaidalos agora* and choral dances in honor of Semele at lines 5 and 19 respectively, suggests that the chorus imagine the gods as their συγχορευταί. It is worth noting that the gods are asked to crown themselves with wreaths, as dancers tend to do. To quote Sourvinou-Inwood again:

The fact that the other Olympians receive *iodeton stephanon*, wreaths bound with violets, while Dionysos is wreathed with ivy, again fits the context of the rite of *xenismos* at the City Dionysia. For this combination of ivy and violets corresponds to, and may perhaps be reflecting, the wreaths of violets and ivy worn by the *phallophoroi* when they appear with the *ithyphalloi* in the theater, in a context which, I suggested, was the context of this *xenismos* at the Dionysia.⁴⁰

At this holy time, the chorus liken themselves to seers (ὥτε μάντιν, 13). The clear signs that the chorus interpret are of a cultic nature, namely the appropriate time of year to set up dances which will honor Dionysus in the imagined presence and participation of the gods. This must have been a well-known song-dance in Athens. It is possible that, together with the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, it offered Plato inspiration for his account of the Muses, Apollo, and Dionysus as συγχορευταί and συνεορτασταί.

- (iii) Mnemosyne imparts omniscience to the chorus of Κηληδόνες (*Paean* 8)

ἀλλά μιν Κρόνου παῖδες
κεραυνῷ χθόν' ἀνοιξάμ[ε]ν[ο]ι
ἔκρυσαν τὸ [π]άντων ἔργων ἱερώτ[α]τον
γλυκείας ὁπὸς ἀγασ[θ]έντες,

75

ὅτι ξένοι ἔφ[θ]<ι>νον
ἄτερθεν τεκέων
ἀλόχων τε μελ[ί]φρονι αὐδ[ᾶ] θυ-

⁴⁰ Sourvinou-Inwood 2003: 97.

μὸν ἀνακρίμαντες· ἐπε[
 λυσίμβροτον παρθενία κε[80
 ἀκηράτων δαίδαλμα [
 ἐνέθηκε δὲ Παλλὰς ἀμ[
 φωνᾷ τὰ τ' ἔοντα τε κα[ῖ
 πρόσθεν γεγενημένα 85
]ται Μναμοσύνα[
]παντα σφιν ἔφρα[σ . ν

(Pindar, *Paeon* 8, 72-86)

But the children of Cronus split open the earth with a thunderbolt and buried that most holy of all works, in astonishment at the sweet voice, because strangers were perishing away from their children and wives as they suspended their hearts on the honey-minded song...the man-releasing contrivance (?) of undamaged... to the virgin...and Pallas put (enchantment?) into their voice and Mnemosyne declared to them all the things that are and happened before.

The eighth *Paeon* offers precious evidence with regard to the kind of divine omniscience that immortals can impart to a chorus. Mnemosyne reveals to them the present and the past and Athena gives them a most enchanting voice. There is no need to say that the chorus of the Κηληδόνες is not an ordinary mortal chorus. It is the amazing work of Athena and Hephaestus, who had to destroy this enchanting chorus out of pity and concern for the mortals who could not leave the sanctuary once they had experienced the fatal charm of the Κηληδόνες.

The Κηληδόνες may not be an ordinary mortal chorus, but, as Timothy Power observes, the performing paeanic chorus invite their audience to contemplate not only the differences but also their affinities with the chorus of Κηληδόνες:

At the same time, however, it is possible to see the Κηληδόνες as hidden or implicit models, embodying, despite their excesses, traits to which the paeanic Chorus, indeed any Chorus, would aspire. Arguably, in any instance of 'choral projection' there is a rhetoric of assimilation at work, an implicit transfer of identities; some minimal yet still discernible mimetic fusion takes place

when a Chorus in live performance in the here and now imagines, even in attenuated fashion, the performance of another Chorus there and then. That the Κηληδόνες once upon a time sang more or less on the same spot on which the Pindaric Chorus that conjures them up is now performing of course makes apparent the differences between the two, yet at the same time strongly invites the perception of a certain underlying continuity as well: the contemporary singer-dancers are themselves playing the roles of entrancers, and in doing so they recall the powerfully resonant legacy of the Κηληδόνες and indirectly recoup their formidable glamour.⁴¹

Owing to the fragmentary state of the eighth *Paean* we have no way of knowing if there were any links between the performing chorus and the chorus of the Κηληδόνες, but Pindar's account of Athena's and Mnemosyne's gift to the Κηληδόνες might have offered Plato inspiration, if of course he knew this paean. Pindar probably composed the *Eighth Paean* for an Athenian chorus who would celebrate in song and dance the inauguration of the Alcmaeonid temple. In the light of the Athenian interest in Delphi this must have been a well-known song in Athens. Plato's interest in Delphi and in Pindar suggest that he probably knew this paean. But whatever the case may have been, Pindar's account shows that Mnemosyne was thought to impart her knowledge of past and present to choruses as well.

(iv) ἐν ζαθέῳ χρόνῳ: singing and dancing for the divine audience at the Delphic Theoxenia (*Paean* 6)

It is time to go back to Pindar's sixth *Paean* which, like the Dithyramb for the Athenians, is also theoxenic, and to revisit briefly the authoritative first-person statement in the light of the authority that choruses were believed to possess as disciples of the Muses, Apollo and Dionysus.⁴² The paeanic chorus who ask Pytho to accept them in the theoxenic festival and claim to be the spokesmen of the Muses add in the same breath that they have come because they heard about the absence of male cho-

⁴¹ Power 2011: 98.

⁴² Kurke 2006 has brought out the sacrificial imagery of the first three triads. For the religious background and cultic context of the ode see also Kowalzig 2007: 181-223.

⁴³ See Rutherford 2001: 307-308.

ruses.⁴³ This is an enigmatic statement, but whatever the precise reference may have been, what the chorus say in this instance is that they have come to fill an important cultic gap.⁴⁴

The spokesmen of the Muses (5-6) have come to fill this gap with their song-dance at the place 'where the maidens of Delphi often sing to Leto's son at the shady navel of the earth and beat the ground with a rapid foot...' In the preserved part of the *Sixth Paean*, the chorus do not invite the divine guests to join in the dance, but they state that they have come with the Charites and Aphrodite. Do the chorus imagine these deities as συγχορευταί? It is hard to know, but the imagery is reminiscent of the divine chorus in the *Hymn to Apollo* featuring the Charites, Horae, Harmonia, Hebe and Aphrodite.⁴⁵ We should also bear in mind that 30 lines are missing after the description of the dance of the Delphides, whom the chorus imagined in all likelihood as choreuts at the theoxenic rite as well.

Space limitations do not allow me to do justice either to the many thorny issues of the *Sixth Paean* or to the holistic interpretation of Leslie Kurke, who has marshaled a whole array of arguments in favor of the poet as the speaker of the first two triads. I therefore restrict myself to the observation that if at the Theoxenia Pindar led a chorus, Delphian, Aeginetan or other, the poet together with the choreuts would embody the inscribed authoritative persona and would share with them the ritual authority they all had from being in close contact with the gods. The collective authoritative persona could be enhanced by Pindar's own authority, which poets traditionally derived from the Muses and which Plato, cunningly, was quick to transfer to his idealized choruses in Magnesia.

We have seen that Plato was not the first to attribute authority to choruses. It is worth noting that the speaker of the sixth *Paean* underscores the divine origin of poetic wisdom in their address to the Muses. The mention of Mnemosyne in the same breath evokes the eighth *Paean*, where Mnemosyne is depicted as imparting her divine wisdom to the enchanting chorus of the Κηληδόνες:

⁴⁴ See Kurke 2006: 86 for a brief survey of scholarly opinion.

⁴⁵ αὐτὰρ ἐνπλόκαμοι Χάριτες καὶ εὐφρονες ὦραι / Ἀρμονίη θ' Ἥβη τε Διὸς θυγάτηρ τ' Ἀφροδίτη / ὄρχευντ' ἀλλήλων ἐπὶ καρπῷ χεῖρας ἔχουσαι (*HHApollo*, 194-96). The poet of the hymn imagines this chorus performing on Olympus for the other gods, but it is not impossible to imagine Aphrodite and the Charites as fellow-celebrants and fellow-choreuts of mortals in a theoxenic festival.

καὶ πόθεν ἀθαν[άτων ἔρις ᾗ]ρξατο. (50)

ταῦτα θεοῖσι [μ]έν
πιθεῖν σοφοῦ[ς] δυνατόν,
βροτοῖσιν δ' ἀμάχανο[ν εὐ]ρέμεν
ἀλλὰ παρθένοι γάρ, ἴσθ' ὅτ[ι], Μο[ι]σαι,
πάντα, κε[λαι]νεφεῖ σὺν (55)

πατρὶ Μναμοσ[ύν]α τε
τοῦτον ἔσχετ[ε τεθ]' μόν,
κλῦτε νῦν ἔρα[ται] δέ μο[ι] — — —
γλῶσσα μέλιτος ἄψτον γλυκὺν [
ἀγῶνα Λοξία[ι] καταβάντ' εὐρὺν (60)
ἐν θεῶν ξενίᾳ.

(Pindar, *Paeon* 6.50-61)

and as to whence the immortals' strife began, it is possible for the gods to entrust that to wise men but mortals have no way to find it. But, virgin Muses, because you know all things—along with your father of the dark clouds and Mnemosyne you have that privilege—hear me now. My tongue longs (to sing?) the sweet essence of honey...having come to the broad gathering for Loxias in the guest-feast of the gods.

The chorus' address to the Muses raises another question. Does this chorus imagine their performance in the presence of the Muses? The second person *deixis*, the request κλῦτε νῦν, and the nature of the festival (ἐν θεῶν ξενίᾳ) taken together suggest that the chorus envisage their performance before a divine audience, and for obvious reasons single out the Muses for mention.

It is possible that Plato had in mind the sixth *Paeon* when he was thinking of the interaction of mortals and immortals. The Delphic theoxenic festival, in which this chorus perform, is full of gods who are envisioned as συγχορευταί and συνεορτασταί. Like the Dithyramb for the Athenians (fr. 75), the sixth *Paeon* too evokes a sacred time and space where mortal choreuts come into close contact with the gods who are imagined to sing, dance, and celebrate with them, thus granting them the ability to sing and worship the gods with authority. To put it differ-

ently, mortal choruses are disciples of the gods, as poets are disciples of the Muses. In these uncanny circumstances those who honor the gods through sacrifice and song-dance are as empowered as the poet who translates this intense ritual experience into words, music, and dance.⁴⁶ The famous anecdote according to which Pindar said he had gone to Delphi to sacrifice a paean reflects the synergy of poet and chorus.⁴⁷

In the foregoing discussion I have traced choral authority as mastery of truth and expertise in cultic etiquette from Plato all the way back to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Platonian, dramatic, Pindaric and epic choruses lay credible claims to mantic authority, especially to expertise in cultic etiquette, but sometimes to mastery of truth too, because they derived it from the gods, with whom they were thought to interact. Choruses are therefore entitled to designate themselves collectively as μάντις and προφάτας.⁴⁸ We should also bear in mind that from Homer onward mortal seers know the past, the present and the future and have expertise in cultic matters. It is not accidental that on cultic occasions seers, poets and choruses joined forces, artistic talent and cultic expertise, in order to honor the gods.

⁴⁶ Note that the prefix ζα (διά) in ζάθεος is augmentative; Chantraine 1999 s.v. translates it 'très divin'. In the light of the theoxenic festival for which Pindar composed the *Sixth Paean* it is legitimate to translate it as 'full of gods'.

⁴⁷ Παραγενόμενος δὲ εἰς Δελφοὺς καὶ ἐρωτώμενος τί πάρεστι θύσων, εἶπε· παιᾶνα (*Apophthegmata*, Drachmann I, p. 3, ll. 18-19). On this apophthegma, see Kurke 2006: 102-3 with references.

⁴⁸ Pindar capitalized on the widespread belief in choral authority, because he did not compose for a single occasion nor for only one mode of performance. I have explored the adaptability of the *First Pythian* to different contexts in Athanassaki 2009b. Most recently Eva Stehle has also argued for the many lives for which the Pindaric odes were destined and their built-in adaptability: 'In each life an ode had a different authorship in the sense of an authorizing voice that bespoke its truth, authenticity, significance, or literary quality. The range of authorizing voices included those of its performer(s), the physical text as keeper of the tradition of a family's glory, the poet as an inspired figure, the poet as the speaker constructed from a collection, each having a different kind of relationship with the audience. Because Pindar composed odes whose voice, the famously elusive first-person speaker, is defined almost entirely as a speaker or as arriving in order to speak or performing an action that metaphorically represents speech, this voice usually moved easily from one life to another, its identity adaptable to each situation' (Stehle 2017: 8).

References

- Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. 2011. *Archaic and Classical Choral Song. Performance, Politics & Dissemination*. Trends in Classics, 10. Berlin.
- Athanassaki, L. 1990. *Mantic Vision and Diction in Pindar's Victory Odes*. PhD Thesis. Brown University, <http://thesis.ekt.gr/thesisBookReader>
- Athanassaki, L. 2003. 'A Divine Audience for the Celebration of Asopichus' Victory in Pindar's *Fourteenth Olympian Ode*,' in G. W. Bakewell and J. P. Sickinger, eds *Gestures. Essays in Ancient History, Literature and Philosophy Presented to Alan L. Boegehold on the Occasion of His Retirement and His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Oxford. 3-15.
- Athanassaki, L. 2009a. αἰδέτο πᾶν τέμενος. Οι χορικές παραστάσεις και το κοινό τους στην αρχαϊκή και πρώιμη κλασική περίοδο. Heraklion.
- Athanassaki, L. 2009b. 'Deixis, Narratology, and the Performance of Choral Lyric: On Pindar's First Pythian Ode', in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos, eds. *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of the Form of the Ancient Texts*. Berlin. 241-73.
- Athanassaki, L., Martin, R. P. and Miller J. F. eds 2009. *Apolline Politics and Poetics*. Athens.
- Bacon, H. 1994/95. 'The Chorus in Greek Life and Drama', in H. Golder and S. Scully, eds., *The Chorus in Greek Tragedy and Culture*. Arion 3.1: 6-24.
- Bakker, E. J. 2017. *Authorship and Greek Song. Authority, Authenticity and Performance*. Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, vol. 3. Leiden.
- Bond, G. W., ed. 1981. *Euripides. Heracles*. Oxford.
- Burnet, J., ed. 1907. *Platonis opera*, vol. 5. Oxford.
- Burnett, A. P. 1989. 'Performing Pindar's Odes', *CPh* 84: 283-93.
- Bury, R. G., ed. 1926. *Plato. Laws, Volume I: Books 1-6*. Cambridge, MA.
- Calame, C. 2013. 'Choral Practices in Plato's *Laws*', in A.-E. Peponi 2013c, ed.: 87-108.
- Carey, C. 1989. 'The Performance of the Victory Ode', *AJPh* 110: 545-65.
- Carey, C. 1991. 'The Victory Ode in Performance: The Case for the Chorus', *CPh* 86: 192-200.
- Carey, C. 2017. 'Voice and Worship', in Bakker 2017: 34-59.
- Chantraine, P. 1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. His-*

- toire des mots*. Paris.
- Clay, J. S. 1989. *The Politics of Olympus. Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. Princeton.
- D'Alessio, G. B. 1994. 'First-Person Problems in Pindar', *BICS* 39: 117-39.
- Dover, K. ed. 1993. *Aristophanes. Frogs*. Oxford.
- Evelyn-White, H. G., ed. 1914. *The Homeric Hymns and Homerica*. Cambridge, MA.
- Garland, R. 1992. *Introducing New Gods. The Politics of Athenian Religion*. London.
- Heath, M. 1988. 'Receiving the κῶμος: The Context and Performance of Epinician', *AJPh* 109: 180-95.
- Heath, M., and M. Lefkowitz. 1991. 'Epinician Performance', *CPh* 86: 173-91.
- Henderson, J., ed. 2002. *Aristophanes. Frogs, Assembly Women, Wealth*. Cambridge, MA.
- Henrichs, A. 1994/95. 'Why Should I Dance?: Choral Self-Referentiality in Greek Tragedy', in H. Golder and S. Scully eds., *The Chorus in Greek Tragedy and Culture. Arion* 3.1: 56-111.
- Henrichs, A. 1996. 'Dancing in Athens, Dancing on Delos: Some Patterns of Choral Projection in Euripides', *Philologus* 140: 48-62.
- Jebb, R. C., ed. 1893. *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments. Part I, The Oedipus Tyrannus*. 3rd ed. Cambridge.
- Kakridis, Th. 2009. 'Apollo the Lover', in L. Athanassaki, R. P. Martin and J. F. Miller, eds 633-40.
- Kavoulaki, A. 2011. 'Choral Self-Awareness. On the Introductory Anapaests of Aeschylus' *Suppliants*', in L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie, eds 365-390.
- Kovacs, D., ed. 1998. *Euripides. Suppliant Women, Electra, Heracles*. Cambridge, MA.
- Kovacs, D., ed. 2003. *Euripides. Bacchae, Iphigenia at Aulis, Rhesus*. Cambridge, MA.
- Kowalzig, B. 2007. *Singing for the Gods. Performance of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford.
- Kurke, L. 2006. 'Choral Lyric as 'Ritualization': Poetic Sacrifice and Poetic Ego in Pindar's Sixth Paian', *CA* 24: 81-130.
- Kurke, L. 2013. 'Imagining Chorality: Wonder, Plato's Puppets and Moving Statues', in Peponi A.-E. ed. 2013: 123-70.

- Lefkowitz, M. R. 1988. 'Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?' *AJPh* 109: 1-11.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. 1991. *First-Person Fictions. Pindar's Poetic 'I'*. Oxford.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. 1995. 'The First Person in Pindar Reconsidered-Again', *BICS* 40: 139-50.
- Lloyd-Jones, H., ed. 1994. *Sophocles I. Ajax, Electra, Oedipus Tyrannus*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lonsdale, S. H. 1994/95. 'Homeric Hymn to Apollo. Prototype and Paradigm of Choral Performance', in H. Golder and S. Scully, eds., *The Chorus in Greek Tragedy and Culture. Arion* 3.1: 25-40.
- Maehler, H., ed. 1989. *Pindarus. Pars II. Fragmenta-Indices*. Leipzig.
- Marinis, A. 2018. 'Pindar's Sixth Paean: Conceptualizing Religious Panhellenism'. In A. Kavoulaki, ed., *ΠΑΕΙΩΝ. Studies in Memory of Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood* (Ariadne Supplements 1). Rethymnon. 149-81.
- Maslov, B. 2015. *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature*. Cambridge.
- Meyer, S. S. 2015. *Plato. Laws 1 and 2*. Oxford.
- Morgan, K. 1993. 'Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ', *CP* 88: 1-15.
- Nagy, G. 1994. 'Genre and Occasion', *Mètis* 9: 11-25.
- Nagy, G. 2009. 'Perfecting the Hymn in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*', in L. Athanassaki, R. P. Martin and J. F. Miller: 17-44.
- Nagy, G. 2011. 'The Earliest Phases in the Reception of the *Homeric Hymns*', http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn3:hlnc.essay:Nagy:The_Earliest_Phases_in_the_Reception_of_the_Homeric_Hymns.2011.
- Neer, R. T., and L. Kurke. 2014. 'Pindar Fr. 75 SM and the Politics of Athenian Space', *GRBS* 54: 527-579.
- Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion. A History*. Oxford.
- Parry, H. 1965. 'The Second Stasimon of Euripides' *Heracles* (637-700)', *AJP* 86: 363-374.
- Peponi, A.-E. 2009. 'Choreia and Aesthetics in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo: The Performance of the Delian Maidens', *CA* 28: 39-70.
- Peponi, A.-E. 2013a. 'Choral Anti-Aesthetics', in A.-E. Peponi, ed. 212-39.
- Peponi, A.-E. 2013b. 'Theorizing the Chorus in Greece', in J. Billings, F. Budelmann and F. Macintosh, eds., *Choruses, Ancient and Modern*. Oxford. 15-34.
- Petrakos, V. Ch. [=Πετράκος, B. X.] 1995. 'Ο Μαπαθών. Athens.
- Power, T. 2011. 'Cyberchorus: Pindar's Κηληδόνες and the Aura of the Artificial', in L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie, eds: 67-113.

- Prauscello, L. 2014. *Performing Citizenship in Plato's Laws*. Cambridge.
- Race, W. H. 1997. *Pindar. Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments*. Cambridge, MA.
- Rutherford, I. 2001. *Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 2003. *Tragedy and Athenian Religion*. Lanham, MD.
- Stanford, W. B., ed. 1958. *Aristophanes. The Frogs*. London.
- Stehle, E. 1997. *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
- Stehle, E. 2017. 'The Construction of Authority in Pindar's Isthmian 2 in Performance', in Bakker 2017: 8-33
- Swift, L. A. 2010. *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*. Oxford.
- Yossi, M. I., ed. [=Γιόση, Μ. Ι.] 2009. *ΕΥΡΥΠΙΔΗΣ. Ἡρακλῆς*. Athens.

Justice in the Flesh: Constructing Dike as a Dramatic Character in Aeschylus fr. 281a Radt

Zoe Stamatopoulou

First published by Lobel in 1952, *P.Oxy.* XX.2256 (late 2nd / early 3rd c. CE) preserves an extensive fragment of dramatic dialogue which, thanks to the testimony of the Homeric scholia, can be attributed with some confidence to Aeschylus (fr. 281a).¹ The fragment features a character who identifies herself as Dike (line 15) and explains her role in the cosmos to a group (line 13) presumed to be the chorus. It is possible that other fragments from the same papyrus, including fr. 281b and 451n, belong to the same play.² There is no conclusive evidence regarding the genre of this play, but both the vocabulary and some elements of

¹ Sch. Hom. *Il.* 6.239c Erbse quotes part of line 28 of fr. 281a and attributes it explicitly to Aeschylus; cf. Eustathius Hom. *Il.* 2.311.18. Cf. Cipolla 2010: 134 on the typically Aeschylean features in fr. 281a. All tragic fragments in this paper are numbered in accordance with the *TrGF*.

² In his 1952 edition, Lobel already suggested that fr. 451s 24 should perhaps be linked with fr. 451n, fr. 451s 25 with either fr. 451s 6 or fr. 451n, and frs. 451s 11 and 12 with fr. 281a. Snell 1953: 439 suggests that fr. 451n, as well as frs. 451s 6, 7, 11, 12 belong to the same play as frs. 281a-b. Mette 1959: 195-99 groups together frs. 451s 11, 13; 281a; 281b, 451s 12, 7, 6; 451n; 451s 24, 25 in this order.

³ Currently the scholarly consensus is that Aesch. fr. 281a and connected fragments belong to a satyr play; see Sutton 1980: 20-22, Wessels 1999: 98-106, Podlecki 2005: 15-16, Sommerstein 2009: 277-78 (with some reservations), and O'Sullivan and Collard 2013: 298-99. The word ὀτυή (fr. 281a.9) is only found in Old Comedy and in Eur. *Cyc.* 643; other lexical indications include the Doric form ἰεppύθυξα in fr. 281b.4 and, possibly, λέληνται in fr. 451n.7 (see Sutton 1983: 19 n.1). In addition, as O'Sullivan and Collard 2013: 303 point out, the simplistic discussion about ethics in fr. 281a and the focus on the story of a villain in fr. 281a.30-41 would be more at home in a satyr play than in tragedy, as would perhaps the disproportionate focus on the fate of offenders in fr. 281a.19-23. Fr. 281a was identified as part of a satyr play already by Lobel 1952: 39; cf. also Görschen 1955: 151 and Lloyd-Jones 1957: 576 (contrast, however, Lloyd-Jones 1983: 99-102).

content seem to suggest a satyr play rather than a tragedy.³ The fragment has received some scholarly attention mainly in connection with its textual restoration, its place in the Aeschylean corpus, and the unparalleled mythological narrative in lines 31-41. However, the representation of Dike herself has remained largely ignored. In this paper, I examine closely how fr. 281a constructs Dike as a divine figure and how her portrayal in this play relates to the Hesiodic tradition.

In the context of her epiphany, Dike defines her identity as a divinity and indicates to her audience how she should be perceived and received by those who belong to the mortal realm. In the speech that occupies the first 13 lines of the fragment, Dike introduces herself as follows:

[Δί.] μακάρων . [1
 αυτη θεων[
 .]αι' . . λ . πε . δ . [.]
 .] . [.] . ν . [.]
 ἵξει δ' ἐν αὐτῷι . [.] . . [.] . [.] . [5
 δίκη κρατήσας τῷιδε . [.]
 πατήρ γὰρ ἥρξεν ἀνταμ[.]
 ἐκ τοῦ δέ τοί με Ζεὺς ἐτίμησεν
 ὁτὶ παθὼν ημι[.] . [.]
 ἵζω Διὸς θρόνοισιν[. . .] ἱςμένη· 10
 πέμπει δέ μ' αὐτὸς οἷσιν εὖμεν[.]
 Ζ[ε]ὺς, ὅσπερ ἐς γῆν τήγδ' ἔπεμψέ μ' . . [.]
 . [.] εσθε δ' ὑμεῖς εἴ τι μὴ μά[την] λέγω. (fr. 218a.1-13)⁴

τῷι δ' ἐχ[ὼ] παρεστάτουν Mette 7 ἀνταμ[ύνεται δ' ὅδε Mette 6

Fränkel 1954, however, proposed that the fragment was from a tragedy, and in particular from the *Aetnaeae*, a play composed by Aeschylus for Hieron of Syracuse (cf. Stark 1956: 83-89, who considers the fragment tragic but not necessarily from the *Aetnaeae*). For a refutation of Fränkel and his followers (e.g. Lloyd-Jones 1983: 99-102, Bremer 1991: 40-41, Corbato 1996, and Patrito 2001: 91-95), see Poli-Palladini 2001: 313-14; for more recent iterations of Fränkel's reconstruction, see Stewart 2017: 106-07 and Smith 2017: 24-30. Cipolla 2010: 141-50 attempts to reconcile the two competing interpretations of fr. 281a by suggesting that it belongs to the play listed in the *codex Laurentianus* 32.9 (M) as Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι (T 78.2a Radt). This, he argues, may have been a satyr drama composed as a comic remake of Aeschylus' original *Aetnaeae* (i.e. the Αἰτναῖαι γνήσιοι, T 78.1d Radt).

⁴ I have reproduced the text in Radt's edition with the following exceptions: I have opted for Lobel's παθὼν in line 9, although admittedly παθῶν is also possible (cf. Radt's παθων) and for εὖμεν[.] instead of Radt's εὖμεν[.] in line 11. The *apparatus criticus* is very selective here and throughout the paper. For my translation of fr. 281a, I have consulted Sommerstein 2009.

ἀνταμείψασθαι Görschen 9 παθὼν ἤμ[ειψεν vel ἤμ[είψατο Lobel παθὼν
 ἤμ[είψατο Vysoký 11 εὖμεν[ῆς πέλει vel κυρεῖ Lobel εὖμεν[ῆς ἄν ᾧ
 Mette 13 ὅ[ψ]εθε Lobel δ[έξ]εθε Fränkel

Justice: ...of the blessed ones...I myself (?) of the gods... he takes a seat in it...having prevailed justly in (?) this ... For the father started... For this, you see, Zeus started honoring me, because, having suffered, he (repaid?)...I sit on⁵ the throne of Zeus ... And Zeus himself sends me to those towards whom he (is) well-disposed, Zeus, who has sent me to this land here...but you... if I do not say something idle.

Judging by their immediate reaction, Dike's interlocutors have never encountered the goddess before. They ask her to reveal the name by which they should address her (fr. 218a.14-15):

[Xo.]	. [. .]οὔ[. προ]ξεγγέποντες εὖ.[.]ήκομε[ν];	
[Δί.]	Δίκην μ .[. . .]ον πρέεβο . η . ε . . . ρο.[15

τί σε] οὔ[ν προ]ξεγγέποντες εὖ κ[υ]ρήκομε[ν vel π[ο]λήκομε[ν Lobel 14	
μέ[γιστ]ον πρέεβο vel sim. Lobel	15

Chorus: So calling (you what) will we ... well?

Justice: 'Justice'... (most?) august...

and then they prompt her to explain her divine prerogatives (fr. 281a.16-23)⁶:

[Xo.]	ποίας δὲ τ[ιμ]ῆς ἀρχ εις . [
[Δί.]	το]ῖς μὲν δ[ι]καίοις ἔνδικον τείνω βίω[ν].
[Xo.]]. κα θέ[ς]μ[ι]ον τὸδ' ἐν βρ[ο]τ[ο]τ[ο]ί[ς].
[Δί.]	τοῖς δ' αὖ μα]ταίοις . [.] . [.] [.]φ[

⁵ Some translate 'by the throne' (e.g., Lloyd-Jones 1957: 580, O'Sullivan and Collard 2013: 301). On Δίκη πάρεδρος, see below.

⁶ In line 17, I have printed τείνω βίω[ν, which Lobel finds 'compatible with the traces,' instead of Radt's τειν . . ο[ι] . I have also incorporated in the text Lobel's supplements for lines 22 (ποίωι χρό]ωι for]ωι) and 23, although Radt's κακ[οῖς (22) is certainly possible. As for the ending of the verb in line 22, both Lobel and Radt print ἀναπτύσσει[ς] (-ει[ς], Lobel); however, the trace of the letter immediately preceding κακ- is visible and it is consistent with the lower curve of a sigma, thus I have printed ἀναπτύσσει[ς] (cf. Mette).

[Xo.] ἐ]πρωδαῖς ἥ κατ' ἰσχύος τρόπο[ν]; 20
 [Δί.] γράφουσα] τὰ<μ>πλακῆματ' ἐν δέλτῳ Διό[ς].
 [Xo.] ποίῳι χρό]νῳι δὲ πίνακ' ἀναπτύσσεις κακ[ῶν];
 [Δί.] εὗτ' ἂν φέρ]ῃι σφιν ἡμέρα τὸ κύριον.

17 τείνω Π τίνω Lobel βί[ο]ν Lobel 20 πότερον ἐ]πρωδαῖς Lobel πειθοῦς
 ἐ]πρωδαῖς Pohlenz (cf. [Aesch.] PV 172-73) 22 ποίῳι χρό]νῳι Lobel
 κακ[ῶν] Lobel κακ[οῖς] Radt 23 suppl. Lobel

Chorus: Of what sort of prerogative...?

Justice: For the just, I extend their righteous lives.

Chorus: This...law among mortals.

Justice: And for the (offenders, on the other hand)...

Chorus: With charms ... or by way of force?

Justice: (By writing down) their offenses on the tablet of Zeus.

Chorus: (When) do (you) unfold the tablet (of) evils?

Justice: (When) a day (brings) them their ordained (sc. time?').

In the remaining lines of the fragment, Dike claims that mortals should accept her as a beneficial presence for communities and individuals alike (fr. 281a.24-29), and promises to give a token of her positive impact (τέκμαρ δὲ λέξω, fr. 281a.30). At this point, perhaps, one would expect Dike to recall past dealings with just and unjust mortals, thus illustrating her τιμή as she herself just defined it to the Chorus in lines 16-23. Instead, however, she recounts her success in reforming a certain reckless and bloodthirsty son of Hera and Zeus (fr. 281a.31-33):

ἔθρε[ψ.] παῖδα μάργον ὃν τίκτει [
 Ἥρα μιγεῖσα Ζηνὶ θυμοιδ[
 [δ]ύξαρκτ[ο]ν, αἰδῶς δ' οὐκ ἐνῆ[ν] φρ[ον]ήματι·

31 ἔθρε[ψε] Lobel ἔθρε[ψα] Mette, Kakridis, Radt 32 θυμοιδ[έ]ς vel
 θυμοιδ[ή]ς

...nurtured the raging son whom Hera bore...having mingled
 with Zeus...of swollen spirit...hard to control, and there was no

⁷ Lobel 1952: 41 based on Aesch. *Suppl.* 732 and *Ag.* 763. Contrast, however, Sommerstein 2009: 283, who interprets τὸ κύριον as 'their appointed fate'.

reverence in his mind.

This μάργος παῖς, most probably Ares,⁸ used to enjoy killing unsuspecting mortals indiscriminately (fr. 281a.34-37). Presumably, Dike's intervention put an end to this character's blind violence and turned him into an agent of justice who leaves the righteous in peace and harms only those who have committed wrongdoing. Dike concludes this story with what seems to be an aetiology for this divine character's name (fr. 281a.40-41):

]οῦν ἐνδίκως κικλήσκεται 40
]νιν ἔνδικ[. . . .].οc

He is justly called...righteous...

Punning on her own name, Dike crafts an etymological connection between this god's appellation and some defining characteristic that probably resulted from his rehabilitation.⁹ Through the repetition of ἐνδικ- in this aetiology, Dike reiterates her catalytic role in reforming and recruiting this divine force, but, subtly, she also extends her sphere of influence to encompass language. Indeed, the degree to which the name (i.e. the signifier) corresponds to a core feature of this παῖς (i.e. the signified) and thus constitutes a fair repre-

⁸ Ever since Lloyd-Jones 1957: 577, the majority of scholars have assumed that the scion of Zeus in question is Ares, and the story of his blind violence has been associated with the deadly harassment of pilgrims by Cycnus and Ares at Pagasae (e.g. Hes. *Aspis*). Robertson 1953 already proposed that the passage preserves an uncommon version of Ares' trial at the Areopagus. There are some, however, who do not identify this divine child with Ares. Lobel 1952: 41, for instance, entertained the possibility that the story was about a Sinis-like highway robber. Assuming that the fragments belongs to the *Aetnaeae*, Kakridis 1962, Sutton 1983, and, more recently, Smith 2017: 27 have argued that the son of Zeus and Hera is Heracles and that lines 30-37 recount the hero's violent clash with the local population when he passed through Sicily with the cattle of Geryon, a story attested in Diod. Sic. 4.23.5. It is hard to reconcile, however, the nature of this παῖς as described in lines 32-33 with Heracles in the midst of his labors; furthermore, as Cipolla 2010: 140 has demonstrated, the sources that support this reading are either much later than Aesch. fr. 281a or unreliable. For a summary of the various suggested interpretations of lines 30-41, see Patrito 2001: 86-89 and Cipolla 2010: 139-41, who rightly points out that the synergy between Ares and Dike appears elsewhere in Aeschylean drama (*Cho.* 461, 935-39; cf. *Sept.* 412-16).

⁹ Assuming the παῖς is indeed Ares, di Benedetto and Maltomini 1976: 5-6 suggest a pun on ἀρά, following a tentative suggestion by Lobel 1952: 41. Sommerstein 2009: 285 n.7 offers different possibilities (ἀρος or ἀρείων).

¹⁰ Cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 403-05 on the representation of the night (a non-verbal signifier) on Tydeus' shield: εἰ γὰρ θανόντι νύξ ἐπ' ὀφθαλμοῖς πέσοι, / τῷ τοι φέροντι σῆμ' ὑπέρκομπον τόδε / γένοιτ' ἄν ὀρθῶς ἐνδίκως τ' ἐπώνυμον. For a word-play involving Δίκη and a -δίκως adverb in the context of semiotics, see *Sept.* 670-1, πανδίκως ψευδώνυμος Δίκη (on the meaning of πανδίκως, see Hutchinson 1985: 72-73). On δίκη in connection with truthful and accurate communication in tragedy, see, e.g. Papadodima 2010: 103-4.

sensation of him is a matter of δίκη (ἐνδίκως κυκλίσκεται, fr. 281a.40).¹⁰

In fr. 281a, then, Dike situates herself both within the realm of the gods and in relation to mortals. In the context of presenting herself to the human world and making a case for being accepted by individuals and the community alike, she defines her divine prerogative, her τιμή, as two-fold. On the one hand, she rewards the just and, assuming the reading of line 17 is correct (ἐνδίκων τείνω βίον),¹¹ she does so by ensuring that they live long lives. The Chorus, however, seems more interested in the fate of the wicked, so Dike never explains exactly how she prolongs the lives of the righteous. Perhaps implied here is her role as a protector from undeserved harm, a benefaction almost certainly exemplified later in connection to the rehabilitation of the violent divine child (fr. 281a.30-41). After all, peace and prosperity were traditionally considered the reward of the just, as attested already in Hes.WD 225-37, and the play may have made this link between peace and justice explicit elsewhere. Indeed, fr. 451n, which in all likelihood belongs to the same play,¹² sketches life in a peaceful community without conflict (ἐστιν εἰρήνη βροτοῖς, fr. 451n.2; ἐν ἡσυχίαι[χοις]! πράγματι, fr. 451n.4), where people work the land and prosper instead of waging war (fr. 451n.5-9).

As for Dike's treatment of the μάταιοι, exactly what she claims to do with them in line 19 is, unfortunately, lost in the lacunae. Based on the follow-up question in line 20, which he paraphrased as πειθοῖ ἢ βίᾳ, Lobel suggested—albeit very tentatively—that in line 19 Dike claims that she reforms the offenders.¹³ This reconstruction of line 20, however, is not without problems, since there is no parallel from the fifth century or earlier for Dike herself using persuasion to reform offenders.¹⁴ [Aesch.] PV 172-3 (καί μ' οὔτι μελιγλώσσοις πειθοῦς / ἐπαοιδᾶσιν θέλξει), the passage produced to clarify fr. 281a.20 and to support the supplement πειθοῦς ἐ]πωδαίς,¹⁵ does not refer to the rehabilitation of a wrongdoer

¹¹ As Lobel 1952: 40 points out, the use of τείνω βίον in the sense of 'to give a long life' is unparalleled. In support of τίνω, see Patrito 2001: 82. In his *apparatus criticus*, Mette supports emending the transmitted τείνω into τίνω on the basis of Aesch. Ag. 773-75 (Δίκα...τὸν δὲ ἐναΐσιμον τίει βίον). While it is generally assumed that fr. 281a.17 refers to the fate of the just while still living, it is worth considering that the righteous life appears as a necessary prerequisite for a better afterlife in Orphic texts; see, e.g., Bernabé and Jiménez San Cristóbal 2011: 86-87, 98.

¹² Sommerstein 2009: 339 speculates that Dike may be the speaker of 451n too.

¹³ Lobel 1952: 40.

¹⁴ Aesch. Eum. 440, πεποιθὼς τῇ δίκῃ is not an adequate parallel in meaning despite the use of the verb πείθω; more helpful is Eur. IT 968, πεισθεῖσαι δίκη.

¹⁵ πειθοῦς ἐ]πωδαίς is adopted by Lloyd-Jones 1957, Mette 1959 (cf. 1963), and Patrito 2001: 77,

but to a way of extracting a secret from an unwilling source. Perhaps in line 20 the Chorus is thinking of a compelling advisor persuading the unjust to change their ways,¹⁶ but that would hardly address the problem of offenses already committed (cf. τᾶ<μ>πλακῆματ', fr. 281a.21).¹⁷ It is worth noting that the extant text of fr. 281a.5-9 does not raise the possibility of rehabilitation for Cronus, whose defeat is defined as retribution for the suffering he inflicted and thus an act of righteousness (δίκη κρατήσας, 6).¹⁸ As for the divine παῖς in lines 31-41, his story demonstrates successfully certain benefits reserved for mortals who endorse Dike (28-30, see esp. τέκμαρ in line 30), but there is no reason to assume that the rehabilitation itself is typical of Dike's approach to human crimes. On the contrary, his transformation is framed as a single, pivotal event, the *aition* of a new status quo in which Dike directs destructive violence exclusively towards the unjust. It is quite likely, then, that in line 19 Dike draws attention to the punishment of the μάταιοι rather than their rehabilitation, and that in line 20 the Chorus is inquiring about two alternative ways of hurting these humans: destructive spells¹⁹ or destructive violence. Whatever assumptions one wishes to make about fr. 281a.19-20, Dike's treatment of the unjust seems to be highly personalized.²⁰ A written record of crimes is kept on the 'tablet of Zeus', presumably by Dike herself (γράφουσα] τᾶ<μ>πλακῆματ' ἐν δέλτῳ Διός[c, fr. 281a.21), and the goddess reviews the record of each individual at an appointed time of reckoning, which defies further definition (fr. 281a.23).²¹

Dike's role as the record-keeper of human activity is unparalleled in

and has been tentatively included in Sommerstein's 2009 translation. On persuasion as a spell, cf. Gorgias, *Encomium of Helen* ch.10.

¹⁶ One thinks, for instance, of the poet's attempt to persuade Perses and the corrupt *basileis* to act justly in the Hesiodic *Works and Days* (e.g., ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δ' ἄκουε δίκης μηδ' ὕβριν ὄφελλε, 213; καὶ νῦν δίκης ἐπάκουε, 275).

¹⁷ Cf. Cipolla 2010: 138-39.

¹⁸ Cf. Cataudella 1964/65: 382-83.

¹⁹ Lobel's suggested supplement πότερον ἐ]πῳδαῖς allows for this interpretation.

²⁰ The implication of fr. 281a.11-12, however, is that Zeus inflicts collective punishment upon entire communities by not sending Dike to them at all. Pinchard 2016 examines individualized Dike in Aeschylean drama—albeit not in fr. 281a—as a feature informed by Orphic beliefs about reincarnation, a fairer alternative to the Hesiodic tradition, according to which punishment for one's offenses could fall upon innocent parties (the entire community and/or subsequent generations).

²¹ Aesch. fr. 281a.22-23 may be understood as a reference to judgment after death (cf. Hades as the judge of mortals in Aesch. *Eum.* 273-75), but this is by no means the only possible interpretation (cf. Aesch. Ag. 251-52, Δίκα δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσιν μαθεῖν ἐπὶρρέπει). Perhaps the ambiguity is deliberate. On writing in connection with threatening situations in Aeschylean drama, see Torrance 2013: 139.

extant literature, but we find written accounts linked to divine justice elsewhere in fifth-century drama.²² In Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, the Chorus casts Hades as the ultimate judge of mortals (μέγας...εὐθυνος βροτῶν, 273), who 'observes everything with his recording mind' (δελτογράφῳ δὲ πάντ' ἐπωπᾶ φρενί, 275). In his capacity as the judge of the dead, Hades is not only all-seeing but also all-remembering.²³ While the tablets are purely metaphorical in the *Eumenides*,²⁴ a Euripidean fragment engages with the idea of the Olympians keeping actual records. Fr. 506 from one of Euripides' *Melanippe plays* (probably the *Wise Melanippe*)²⁵ ridicules the belief that someone (τιν' in line 3)²⁶ records in writing the injustices of men for Zeus to assess:

δοκεῖτε πηδᾶν τάδικήματ' εἰς θεοὺς	1
πτεροῖσι, κᾶπειτ' ἐν Διὸς δέλτου πτυχαῖς	
γράφειν τιν' αὐτά, Ζῆνα δ' εἰσορῶντά νιν	
θνητοῖς δικάζειν; οὐδ' ὁ πᾶς ἂν οὐρανὸς	
Διὸς γράφοντος τὰς βροτῶν ἁμαρτίας	5
ἐξαρκέσειεν, οὐδ' ἐκεῖνος ἂν σκοπῶν	
πέμπειν ἐκάστῳ ζημίαν· ἄλλ' ἡ Δίκη	
ἐνταῦθά πού 'στιν ἐγγύς, εἰ βούλεσθ' ὁρᾶν.	

(Eur. fr. 506 Kannicht)

You think crimes leap up to the gods on wings, and someone writes them on Zeus's folded tablet, and Zeus looks at them and delivers justice to men? Even the whole sky would not suffice for Zeus to write men's sins on it, nor could he study them and send punishment for each of them. In fact, Justice is somewhere here

²² Lucian *Merc. Cond.* 12 treats δέλτοι Διός as proverbial; cf. the discussion of Zeus' διφθέρα in van Looy 1964: 230. On the Near-Eastern origins of the δέλτοι Διός, see van Looy 1964: 227-28 (cf. 231), and especially West 1997: 561-62, who sees in Aesch. fr. 281a a 'more or less figurative use of *deltos*'.

²³ Cf. the portrayal of Zeus as the all-seeing judge of the living in *WD* 267-69 with West 1978: 223-24.

²⁴ Writing on 'the tablets of the mind' as a metaphor for committing to memory is found elsewhere in fifth-century drama (Aesch. *Cho.* 179, [Aesch.] *PV* 789, and Soph. fr. 597); cf. Solmsen 1944.

²⁵ See Collard *et al.* 1995: 278 for an overview of scholarly views regarding the identity of the speaker. The fragment is found in Stobaeus (1.3.14a).

²⁶ Dike is not the only possibility; in Babrius 127, the task is carried out by Hermes. Clearly the Euripidean speaker considers this divine intermediary insignificant, since in line 5 he or she skips this divinity altogether and attributes the writing to Zeus (Διὸς γράφοντος).

close by, if you are willing to see her. (trans. Collard and Cropp)

In this fragment, the speaker discredits the popular belief that Zeus guarantees the punishment of the unjust and suggests instead that administering justice is an entirely human affair (7-8).²⁷ In the context of deconstructing the traditional image of Zeus as the all-knowing judge of men, the Euripidean speaker capitalizes on the absurdity of taking the 'tablet of Zeus' literally (δέλτου πτυχαῖς / γράφειν τιν' αὐτά, 2-3). If we consider the two passages together, both Aesch. *Eum.* 275 and Eur. fr. 506 debunk—albeit in different ways—the existence of actual δέλτοι, of the sort that Dike claims to keep in Aesch. fr. 281a.21-23.²⁸ Given how little we know about the genre and the context of Aesch. fr. 281a, it is impossible to tell whether Dike's record-keeping and the literal meaning of Διὸς δέλτος that it appears to entail are meant to be serious or facetious.²⁹ Either way, however, it is worth noting that, in the extant text at least, Dike's tasks seem to extend beyond monitoring and recording human actions for some ultimate judge to review. The δέλτος is said to be of Zeus but, when the goddess explains how she deals with mortals, both the righteous and the unjust, she does not mention a consultation with Zeus or any other Olympian. Assuming that Lobel's reading of a first-person verb in line 17 is correct, Dike underscores her independent agency in rewarding virtuous men. Based on the (presumed) parallel between the beginning of 17 (τοῖς μὲν δ[ι]καίοις) and of 19 (τοῖς δ' αὖ μα[ρ]ταίοις), it is possible—albeit by no means provable—that line 19 contained a first-person statement too, an action that the Chorus immediately seeks to clarify further in line 20. In addition, after she establishes herself as a record-keeper (fr. 281a.21), the Chorus shows further

²⁷ On lines 7-8, cf. Collard et al. 1995: 279. The commentator is certainly right in pointing out that this fragment constructs justice 'not in Hesiod's traditional sense...but in the sense that recognizing and enacting justice lie within human power'. The way justice works according to the speaker of Eur. fr. 506 is certainly not Hesiodic, yet the image of Dike as a female figure located 'somewhere here close by' within the mortal realm may still be informed by traditional Hesiodic imagery. In fact, evoking Hesiod's personification of Dike, who roams the earth without the power to administer justice directly (WD 258-62), would be a brilliant rhetorical move as the implicit juxtaposition amplifies the speaker's point.

²⁸ Cataudella 1964/65: 281-83 has argued that, in fr. 506, Euripides ridicules specifically Aesch. fr. 281a, which he takes to be a tragic fragment. While there is no good reason to assume that the Euripidean lines engage with Aesch. fr. 281a in particular, they certainly seem to take the independent agency of personified Dike to a level that exceeds that of her representation in the Aeschylean fragment, where she claims to be sent by Zeus and draws authority from him.

²⁹ On the (rather improbable) echoes from contemporary administrative practices in the passage, see Patrito 2001: 83.

interest in the Dike's own involvement in the judgment of the μάταιοι (ἀναπτύσσει, 22). Unlike the belief debunked in Eur. fr. 506, according to which Zeus—in his guise as supreme judge—reviews records kept by some other divinity, the extant text of Aesch. fr. 281a appears to invest Dike not only with the task of record-keeping but also with the overview and assessment of the record. In this play, it seems, Zeus has bestowed upon Dike his δέλτος and, along with it, the prerogative to pass judgment and to distribute rewards and punishments. In other words, in Aesch. fr. 281a Dike does not present herself as a consultant of Zeus in the assessment of mortals, but as a judge sent by Zeus to the mortal realm with the power to dispense justice and to protect those favored by Zeus, presumably for leading righteous lives (πέμπει δέ μ' αὐτὸς οἶκιν εὖμεν[ής, fr. 281a.11).

While Dike claims her own agency and her power over human affairs, however, she also underscores her importance in the divine realm. In fr. 281a.5-12, Dike establishes her authority by divulging how she acquired the prerogative to oversee human affairs. Despite the lacunose state of the text, it is beyond doubt that Dike draws a strong connection between herself and Zeus' ascent to power after his victory over Cronus. According to lines 8-9, Zeus bestowed honor upon Dike in recognition of the fact that his victory over Cronus was δίκη enacted (δίκη κρατήσας, fr. 281a.6). Indeed, lines 7 and 9 cast the dethronement of Cronus as a fair act of retribution, and what's left of Dike's brief account is vague enough to allow for the possibility that Zeus repaid his father for his offenses against both his own father, Ouranus, and his children.³⁰ As a single act of punishment for wrongdoings committed over a stretch of time, Zeus' treatment of Cronus prefigures and enacts on a cosmic level the type of punitive action that Dike is subsequently sent to apply to transgressive humans (fr. 281a.22-23).³¹ As for her τιμή, her prerogative (ἐτίμη[σεν, 8 ~ ποίας δὲ τιμ[ῆς, 16), Dike eventually reveals herself to be a divine emissary appointed by Zeus himself (fr. 281a.11-12), but first she constructs an image of herself on Olympus,

³⁰ An evocation of Ouranus' castration in line 7 (πατὴρ γὰρ ἦρξεν) is possible but not certain. Garabo 1986 offers a useful overview of the various reconstructions proposed for fr. 281a.5-13. On δίκη here in relation to Hesiodic τίσις, see below.

³¹ Lloyd-Jones 1956: 60 claims that this manner of acquiring *timai* is accidental.

³² Note the polyptoton ἴζει, 5 ~ ἴζω, 10, with which Dike underscores her intrinsic connection with Zeus and the principles of his rule. Almost all commentators construe θρόνοισιν both with the verb ἴζω and with the participle that concluded fr. 281a.10, which Lobel 1952: 40 reconstructed as [ἡγλα]ῖσμένῃ only to reject the form due to insufficient space. Kakridis 1955: 92 has proposed [ὥρα]ῖσμένῃ, which would be a pun on Dike's identity as one of the Horae (cf. Hes. *Th.* 902). On the question of the participle, see more recently Cipolla 2010: 136-37. Only Wessels

sitting on Zeus' throne (fr. 281a.10).³² Conveying her high status in the cosmic hierarchy as well as her close relationship with Zeus, this powerful self-portrait aims at solidifying the goddess' authority in the eyes of her addressees. It is significant that Dike advertises her status among the Olympians again later, when she reveals that she reformed—and perhaps even nurtured³³—a member of the younger divine generation, a son of Zeus and Hera (fr. 281a.31-41). Given that her formative intervention not only facilitated this young god's integration within the order of Zeus but also had a positive impact upon humankind, this story demonstrates Dike's power to influence and change both the divine and the mortal realms.

The goddess' self-presentation in Aesch. fr. 281a is consistent in many ways with extant Aeschylean and pre-Aeschylean treatments of personified Dike, including the only other extensive account of the goddess' actions among gods and mortals, which is featured in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (220-24 and 256-62). As already mentioned, in fr. 281a.10 (ἵζω Διὸς θρόνοισιν[. . .]ἱμένη) Dike reduces her presence on Olympus to a single focal point, Zeus' throne. The image she conjures up is a (comically?) augmented version of her traditional depiction as a πάρεδρος of Zeus found already in Hesiod's *Works and Days*,³⁴ where it is linked to the punishment of the unjust but also confirms Dike's high status among the Olympians:

ἡ δέ τε παρθένος ἐστὶ Δίκη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,
 κυδρὴ τ' αἰδοίη τε θεῶν, οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν.
 καὶ ῥ' ὅπότε ἄν τις μιν βλάβῃ σκολιῶς ὀνοτάζων,
 αὐτίκα παρ Διὶ πατρὶ καθεζομένη Κρονίωνι
 γηρύετ' ἀνθρώπων ἄδικον νόον, ὅφρ' ἀποτίσῃ
 δῆμος ἀτασθαλίας βασιλέων, οἳ λυγρὰ νοεῦντες
 ἄλλῃ παρκλίνωσι δίκας σκολιῶς ἐνέποντες.

260

(Hes. *WD* 256-62)

1999: 101 construes θρόνοισιν exclusively with the participle.

³³ The ending of ἔθρε[ψ.] in line 31 is unfortunately irrecoverable. Lobel 1952: 41 thought that ἔθρεψε (sc. ἦρα) is more likely than ἔθρεψα, but Radt tentatively agrees with the preference of Kakridis 1962 for ἔθρεψα.

³⁴ On Δίκη πάρεδρος or σύνεδρος, see Soph. *OC* 1382-83 (ξύνεδρος) and Anaxarchus (4th c. BCE, 72 A 3 and 5 DK), but also her appropriation by the Orphic traditions as attested by *OF* 32 (cf. *OF* 233 with Burkert 1969:11 n.25 and West 1983: 109) and *OF* 33 (= [Dem.] 25.11). It is noteworthy that *Orph. H.* 62 to Δίκη, which postdates Aesch. fr. 281a by several centuries, presents the goddess as sitting on Zeus' throne (ἡ καὶ Ζηνὸς ἀνακτος ἐπὶ θρόνον ἱερὸν ἵκει, 2), and, much like the Aeschylean fragment, invests her with the power to punish the unjust and reward the just all by herself. See also Thalheim 1903, Shapiro 1986, and Bernabé 2004: 48-49.

brings to humankind.³⁷

If spectators of this scene did recall the *Works and Days* at all, they would certainly recognize the familiar synergy between Zeus and Dike in Aeschylus' version, but the juxtaposition of the two poems would also highlight the remarkable extent of Dike's power in the play.³⁸ In fr. 281a Dike presents herself as the sole representative of Zeus charged with monitoring the deeds of mortals, making no mention of other divine watchers, such as the invisible immortal *daimones* featured in the *WD* (252-55; cf. 122-26). Furthermore, while the play clearly aligns Dike with the will of Zeus (fr. 281a.11-12, 21), its emphasis on Dike's own agency when it comes to assessing, rewarding, and punishing mortals grants her power that is exercised almost exclusively by Zeus in the Hesiodic poem.³⁹

Regarding Dike's divine prerogative (τιμή), fr. 281a is certainly consistent with the Hesiodic tradition in identifying the human realm as the sphere of influence granted to Dike by Zeus. Her preoccupation with human actions is central to her identity not only in the *WD*, as evidenced in the passages discussed above, but also in the *Theogony*. In the context of recounting the birth of Dike and her sisters, the *Theogony* etymologizes their collective name in a manner that binds them intrinsically with the deeds of mortals:⁴⁰

Δεύτερον ἡγάγετο λιπαρὴν Θέμιν, ἥ τέκεν Ὠρας,

did eventually experience some abuse in the course of the play; see O'Sullivan and Collard 2013: 301. Hall 1998 and 2006: 142-69 discusses the sexual aggression of the chorus as a generic feature of satyr plays.

³⁸ West 1978: 221 claims that the 'little scene' in *WD* 259-62 'is developed by' Aesch. fr. 281a. Besides her status and her proximity to Zeus' throne, however, no other element of Dike's construction in fr. 281a overlaps with this Hesiodic passage; in fact, as I discuss below, there are significant differences between Hesiod's and Aeschylus' Dike. To the extent that it engages with the Hesiodic tradition, therefore, the Aeschylean fragment seems to rework and rewrite Hesiod's Dike considerably.

³⁹ See especially *WD* 228-29, where Zeus protects the Just City from war, *WD* 238-47 on Zeus' punishment of the Unjust City, and *WD* 267-69 on Zeus as the all-seeing and all-knowing surveyor of human affairs. Although *WD* 223 constructs Dike as 'bringing evil' (κακὸν ... φέρουσα) to the humans who abuse her, *WD* 257-62 place limitations upon her agency and identify Zeus as the source of punishment. Cf. Clay 2003: 144 ('Dike and Zeus have become inseparable or, rather, Zeus has become the enforcer of her decrees'). Constructing personified Dike as an independent divine agent within the human realm is a rather typical element for Aeschylean drama: see Aesch. *Sept.* 415-16, 645-48, 662-63, 667-69; *Suppl.* 343; *Ag.* 250-51, 772-75, 1535-36, 1607; *Cho.* 310-11 (cf. 306-9), 497-99, 935-36, 948-52; fr. 266.5.

⁴⁰ On fr. 281a and *Th.* 901-03, see also the brief discussion by Garabo 1986: 56-57.

Εὐνομίην τε Δίκην τε καὶ Εἰρήνην τεθαλυῖαν,
αἶ τ' ἔργ' ὠρεῦουσιν καταθνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι
(Hes. *Th.* 901-903)⁴¹

Second, he (sc. Zeus) married bright Themis, who gave birth to the Horae, Eunomia and Dike and blooming Eirene, who care for the works of mortal human beings (trans. Most)

Although there is no mention of Dike's sisters or of their collective name 'Horae' in the extant text of fr. 281a,⁴² the rehabilitation of the violent god in lines 31-41 reflects precisely the close connection between justice and peace encoded in their mythological genealogy. In fact, this drama may have featured the bond between Dike and Eirene much more prominently if indeed it included fr. 451n, where the speaker mentions εἰρήνη (l. 2) and describes the thriving opulence of a community shielded from war.⁴³

In its re-mythologization of Dike, however, this play departs from the Hesiodic tradition not only by granting Dike formative powers over another divinity (fr. 281a.31-41), but also by reinterpreting the Titanomachy so as to explicitly frame this cosmic event as an instantiation of what Dike stands for, before she is even given her τιμή (fr. 281a.6). Hesiod's *Theogony* justifies Zeus' victory against his father as inevitable τίσις for Cronus' crimes against his father and his children (*Th.* 209-10 and 472-73).⁴⁴ Dike does not emerge in the world until after Zeus has become the ruler of the cosmos (*Th.* 886) and applies herself to human rather than divine affairs.⁴⁵ In Aeschylus' play, on the other hand, δίκη—defined broadly enough to include retribution⁴⁶—is proclaimed by Zeus

⁴¹ OF 252 ~ Hes. *Th.* 901-2. Much like OF 252, *Orph. H.* 43.1-2 (for the Horae) reiterates the genealogical information found in Hes. *Th.* 901-2, but without any attempt to etymologize their name in the context of defining their divine prerogative, as seen in Hes. *Th.* 903.

⁴² However, there may be a subtle evocation of Themis (*Th.* 901) in fr. 281a.18 (θέ[ε]μ[ι]ον).

⁴³ In this context, Aesch. fr. 452n may be engaging with the Hesiodic contrast between constructive (ἄμυλλαν ὥστε γειτόνων ὀλβιοὶ κρατεῖν, 6) and destructive Eris (7-9) in WD 11-26.

⁴⁴ For *Th.* 472-73, I follow the text in West 1966: ...τείσατο δ' ἐρινὺς πατὴρ ἐοῖο / παίδων < θ' > οὐς κατέπινε μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης. Notice that both references to τίσις are made through the perspective of an injured party (Ouranus' in *Th.* 209-10, Rheas in *Th.* 472-73).

⁴⁵ On the exclusive association of Dike with the mortal realm in Hesiodic poetry, see, recently, Clay 2016.

⁴⁶ Despite the lacunae, there is little doubt that, in lines 7 and 9, Dike claims that Zeus was justified to retaliate.

himself as the overarching principle that defines his rule from its violent inception.⁴⁷ We do not know when Dike is supposed to have been born in this play or who her parents are. Given other Aeschylean treatments of the goddess (*Sept.* 662, *Cho.* 948-52; cf. *Cho.* 244-45), it is very likely that she presented herself as the daughter of Zeus in this play as well; it remains remarkable, however, that there is no unambiguous reference to Zeus as her father in fr. 281a.⁴⁸ At least in the extant text, Dike does not seem to rely on her genealogy to establish her authority; instead, she draws attention to Zeus' acknowledgement of her value and importance within his regime.

I hope that my discussion of Aesch. fr. 281a has shed some new light upon Dike's portrayal in this fragmentary play, especially with regard to the nature of her τιμαί and her place within Zeus' cosmos. Fr. 281a, I have argued, offers an enhanced and empowered version of Dike, especially when juxtaposed to the Hesiodic tradition.

⁴⁷ Given the lack of context, it is impossible to tell whether the (seemingly unchallenged) justification of Zeus' violence against his father as a righteous act is supposed to be funny or serious. The intergenerational violence of the Succession Myth is problematized elsewhere in the Aeschylean corpus, most prominently in the *Oresteia* and in [Aesch.] *PV*, but a thorough examination of this topic is beyond the scope of this paper.

⁴⁸ Dike always refers to Zeus by name (με Ζεὺς ἐτίμ[ησεν, 8; ἴζω Διὸς θρόνοισιν, 10; πέμπει.../Ζ[ε]ῦς, 11-12, Ζηνί, 32). The only possible exception is πατήρ in line 7, yet, as Lobel 1952: 39 already points out, it is uncertain whether πατήρ stands for Zeus' father (Cronus) or Dike's father (presumably Zeus). For a concise overview of all the proposed readings and interpretations of fr. 281a.5-7, see Garabito 1986: 51-55. It is still possible to read in line 8 (Διός) a wordplay between the name of Zeus and Δίκη; for a more overt connection between genealogy and etymology, see Aesch. *Cho.* 948-52 (cf. already Hes. *WD* 236) with Garvie 1986: 309-10.

References

- Benedetto, V. di and F. Maltomini 1976. 'Eschilo, P. Oxy. 2256 fr.9a vv.31ss.," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia*, Serie III 6: 1-8.
- Bernabé, A. 2004. *Poetae Epici Graeci. Testimonia et Fragmenta. Pars II, Fasc. 1*. Munich.
- Bernabé, A., and A. I. Jiménez San Cristóbal. 2011. 'Are the 'Orphic' gold leaves Orphic?', in R. G. Edmunds III, ed., *The 'Orphic' Gold Tablets and Greek Religion*. Cambridge. 68-101.
- Bremer, J. M. 1991. 'Poets and their patrons', in H. Hofmann and A. M. Harder, eds., *Fragmenta Dramatica*. Göttingen. 39-60.
- Burkert, W. 1969. 'Das Proömium des Parmenides und die Katabasis des Pythagoras', *Phronesis* 14: 1-30.
- Cataudella, Q. 1964/65. 'Tragedie di Eschilo nella Siracusa di Gerone', *Kokalos* 10/11: 371-98.
- Cipolla, P. 2010. 'Il frammento di Dike (Aesch. F 281a R.): uno *status quaestionis* sui problemi testuali ed esegetici', *Lexis* 28: 133-54.
- Clay, J. S. 2003. *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge.
- Clay, J. S. 2016. 'The Justice of Zeus in the *Theogony*?' in J. J. Clauss, M. Kuypers, and A. Kahane, eds., *The Gods of Greek Hexameter Poetry: From the Archaic Age to Late Antiquity and Beyond*. Stuttgart. 21-31.
- Collard, C., and M.J. Cropp, eds. 2008. *Euripides. Volume VII. Fragments: Aegeus-Meleager*. Cambridge, MA.
- Collard, C., et al. 1995. *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays. Volume I*. Warminster.
- Corbato, C. 1996. 'Le *Etnee* di Eschilo', in B. Gentili, ed., *Catania antica*. Pisa. 61-72.
- Ercolani, A. 2010. *Esiodo. Opere e giorni*. Rome.
- Fränkel, E. 1954. 'Vermutungen zum Aetna-Festspiel des Aeschylus', *Eranos* 52: 61-75.
- Garabo, M. L. 1986. 'Eschilo, fr. 281A, 5-13 Radt', *Giornale Filologico Ferrarese* 9: 51-57.
- Garvie, A. F., ed. 1986. *Aeschylus: Choephoroi*. Oxford.
- Görschen, F. C. 1955. 'Zum sogenannten Dike-Fragment des Aischylos', *Dioniso* 18: 139-51.

- Hall, E. 1998. 'Ithyphallic Males Behaving Badly; or, Satyr Drama as Gendered Tragic Ending', in M. Wyke, ed., *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the bodies of antiquity*. Oxford. 13-37.
- Hall, E. 2006. *The Theatrical Cast of Athens. Interactions between Ancient Greek Drama and Society*. Oxford.
- Hutchinson, G.O., ed. 1985. *Aeschylus. Seven Against Thebes*. Oxford.
- Kakridis, J. Th. 1955. 'Aeschylea', *Acme* 8: 91-92.
- Kakridis, J. Th. 1962. 'Der ΠΑΙΣ ΜΑΡΤΟΣ im Dike-Fragment des Aischylos (Pap.Ox. 2256, Fr.9a)', *Eranos* 60: 111-21.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1956. 'Zeus in Aeschylus', *JHS* 76: 55-67.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1957. 'Unknown Play (IIb)', in H. W. Smyth, ed., *Aeschylus. Vol. 2*. Cambridge, MA. 576-81.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983². *The Justice of Zeus*. Berkeley.
- Lobel, E. P. 1952. '2256. Aeschylus, Various Plays', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 20: 41-65.
- Looy, H. van 1964. *Zes Verloren Tragedies van Euripides*. Brussels.
- Mette, H. J. 1959. *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos*. Berlin.
- Mette, H. J. 1963. *Der verlorene Aischylos*. Berlin.
- O'Sullivan, P., and C. Collard, eds. 2013. *Euripides: Cyclops and Major Fragments of Greek Satyric Drama*. Oxford.
- Papadodima, E. 2010. 'Dike in Attic Tragedy: An overview' *Eranos* 106: 93-110.
- Patrino, P. 2001. 'Sul frammento di Dike (= Aesch. fr. 281a-b Radt)', *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Filologia A. Rostagni*: 77-95
- Pinchard, A. 2016. 'Dikē as Global World Order: An Orphic Inheritance in Aeschylus?', *TC* 8(2): 242-81.
- Podlecki, A. J., 2005. 'Aischylos Satyrikos' in G. Harrison, ed., *Satyr Drama: Tragedy at Play*. Swansea. 1-38.
- Poli-Palladini, L. 2001. 'Some reflections on Aeschylus' *Aetnae(ae)*', *RhM* 144: 287-325.
- Radt, S., ed. 2009. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Volume 3*. 2nd ed. Göttingen.
- Robertson, D. S. 1953. 'Dike and Ares', *CR* 3: 79-80.
- Shapiro, A. H. 1986. 'Dike', *LIMC* III, 1:388-91.
- Smith, D.G. 2017. 'The Reception of Aeschylus in Sicily', in R. Futo Kennedy, ed., *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aeschylus*. Leiden and Boston. 9-53.
- Snell, B. 1953. 'Review of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part 20*. Edited with

- notes by E. Lobel, E. P. Wegener, C. H. Roberts. London: Egypt Exploration Society 1952. XVI, 192 S. 16 Taf. 40. 80 sh. (Egypt Exploration Society)', *Gnomon* 25: 433-40.
- Solmsen, F. 1944. 'The Tablets of Zeus', *CQ* 38: 27-30.
- Sommerstein, A.H., ed. 2009. *Aeschylus. III: Fragments*. Cambridge, MA.
- Stark, R. 1956. 'Osservazioni su due drammi di Eschilo perduti', *Maia* 8: 83-91.
- Stewart, E. 2017. *Greek Tragedy on the Move. The Birth of a Panhellenic Art Form c.500-300 BC*. Oxford.
- Sutton, D. F. 1980. *The Greek Satyr Play*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Sutton, D. F. 1983. 'A Possible Subject for Aeschylus' *Dike-Play*', *ZPE* 51: 19-24.
- Thalheim, T. 1903. 'Dike', *RE* V, 1: 574-80.
- Torrance, I. 2013. *Metapoetry in Euripides*. Oxford.
- Verdenius, W. J. 1985. *A Commentary on Hesiod's 'Works and Days', vv. 1-382*. Leiden.
- Vysoký, Z. K. 1957. 'Přispěvky k výkladu a určení některých nových zlomků aischylových', *Listy filologické* 80: 164-73.
- Wessels, A. 1999. 'Dike-Drama', in R. Krumeich, N. Pechstein, and B. Seidensticker, eds., *Das Griechische Satyrspiel*. Darmstadt: 98-106.
- West, M. L., ed. 1966. *Hesiod. Theogony*. Oxford.
- West, M. L., ed. 1978. *Hesiod. Works and Days*. Oxford.
- West, M. L., ed. 1983. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford.

The Inconsistency of Antigone: Human Character and Divinely-Sent *atē* in Sophocles' Play

David Kovacs

This essay is offered in homage and deep affection to my dear friend and colleague Jenny Strauss Clay. Both of us have pondered on the gods in Greek and Latin poetry, and both of us have occasionally proposed bold and controversial solutions to scholarly problems in this area. I hope she will appreciate the venturesome spirit of this paper—or will at any rate recognize the affection behind it.

By Antigone's 'inconsistency' I do not principally mean the contradiction between her reply to Creon (45-70) and the notorious passage (904-20) in which she says she would not have tried to bury Polynices if he had been her husband or son. The latter is a self-contained passage, and deleting it (or portions of it) remains a possibility.¹ Arguably a more fundamental inconsistency is the contrast between, on the one hand, the Antigone of the prologue and the second episode (who tells Ismene and Creon that not only does the threat of death not prevent her from carrying out her duty to her brother but that she even welcomes such a

¹ The lines were current in Aristotle's day (see the citation of 911-12 at *Rhet.* 1417a32-33). Their adaptation of Herodotus 3.119 speaks in favor of Sophoclean authorship since there is ancient testimony to a friendship between the poet and the historian. Further connections between the play and Herodotus' third book are noted by West 1999. On the other hand the speech considerably qualifies Antigone's point at 450-60 and does so for reasons that seem fussy (why does it matter that she could not get another brother?). Attempts to integrate the passage into the rest of the play by means of psychology or thematic considerations seem to me not eminently successful. The safest course is to write about inconsistency in the rest of the play and leave this passage to one side.

death) and, on the other, the Antigone of the fourth episode, who is led away lamenting that she is dying before her time and will never have the chance to be married. Greek tragedy, to be sure, can show sharp changes of mind.² In *Iphigenia in Aulis* Iphigenia's initial reaction to the prospect of being sacrificed is to supplicate her father and to enlist the aid of Achilles in preventing the sacrifice. When the sacrifice cannot be avoided, she adopts the attitude that her death, like the death of the Greek soldiers who will die at Troy, is for the good of Greece. Likewise in *Hecuba* Polyxena is initially distraught that she is to be sacrificed to the shade of Achilles but later says that with her native city destroyed death is preferable to servitude. In Euripides' *Suppliants* Theseus at first refuses to involve Athens in a war to secure burial for the Argives who died at Thebes but is later persuaded by his mother that this risky course of action is in his country's and his own best interest. In all three of these cases Euripides creates a movement from fearfulness and caution to a more heroic stance. Sophocles begins his treatment of Antigone by giving her the intransigence and carelessness of consequence to herself that are often the marks of the heroic. Why, having created such a figure, does he then proceed to diminish her heroism and replace her defiance with complaint at her (self-chosen) lot?³ Shall we explain it naturalistically, that only when she is being led away does Antigone take in the full import of what she has done? Natural this may be, but it hardly seems like Sophocles.⁴

The struggle of Antigone with Ismene and Creon has seemed to most interpreters to be an affirmation of the individual in the face of the multi-

² Gibert 1995 is devoted to this topic. On pp. 105-109 he discusses the Guard, who swore he would never return but does so; Ismene, who attempts to claim a role in the burial after earlier refusing to participate; and Creon, who decides to exempt Ismene from punishment, to change Antigone's punishment from stoning to immuring in a cave, and, after the departure of Teiresias, to bury Polynices and rescue Antigone. He mentions Antigone's regret (29-30) only to say that he is not going to discuss it.

³ To be sure, Antigone says forthrightly both to Creon and to others that her death is unfair (902-903, 916-28, 940-43), but there is a considerable difference between such a complaint and the embracing of her own death that she exhibited earlier (84-87, 460-68).

⁴ Knox 1964: 103, as part of an argument intended to show that heroic types such as Antigone do not change, says 'She made light of death before, welcomed it as a gain, claimed it as her choice, but now she is face to face with it alone'. Antigone, he says, 'does not weaken, but her mood does change'. But this seems more than a change of mood. Fear of death is the expected thing, as is shown by Creon's 580-81 (quoted by Knox to make Antigone's new attitude less surprising), and Antigone's reaction is now the expected one. When Antigone complains (895-96) that she is dying the worst death by far (κάκιστα δὴ μακρῶι), she echoes Ismene's ὅσω κάκιςτ' ὀλούμεθα (59). This 'Ismenian' Antigone is new.

tude and of courage in the face of timidity on the one hand and arrogance on the other. That is why it is disconcerting that this luminous figure is replaced by someone more ordinary. But what if we have things the wrong way round? What if we are not meant to see the defiant Antigone as heroic but to view her self-destructive behavior as the result of a divinely sent derangement intended to bring the race of Laius and Oedipus to an end? That, in a nutshell, is what will be argued in these pages.⁵

Since the seventies and eighties of the last century there has been some dissent from the view that Sophocles expected his audience to see Antigone's stance as wholly admirable. Andrew Brown in the introduction to his 1987 Aris and Phillips edition of the play administered a salutary shock to his readers when he wrote (p. 7):

Most critics allow that [Antigone] is no plaster saint, for there can be no moral justification for her rudeness and cruelty to Ismene.... But Antigone's treatment of the living is almost incidental, for what matters to her, and is central to her dramatic existence, is her treatment of the body of Polynices. Now most critics still assume, with little argument, that she was under a genuine moral and religious obligation to attempt the burial. And yet some argument is perhaps needed. I personally would not be conscious of an obligation to give up my life in an attempt to bury a dead relative; and, if an acquaintance of mine had done so, my feelings towards him or her would not be ones of unmixed admiration.

Brown goes on to say that there is no evidence that the Greeks would have felt such an obligation either. He notes further, as does Ismene (90, 92), that Antigone cannot succeed in actually giving her brother a funeral, and the only thing her action will accomplish is to bring about a further death, her own. Additionally, the gods themselves can presumably look out for the vindication of their own laws. They later make their disapproval of Creon's actions apparent in signs communicated to Teiresias,

⁵ Many of the points made here were made by Else 1976, a work I encountered only after I had formulated my own ideas. My justification for making a case that has, at least in part, already been made is that Else has been largely ignored. This is partly because of certain gratuitous assumptions he makes (e.g. that Creon is an adoptive Labdacid) and partly because his approach is scattershot and involves no systematic beginning-to-end treatment of the play. I have indicated in footnotes the principal points where I have been anticipated.

and there is no reason to think that they would not have done so even if Antigone had not flouted Creon's edict. Brown suggests further that when we see Antigone defying authority in the name of a religious principle, we tend to invest her with the characteristics of a Christian martyr.⁶ The pagan Greeks, however, did not believe in martyrdom.⁷ Their gods were not trying to convert an unbelieving world by demonstrations of superhuman endurance, and they promised no eternal rewards to their votaries. Martyrdom was not among the lenses through which the original audience could have seen Antigone's action.

When we look at ancient literature, a lot of it seems to be speaking to us pretty directly. Here is Antigone, bravely championing the principle that everyone must be given a burial. In her defiance of authority she has for us a deep appeal. Yet we have to remind ourselves that the play was not written for us, the heirs of the Judeo-Christian tradition in the twenty-first century. It is part of a conversation between Sophocles and his fifth-century Athenian audience, a conversation we are overhearing. And like many an overheard conversation, even one overheard from the next booth in a restaurant, it is likely to be imperfectly caught or substantially misunderstood.⁸ The big point we are likely to overlook or misunderstand in Greek tragedy is the idea that the gods can act with hostility toward human beings, deliberately

⁶ The use of the word 'martyrdom' to describe Antigone's act is widespread: see, e.g., Else 1976: 8, Lesky 1983: 442n49, and Palmer 2014.

⁷ The closest thing to martyrdom in the classical period is Socrates' refusal at his trial to entreat the jurymen to spare him. Socrates, of course, is in several respects a complete outlier.

⁸ Useful warnings about the danger of bringing modern presuppositions to the interpretation of *Antigone* are to be found in Sourvinou-Inwood 1989. But Sourvinou-Inwood insists so strongly that from the first Antigone would have seemed completely wrong to Sophocles' first audience that it is difficult to see how the poet could have chosen to write a play about such a perverse creature. Instead, I believe Sophocles intended us to see in Antigone a nobly-born and morally admirable woman who has been influenced by gods hostile to her family to act self-destructively in furtherance of a principle that is clearly good. There is ample room for audience sympathy.

⁹ A referee who read an earlier version of this paper somehow got the impression that I was biased in favor of the Judaeo-Christian tradition and against Greek polytheism. In order to ward off such a misunderstanding, let me say clearly that, although I do not believe in anthropomorphic gods myself, I have a great deal of respect for the archaic Greek world-view, which strikes me as a clear-eyed and brave faith. Much earlier scholarship seems to have valued Aeschylus and Euripides only to the extent that they were thought to represent an advance on the religious beliefs and values we find in epic. But it is not true or useful to regard Aeschylus as a quasi-monotheist: see Lloyd-Jones 1956. And it is increasingly recognized that to read Euripides through the lens of pre-Socratic philosophy and to emphasize his differences from Sophocles produces distortion and arbitrariness in interpretation: see e.g. Spira 1960, Steidle 1968, Heath 1987: 49-64, and many others, including Kovacs 1994: 1-36 and Kovacs 1997. The day when Wilamowitz or Murray could patronize Sophocles for holding to an outworn creed is long past, and we have reason to be grateful.

causing them to make wrong decisions that will ruin them.⁹

In the monotheist view of the world, God always wills the good of his creatures. The Judeo-Christian god is portrayed as angry toward those who flout his laws but well-disposed toward the innocent.¹⁰ He is not to be blamed when *we* make bad decisions.¹¹ He wants us to do what is right and what is also in our own long-term interest, and it is we human beings who make the wrong choices. In the whole of the Bible, there is only one clear case where God encourages someone to make a wrong decision, the notorious case of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart (Exodus 7.3-5, 14.4). But in the Greek literary tradition the gods not infrequently punish those who are not themselves guilty of any crime but are the offspring of guilty persons.¹² Often they do this by warping their judgment. An overview of divine hostility in Greek tragedy will serve as a reminder of the mythological motifs that the first audience of Sophocles' *Antigone* brought to the theater that day.¹³

When the gods have it in for you, how do they carry out their hostile plans? In Greek literature clear-cut miraculous interventions by the gods—lightning bolts from a clear sky striking the guilty—are comparatively rare. More frequently the gods accomplish their purposes by means that are barely distinguishable from natural events and can often be seen to be divinely caused only in retrospect. Agamemnon is killed not by overt divine intervention but by his wife Clytaemestra. After the event she herself expresses the poet's ideas for him by saying to the Chorus that in reality she is not so much the wife of Agamemnon as a spirit of vengeance sent by the gods to punish him (Aesch. Ag. 1497-1504). Cassandra (1186-93) makes it clear that Thyestes' adultery and Atreus' cruel revenge are the cause of the murder that will ensue. There is every reason to take

¹⁰ At times, of course, the innocent may be swept up in the punishment of the guilty, though passages such as Genesis 18.23-33 and Jonah 1.4-12 show that God is portrayed as aware of the problem.

¹¹ At the beginning of the *Odyssey*, of course, Zeus makes a similar point, but the poem as a whole does not bear out this attempt at theodicy.

¹² The offspring of guilty persons are liable to punishment also in the Old Testament: see Joshua 7.24-26. But they are not punished by being led into wrong decisions.

¹³ Did the Athenians accept the possibility of divine hostility toward themselves? Parker 1997 contrasts the sunny view, seen in oratory, that the Athenians had of their own relationship to the gods (in which careful observance of piety is requited with unflagging divine benevolence) with the relations between gods and certain figures in tragedy. He rejects certain ways of papering over this discrepancy (on pp. 144-48 that cruel gods are merely a plot element of a certain kind of fiction; on p. 149 that divine hostility is visible only in places other than Athens). He notes (pp. 150-55) that the hostility of the gods is directed most often in tragedy against individuals or households. His conclusion is that the optimism of oratory is obligatory convention, and that

these statements with the utmost seriousness.

Agamemnon was killed in part because of the choice he made at Aulis to sacrifice Iphigenia. The description of this deed in the parodos of *Agamemnon* makes it clear that it was not a free decision but one forced upon him: because of adverse winds it was not possible for the expedition either to go forward or to be disbanded, and food was running out. The gods, it is clear, put Agamemnon in a place where there was no good choice, where he must perform an abhorrent act, one that would result in his death after he returned from Troy. The Chorus say (218-23) that Agamemnon suffered from a visitation of αἰσχρόμητις τάλαινα παρακοπὰ πρωτοπήμων, 'a foully plotting, miserable delusion, begetter of woes'. I think Aeschylus intended his audience to accept this description. In other cases the gods make the disastrous choice not so much inevitable as highly likely. When Oedipus asks Apollo at Delphi who his parents are, the god refuses to answer his question but tells him that he is bound to kill his father and marry his mother. I have argued elsewhere that the god gives this response in order to make it probable that Oedipus will not return to Corinth but will set off from Delphi in the other direction, taking a road on which, as Apollo knows, Laius is now traveling.¹⁴ A further way of causing bad decisions is to interfere with the victim's organs of sense. When the title hero of Euripides' *Heracles* kills his own children, he thinks they are those of his enemy Eurystheus. Likewise Agave in *Bacchae* thinks that her son Pentheus is a lion.

The gods also prompt people to make conscious decisions that are ruinous. In Aeschylus' *Septem*, for example, Eteocles is presented in the first half of the play as a clear-headed leader. When he makes arrangements for the defense of Thebes's gates against the attacking leaders, he assigns appropriate Theban captains to the first six, giving sober and sound reasons for his choices. But when he learns that his brother Polynices is attacking the seventh gate, he declares himself convinced that he must meet his brother in battle. The Chorus try to dissuade him, but he sees it as the working out of his father's curse (655) and of the animus Phoebus feels for his whole race (689-91), a state of affairs that he actively embraces. The Chorus in the following stasimon conclude that there is a house-destroying Erinys at work. In *Hippolytus* Phaedra is inspired with an uncontrollable

ordinary Athenian belief did not resolutely exclude the possibility of divine hostility.

¹⁴ See Kovacs 2009: 359-63, where I also discuss the intended effects of the oracle to Laius.

passion for her stepson, a passion she knows is ruinous. It will lead to her death, though it is intended by the goddess to cause the death of Hippolytus. When Medea ponders killing her children, she admits that this murder will be ruinous to herself but says that she must commit it anyway. Several passages suggest that the source of the compulsion is divine.¹⁵ Though we have less context than we need for proper interpretation, the famous fragment from Aeschylus' *Niobe* (154a.15-16 Radt) says that when a god wishes to ruin a house, he plants a fault or a cause (αἰτία) in mortals. The same idea, that when the gods wish to destroy someone they frequently cause him to make unaccountably bad decisions, is made explicitly at *Antigone* 620-24, where the Chorus cite as a well-known maxim 'the bad appears the good to the man a god would doom.'

The audience at the first performance of *Antigone* were surely aware of the possibility that divine hostility in its various forms would figure in a play involving the descendants of Laius. Sophocles' play situates itself mythically as a sequel to Aeschylus' *Septem*, and, as we have seen, divinely sent ruin dominates the latter half of Aeschylus' play. We have only the last play of the trilogy, but at *Septem* 742-49 the Chorus repeat what the audience may have experienced in the first play, that when Laius went to Delphi to ask about begetting children, Apollo told him that it would be best if he died without issue. Apollo wants to bring Laius' race to an end.¹⁶ That is the reason why he gives him the further oracle that if he begets a son, that son will kill his father and marry his mother: this is intended to encourage him to die without issue. But Laius does have a son, so the gods, who have plenty of time, destroy the line more slowly by using Oedipus to kill Laius and later to curse the sons he has begotten. The gods' hatred of Laius and their desire to bring his race to an end are an indispensable motif in the story. That the dramatist meant his audience to see that *Antigone's* initial stance is brought about by gods intent on her death and that her later desire to preserve her life is the unaltered *Antigone* is most convincingly shown if we walk through the play from beginning to

¹⁵ See Lloyd-Jones 1983: 149 and Kovacs 1993.

¹⁶ A mistaken *obiter dictum* of Wilamowitz at the end of the nineteenth century (1899: 55, rpt. *KS* vi.209), uncritically accepted by scholars as late as the twenty-first century, claims that in *Oedipus Tyrannos* the oracle was unconditional, that Laius was bound to sire a son who would kill him and marry his mother. In fact Sophocles too presupposes the desire of Apollo to bring Laius' race to an end. See Kovacs 2009: 366-67 with references. The same state of affairs seems to be presupposed in *Antigone*.

end, elucidating Antigone's actions through the lens of divine hostility.

But before we do this, I must discuss the way in which, in Greek tragedy, characters' talk about the gods is a way for the dramatist to suggest realities he cannot directly portray. Greek tragedy is always a two-decker affair, human actions and divine actions combined. But the gods are rarely brought onto the tragic stage during a play,¹⁷ and their appearance at beginnings or ends of plays is far from universal (Euripides is unusual in the frequent use he makes of divine *προλογίζοντες* at the beginning and gods from the machine at the end). How then convey to the audience the idea that the gods are at work? There are, of course, the gods' accredited spokesmen such as Teiresias and Cassandra, but sometimes they are unavailable. An epic poet like Homer speaks from an omniscient point of view and is able not only to take his hearers from the battlefield up to Olympus to hear the gods discussing their purposes but also to show one of the gods spiriting a warrior away from the battlefield in a cloud of invisibility.

These means are not available to the tragic poet, but it is frequently necessary for him, like the epic poet, to convey to his audience information of this kind. Hence what I take to be a rule: when a character in a tragedy, even—or especially—a minor one, says that something is so mysterious that it might be supernatural or uses language that suggests divine activity, the audience knew to take notice.¹⁸ The character himself is merely guessing and has no *knowledge* that the gods are at work, but the dramatist has him speak as he does in order to suggest a possibility he wants his audience to take seriously. Thus when the Exangelos in *Oedipus Tyrannos* says (1258-62) that Oedipus was mysteriously guided by some unseen force to find the body of Jocasta, I suggest we are meant to take the hint that there was something uncanny about the business and that Apollo was at work guiding Oedipus to his meeting with the brooches on her dress, with which Apollo means him to put out his eyes. Likewise in our play when the Guard (418, 421) calls the dust storm that precedes the appearance of Antigone a 'god-sent plague', this

¹⁷ Apart from *Eumenides* and *Prometheus*, with their mostly divine cast lists, we have Lyssa and Iris in *Heracles*, and Dionysus in *Bacchae*. The fourth century gives us Athena and the Muse in *Rhesus*.

¹⁸ See Kovacs 2000. (This piece is published in a not easily obtainable journal. I am happy to supply a copy of it on request.) Remarks from a similar perspective specifically regarding *Antigone* are to be found in Scodel 1984.

is to him conventional talk about the weather but is intended by the poet to suggest that the dust storm is divinely sent. We can now proceed through *Antigone*.

Antigone and Ismene, both perhaps dressed in the dark vestments of mourning, emerge from the *skene*. From Antigone's first lines to Ismene, the audience are given to understand that the family to which she belongs is in the cross-hairs (1-6):

O dearest sister, my own dear Ismene, do you know any woe stemming from Oedipus that Zeus is not accomplishing (will not accomplish?) for us while we still live? For there is nothing painful or dishonored or ruinous that I have not seen among our calamities.¹⁹

Ismene replies (11-17) that she has heard of no disaster since the death of their two brothers. Antigone informs her (21-36) of the latest calamity: the new king Creon has buried²⁰ Eteocles with full honors but has pronounced an edict that no one, on pain of death by stoning, shall mourn Polynices or give him a burial. She announces (44-46) that she will nevertheless bury him.

Ismene (49-57) replies to Antigone's announcement by listing all the family's previous troubles: the self-blinding and death of Oedipus, the suicide of Jocasta, and the mutual slaughter of Eteocles and Polynices. Why add another death to these? All this calls to the audience's mind the divinely caused destruction of the royal house treated in Aeschylus' Theban trilogy and in the two Theban cyclic epics.²¹

From its first mention it is evident that Antigone's decision to bury her brother is irrational and self-destructive. For she not only wants to bury him but also demands that her act not be concealed even though she knows that the penalty is death. Her decision, which is suicidal in

¹⁹ The textual problems in these lines are discussed in Brown 1991: 325-26, Kovacs 1992: 9-12, Willink 2000, and Austin 2006: 103-13. The words $\nu\omicron\iota\nu \xi\tau\iota \zeta\acute{o}\kappa\alpha\iota\nu$, whose puzzling nature is admitted by Dawe 1978: 99, perhaps imply a belief on Antigone's part that the gods would be expected to cause the sisters' death rather than bring woes on them during their lifetime.

²⁰ Or 'will bury' if the attractive conjecture of Willink 2007 is accepted.

²¹ It is not necessary to suppose, with Else 1976: 70, that the audience at the first performance of *Antigone* remembered in detail Aeschylus' plays of some twenty-five years earlier since the epic cycle was a further source. The cyclic poems on Thebes are discussed in detail by Davies 2014. For an argument that persistent divine anger against the race of Laius figured in them see Lloyd-Jones 2002.

intent, makes little or no sense in human terms and would appear to call for a different kind of explanation: the gods, it seems, are setting Antigone on a course for death by stoning. Aeschylus did not mention Antigone or Ismene, preferring to focus on Eteocles and Polynices as the last of the line.²² In Sophocles' play they are presented as the last living members of the family (58). It is a doomed family, one that is, by turns, either incestuously close or full of excessive mutual hatred. The first of these is apparent in Antigone's words,²³ and both in those of Ismene (49-57). One of the sisters is engaged to be married. If she is killed and Ismene does not marry, the line of Labdacus and Laius comes to an end for good and all. That has been the gods' wish for some time, and there is no reason to think that their purposes have altered.

After Antigone exits for the battlefield and Ismene re-enters the palace, the Chorus of Theban elders make their entrance. They have been summoned to hear a speech by the new king Creon, and they sing with palpable relief of the defeat of Thebes' attackers. Creon then enters and announces the principles that will govern his new regime: he will make all his decisions in the interests of the common good, and no favor will be shown to members of his own family. These are sound principles and were quoted as such in the next century in Demosthenes' *De falsa legatione* (19.247). His next remark is not so sound: he proclaims that the traitor Polynices shall not be buried at all but left to be eaten by birds and dogs.²⁴ The Chorus seem a bit cool to this but make no protest. Creon indicates that he has set guards over the body to see that his edict is carried out.

A person of low status comes up the eisodos that leads from the battlefield, one of the guards Creon has stationed over Polynices' body. He is clearly worried (223-32) that he may get into trouble because of the

²² The final scene between the Herald and Antigone (1005-78) is spurious. See the thorough discussion in Barrett 2007.

²³ Liapis 2013: 85-86 well describes the family that is on display in the prologue, 'a doomed *oikos*, where procreation is overwhelmed by self-annihilating introversion' and where Antigone describes herself (74-77, with incestuous overtones) as lying next to her brother in death for all time.

²⁴ It has often been pointed out that traitors in Athens were denied burial and cast out beyond the borders of Attica. In view of this it is hard to know whether Creon's act would have been instantly recognized as mistaken or whether it would be seen thus only gradually throughout the play. Teiresias' words make it plain that Creon's act is a religious offense. How much earlier this would have been apparent is a difficult question to decide. I suggest that there is a difference between casting the body of a traitor beyond the borders (where his kin could give him a burial) and forbidding burial or mourning in any form.

news he brings, but he reports that during the night someone, acting in the dark, has thrown a covering of dust over the body and that (as a result) it was undisturbed by birds or dogs (245-67). The Chorus suggest, somewhat surprisingly, that this may be the work of the gods (278-79). The audience, of course, have seen Antigone disappear down the *eisodos* to the battlefield, and so they have good reason to think that she has done this deed. But the suggestion is left in their minds that she has had divine help to accomplish her task in the dark and that the gods have protected the corpse of Polynices. Creon, of course, denies this and proclaims (in the rationalistic way so common to tragic characters about to receive their comeuppance) that of course the gods could not have had a hand in this and that the real explanation is his political opponents, who want to replace him as king and have bribed people to go against his edict (280-97). He sends the guard back to where he came from, telling him that if he and his fellow guards do not find the culprit, they will be punished (305-12).

There follows a choral ode, the famous Ode on Man, which I shall not describe in detail here. The Chorus, marvelling at the skill of the person who did the burial, relate it to the dangers and glories of all human skills. Thereafter the Guard returns, this time with Antigone. He tells the story of her capture (407-40). He and his fellow guards were sitting near the corpse, upwind from it to avoid the smell, when a dust-storm arose. He describes this storm twice in language that suggests it is heaven-sent (418, 421). The poet who made the Guard speak this way intends, I have argued above, that his audience shall take his hint seriously. He says that when the storm cleared, they saw Antigone and that before they could stop her, she poured more dust on the corpse. As Scodel argued in 1984, this storm is the tragic equivalent of the cloud of invisibility that allows the gods to spirit warriors off the battlefield in the *Iliad*. Antigone might have been stopped by the guards before she got near her brother's corpse, but thanks to the storm she arrived undetected and performed her deed of piety only to be discovered shortly thereafter. The fact that the storm arose when it did and ceased when it did makes it possible for Antigone to perform the deed and makes it certain that she will be caught. If the Guard's language is intended to suggest to the audience that the gods are at work, the intent of the storm may be judged from its effect: the gods intended for Antigone to perform her deed and

to be caught doing so.

Thereafter she confronts Creon and tells him that she was obeying higher laws than his edict when she buried her brother (450-70). These laws, she says, are eternal—no one knows where they come from—and so they cannot be overturned by human ordinance. All this is shown to be true in the course of the play. But, as Brown has argued, Greek sentiment does not require anyone to throw away his life in order to see that the dead are buried. That is what Antigone is doing. She claims that the penalty of death was no deterrent to her since she positively welcomes an early death to put an end to her miseries. For his part Creon reacts with thoroughly stupid arguments: those who oppose him will be crushed; he will not take orders from a woman; and it is monstrous for someone detected in wrongdoing to boast of it as a fine accomplishment (473-85). He orders Ismene—Antigone's accomplice, as he imagines—to be brought forth. Ismene now wants to take the blame with Antigone, but Antigone treats her with cruelty and contempt (436-60). After further discussion Antigone and Ismene are escorted indoors.

The Chorus then sing an ode, the second stasimon, almost as well known as the Ode on Man, a meditation on what happens when the gods are bent on destroying a family. When the gods shake a house, they sing, trouble does not cease to dog it down the generations (583-92). This is certainly highly relevant to Oedipus' sons and daughters, and the Chorus proceed to make the application: now the house of Labdacus is being destroyed root and branch, and it is folly of reason²⁵ and an Erinyes in the mind that are cutting off its last root (594-603). Zeus's power is ineluctable, and he always brings down the great. And when he does, the old maxim is proved true: the bad appears to be good to that person whose mind the god is driving toward ruin (604-14). Three things stand out in this ode. First, the destruction of a house is certainly being accomplished before the audience's eyes: Eteocles and Polynices, like their parents Oedipus and Jocasta, are dead, and Antigone has been sentenced to death. Second, 'folly of reason and an Erinyes in the mind' is a plausible description of the intentions of Antigone, intentions which have resulted in her being condemned to death. Third, what most call bad (an ignominious death by stoning at the hands of one's own fellow citizens) has clearly seemed

²⁵ This, rather than 'folly of speech', is recommended by Liapis 2013: 114n50 as a translation for λόγου τ' ἄνοια.

to her to be a good, and she has described it as such both to Ismene and to Creon. Tragic choruses can sometimes draw the wrong moral from events, and there is no firm rule by which their judgments are automatically correct. But here, it seems to me, the Chorus say what is both highly relevant and incontrovertible. The reason so many scholars are disinclined to take it at face value is that the view they hold of Antigone's action is not the one Sophocles expected them to hold. For this reason they are not in a position to evaluate the hints Sophocles put in his play that the gods have warped her judgment in order to destroy her.²⁶ But if considering it as martyrdom is not a possibility, Antigone's suicidal act makes no human sense. It has resulted in her destruction, and she is one of two remaining members of a house that the gods are determined to bring to an end. The Chorus are here drawing a conclusion for the audience that the audience could have drawn even without their help.

Creon's son Haemon enters next. He has heard of his father's decision to execute Antigone and he professes at first to acquiesce in this, on the grounds that such acquiescence is the duty of a loyal son (635-38). Creon replies in a long and windy speech mostly devoted to the excellence of filial obedience (639-80). Then Haemon replies in a speech of exactly equal length (683-723). He has heard the citizens, he says, saying that Antigone does not deserve to die for performing her pious and brave act, and he wants his father to enjoy good repute, not to be disgraced. No one, he says, should think he possesses all wisdom in himself: he must be prepared to learn from others and alter decisions accordingly to avoid disaster. Trees that do not bend are uprooted by floodwaters, whereas more pliant ones survive. The sailor who refuses to furl his sails in a high wind will end up at the bottom of the sea. A quarrel ensues in which Creon accuses Haemon of letting love for Antigone warp his sense of loyalty and his good judgment (726-57). Finally Creon is so

²⁶ Müller 1967: 136 regards the Chorus's sentiments as simply a *Fehldiagnose*: the Chorus are mistaken about Antigone, and the poet intends their words to apply only to Creon. Easterling 1978: 156-57 allows the validity of a family curse but denies that Antigone suffers from *Verblendung*. Griffith 1999: 219-20 raises some good questions about the meaning of particular phrases in the ode, but I do not find compelling his attempt to dissuade his readers from understanding the Chorus's comments as both applicable to Antigone and plausible. Cairns 2014: 2 says that 'there is plenty of purchase' for the view that these words are meant to apply to Antigone but then goes on to argue that their only serious application is to Creon. By contrast Else 1976: 11-18, after analyzing the ode, draws the conclusion that when the Chorus say that folly of reason and an Erinys in the mind are destroying the last of the Labdacids, they say no more than the truth. A similar view is taken by Lloyd-Jones 1983: 113-17.

outraged that he gives the order for Antigone to be brought out and killed before Haemon's eyes (760-61). This is so monstrous that Haemon cannot remain on the scene any longer, and after telling his father he will never see him again he storms off. Creon calmly goes about his plans for executing Antigone (he decides to spare Ismene), but there has been a change in those plans. Instead of having her stoned to death, as his edict had first proclaimed, he means to wall Antigone up in a cave out in the countryside, apparently to avoid the pollution of killing a blood relation. There she can pray to Hades to save her life if she wants (768-80).

After a choral ode in which the Chorus sing about the power of the god Eros to warp the reasoning of those who are in love, Antigone is led forth from the palace. She sings despairingly that her life is now at an end and that she will never hear the marriage hymn sung at her wedding (806-16). The Chorus and she both talk of the troubled race of Labdacus and Laius. The Chorus suggest (856) that she is paying for an ancestral crime. Antigone for her part bewails the sad fate of the whole Labdacid family (858-62) and the incestuous marriage of Oedipus and Jocasta which led to her own birth (863-68). She laments Polynices' fatal marriage and says that her brother, though dead, has slain her, though she still lives (869-71). That the divinely sent troubles of the Labdacids are determining the fate of Antigone has been strongly suggested from the beginning of the play. When Creon comes out, he chides her for postponing the inevitable with lengthy lamentation (883-90). The guards finally take her away down the *eisodos* that leads to the countryside, but not before she once more laments that she is dying before she has the chance to marry (916-18, if they are genuine).

Why does Antigone now wish to live when earlier she had wished to die? Did Sophocles not care about consistency of stance in his heroine? Is he willing to sacrifice it for the sake of an emotional scene? Some have thought so.²⁷ Instead I suggest that this scene helps to make clear that Antigone is being destroyed by the gods. They once caused her to make the self-destructive decision to court death by openly burying Polynices, but now that her death is assured, there is (for the moment) no longer any motive for them to interfere with her reason: Antigone is

²⁷ The 1917 dissertation of Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff is the most sustained attack on the idea that consistency is to be looked for in Sophocles. See also Neuberg 1990: 62-66.

no longer bent on suicide and now laments the death she had welcomed before. We will see that the gods interfere with her mind once more when it becomes necessary.

After a choral ode, the blind prophet Teiresias enters, led by a boy. He tells Creon that the gods have shown their disapproval of his edict by bird signs and by sacrifices that would not burn. He advises him to adopt a different course, to relent for his own good (998-1032). Creon refuses his advice and charges the prophet with having accepted a bribe to prophesy falsely (1033-47). Thereafter Teiresias says (1064-86) that since Creon has twice violated the distinction between the living and the dead—having refused burial to a corpse that belongs in the earth and immured in a Hades-like tomb someone who belongs to the living—he will soon have to pay with the life of his son.²⁸ Creon is initially unmoved, but after Teiresias has departed and the Chorus have indicated how reliable Teiresias' prophecies have been in the past, he has a change of heart. The Chorus advise him to rescue Antigone from her tomb and bury the body of Polynices.²⁹ They tell him that haste is necessary (1103-1104). Creon leaves with his attendants to do as they have urged.

After a choral ode whose tone is hopeful—all the better to set up the disaster that follows—a messenger enters from the countryside. This man, who was one of Creon's attendants when the king set out to put matters right, announces to the Chorus and to Creon's wife Eurydice that Haemon is dead (1155-79). He reports that Creon and his entourage went first to the battlefield and cremated what was left of Polynices' body (1196-1203). Then they went to the tomb. There they found that Haemon had already broken in but too late to save Antigone, who had hanged herself (1204-25). When Haemon—fresh from the sight of his dead betrothed—caught sight of Creon, he first tried to kill him with a sword and, when that attempt failed, drove the weapon into his own

²⁸ It seems that this is a categorical prophecy and that the possibility of avoiding disaster, suggested in Teiresias' first speech (1023-32), has been withdrawn. Did that possibility really exist, or do these lines, like other prophetic statements in Sophocles such as *Aj.* 749-57, describe a merely theoretical state of affairs, always destined to remain unrealized? We cannot tell. Note that Creon's relenting would not necessarily have entailed the rescue of Antigone, who is unmentioned in Teiresias' first speech. It is not true that Teiresias orders her to be rescued, an act suggested only later by the Chorus Leader; see Riemer 1991: 29-30. So there is nothing here to contradict the thesis that the gods intend Antigone's death: neither of the speeches by their accredited spokesman calls for her to be spared.

²⁹ They name both actions, but they use no word such as 'then' to indicate which should be done first.

heart (1226-39). The death of Haemon brings Creon down into misery, for he not only loses his son (his only remaining son and his only hope of living on in his offspring) but his wife as well: she hangs herself when she hears the news. And so when Creon returns with the body of his son and learns of the death of his wife, he knows that his happiness is over for good.

There is a pointed hint that Antigone's suicide represents a further interference by the gods with her decision making. The Chorus tell Creon to free Antigone and bury Polynices, but Creon performs the burial first and the rescue second. This may seem like gratuitous stupidity on his part since if he is to avoid disaster it is essential in the Chorus's view that he save Antigone's life. But actually Creon's choice is quite natural. He has become convinced that the unburied corpse of Polynices represents a grave offense to the gods, and he understandably makes undoing that offense a high priority. By contrast, he has no reason to think that there is any urgency about freeing Antigone.³⁰ Her suicide is a completely unexpected development. She had shown every sign in her last scene of wanting to live, of not wishing to die as an unmarried girl. Creon had accused her of trying to delay the inevitable (883-84). So when Creon approaches the tomb and learns that she has died by her own hand, his words, addressed to her dead body, fully express his surprise: 'Unhappy one, what deed have you wrought? What frame of mind did you take on? With what disaster was your reason destroyed?'³¹ These words make sense only when addressed to Antigone, not to Haemon, as

³⁰ This point is made by Brown on 1196-1205 and by Griffith on 1196-98.

³¹ That διεφθόρης refers to being mentally deranged (with νοῦν understood again) is made likely in view of the passages cited by Jebb and Griffith ad loc. But if it is addressed to Antigone the verb could also mean 'was your life destroyed'. The addressee changes to Haemon in 1230. The asyndeton is normal after a question. For an instance in quoted *oratio recta* of such a change of addressee, effected by the bare vocative without connecting particle, see *Alc.* 1002-1004 and the similar change of addressee, without vocative, at *Eur. El.* 834-37. For examples not in quoted *oratio recta* see the two asyndetic changes of addressee in *Ant.* 858-71 and the single changes at *Ant.* 1261-69 and *OT* 1307-11.

³² Broadhead 1968: 77-80 and Ledbetter 1991. See also Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990: 147-48. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson in their OCT adopted Broadhead's αὐτῷ. I myself prefer Ledbetter's αὐτήν. In Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1997: 85 the authors, influenced by Davidson 1992, retract their alteration of the text on the grounds that 'Creon does not care about Antigone, but he does care about Haemon, and it is to him he speaks'. Davidson is answered by Ledbetter 1999, who points out the excellent reason Creon has for being concerned with the fate of Antigone. Griffith ad loc. admits that the case for emendation is 'quite strong' but opts for the paradosis for reasons that, in my judgement, are weaker than the arguments against it.

was pointed out by Broadhead in 1968 and again by Ledbetter in 1991.³² If they were addressed to Haemon they would imply that breaking into Antigone's tomb was evidence of derangement (τίνα νοῦν ἔχχει; ἐν τῷ κυφορᾷ διεφθάρη, where the first question certainly, and the second probably, indicates mental disturbance), but Haemon cannot plausibly be described as deranged for desiring to free his fiancée. Their meaning when addressed to Antigone is far superior: what madness possessed you to take your life when you so clearly wished to live? Creon has every reason to be surprised that Antigone has killed herself. And the reference to her reason being destroyed is a pointed hint that Antigone's thinking has once more been interfered with. From the gods' perspective it is imperative that she die. She and Ismene are the last of the line of Laius, and she must not live to marry Haemon and carry that line on further. And the same death that brings the line of Laius to an end also punishes Creon for his impiety. There is plenty of cause here for divine intervention.

My reading of the play, based on a study of tragedy's theological content and on one of its frequently ignored conventions, gives us a heroine who is less luminously attractive than we may be used to. I am reminded of an anecdote that is told about one of my Harvard teachers, Cedric Whitman. Whitman's 1951 book tried to show that Sophocles didn't care much about the gods, that he located virtually the sole interest of his dramas in their heroic human figures, the Oedipuses, Ajaxes, and Antigones. In fact so engaged were Whitman's sympathies with these characters that on one occasion, when someone pointed out some of Antigone's less attractive character traits, he rose to his feet and in the tone of voice of someone replying to a personal insult, said 'You're speaking of the woman I love'. This was a joke, of course, but like many jokes it seems to have been meant to some degree in earnest.

It is apparent from the argument of this paper that, unlike my esteemed teacher, I am not in love with Antigone. What I love is the play. The compensation we get for accepting a less lovable heroine is a more intelligible play. For one thing, we can understand why she dies near the end. If we do not take into account the hostility of the gods against her, we must regard her death as quite arbitrary.³³ Creon has a change of heart and decides to take Teiresias' advice. The Chorus advise him to

³³ It is so regarded by Burton 1980: 89, who puts it down to the requirements of the plot.

free Antigone and bury Polynices. But he buries Polynices first and only then goes to free Antigone. Had he arrived at the cave earlier, he might have saved Antigone and avoided the death of his son and his wife. Antigone stood up for the laws of the gods. Why couldn't the gods do something for her? Creon meant to save her life and failed only because he performed the burial before the rescue, which seems a trivial cause. But the arbitrary and the trivial are avoided if we realize that the gods from the start intended Antigone's death. In bringing it about they accomplish two purposes at once, bringing Laius' line to an end and punishing Creon for his violation of the divinely sanctioned principle that all who die must be buried.

Critics sometimes complain that the play is mistitled and should be called *Creon*. Antigone, after all, leaves the stage about two-thirds of the way through the play to appear no more. In my view, however, this criticism is misconceived. The description of her death and its effect on Haemon and Creon takes us to within 110 lines of the end of the play. Creon appears to attribute her suicide to mental derangement sent by the gods, and there is no reason to disagree. It is Antigone's play as much as Creon's up to the very end. Her fate matters to us, and we are allowed very near the end to see the gods once more at work in bringing about the extermination of the house of Labdacus in the person of Oedipus' daughter.

It is good to be reminded by Parker 1999 (especially: 25-27) that Sophocles is mysteriously silent in response to many of the questions his modern readers might raise about the workings of the gods in his plays. But where Sophocles is not wholly mute, we need not confine ourselves to shaking our heads over his mysterious and ineffable ways but can spell out the hints he has actually dropped. He has given us, I have argued, not an inspiring martyr's death but something quite different, a drama about the last members of a dynasty being brought to an end because of divine hostility. Even if we do not believe in deities that destroy mortals by warping their judgment, there is still a kind of grandeur in a story of inexorable doom overtaking a great house. Such destruction leaves us with a sense both of elegy and of wonder. There is elegiac sadness in the fact that all human greatness is destined eventually to come to an end. And there is wonder at the unexpectedness of the way in which that end is brought

³⁴ I am grateful to Andrew Brown and Patrick Finglass for comments on an earlier version of this article.

about. Such, Sophocles tells us, are the ways of the gods.³⁴

References

- Austin, C. 2006. 'The Girl Who Said 'No' (Sophocles' *Antigone*)'. *Eikasmos* 17: 103-15.
- Barrett, W. S. 2007. 'Seven against Thebes: The Final Scene', In *Greek Lyric, Tragedy & Textual Criticism: Collected Papers*, ed. M. L. West (Oxford) 322-50.
- Broadhead, H. D. 1968. *Tragica: Elucidations of Passages in Greek Tragedy*. Christchurch.
- Brown, A. L., ed. 1987. *Sophocles: Antigone*. Warminster.
- Brown, A. L. 1991. 'Notes on Sophocles' *Antigone*'. *CQ* 41: 325-39.
- Burton, R. W. B. 1980. *The Chorus in Sophocles' Tragedies*. Oxford.
- Cairns, D. L. 2014. 'λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν' Ἐρινός. *Atē* in Sophocles' *Antigone*'. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Symposium on Ancient Greek Drama*, Cyprus Centre of the International Theatre (Nicosia) 37-54.
- Davidson, J. F. 1992. 'Sophocles, *Antigone* 1226-30 Revisited'. *Hermes* 120: 502-503.
- Davies, M. 2014. *The Theban Epics*. Washington and Cambridge, Mass.
- Dawe, R. D. 1978. *Studies on the Text of Sophocles*, vol. 3. Leiden.
- Easterling, P. E. 1978. 'The Second Stasimon of *Antigone*', in R. D. Dawe et al., eds. *Dionysiaca* (Cambridge) 141-58.
- Else, G. F. 1976. *The Madness of Antigone*. Heidelberg.
- Gibert, J. 1995. *Change of Mind in Greek Tragedy*. Göttingen.
- Griffith, M., ed. 1999. *Sophocles: Antigone*. Cambridge.
- Heath, M. 1987. *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*. Stanford.
- Jebb, R. C. 1900. *Sophocles' Plays: Antigone*, 3rd ed. Cambridge. (Rpt. London 2004.)
- Knox, B. M. W. 1964. *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Kovacs, D. 1992. 'Notes on *Antigone* and *Oedipus Tyrannus*'. *ICS* 17: 9-22.
- Kovacs, D. 1993. 'Zeus in Euripides *Medea*'. *AJP* 114: 45-70.
- Kovacs, D. 1994. *Euripides: Cyclops, Alcestis, Medea*. Cambridge, Mass. (Rpt. with corrections 2001.)

- Kovacs, D. 1997. 'Gods and Men in Euripides' Trojan Trilogy'. *Colby Quarterly* 33: 162-76.
- Kovacs, D. 2000. 'The 'Grammar' of Divine Intervention in Greek Tragedy'. *Phasis* 2-3: 224-27.
- Kovacs, D. 2009. 'The Role of Apollo in *Oedipus Tyrannos*'. In J. R. C. Cousland and J. R. Hume, eds., *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp* (Leiden) 357-68.
- Ledbetter, G. 1991. 'Sophocles, *Antigone* 1226-1230'. *CQ* 41: 26-29.
- Ledbetter, G. 1999. 'Sophocles, *Antigone* 1226-30: A Reply to Davidson'. *Hermes* 127: 122-23.
- Lesky, A. 1983. *Greek Tragic Poetry*, tr. by M. Dillon. New Haven.
- Liapis, V. 2013. 'Creon the Labdacid: Political Confrontation and the Doomed *oikos* in Sophocles' *Antigone*'. In D. Cairns, ed., *Tragedy and Archaic Greek Thought*. Swanswea. 81-118.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1956. 'Zeus in Aeschylus'. *JHS* 76: 55-67.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983. *The Justice of Zeus*. 2nd ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 2002. 'Curses and divine anger in early Greek epic: the Pisander scholion'. *CQ* 52: 1-14. (Rpt. in Lloyd-Jones 2005: 18-35.)
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 2005. *The Further Academic Papers of Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford.
- Lloyd-Jones, H., and N. G. Wilson. 1990. *Sophoclea: Studies on the Text of Sophocles*. Oxford.
- Lloyd-Jones, H., and N. G. Wilson. 1997. *Sophocles: Second Thoughts*. Göttingen.
- Müller, G. ed. 1967. *Sophokles: Antigone*. Heidelberg.
- Neuberg, M. 1990. 'How like a Woman: Antigone's 'Inconsistency''. *CQ* 40: 54-76.
- Palmer, S. 2014. 'Martyrdom and Conflict: The Fate of Antigone in Tragic Drama'. *Mortality* 19: 206-23.
- Parker, R. C. T. 1997. 'Gods Cruel and Kind: Tragic and Civic Theology'. in C. Pelling, ed., *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*. Oxford. 143-60.
- Parker, R. C. T. 1999. 'Through a Glass Darkly: Sophocles and the Divine', in J. Griffin, ed., *Sophocles Revisited: Essays Presented to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford. 11-30.
- Riemer, P. 1991. *Sophokles, Antigone: Götterwille und menschliche Freiheit*. Stuttgart.

- Scodel, R. 1984. 'Epic Doublets and Polynices' Two Burials'. *TAPA* 114: 49-58.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1989. 'Assumptions and the Creation of Meaning: Reading Sophocles' *Antigone*'. *JHS* 109: 134-48.
- Spira, A. 1960. *Untersuchungen zum Deus ex machina bei Sophokles und Euripides*. Kallmünz.
- Steidle, W. 1968. *Studien zum antiken Drama: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Bühnenspiels*. *Studia et testimonia antiqua* 4. Munich.
- West, S. 1999. 'Sophocles' *Antigone* and Herodotus Book Three'. In J. Griffin, ed., *Sophocles Revisited*. Oxford. 109-36.
- Whitman, C. H. 1951. *Sophocles: A Study of Heroic Humanism*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, T. von. 1917. *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1899. 'Excuse zum Oedipus des Sophokles'. *Hermes* 34: 55-80. (Rpt. in *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin and Amsterdam 1935-72, vi: 209-33.)
- Willink, C. W. 2000. 'The Opening Speech of Sophocles' *Antigone*'. *Mnemosyne* 53: 662-71. (Rpt. in Willink 2010: 307-15.)
- Willink, C. W. 2007. 'Sophocles, *Antigone* 23-5 and the Burial of Eteocles'. *Mnemosyne* 60: 274-80. (Rpt. in Willink 2010: 683-89.)
- Willink, C. W. 2010. *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*, ed. W. B. Henry. Leiden and Boston.

Hermes and Carion in Aristophanes' *Plutus*

Athanassios Vergados

Introduction

Aristophanes' *Plutus* operates on a principle familiar from other Aristophanic comedies: the hero, facing a serious problem, decides to take action by conceiving and implementing a utopic plan.¹ Once the plan has been executed a group of characters appear who challenge it or wish to derive some profit from it. Their challenges overcome, the hero and his allies celebrate at the end of the play. In *Plutus* (produced in 388 BC) Chremylus, appalled by the unfair distribution of wealth that he observes in Athenian society, asks the Delphic oracle whether his son should become an honest man or not. Instead of giving a direct answer the oracle instructs him to follow the first man he sees as he leaves the temple. This he does, and the first person he encounters happens to be blind, filthy, and dressed in rags. But this man turns out to be none other than Plutus himself, the god of wealth. After his exchange with Plutus, Chremylus discovers that the god had been blinded by Zeus because as a youth he had threatened to consort only with the just. Chremylus decides to bring him to the Asclepieion at Zea in the Piraeus² so that he can be cured of his blindness. If this happens, it is assumed, Plutus will grant his blessings only to the just and honest,

¹ On the utopian element in Aristophanes, see, e.g. Zimmermann 1983 and Ruffell 2010 for this theme in the fragments of Old Comedy.

² See Tordoff 2012: 152 n. 2. For the cult of Asclepius at the Piraeus, see now Lamont 2015.

³ This thought is attested already in archaic poetry, e.g. in Thgn. 315 and Eur. *Aeol.* fr. 20; cf. Orfanos 2013: 214-15.

thus remedying the current unfair state of affairs in which only the unjust are wealthy whereas the virtuous are poor.³

Chremylus' plan operates in two stages. Initially at least, it seems that only those who are just are meant to enjoy Plutus' gifts. But by the time Hermes converses with Carion it appears that *everybody* is wealthy. Unless we wish to impute a logical error to Aristophanes, we must assume that seeing the just men's prosperity the unjust ones have been converted to justice.⁴ Some critics have found the plan ironic, a tendency particularly prominent in German scholarship on the play,⁵ while doubts have been cast on the logic of the 'great idea.'⁶ Besides, just as the *Ecclesiazusae*, *Plutus* has often been thought to show signs that Aristophanes' poetic verve was in decline. It has also been speculated that Aristophanes' social and political views had shifted compared to those of earlier plays.⁷

Instead of directly engaging with these questions, this paper explores the significance of the exchange between Hermes and Carion at *Plutus* 1099-1170. I argue that this dialogue represents the inversion of verbal strategies commonly found in a hymn or prayer,⁸ a marked type of utterance that aims at establishing a relation of reciprocity (or *charis*) between man and his divine addressee. While the presentation of Hermes as a hungry god in this scene has antecedents in archaic hymnic and iambic poetry and parallels elsewhere in Aristophanes, it can also be linked to one of *Plutus*' main issues, i.e. the collapse of *charis*-based re-

⁴ Cf. Dover 1972: 204 and Heberlein 1981: 30-32. Lévy 1997 offers criticism of the play's double utopian plan and proposes that Aristophanes sides with the 'old rich' against the *nouveau riche* and supports conservative views.

⁵ See Reckford 1987: 360-61 and Flashar 1996. Rather than speaking of irony, Barkhuizen 1981 prefers to call Chremylus' project an illusion (a plan that cannot be implemented). For criticism of ironic interpretations of the play, see Konstan & Dillon 1981: 378-79 n. 10 and McGlew 1997.

⁶ On the logical problems with the equation of the rich with the unjust and dishonest and the poor with the just, see Dillon 1987: esp. 162-63. Note especially that at 231-33 Chremylus is willing to acquire wealth whether by just or unjust means (ἡ γὰρ οἰκία | αὕτη 'στὶν ἦν δεῖ χρημάτων σε τήμερον | μεσθὴν ποιῆσαι καὶ δικαίως κἀδίκως, 'this is the house which you must make full of money today, both by just and unjust means'), though this has been read as a polar expression (e.g. by Sommerstein 1996: 256); but cf. Flashar 1996: 317 who also draws attention to the content of Chremylus' question to the oracle. Lines 231-33 are not the only 'fissure' in the plot; for instance, not all of Penia's arguments hold, and Chremylus' premise that everyone's actions are determined by financial calculations will also be proven one-sided. Even the initial premise that nowadays all wealthy men are unjust is never questioned in the play and is (wrongly) assumed to be correct. Flashar 1996: 317-18 stresses the incompatibility of the idea that the righteous should prosper and that wealth corrupts, both of which are implied in the play.

⁷ See Sommerstein 1996 and Heberlein 1981. Questions regarding the political ideology and the social realities reflected in the play have been addressed by Konstan & Dillon 1981 and Olson 1990.

⁸ On parody of prayers, see Kleinknecht 1937 and Horn 1970, specifically on Aristophanes.

lations in the play's imaginary society, a theme further underscored by allusions to Hesiod's *Works and Days* (and, to a lesser degree, to the *Odyssey*). Thus, this scene's importance lies not only in what it accomplishes in its immediate dramatic context but also in the fact that it resonates with themes that are central for the appreciation of the entire play, *viz.* the significance of reciprocal relations that hold society together and the question of whether wealth is the only factor that motivates human action.

Hymnal elements in Hermes' and Carion's exchange

Hymns typically use certain verbal strategies in order to establish a relation of reciprocity between the human speaker (and, by extension, the community he represents) and the divine addressee. By reminding the god of past offerings (*da quia dedi*), by calling to memory previous instances when the god had been helpful (*da quia dedisti*) or, finally, by promising future offerings if the god shows his benevolence in the present circumstances (*da ut dem*), the hymn/prayer aims at creating a relation of mutual beneficence. This relation of reciprocity makes the hymn itself an offering that is intended to spur the god into benevolent action towards the speaker or the community.⁹ The so-called *Homeric Hymns*, for instance, verbalize this conception of the hymn as a text whose aim is to engender *charis* through their typical clausular formula καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαίρει 'and you, on the one hand, hail/rejoice in this way (i.e. because of this song)'. In this respect, hymns function in no way differently from inscribed dedicatory objects. Many dedicatory inscriptions are performative and represent the 'speaker's' request for a favor in return for the dedication.¹⁰ The direction of the utterance is clear: the human worshipper presents the god with an ἄγαλμα, whether verbal (a hymn/prayer) or a non-verbal (an ἀνάθημα), with which he hopes to elicit the god's kindly action.

At 1099-1170, formally a dialogue between two characters in spoken verse, we encounter a paradox: instead of a human worshipper asking the god's help by reminding him of his previous offerings or by evoking previous instances when the god helped him, it is the god who reminds the

⁹ For the (*Homeric*) *Hymns* as verbal offerings, see Calame 2011. On the general characteristics of hymns, see Furlley 1995; on *charis* in the hymns, see Race 1982: 8-10; on *charis* in general, see McLachlan 1993.

¹⁰ See Day 2010.

mortal of what he did for him in the past and requests to be admitted into the new order established after the healing of Plutus (esp. 1139-46). What is more, the mortal reminds the god of the times in which he and the other gods did *not* help men (1116-17).¹¹ And, significantly, Hermes, often perceived in comedy to be the divine counterpart of a slave or servant,¹² directs his request to Carion, a slave.¹³ Now that everyone is rich, gods receive no offerings (1113-32),¹⁴ and Hermes therefore attempts to win Carion's favor so that he can continue to enjoy the delicacies to which he was accustomed in the past. To Carion's question what the benefit would be for men if Hermes is accepted, the god replies with a list of some of his cult-titles, thereby presenting his own aretology (1153-63). Hermes' appearance in *Plutus* has no altruistic motive. He is rather concerned with his own plight (1118-19: καὶ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων μοι θεῶν ἦττον μέλει· | ἐγὼ δ' ἀπόλωλα κάπιτέτριμμαι, 'and I care less about the other gods; I have perished and am utterly destroyed'), while his lack of allegiance to his fellow gods is made clear from the creed bluntly expressed at 1151: πατρίς γάρ ἐστι πᾶσ' ἴν' ἂν πρᾶττη τις εὖ ('the homeland is only where one happens to fare well').¹⁵

In 1120-37 in particular Hermes reminds us of his hymnic counterpart in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, the hungry god as Henk Versnel has named him.¹⁶ In that poem it is his desire for meat that motivates Hermes' actions as soon as he is born. The young god is characterized as κρειῶν ἐρατίζων ('desirous of meat', v. 68), through a phrase used in the *Iliad* only of lions (*Il.* 11.551, 12.660). Later in the same poem Hermes faces

¹¹ A similar complaint is expressed by Odysseus in a prayer at *Od.* 6.324-26, though the sentiment there is different.

¹² Note Hermes' role at *Peace* 180-235, on which, see Cassio 1987: 59-67 and Pòrtulas 2006: 25-29. On p. 63 Cassio posits the existence of a negative characterization of Hermes in comedy and satyr-drama at the end of the 5th c. The evidence for a tradition of humorous representation of Hermes in archaic hexameter and iambic poetry is discussed in detail in Vergados 2011. On dialogues with Hermes/herms in comedy, see Kassel 1983: 6-7.

¹³ On the role of the slave Carion in *Plutus*, see Dover 1972: 204-206 and Olson 1989.

¹⁴ This is reminiscent of the situation in Aristophanes' *Birds* 1494-1552, where the birds have replaced the gods and receive the sacrifices that were due them. Prometheus then appears in Cloudcuckooland to warn Pisthetairos of Zeus's ambassadors who will soon visit them and suggests the strategy that should be followed. Similar points are made by the priest of Zeus later in *Plutus* (1176-84), who is likewise willing to abandon the former cult and join the worship of Plutus, now the most powerful god. Riu 1999: 221-27 examines *Plutus* as the reversal of a sovereignty myth, especially considering the elements of φθόνος and ὕβρις.

¹⁵ See Sommerstein 2001 ad loc. for other occurrences of this proverbial phrase.

¹⁶ See Versnel 2011: 309-77.

¹⁷ See Clay 1989: 122.

what the *honoranda* of this volume has called his 'identity crisis'.¹⁷ Having killed two of Apollo's cows and divided up their meat in twelve equal portions, each accompanied by a *geras*, he attempts to consume his own portion since the meat's savor torments him, immortal though he is (131-32: ὁδμὴ γάρ μιν ἔτειρε καὶ ἀθάνατόν περ ἔοντα | ἡδεῖ(α), 'an odour tormented him, immortal though he was, a pleasant one . . .'). Had he consumed the meat, he would have been demoted to the status of a mortal. That he does not partake of his portion of meat manifests Hermes' divine nature beyond doubt.

The playful tone of the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* is evoked and exaggerated in Aristophanes' *Plutus*.¹⁸ Whereas the infant Hermes does not even taste his portion of meat in the *Hymn*, Aristophanes' Hermes complains about all the delicacies that he used to consume in the good old days. First come the cakes, honey, and figs which Hermes received from the inn-keepers early in the morning (1120-22: πρότερον γὰρ εἶχον <ἄν> παρὰ ταῖς καπηλίσιν | πάντ' ἀγάθ' ἔωθεν εὐθύς, οἰνοῦτταν, μέλι, | ἰσχάδας, ὅσ' εἰκόσ' ἔστιν Ἑρμῆν ἔσθιειν, 'for in the past I would receive from the inn-keepers all the good things at earliest dawn, a wine cake, honey, dried figs, all the things which it is appropriate for Hermes to eat'). This is a reference to the realities of Hermes' worship, the offering of honey and figs, which seems to be a persistent feature of his cult.¹⁹ Now Hermes is constrained to sleep on an empty stomach (1123: νυνὶ δὲ πεινῶν ἀναβάδην ἀναπαύομαι, 'right now I lie down hungry, with my legs up'). A further reference to cultic realities is found in Hermes' next utterance at 1125-26 (οἴμοι τάλας, | οἴμοι πλακοῦντος τοῦ 'ν τετράδι πεπεμμένου, 'Alas! Wretched me! Alas! The cake that was baked on the fourth day!'), where the god sorely misses the cake he received in the celebration of his birthday on the fourth day of the month.²⁰ Hermes' next line also alludes to cultic events and at the same time to the god's immense hunger (1128: οἴμοι δὲ κωλῆς, ἦν ἐγὼ κατήσθιον, 'Alas! The thighbone which I used to eat up!'). There is here a play on the fact that the priest (and sometimes also the herald, Hermes' human counterpart) received during the sacrifice parts of the animal, including the κωλῆ, as

¹⁸ The influence of *h.Herm.* on *Plutus* has been argued for by Eitrem 1909 and Nobili 2011: 217-24.

¹⁹ See Vergados (forthcoming) for a later reflection of this cultic reality.

²⁰ See Sommerstein 2001 *ad* 1126 for references to inscriptions and to Thphr. *Char.* 16.10 for offerings to Hermes on the fourth day of the month.

²¹ Note that at *Peace* 192-94 Trygaeos attempts to win Hermes' favor by offering him meat.

his prerogative (ἱερώσυνα).²¹ This might also call to mind Hermes' strange 'ritual' at the Alpheios in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* that plays with the conventions of the sacrifice.²² Finally Hermes also misses the innards which he used to gulp down hot (1130: σπλάγχνων τε θερμῶν ὦν ἐγὼ κατήσθιον, 'and the hot entrails which I used to eat up').

Carion's replies to Hermes' complaints are mocking, sometimes punning on the words used by the god.²³ With line 1134 (ἄρ' ὠφελήσαις ἂν τι τὸν σαντοῦ φίλον; 'would you render any service to your friend?') Hermes plays on the idea that he was considered the god closest to men (cf. *Il.* 24.334-35) and immediately asks for some bread and meat from the sacrifice that had just been conducted at Chremylus' house (1136-38). To this Carion responds with the parody of a *lex sacra* (1138: ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκφορά, 'but [sacrificial meat] is not to be carried out').²⁴ Thereupon Hermes reminds the slave of his past services to him (lines 1139-41). As the patron god of thieves, Hermes ensured that Carion was not discovered whenever he stole something that belonged to his master (1138-39). But this does not convince Carion. First, because Hermes always received a *ναστός* (a type of cake) as an expression of Carion's gratitude, as the slave reminds him, appositely calling him a *τοιχωρύχος* (1141).²⁵ To be sure, Carion ended up eating this cake himself (1142): just as the *kēryx* officiating at a sacrifice (i.e. the human counterpart of Hermes), Carion eventually consumed the *ναστός* intended for the god. And second, Hermes had not shared in the beating he had received from his master for stealing from him.

Beyond the similarities linking the two characters (both are thieves and both have a great appetite), the humor of this scene derives from the reversal of the hymnal relationship: it is Hermes who reminds his mortal 'worshipper' of his past services to him, rather than vice versa. And it is the god who asks the mortal for a favor, to be accepted in the new order established after Plutus' healing. To achieve this, Hermes uses several of his cult-titles as possible arguments intended to prove his usefulness in Plutus' rule. This is a further strategy of persuasion that links this scene

²² See Vergados 2013: 325-29. Note also that herms are often represented in sacrificial scenes; see Versnel 2011: 348-52.

²³ Cf. 1128-29: κωλῆς ~ ἀσχωλίαζε and 1131: ὀδύνη σε περὶ τὰ σπλάγχν' ἔοικέ τις στρέφειν ('it seems that some pain torments your heart'), picking up σπλάγχνων from the previous verse.

²⁴ See Sommerstein 2001 ad loc. for parallels.

²⁵ The use of this comic term of abuse recalls Hipponax, fr. 32.6, as well as Hermes' own words in *h.Herm.* 178 and 283.

to the hymnic genre: Hermes evokes his own polyonymy as a means to alert his (mortal) audience of his usefulness and, indirectly, of the future benefits they may derive from him if his request is granted.²⁶ It is, then, a variation of the *da ut dem* trope. However, each of these cult-titles of Hermes is humorously rejected by Carion as unnecessary in a world where everybody is wealthy. Thus, the reversal of roles continues in l. 1147 when Hermes asks (by the gods!) to be admitted to Chremylus' house as a ξύνοικος deity, thereby (ab)using the technical term for a god worshipped together with another god in the same temple: in this case, this would be Plutus, and Hermes, associated with profit (note his *epiklēsis* κερδῶος) and especially wealth acquired as the result of a stroke of luck or by chance (αἵματιον), would be found in the same house as the god of wealth. This tongue-in-cheek enumeration of divine *epiklēseis* continues: at 1152 Hermes begs to be admitted by the door as a στροφαῖος god, the god of doors and hinges—this, too, is rejected by Carion as στροφαί, the twists and turns of Hermes πολύτροπος, are not necessary.²⁷ The proposal to establish him as an ἐμπολαῖος god, a god of commerce, is likewise rejected since there is again no need for this παλιγκάπηλος god any longer: everyone is now rich, and there is no use for trading.²⁸ Even in his role as δόλιος (1157) Hermes is worthless in the new establishment because now honest behavior is valued rather than trickery (οὐ γὰρ δόλου νῦν ἔργον, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶν τρόπων, 'for now there is no use of trickery but of simple [i.e. honest] manners' 1158). Since only the just may be rich under the new dispensation, everyone wishes to be just. But even as ἡγεμόνιος the god is useless: Plutus has regained his sight and does not need a guide.²⁹ To Hermes' proposition that he be installed in his role as ἐναγώνιος, to be in charge of the musical and athletic competitions in honor of Plutus, Carion replies with further irony: the god's polyonymy resembles the jurors who register themselves under several letters in order to secure their selection for jury duty. In the end Hermes is admitted

²⁶ On the phenomenon of divine polyonymy, see Versnel 2011: 49–60.

²⁷ Also an allusion to his role as a god θυραῖος—herms were found at the entrance to houses and at doors; cf. Thuc. 6.27.1; Wrede 1985: 33–34, 37–38; Osborne 1985–86; Rückert 1998: 180–84; Furlley 1996: 13–28. Cf. also Hermes' role as janitor in *Peace*.

²⁸ This picks up one of the points made by Penia in her speech; see pp. 176–77 below.

²⁹ For the willful misunderstanding of the sense of ἡγεμόνιος here, see Olson 1990: 232. This is similar to Carion's 'misinterpretation' of στροφαῖος at 1152. Likewise, the infant Hermes of the *Homeric Hymn* 'misunderstands' Apollo's words at 261–68.

under the newly-coined title of διακονικός and is immediately asked by Carion to wash offal in the well.

The comic inversion of hymnic language posited here is echoed in the humorous evocation of sacred regulations at 1110 (ἡ γλῶττα τῷ κήρυκι τούτῳ τέμνεται, 'the tongue is cut for this herald'), comically alluding to the offering of the victim's tongue to the herald, and at 1148 (ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκφορά), a reminiscence of sacred laws that prohibit the removal of sacrificial meat from the sanctuary, as mentioned earlier.

So far we have seen in the exchange between Hermes and Carion the reversal of the roles between mortal and divine addressee in a hymn or prayer. In *Plutus* it is the god who aims at establishing a relation of reciprocity / *charis* with the mortal, by reminding him of the services rendered to him and by pointing out his many roles and functions, expressed through his polyonymy, which suggest possible ways in which the god could be helpful to the mortal in the future. This relation of utilitarian reciprocity is already prefigured in the prologue, v. 128-97, where Chremylus and Carion prove to Plutus the utilitarian character of the city's cult.³⁰ This inversion, furthermore, is cast in ordinary, everyday (comic) language that differs from the marked higher register of a hymn or prayer. And it is certainly amusing to see Hermes, the divine 'slave', becoming subordinate to a human one. The comic inversion in the exchange between Hermes and Carion is not without precedent in the presentation of Hermes in the poetic tradition. The *Homeric Hymn* dedicated to him likewise inverts and plays with the conventions of the hymnic genre. One of the most intriguing issues in that *Hymn* is its humorous tone, which verges at times on the comical and the absurd by representing situations that are patently irrational: a newborn god steals fifty cows and roasts the meat of two of them, creates the first lyre and invents the hymnic genre by singing a hymn praising his own parentage and the amorous discourses of his parents, argues with impeccable rhetoric or (when it suits him) in a feigned childish language.³¹ At the same time, and this is more important from a theological perspective, the god acquires many of his traditional prerogatives by enacting his functions: thus, by stealing his brother's cows Hermes becomes the god of thieves; by officiating at an event that alludes to the sacrificial ritual (though not itself a proper sacrifice) he enacts his function as *kēryx*; by arguing rhetorically he becomes the god of

³⁰ As pointed out by Torchio 2007: 159.

³¹ On these aspects of the *Hymn*, see Vergados 2013: 22-39.

language and rhetoric, and so forth. Similarly (and by way of comic inversion) Aristophanes' Hermes wishes to be admitted to the world of the humans by promising to enact several of the functions codified in his divine epithets: he can be *στροφαῖος* if he is established at the gate; alternatively, he may become *δόλιος* but, it turns out, there is no need for *δόλοι* after *Plutus* has been healed. More important, in the *Homeric Hymn* Hermes is portrayed as a god tormented by hunger (just as in *Plutus*) and tempted by the savor of meat, even though in the end he does not partake of his portion. Moreover, in replying to his mother's angry threats that Apollo may punish him, he exposes his plan to acquire personal *timai* like those of the other gods (and especially Apollo). While in the *Hymn* his egocentric quest for honors and wealth is somewhat mitigated by his intention to use it to support his mother as well, in *Plutus* this side of Hermes is exaggerated to the extreme, and the god is rendered as a self-centered character who does not feel any allegiance to his fellow Olympians now that his belly is empty.

Hesiodic references

Besides the play with the conventions of the hymnic genre in the scene involving Carion and Hermes, *Plutus* reflects certain themes of Hesiod's *Works and Days* that call to mind the bleak description of the Iron Age and serve as the key to understanding the situation in which the play's heroes are found. On a basic level, both works play with the idea that progress is possible through the beneficial action of a divine being: in *Plutus* this is achieved through healing the god of wealth, who is now able to distinguish the just from the unjust, although, as mentioned above, it seems that eventually *everyone*, not only the just, become rich.³² Mankind can thus return to an abundance characteristic of the Golden Age.³³ In the *Works and Days* an attempt to advance the condition of the human race is made by Prometheus who brings to men the fire that he stole from Zeus, which proves only a temporary benefit: Zeus 'reciprocates' with the creation of Pandora, the source of many evils for humankind. But there are also points of detail in common between the two works. At the beginning of the play Chremylus returns from the Delphic oracle, where he had asked whether it

³² Cf. above, n. 4.

³³ For similarities between the conception of the Golden Age in comedy and Hesiod, see Zimmermann 1983: 60-61 and Ruffell 2010: 475-77 for Hesiodic influence in the fragments of Cratinus' *Pluti*.

would be beneficial for his son to be a just man or a scoundrel (32-38):

ἐπερησόμενος οὖν ὥχόμην ὡς τὸν θεόν,
 τὸν ἐμὸν μὲν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ταλαιπώρου σχεδὸν
 ἤδη νομίζων ἐκτετοξεῦθαι βίον,
 τὸν δ' υἱόν, ὅσπερ ὦν μόνος μοι τυγχάνει, 35
 πευσόμενος εἰ χρὴ μεταβάλοντα τοὺς τρόπους
 εἶναι πανοῦργον, ἄδικον, ὕγιες μὴδὲ ἔν,
 ὡς τῷ βίῳ τοῦτ' αὐτὸ νομίσας συμφέρειν.

I thus went to the god in order to consult him—since I considered that my own miserable life had been shot off almost entirely by now— to enquire about my son, who is the only one I have, whether he should change his manners and be knavish, unjust, in no way honest, thinking that this very thing is beneficial for life.

The question whether one's son should be just in the current state of society is emphatically posed in the *Works and Days* (270-72), where Hesiod declares that in a world where justice is not respected but perverted it is bad to be just:

νῦν δὴ ἐγὼ μήτ' αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δίκαιος
 εἶην μητ' ἐμὸς υἱός, ἐπεὶ κακὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον
 ἔμμεναι, εἰ μείζω γε δίκην ἀδικώτερος ἔξει.

Indeed, would that neither I myself nor a son of mine was just among men, since it is a bad thing for a man to be just when a more unjust person receives a greater reward.

While the comic hero modifies Hesiod's message, in that he excludes himself from this character change,³⁴ he nevertheless bears witness to the same problem as Hesiod in the *Works and Days*: does being δίκαιος have any value in a society where there is no respect for δίκη? Hesiod describes the future collapse of the Iron Race in bleak colors which he hopes Zeus

³⁴ This is similar to the *Clouds*' Strepsiades: his son could learn the sophistic techniques so that he can argue his way out of debt, while Strepsiades himself, an old man, is not capable of attaining this knowledge. Likewise in *Plutus*, changing his own character will not bring much to Chremylus since his life is for the most part spent; it is his only son who needs to find his way in life.

will not bring to pass (273): there will be no respect for δίκη or oath, men will honor only those who assert their right through might (χειροδικαί), and the relations of reciprocity that hold together the family and society (those between parents and children, between friends, or between guest and host) will no longer have any force as the Iron Race draws to its end (see esp. lines 180-94). Chremylus, too, belongs to the Iron Race, which has now decayed to such a degree that advancement is possible only through illegal means. For as Carion claims (48-50):

δῆλον ὅτι καὶ τυφλῷ
γνῶναι δοκεῖ τοῦθ' ὥς σφόδρ' ἐστὶ συμφέρον
τὸ μηδὲν ἀσκεῖν ὑγιᾶς ἐν τῷ νῦν γένει.

For this seems to be evident even to a blind man, the knowledge that exercising no honesty is extremely beneficial in our current generation.

Characteristically, in this *genos* there is no respect for oaths, as lines 60-61 imply (ἀλλ' εἴ τι χαίρεις ἀνδρὸς εὐόρκου τρόποις, | ἐμοὶ φράσον, 'But if you take pleasure in the manners of a man who abides by his oath-abiding, tell me'), to which we may compare Hes. *Op.* 190 (οὐδέ τις εὐόρκου χάρις ἔσσεται οὐδὲ δικάιου, 'there will be no good will towards the oath-abiding man nor towards the just'). Indeed, Chremylus complains that he suffers despite being a god-fearing and just man (v. 28-29: ἐγὼ θεοσεβῆς καὶ δίκαιος ὦν ἀνὴρ | κακῶς ἔπραττον καὶ πένης ἦν, 'being a god-fearing and just man, I fared badly and was poor'). Conversely, godless and bad politicians, sycophants and other immoral characters become rich and consequently are held in high esteem (v. 30-31: ἕτεροι δ' ἐπλούτουν. ἱερόσυλοι, ῥήτορες, | καὶ συκοφάνται καὶ πονηροί, 'others were wealthy: the sacrilegious ones, the politicians and the sycophants and the knavish'). To this situation the hero reacts by resorting to the god's prophetic advice. The motif of the prophecy is also present in Hesiod's prediction of the moral collapse of the Iron Race (*Op.* 180-94).

³⁵ For the motif of the blind Plutus, see Olson 1990: 226 n. 13. It goes back to Hipponax fr. 36, and in fact Tzetzes' Schol. on Ar. *Plut.* 87 claims that Aristophanes was inspired with the idea of a blind Plutus by Hipponax (τυφλὸν δὲ τὸν Πλούτὸν φησὶν ἐξ Ἰππώνακτος τοῦτο σφετερισάμενος, 'he says that Plutus is blind, having taken this idea from Hipponax'; the citation of Hippon. fr. 36 follows). For the Hipponactean background in the *Plutus*, see Sfyrer 1997: 233-34.

Just people have to toil without ever being able to acquire wealth because Zeus blinded Plutus when he threatened to consort only with the just.³⁵ This idea brings about another inversion of the Hesiodic subtext: whereas in the *Works and Days* Zeus is time and again presented as the guarantor of justice, in *Plutus* he turns out to be the protector of the unjust.³⁶ In the *Works and Days* the link between Zeus and δίκη is emphasized already in the proem (9-10) and is repeated throughout the poem, as for instance when Zeus is presented as the father of the goddess Dike, picking up the genealogy of Dike briefly presented in the *Theogony* (901-3), or at lines 35-36 where Hesiod urges his brother Perses ἀλλ' αὖθι διακρινώμεθα νεῖκος | ἰθείησι δίκης, αἱ τ' ἐκ Διός εἰσιν ἄρισται ('but let us now settle our dispute with straight justice, which comes from Zeus and is the best').³⁷ Furthermore, when men respect δίκη, their city prospers, as we find out in lines 225-37 where a near-Golden Age abundance rewards the citizens of the just city. The opposite is true in *Plutus*, where Zeus is accused of rewarding the unjust and dishonest while putting the just and hard-working men at a disadvantage.

With Zeus's blinding of Plutus, which meant poverty for several honest and just citizens, we may compare *Works and Days* 42 (κρύψαντες γὰρ ἔχουσι θεοὶ βίον ἀνθρώποισιν, 'for gods keep hidden the means of sustenance from men'), as recognized already by the scholiast.³⁸ Zeus hid the means for sustaining life in anger at Prometheus' deception, which, initially at least, had given mortals an advantage. Likewise, according to *Plutus* it was Zeus who blinded the god, and while the *Works and Days* attribute χόλος to Zeus (47) because of Prometheus' deception, *Plutus* cites φθόνος against the χρηστοί and the δίκαιοι as the reason for Zeus's action. Prometheus' actions pose a threat to Zeus's dispensation. Hence the father of gods and men punishes the Titan and offsets his gift (fire) through the creation of Pandora. Likewise, by threatening to support only the just, Plutus calls into question the *status quo* as established by Zeus. As a consequence, Zeus punishes Plutus by blinding him, thereby also limiting the effects of his gift (wealth). Aristophanes chooses to remind his audience of the harsh and vindictive Zeus of *Works and Days* 42-105 (the myth of Prometheus and Pandora) rather than the overseer

³⁶ Cf. Torchio 2007: 160.

³⁷ For the centrality of Zeus in Hesiod's protreptic to justice in the *Works and Days*, see Clay 2003: esp. 142-5.

³⁸ Cf. Schol. *Plut.* 90a: παρῳδῆται ἐκ τῶν Ἡσιόδου, quoting *Op.* 42 and Torchio 2007: 160.

of δίκη for whom Hesiod had argued so emphatically in subsequent parts of his *Works and Days*.

In Hesiod's poem wealth and the means that lead to its acquisition are a central issue. Time and again Hesiod advises his brother Perses not to acquire wealth illegally by bribing the kings (or judges) or by laying his hands on the part of the inheritance that belongs to his brother. This advice is also given in the first section of maxims where the narrator emphasizes the necessity of acquiring wealth that is not ἀρπακτά (320: χρήματα δ' οὐχ ἀρπακτά· θεόσδοτα πολλῷ ἀμείνω, 'wealth should not be acquired through theft; god-given riches are much better'). For the *Works and Days* the only way to acquire wealth by honest means is through work, which in Hesiod's milieu means primarily agricultural work.

As the Hesiodic references show, Chremylus lives in the Iron Age, which has decayed to such a degree that advancement is possible only through illegal means (49-50) and where respect for oaths (60-61; cf. *Op.* 190-91) or for human relations (cf. *Op.* 182-84) is lacking. Like Hesiod's ἀδικώτερος (*Op.* 272) Chremylus' unjust characters (*Pl.* 30-31) enjoy greater prosperity so that injustice appears to be more expedient (συμφέρον). This is in essence a reformulation of Hesiod's paradox that an ἀδικώτερος (someone who by definition possesses less *dike* than someone else) ends up receiving a larger share of *dike*, this time understood as the benefits granted through the judges' verdict.

The question of reciprocity

We have seen so far that the exchange between Hermes and Carion mocks the god of reciprocity and comically appropriates some of the conventions of a hymn or prayer. The reminiscences of the *Works and Days* provide the 'theoretical' framework with which we are to understand the condition in which *Plutus*' heroes live: the Iron Age as presented in Hesiod's poem. What appeared in Hesiod to be a negative prophecy which the poet did not expect or hope Zeus to fulfill seems now to have come true, so that the hero asks the Pythia whether there is any real value in being just, a question that is implied in Hes. *Op.* 270-72. What Hesiod had stated as signs of the future collapse of the Iron Age, the prevalence of ἀδικία and the disregard of relations governed by reciprocity that hold society together, seems to be true for the play's dramatic reality.

The question of reciprocity that had been latent throughout the play becomes more pressing after the implementation of Chremylus' 'great idea' and casts doubts on Chremylus' utopian undertaking.³⁹ Significantly, Carion's complaint to Hermes focuses on the lack of reciprocity when humans did sacrifice to the Olympians (1117); and Hermes emphasizes the benefits for men if they accept him, thus rendering this scene a transaction characterized by reciprocal benefit. By demoting Hermes, the very god of reciprocity, Aristophanes meditates on the dangers involved in the collapse of *charis* in an absolute rule of wealth.

The issue of reciprocity is also implicitly addressed in the exchange between Carion and the chorus at lines 290-322. This time the poet draws on the *Odyssey* rather than the *Works and Days* and alludes to the Polyphemus and the Circe episodes (290-300 and 301-22, respectively). Both Odyssean characters violate the laws of hospitality that are based on the principle of reciprocity and are explicitly singled out by Hesiod in his dark vision of the moral collapse of the Iron Age. Both Odyssean stories alluded to here depict 'societies' in which the laws of ξενία are subverted and δίκη is lacking. Polyphemus violates ξενία by not treating Odysseus and his men as sacred, protected by Zeus Xenios, but instead killing and eating some of them. He even plays with the notion of offering a ξείνιον to his guest when he states that he will fulfill his obligation to Odysseus by eating him last (9.369-70). There are no laws in Cyclopean society; the Cyclopes lack trade, crafts, technology, and other professions; and they show no respect for law or the gods (9.107-130).⁴⁰ Circe, too, is an example of perverted ξενία, since she ostensibly treats her guests to the customary welcoming dinner, only to transform them into swine and keep them in her pigsties. In contrast to the Cyclopes, Circe lives in complete isolation, on an idyllic island perhaps, but her isolation (as well as the treatment of her guests) precludes the possibility of relations governed by *charis*.

Reciprocity was already lacking at the time prior to Plutus' healing. For instance, we find out that the impoverished just man (829-37) had inherited a great fortune and squandered it by doing what he considered to be right, namely by helping his friends in need (830-31: . . . ἐπέρκουν τοῖς δεομένοις τῶν φίλων, | εἶναι νομίζων χρήσιμον πρὸς τὸν βίον, 'I

³⁹ For *charis* in *Plutus*, see Bowie 1993: 273-78.

⁴⁰ For the parallel between the Cyclopean society and the situation described by Penia, see Bowie 1993: 286-88, who links this with the choral song.

used to assist those of my friends who were in need because I thought that this was a useful thing for life').⁴¹ In the end, however, when he himself was impoverished, his former 'friends' avoided him (833-7: ... κἀγὼ μὲν ᾧμην, οὓς τέως | εὐηργέτησα δεομένους, ἔξιν φίλους | ὄντως βεβαίους εἰ δεηθείην ποτέ· | οἱ δ' ἔξετρέποντο κοῦκ ἐδόκουν ὀρᾶν μ' ἔτι, 'and I thought that those to whom I had shown kindness up to that point would be truly steadfast friends, should I ever be in need. But they turned away and pretended that they did not even see me'). From this first encounter it would seem that Chremylus' idea solves the problem caused by the absence of reciprocity since this just man, formerly poor and ἄθλιος, is now restored to wealth.

But even during *Plutus*' rule, lack of reciprocity is evident. Take for example the next character who talks with Carion, the sycophant (850-958).⁴² In the world of comedy the sycophant could be presented as someone who upheld democracy by prosecuting those violating the laws. Since there was no public prosecutor in Athenian law, the state relied on the citizens' willingness to uphold the laws.⁴³ The sycophant, generally viewed as a negative character to be sure, offers a *prima facie* logical argument for his 'trade': he comes to the aid of the laws,⁴⁴ reciprocating the protection they provide him, as it were. With his activity he upholds democracy, which allows everyone who wishes to bring forth an accusation.⁴⁵ In fact, [Aristotle] *Ath. Pol.* 9.1 considers τὸ ἐξεῖναι τῷ βουλομένῳ τιμωρεῖν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδικουμένων as one of the δημοτικώτατα measures of Solon's πολιτεία, while *Plu. Solon* 18.6-7 links this measure to the lawgiver's desire to accustom the citizens to feeling like members

⁴¹ Incidentally, the just man's appearance shows that one of the premises of Chremylus' argument, that only unjust men are wealthy nowadays, does not hold: the just man became rich through an inheritance and not through any illegal means, and was impoverished although he was just.

⁴² On sycophants, see Osborne 1990; Harvey 1990 with earlier bibliography; Pellegrino 2010 with commentary on this scene on p. 181-213; also the remarks in Christ 1992: 338, 342-46. Especially in relation to Aristophanes: Doganis 2001; and more general thoughts (also with references to Comedy), Doganis 2007: 37-63. On the sycophant in *Plutus* as someone who like *Penia* has no place in Chremylus' new world, see McGlew 1997: 46.

⁴³ Cf. v. 917-19: κατηγορεῖ δὲ τίς; | ὁ βουλούμενος, οὐκ οὐκ ἐκεῖνός εἰμ' ἐγώ; | ὥστ' εἰς ἔμ' ἦκει τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα ('and who brings forth charges? Whoever wishes; So, am I not that one? Therefore the affairs of the city fall upon me').

⁴⁴ For the motif of βοηθεῖν τοῖς νόμοις, frequently found in fourth-century oratory, see Torchio 2007: 165 n. 31.

⁴⁵ For the argument of the sycophant (and the problem involved in the just man's political inactivity), see Olson 1990: 232-33.

⁴⁶ This of course does not imply approval of a sycophant's activity; cf. Doganis 2001: 226-27.

of the same body.⁴⁶ The sycophant's words at 859 (ἦν μὴ ἄλλίπωσιν αἱ δίκαι) implies that courts are no longer in session or that there is a danger that this might happen. In this case he runs the risk of losing his source of income. Perhaps we are meant to think that there is no need to resort to courts any longer since the incentive to violate the laws does not exist now that everyone is rich.⁴⁷ Be that as it may, this phrase would imply the absence of a judicial system or a system that enforces δίκη, something that Hesiod's *Works and Days* presents as crucial for the preservation of the human race in the Iron Age. In the end, the sycophant is given the old, worn-out clothes which the just man used to wear when he was poor, an exchange of costume which also symbolizes the exchange of fates between the two characters, and is driven off violently (926-58).⁴⁸

A further comic indication of the collapse of reciprocal relations is given in the following scene of the old woman and her (former) young lover: while she used to enjoy the young man's sexual favors in exchange for money for himself and clothing for his mother and sisters before Plutus' healing (i.e. before everyone's access to wealth), once he became rich the young man lost every interest in her, seemingly realizing only at that point how old and ugly she was. That the young man who certainly did not act as a χρηστός and δίκαιος citizen⁴⁹ is now rich implies that from the initial plan to make only the just rich we have passed to a condition of universal wealth: the young man had clearly been lying to the old woman (e.g. by calling her νητάριον and φάρτιον, 1111) in order to receive money from her, in spite of which he sometimes even abused her out of jealousy (1013-16). Thus the relation of reciprocity that existed between the old woman and her young lover, however comical it may have been, becomes unnecessary now that Plutus has taken over.

These encounters are important for a different reason as well: they show that wealth is not the only motive of human action and thus undermine Chremylus' tenet, expressed most prominently at 146-85, that people do everything for money. Forethought for adverse circumstances in the future as in the case of the just man (despite his miscalculation)

⁴⁷ Cf. Zimmermann 1983: 74 for the fallacy underlying the idea that absolute equality would remove enmity in the *Ecclesiazusae*.

⁴⁸ See Compton-Engle 2015: 86-87 on this scene of the *Plutus* and p. 13-15 on 'costume changes and exchanges' in Aristophanic comedy.

⁴⁹ Dover 1972: 204 remarks on the young man: 'He does not sound to us like a *just* man, but perhaps to the Athenians his ingratitude to a randy old woman raises no moral issue at all'.

or even irrational factors (e.g. the old woman's infatuation for her young lover) may urge one to act. This is especially prominent in the case of the sycophant who is not willing to abandon his 'trade': even if one is wealthy, one's life would amount to an idle *προβατίου βίον* (922: perhaps a humorous reference to the Golden Age?⁵⁰) if one does not practice a trade, which implies that, at least in part, the sycophant engages in his business also for a kind of satisfaction that he derives from it.⁵¹

Besides, these three scenes introduce the problem of work, a central concept in Hesiod's didactic poem, with which *Plutus* interacts as we saw earlier. The just man may have had good intentions in helping his friends, but he did not attempt in any way to increase his fortune, for instance through work. Granted that the old woman's lover intended to support his mother and sisters by offering his sexual favors, it is unclear why the young man did not attempt to escape his poverty by supporting himself and his family by taking up proper work. The question of proper work is introduced in clearer terms in the scene of the sycophant who is explicitly asked by Carion whether he earns his living as a farmer, a merchant, or a craftsman (902-6). While the previous two characters (just man, young lover) did not engage in work, the sycophant did have a profession but not one which would earn Carion's approval. The scene involving Hermes addresses in turn the subject of work from a different perspective: the god attempts to persuade Carion that his admittance will be advantageous for men because of the many roles he can fulfill. In the end, when Hermes is admitted as *διακονικός* and given a disagreeable task (the cleaning of offal) we find out that the necessity to work has not been eclipsed under the rule of *Plutus*.

Conclusions

Penia and *Plutus*, Aristophanes seems to suggest, are two sides of the same coin since they both have the same effect. Both cause men to work, the latter positively by urging them on through the prospect of earning

⁵⁰ As perhaps *αὐτόματος* in 1190, cf. Torchio 2007: 167-68 with n. 44.

⁵¹ This of course is not to say that a sycophant would not derive financial profit from denouncing others (either by receiving a prosecution fee, money from the prosecuted but innocent person so that he withdraws the prosecution, or from a third party on whose behalf he might undertake to prosecute). See Harvey 1990: 110-12 and 114-16. Through his presentation of his activity the sycophant casts himself as the opposite of the *ἀρχεῖος* citizen, as pointed out by Torchio 2007: 163-64. Barkhuizen 1981: 18-19 observes that avarice seems to direct *Chremylus'* actions too.

their livelihood, the former negatively by instilling in them the desire to avoid poverty. This similarity is supported by the scenic representation of the two divine abstractions, both of whom are old, dressed in rags, and dirty.⁵² At the same time, the answer to social problems, the play seems to imply, is not simply universal wealth because this ignores the other factors that drive people to action as well as the relations of reciprocity that hold society together. Each member of society practices a profession that provides him with the means of sustaining his household (i.e. earning what Hesiod calls βίος). But by performing his profession he also fulfills a function necessary for society's existence and welfare which material wealth alone cannot provide. In other words, one earns his βίος while simultaneously offering something to his fellow citizens. Chremylus' 'great idea', that everyone become wealthy, would mean the extinction of this network of exchange and reciprocity and would cause serious problems which the comic hero does not wish to consider. Penia characteristically asks in v. 407-8 of the *agon*: τίς δῆτ' ἱατρός ἐστι νῦν ἐν τῇ πόλει; | οὔτε γὰρ ὁ μισθὸς οὐδὲν ἔστ' οὔθ' ἡ τέχνη ('Who is then now a doctor in the city? For neither the salary is worth anything nor the art').⁵³ This is precisely the thrust of Penia's argument (510-26; cf. also 160-67): no one will be willing to undertake any work or trade if he is already rich, which means that society at large will lack the benefits deriving from these professions. Such a plan as Chremylus' would ultimately harm one's own interests. Significantly, as the example of the doctor shows, this idea is not confined to banausic kinds of work. To Chremylus' answer that slaves will perform this work, Penia retorts that there will be no slaves because no one will engage in slave-trading: being already rich, no one would risk his life in order to enslave other men for

⁵² On the importance of costume in *Plutus*, see Compton-Engle 2015: 82-88, who stresses the paratragic dimension of the rags in which Plutus is dressed, and Revermann 2006: 286. On costume (in the form of rags) and the theme of the wreath, see Groton 1990. For the complementarity of Penia and Plutus seen from a poetological point of view, see Sfyrroeras 1997.

⁵³ I.e. if there is no salary, there is no one to practice the medical art. Criticism of Penia's arguments (some of which are sophistic, as for instance her distinction between πένια and πτωχεία at 540-45, reminiscent of Prodicus' *diairesis*) is offered by Konstan & Dillon 1981: 384-88 and Sommerstein 1996: 274-76, though the latter concedes that she makes some solid points (pp. 258-60) to which Chremylus is unable to reply. For the view that her arguments 'make remarkably good sense in terms of the real, extra-dramatic world', see Olson 1990: 234-35. Sophistic influence on *Plutus* was argued for already by Cataudella 1935: 199-204 who compared the scenes of the just man and the sycophant with the *Anonymus Iamblichi*. For a more positive evaluation of Penia's arguments, see Schmidt 1981: esp. 64-66.

money. Besides, Penia's statement that she causes citizens to be wasp-like and brave, whereas Plutus renders them fat and idle, resonates with ideas found elsewhere in Aristophanes (e.g. in the *agon* between Aeschylus and Euripides in *Frogs* 1013-17). To Penia's arguments Chremylus has no good answer (cf. esp. 571, 600), and it is significant that Chremylus is forced to chase her off the stage and that she does not admit her defeat at the end of the *agon*.⁵⁴

Thus, even if universal wealth were possible, it would not eliminate the necessity to work and to observe reciprocity. As Penia's questions show, one would still be forced to undertake some form of work, which would ultimately lead to further movement of wealth and consequently unevenness in its distribution. While work is the precondition for acquiring wealth by just means, as Hesiod had argued in the *Works and Days* and as it holds true in the extra-dramatic world of *Plutus*, the upholding of the network of reciprocal relations (familial, interpersonal, professional, ξενία, φιλία, etc.) lies at the heart of any form of human society. If reciprocity does not persist and wealth is treated as the sole motive for action, society breaks down as the exchange between Hermes and Carion shows, in which the self-centered god (of reciprocity!) explicitly states that he cares only for his personal interest (1117-18) and is willing to abandon the Olympian society to join a different one. Like *Plutus* as a whole, a play that starts with a personal question of Chremylus but then widens its focus to include the entire city,⁵⁵ so too the scene of Hermes and Carion, ostensibly focusing only on the sorry plight of a hungry god now deprived of the delicacies he used to enjoy, has a broader significance as it reflects on the concept of reciprocity that, along with justice and work, is of central importance for understanding the entire play.

⁵⁴ For the *agon*, see Revermann 2006: 283-87.

⁵⁵ Dillon 1987: 182-83 on the widening focus of the play, from the son, to include friends and the community in Chremylus' plan.

References

- Barkhuizen, J. H. 1981. 'The *Plutus* of Aristophanes', *AC* 24: 17-22.
- Bowie, A. M. 1993. *Aristophanes. Myth, Ritual and Comedy*. Cambridge.
- Calame, C. 2011. 'The *Homeric Hymns* as Poetic Offerings. Musical and Ritual Relationships with the Gods', in A. Faulkner, ed., *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*. Oxford. 334-57.
- Cassio, A. C. 1985. *Commedia e partecipazione. La Pace di Aristofane*. Naples.
- Cataudella, Q. 1935. 'Due note ad Aristofane', *Athenaeum* 13: 195-204.
- Christ, M. R. 1992. 'Ostracism, Sycophancy, and Deception of the Demos: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 43.5', *CQ* 42: 336-46.
- Clay, J. S. 1989. *The Politics of Olympus. Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. Princeton.
- Clay, J. S. 2003. *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge.
- Compton-Engle, G. 2015. *Costume in the Comedies of Aristophanes*. Cambridge.
- Day, J. W. 2010. *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication. Representation and Reperformance*. Cambridge.
- Dillon, M. 1987. 'Topicality in Aristophanes' *Ploutos*', *CA* 6: 155-83.
- Doganis, C. K. 2001. 'La sycophantie dans la démocratie athénienne d'après les comédies d'Aristophane.' *Journal des Savants* 225-48.
- Doganis, C. K. 2007. *Aux origines de la corruption. Démocratie et délation en Grèce ancienne*. Paris.
- Dover, K. J. 1972. *Aristophanic Comedy*. London.
- Eitrem, S. 1909. 'De Mercurio Aristophaneo', *Philologus* 68: 344-67.
- Flashar, H. 1996. 'The Originality of Aristophanes' Last Plays', in E. Segal, ed., *Oxford Readings in Aristophanes*. Oxford. 314-28 [Originally published as Flashar, H. 1967. 'Zur Eigenart des aristophanischen Spätwerks', *Poetica* 1: 154-75.]
- Furley, W. D. 1995. 'Praise and Persuasion in Greek Hymns', *JHS* 115: 29-46.
- Furley, W. D. 1996. *Andokides and the Herms. A Study in Crisis in Fifth-Century Athenian Religion*. London.

- Groton, A. H. 1990. 'Wreaths and Rags in Aristophanes' *Plutus*', *CJ* 86: 16-22.
- Harvey, D. 1990 'The Sykophant and Sykophancy: Vexatious Redefinition?', in P. Cartledge, P. Millett, and S. Todd., eds., *Nomos: Essays in Athenian Law, Politics and Society*. Cambridge. 103-21.
- Heberlein, F. 1981. 'Zur Ironie im *Plutos* des Aristophanes', *WJA* 7: 27-49.
- Horn, W. 1970. *Gebet und Gebetsparodie in den Komödien des Aristophanes*. Nürnberg.
- Kassel, R. 1983. 'Dialoge mit Statuen', *ZPE* 51: 1-12.
- Kleinknecht, H. 1937. *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike*. Stuttgart.
- Konstan, D., and M. Dillon. 1981. 'The Ideology of Aristophanes' *Wealth*', *AJPh* 102: 371-94.
- Lamont, J. 2015. 'Asklepios in the Piraeus and the Mechanisms of Cult Appropriation', in M. M. Miles, ed., *Autopsy in Athens. Recent Archaeological Research on Athens and Attica*. Oxford & Philadelphia. 37-51.
- Lévy, E. 1997. 'Richesse et pauvreté dans le *Ploutos*', *Ktema* 22: 201-12.
- McGlew, J. 1997. 'After Irony: Aristophanes' *Wealth* and Its Modern Interpreters', *AJP* 118: 35-53.
- McLachlan, B. 1993. *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry*. Princeton.
- Nobili, C. 2011. *L'«Inno omerico a Ermes» e le tradizioni locali*. Milan.
- Olson, S. D. 1989. 'Carion and the New World of Aristophanes' *Plutus*', *TAPA* 119: 193-99.
- Olson, S. D. 1990. 'Economics and Ideology in Aristophanes' *Wealth*', *HSPC* 93: 223-42.
- Orfanos, C. 2013. 'Le *Ploutos* d'Aristophane: un éloge de la pauvreté?', in E. Galbois and S. Rougier-Blanc, eds., *La pauvreté en Grèce ancienne: formes, représentations, enjeux*. Bordeaux. 213-22.
- Osborne, R. 1985-86. 'The Erection and Mutilation of the *Hermai*', *PCPS* 31: 47-73.
- Osborne, R. 1990. 'Vexatious Litigation in Classical Athens: Sykophancy and the Sykophant', in P. Cartledge, P. Millett, and S. Todd., eds., *Nomos: Essays in Athenian Law, Politics and Society*. Cambridge. 83-102.
- Pellegrino, M. 2010. *La maschera comica del Sicofante*. Lecce.
- Pòrtulas, J. 2006. 'Il primo canto di Ermes', in P. Mureddu, ed., *Comicità e riso tra Aristofane e Menandro. Atti del convegno di studi Cagliari 29 settembre- 1 ottobre 2005*. Amsterdam. 19-31.

- Race, W. H. 1982. 'Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns', *GRBS* 23: 5-14.
- Revermann, M. 2006. *Comic Business. Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts in Aristophanic Comedy*. Oxford.
- Riu, X. 1999. *Dionysism and Comedy*. Lanham.
- Rückert, B. 1998. *Die Herme im öffentlichen und privaten Leben der Griechen. Untersuchungen zur Funktion der griechischen Herme als Grenzmal, Inschriftenträger und Kultbild des Hermes*. Regensburg.
- Ruffell, I. 2010. 'The World Turned Upside Down: Utopia and Utopianism in the Fragments of Old Comedy', In D. Harvey and J. Wilkins, eds., *The Rivals of Aristophanes. Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*. London. 473-506.
- Schmidt, J.-U. 1981. 'Reichtum und Gerechtigkeit. Ein Beitrag des Aristophanes zur Diskussion um den Wohlstand', *Wort und Dienst* 16: 49-66.
- Sfyrsoeras, P. 1997. 'What Wealth Has to Do with Dionysus: From Economy to Poetics in Aristophanes' *Plutus*', *GRBS* 36: 231-61.
- Sommerstein, A. H. 1996. 'Aristophanes and the Demon Poverty', in E. Segal, ed., *Oxford Readings in Aristophanes*. Oxford. 252-81. [Originally published in *CQ* 34 (1984) 314-33.]
- Sommerstein, A. H. 2001. *The Comedies of Aristophanes. Vol. 11: Wealth*. Warminster.
- Torchio, M. C. 2007. 'Il Sicofante e il Sacerdote: politica e religione nel *Pluto* di Aristofane', in S. Conti, ed., *Tra religione e politica nel mondo classico. Atti dell'Associazione Italiana di Cultura Classica: Delegazione di Siena*. Siena. 159-75.
- Tordoff, R. 2012. 'Carion down the Piraeus: The Tragic Messenger Speech in Aristophanes' *Wealth*', in C. W. Marshall and G. Kovacs, eds., *No Laughing Matter. Studies in Athenian Comedy*. London. 141-57.
- Vergados, A. 2011. 'The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Humour and Epiphany', in A. Faulkner, ed., *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*. Oxford. 82-104.
- Vergados, A. 2013. *A Commentary on the Homeric Hymn to Hermes*. Berlin/Boston.
- Vergados, A. (forthcoming). 'Hermes and the Figs', in J. S. Clay and J. F. Miller, eds., *Tracking Hermes/Pursuing Mercury*. Oxford.
- Versnel, H. S. 2011. *Coping with the Gods. Wayward Readings in Greek Theology*. Leiden/Boston.
- Wrede, H. 1985. *Die antike Herme*. Mainz.
- Zimmermann, B. 1983. 'Utopisches und Utopie in den Komödien des Aristophanes', *WJA* 9: 57-77.

Artemis and the Perils of Divine Intimacy

Thomas K. Hubbard

Our first extant literary hymn to Artemis of any length, that of Callimachus, approaches its end with the ominous warning (*Hymn* 3.264-65):

μηδέ τινα μνᾶσθαι τὴν παρθένον· οὐδὲ γὰρ Ὀτος,
οὐδὲ μὲν Ὠρίων ἀγαθὸν γάμον ἐμνήσθουσιν.

May none woo the maiden! For neither Otus
Nor Orion made suit for a good marriage.

By an almost perfect ring-composition,¹ this passage takes us back to the same number of lines from the hymn's beginning, where an infant Artemis dandled on her father's knees asks him as the first wish on her long list (*Hymn* 3.6):

δός μοι παρθένην αἰώνιον, ἄππα, φυλάσσειν ...

Grant me, Papa, to protect an everlasting virginity ...

¹ Note also the presence of the χορός in v. 3 and v. 266 (the third line from the end). For other manifestations of ring-composition between the poem's beginning and end (and middle), see Plantinga 2004: 272-74 and Petrovic 2007: 240-42. Petrovic suggests that κυκλώσασθαι in v. 267 (the poem's penultimate line) may allude to the poem's coming full circle. As Bing and Uhrmeister (1994: 34) note, 'The playful girl of the start has become an awe-inspiring avenger...this stark contrast provides a final unifying frame.'

Callimachus, who was no mean student of classical and archaic poetry, distills this habitus as the most important essence of the goddess' identity. Young and nubile in a culture where marriage right around the age of puberty was normative for girls (Ingalls 2001), Callimachus' Artemis asks to be spared this one thing before all others. But unlike her two fellow virgins on Mt. Olympus, the masculinized, helmeted Athena and the old maid aunt Hestia, who never leaves home, Artemis breathes the air of a pure, but well-informed teenage *provocateuse* tempting male admiration, only to dominate and punish it ruthlessly. She is the Olympian Lolita, coyly manipulative but always elusive.²

In a paper I presented at an international conference that took place at the European Cultural Centre of Delphi in July 2003, at which Jenny was also a speaker, I argued for a similar and parallel sexual contradiction at the core of Artemis' twin brother Apollo: like his sister, he was young and eternally handsome, but almost without exception causes destruction to every favored boy, nymph, sybil, or princess with whom he grows intimate (Hubbard 2009). In Apollo's case, I argued that this lack of success in establishing a permanent or successful sexual relationship with anyone else, divine or human, reflected his eternally ephebic liminality, perpetually stuck between being himself a desirable *erômenos* and an adept *erastês* as conversant with the proper conventions of seduction as his father Zeus or his uncle Poseidon, both of whom leave behind abundant progeny from their adulterous liaisons as well as from their legitimate divine marriages. A similar sexual ambivalence may also operate in the case of Artemis, whose associations with initiation at Brauron and numerous other venues are familiar.³ However, in her case destruction ensues not from her unfulfilled desire of others, as with Apollo, but others' unfulfilled desire for her or the girls close to her.

Let us first examine the context of the framing lines cited above from Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis*. Scholars have debated the structure and coherence of this rather long hymn (e.g. Bing & Uhrmeister 1994;

² Compare Burkert 1985: 150, who calls her virginity 'a peculiarly erotic, challenging ideal.'

³ Jeanmaire 1939: 257-64; Chirassi 1964: 18; Brelich 1969: 272-311; Arena 1979; Lloyd-Jones 1983: 91-100; Perlman 1983: 126; Burkert 1985: 151-52; Sourvinou-Inwood 1988: 111-13; Dowden 1989: 25-42; Guarisco 2001; Gentili & Perusino 2002; Bathrellou 2012. On the initiatory function of her Laconian cults, for both boys and girls, see Calame 1997: 142-74. For doubts about 'initiation' as the function of these rites, see Faraone 2003; Cole 2004: 203; and Budin 2016: 80.

Köhnken 2004; Petrovic 2007: 184-94; Stephens 2015: 100-1). Invoking the film theorist Laura Mulvey's familiar concept of the eroticized male gaze (Mulvey 1975), I argue that the hymn is unified by a distinctive strategy which throughout focalizes the virgin goddess from the point of view of male gods and humans, whom she encounters and successfully manipulates. From the most tender age, she knows how to use her girlish charms to obtain whatever she wants from the males who fawn over her.

After winning gifts and privileges on the lap of her father (vv. 4-40), the child Artemis visits Hephaestus and the Cyclopes, otherwise so frightful to little girls, to obtain her bow and arrows (46-86), and then the notoriously lustful Pan to acquire hunting dogs (87-97). The hyper-masculinity and shagginess of all three is emphasized: she tries to tug on Zeus' beard (26-28), actually does tear out some of Brontes' chest hair (75-79), and notes Pan's beard as well (90). When she arrives in Olympus, she is chided by another hyper-masculine god, the gluttonous Heracles (152-58), but he is laughed at by all the others; every god bids her to sit by them, but she chaste favors only her brother Apollo (168-69), perhaps in an allusion to Ptolemaic sibling-marriage (cf. 133-34). The sun-god Helios, the panoptic 'eye in the sky',⁴ even stays his chariot and lengthens the day whenever he observes her dancing with her nymphs (180-82); Callimachus chooses here a verb (θεῖται) that emphasizes the theatricality of the spectacle. The catalogue of her cults (225-36) features in every case a specific male founder (Neleus, Agamemnon, Proetus), as we also see in the list of those who failed to honor her sufficiently (251-65). The catalogue of her favored hunting maids (184-224) features digressions on two who successfully eluded male aggression, Britomartis and Atalanta.⁵

Perhaps the most famous and most explicitly sexualized male gaze upon Artemis, that of Actaeon, is deferred into the fifth hymn, where it provides the model for Tiresias' accidental intrusion into the Bath of Pallas (5.107-18). This may provide further evidence for those who be-

⁴ This passage may echo *Homeric Hymn* 28.13-16, where Helios stays his horses to gaze upon Athena. Helios' ability to see everything that happens both on earth and in Olympus is a topos: he witnesses the adultery of Ares and Aphrodite (*Od.* 8.270-71, 302), the abduction of Persephone (*Homeric Hymn* 2.62-89), the underwater birth of Rhodes (Pindar, *Olymp.* 7.54-71), and serves as the ever-observant witness to oaths (*Il.* 3.277 'Helios, you who see all and hear all'; cf. *Od.* 11.109 and 12.323 for the same line). When Zeus and Hera make love in *Il.* 14.344-45, they must wrap a cloud around themselves to elude Helios' voyeurism, for he has the 'sharpest eye to look upon things.'

⁵ Farnell (1896: II, 443) considers Atalanta a double for Artemis herself, an independent huntress who rejects marriage, at least until tricked into it by the three golden apples.

lieve that Callimachus designed the six hymns as a conscious sequence (e.g. Hopkinson 1984: 13-17; Haslam 1993; Cameron 1995: 438-39; Depew 2004; Stephens 2015: 12-14), as if *Hymn* 5 picks up where *Hymn* 3 left off, capping the sequence Otus and Orion with the anticipated third term. Although Callimachus is our first certain textual attestation for Actaeon's offense as seeing the goddess naked, he probably did not invent the story, which he inserts as a brief paradigmatic analogy in a genuinely *hapax legomenon* tale, that of Teiresias seeing Athena naked.⁶

Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* 3.4.4 attests Actaeon's stumbling upon Artemis and her maids while bathing as the dominant version (ὥς δὲ οἱ πλείονες), suggesting it is at least classical in date. Pausanias 9.2.3 even identifies in the vicinity of Mt. Cithaeron the spring and the rock from which the resting Actaeon espied the goddess. However, he relates that the poet Stesichorus (= fr. 236 PMG) assigned a quite different motivation to Artemis for making him look like a stag, namely in order that he not marry his aunt Semele, presumably so that she will be available solely to Zeus;⁷ this version may parallel her killing of the pregnant Coronis as a favor to her brother Apollo (Pindar, *Pyth.* 3.31-37), again in the vicinity of a spring, because Coronis made the mistake of sharing with a human a female body that had already been united with a god. It is significant that both the Stesichorean and more familiar version identify Actaeon's problem as a sexual intrusion into something belonging to the gods, whether it is wooing Zeus' favorite daughter of Cadmus or forbidden knowledge of Artemis herself. The structural constant between both versions (as well as the Coronis story) is Artemis' role in policing the sexual boundaries between god and human.

If we search for an original source to the story of Actaeon's punishment for illicit peeping, it is likely in fifth-century tragedy, which frequently provides the basis for what we find in Apollodorus. Merely wanting to marry his aunt (perfectly legal in Greek custom, particularly in the case of an *epiklēros*) hardly constitutes a very convincing tragic *hamartia*, but intrusion on a goddess' privacy and/or the sexual purity of her followers offers far richer dramatic possibilities. We know that Aeschylus'

⁶ Lloyd-Jones (1983: 99) thinks the tale of Teiresias and Athena was the model for Actaeon and Artemis, but this ignores the wider attestation of the Actaeon story and the greater likelihood that a familiar story will be cited briefly as the parallel for a new or unfamiliar story which is told at greater length.

⁷ See Rose 1932. Apollodorus attests this version as also that of the sixth-century genealogist Acusilaus (2F33 FGrH). *P.Mich.* inv. 1447 verso, Col. II.1-6, attributes this version to the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* as well; see the publication of Renner 1978: 282-87.

lost *Toxotides* (= *Female Archers*) concerned Actaeon, who is named in fr. 241 and whose death by his own dogs is described in fr. 244. Most revealing for our purposes are two fragments quoted in succession by Antigonus of Carystus, where maidens' eyes and sexual purity are the focus of attention (*Incredibilia* 115 = frs. 242-43 TGrF):

αἰδοῖ (γὰρ) ἀγναῖς παρθένοις γαμηλίων
 λέκτρων ἀπείροις βλεμμάτων ῥέπει βολή. . . .
 νέας γυναικὸς οὐ με μὴ λάθῃ φλέγων
 ὀφθαλμός, ἥτις ἀνδρὸς ἢ γεγευμένη·
 ἔχω δὲ τούτων θυμὸν ἱπογνώμονα.

With modesty the eyelids' gaze sinks downward
 for holy maidens with no experience of the marriage bed. . . .
 The flaming eye of a young woman does not escape
 my notice, if she has tasted a man.
 I have a horse-judge's sense for these things.

Eyes and seeing were thematically important to this play. The lines could hardly refer to Semele, who as the aunt of Actaeon would likely be older and thus unlikely to be described as a 'maiden' or 'young woman.' The plural *parthenois* would rather point to a group of young women, probably Artemis' young companions in the hunt. It is unclear whether these lines are spoken by Actaeon himself, suggesting a voyeuristic curiosity in watching Artemis' hunting maids with the possibility of discerning who might be most available for seduction, or by a vigilant Artemis, keen to root out the sexual secrets of any companion who may not be abiding by her strict rules. One might note in favor of the first interpretation that Aeschylus also wrote a *Pentheus*, which may have featured the same scopophilic obsession as Euripides' *Bacchae*; in favor of the second we could point to his authorship of a *Callisto*. Might it be that *Toxotides*, *Callisto*, and *Atalanta* all formed a connected trilogy having to do with Artemis and her sexual vigilance over her hunting maids?⁸ What we can say for sure is that under either scenario, Actaeon's presence in the vicinity poses a sexual threat, whether from his over-curiosity or

⁸ Mette (1963: 133) suggests, based on fr. 116 TGrF, that Aeschylus' *Hiereiai* (*Priestesses*) may have also formed part of an Artemis trilogy.

Artemis' hyper-vigilance or a combination of both. One can easily see how such a plot could develop in several episodes, with his death related by a messenger speech (fr. 244), an early scene with boasting of his hunting prowess (fr. 241), a scene of Artemis alone with her chorus, and one where he spies upon or encounters the chorus and finally Artemis herself. His destruction at the goddess' command would raise the questions of theodicy, human lust, and gender conflict that absorbed Aeschylus' attention throughout his dramatic career.

Callimachus (*Hymn* 5.110-12) does indicate that Actaeon was a companion of Artemis in the hunt, implying some prior relationship between them. Although Callimachus characterizes Actaeon's gaze upon Artemis as an accidental intrusion (5.113 'not willing' = οὐκ ἐθέλων), some later texts suggest otherwise. Diodorus Siculus 4.81.3-5 relates a version in which Actaeon was killed because he wished to marry Artemis (Hyginus, *Fab.* 180 says he wanted to rape her), and this desire is spun into a rather elaborate story by Nonnus (5.432-37, 5.512-19, 44.278-318), who has him climbing to the top of a tree to spy intentionally, and then falling (a detail also alluded to by Statius, *Theb.* 3.201-2). These authors seem familiar with an earlier version, perhaps that of Greek tragedy, in which Actaeon's crime was motivated by sexual passion not just for Artemis' maids, but the goddess herself, the quintessential virgin of whom those maids were but imperfect imitations.⁹ As we shall also see in Orion's case, the two can easily be conflated in mythographic developments.

Orion is named by Callimachus as the paradigmatic example of a mortal who became too enamored of Artemis. However, as in the case of Actaeon, the sexual threat to Artemis appears to have been a somewhat later development of his myth. In *Odyssey* 5.121-24, Calypso complains about the gods taking Odysseus from her by alluding to Orion's death from the arrows of Artemis because the gods were vexed by Eos' love for him. Later in the Nekyia episode (*Od.* 11.572-75), Orion makes an appearance in the Underworld, hunting in a meadow of asphodel, obviously not a victim of eternal punishment, but enjoying a place of favor, described immediately after the honored judge Minos.¹⁰ *Od.* 11.310 notes that the giants Otus and Ephialtes were 'the most handsome of mortals after famous Orion.' While

⁹ See Fontenrose 1981: 34-37, who suspects this strand of the tradition was not merely a later development.

¹⁰ Hesiodic tradition (fr. 148a MW) claims Orion as a grandson of Minos through his daughter Euryale; also cf. Pherecydes 3F52 *FGrH*.

these parts of the Nekyia episode are likely from a later layer of the *Odyssey* tradition, they do reflect a Homeric view of Orion as a handsome giant, desirable to goddesses, and a hunter who is ultimately killed by Artemis.

The pseudo-Eratosthenic *Catasterisms* 32 attributes to 'Hesiod' (presumably the *Astronomia*, although Merkelbach and West (1967) assign this among the *Catalogue of Women* as fr. 148a)¹¹ another story suggesting Orion's penchant for sexual error, namely his drunken rape of Merope, the daughter of King Oenopion of Chios, for which he was blinded and sent forth to find the rising Sun,¹² guided by the boy Cedalion. In this version he later came back to Crete and hunted 'with Artemis and Leto present.' After boasting that he could catch every creature upon Earth, Ge sent a scorpion to sting and kill him. Artemis and Leto intervene with Zeus to procure for Orion a place in the sky. Problematic attribution of this entire account to Hesiod, however, is another testimonium, from the scholia to the *Aratea* of Germanicus, a lesser-known late Augustan masterpiece, to the effect that 'Hesiod' reports a completely different Theban birth story about Orion that is inconsistent with the Cretan account (fr. 148b MW); that the Boeotian Hesiodic tradition would proffer a Theban origin to Orion is not unlikely, the scepticism of Merkelbach and West notwithstanding (*haec Hesiodo tribui vix possunt*).¹³

The part of the story about Oenopion and Orion's blinding is common among the standard mythographers (Apollodorus, *Bibl.* 1.4.3; Hyginus, *Astron.* 2.34.1-2; Parthenius, *Erot. Path.* 20; Servius, *ad Aen.* 10.763), with minor additions or variations. Hyginus (*Astr.* 2.34) and Strabo cite a dithyramb of Pindar (fr. 72-74 S-M) as attesting a sexual misadventure in Chios, but there the woman in question is someone else's wife. That Sophocles wrote a *Cedalion*, possibly satyric, also suggests that this story was well-established by the classical period.¹⁴ Orion's status as a punished rapist does

¹¹ Merkelbach-West is in the distinct minority among editors. Sale (1962: 138-40) raises doubts whether it is Hesiodic at all.

¹² Could this be when and where he first encounters Eos and erotically charms her? If so, there may be some trace of convergence with the Homeric story about a relationship with Eos, but the death is clearly different in this account.

¹³ This is the story preserved in Palaephatus (44F51 *FGrH*), and known to the Romans (Ovid, *Fasti* 5.493-536; cf. Hyginus, *Fab.* 195, *Astr.* 2.34.1), about three gods urinating or masturbating on a hide subsequently buried in the Earth. Not surprisingly, Pindar also favored this Theban version (see below).

¹⁴ As Fontenrose (1981: 9) notes, Servius auct. *ad Aen.* 10.763 preserves a version of the story in which a group of satyrs deliver a drunken Orion to Oenopion to punish. This must have come from a satyr play, whether Sophocles' or another's.

not appear to prevent him from becoming a favorite of the sexually pure and untouchable Artemis, but it was surely a point of narrative instability that tempted poets to find new explanations or invent additional elements.

The A-scholia to *Iliad* 18.486 tell us that Orion pursued the seven Pleiades, daughters of Atlas who chose virginity and a life of hunting with Artemis. Zeus rescues them and turns them into stars, who continue to be pursued (but never caught) by Orion in the night sky (as noted by Hesiod, *Works and Days* 619-20; cf. Pindar, *Nem.* 2.10-12). However, other sources suggest that Zeus and Poseidon themselves turn their sexual attention to some of the Pleiades (see Hellanicus 4F19 *FGrH*, and Pausanias 3.18.10, describing the Amyklai throne). Taygeta's case we shall discuss later in this essay, as it involves direct intervention by Artemis.

The leap from pursuing one of Artemis' maids to pursuing Artemis herself is not very far. Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 1.4.5) tells us that Artemis killed Orion because he violated a Hyperborean maiden named Opis. Her story must have some antiquity, as Herodotus 4.34-35 attests seeing her tomb behind the Artemision at Delos; it also had some longevity, as she continues to be a nymph hunting with Artemis in Vergil (*Aen.* 11.532-35, 11.836-37) and even Nonnus (5.489-91). However, Opis was also a cult title of Artemis herself in Lacedaemonia (Farnell 1891: II, 487-88; Fontenrose 1981, 13), suggesting a conflation between the huntress nymph and the goddess herself, who is invoked as Oupis by Callimachus (*Hymn* 3.204; however, *Hymn* 4.292 identifies Oupis as a daughter of Boreas). Indeed, the scholia to *Od.* 5.121 express confusion whether Orion attacked Opis or Artemis herself, doubtless because the name could in fact designate the goddess. An attack on one of Artemis' maids, inasmuch as they dwelled in the penumbra of the goddess' protective presence, was certainly an attack on Artemis' dignity and tantamount to an attack on herself.¹⁵

As we have seen, Callimachus alludes in a single line to a story about Orion actively wooing Artemis herself and coming to destruction for that reason. (See fr. 570 Pf. for the same.) The brevity of the allusion suggests the story was hardly an innovation. In fact, it was enormously popular among the Hellenistic poets, also cited by Euphorion (fr. 101 Powell), Aratus (*Phaen.* 634-46), and Nicander (*Ther.* 13-20).¹⁶ Our earliest certain attestation is in

¹⁵ For the conflation of the Hyperborean maiden and Artemis, see Macrobius, *Sat.* 5.22, citing Alexander Aetolus, fr. 4.5-6 Powell. See also the discussion of Sale 1961.

¹⁶ His approach took the form of active groping of the goddess' robe in Aratus (*Phaen.* 637-38), Nicander (*Ther.* 16), and Libanius (*Or.* 5.9).

the rationalizing work of the late 4th-century mythographer Palaephatus (44*FGrH* 51), but he surely had poetic sources, particularly in view of its popularity among poets of the following century. We do know that Corinna also wrote a poem about Orion (fr. 673 PMG), calling him a 'most pious man' (εὐσεβέστατον) whose achievements in 'taming' wild places and 'purifying' them of beasts should be celebrated; such a poem not only attests a continuing Theban tradition about Orion, but perhaps even a desire to give him a heroic stature and defend him against other poets' stories about moral impurity or impious boasting. Given the uncertainty of Corinna's date, this does not help us much; however, we do know that Corinna was intimately familiar with and liked to criticize the work of Pindar. We therefore cannot eliminate the possibility that Pindar's dithyramb, which continued to be well-known until Roman times, included a Wrath of Artemis, punishing Orion for improper approaches, whether to herself or to another one of her maids (as related by Hyginus, *Fab.* 195; as we have seen, Hyginus elsewhere cites Pindar's dithyramb as a source for information about Orion).¹⁷

Amid this welter of contradictory stories, it may be worthwhile to adopt a structuralist method and search out common threads synchronically among all the variants and temporal levels of the myth's development. In each version, Orion is a giant hunter of considerable attraction, who becomes sexually involved with someone off limits, and also encounters Artemis, who either strongly favors him or destroys him or both. These motifs are shared with the story of Actaeon, in whom we have an attractive young hunter, who has or seeks sexual knowledge of someone connected with the gods, and is destroyed by Artemis.

The other giant mentioned by Callimachus' hymn is Otus, who is usually associated with his twin brother Ephialtes. The Homeric tradition shows them plotting against the Olympians, whether by imprisoning Ares in a jar (*Iliad* 5.385-91) or by piling Pelion on Ossa to scale the gods' abode (*Odyssey* 11.305-20). As we have seen, *Od.* 11.310 specifically pairs them with Orion as 'the most beautiful of mortals.' Mythographic sources (Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* 1.7.4; Hyginus, *Fab.* 28) add that their ambitions had a sexual component, with Ephialtes aiming to take Hera for himself, and Otus claiming Artemis. Furthermore, they died while pursuing Artemis on the island of Naxos, shooting each other with their

¹⁷ Yet another variant of the same story is the late and clearly romanticized version of the historiographer Istrus (334F64 *FGrH*), wherein Artemis reciprocates Orion's love, but is tricked into killing him by her jealous brother.

own spears when hunting a deer, which was either Artemis in disguise (Apollodorus) or sent by Apollo to distract them from his sister (Hyginus). That this version of their death was known in the fifth century is indicated by two pieces of evidence: Pindar (*Pyth.* 4.88-89) places their death on Naxos, and an Attic bell krater of the mid-fifth century (Basel 404 = ARV² 1067.2 bis) shows Artemis aiming her bow at two hunters as they stalk a deer. Two unassigned Pindaric fragments, both of which have lemmata referring to Otus and Ephialtes, suggest that he treated the story at some length in another poem: one refers to a ladder they used to scale heaven (fr. 162 S-M), and the other relates to them killing each other with their spears (fr. 163 S-M). It is no surprise that the Pindaric scholia (Σ *Pyth.* 4.156a Drachmann) appear to know the same full story as Apollodorus, suggesting that Pindar was indeed the *locus classicus* behind the mythographers' accounts.

The three male figures we have examined so far are all handsome mortal hunters, who either commit or aim at a sexual violation offensive to the gods and who are somehow destroyed by or in the presence of Artemis. The fourth such hunter to die is Hippolytus, the son of Theseus. His case is markedly different from the others, in that he is not, at least on the surface, lustful or sexually incontinent, but a mortal who imitates Artemis' own chastity, at least as he appears in our principal extant source for his myth, Euripides' *Hippolytus*. Such was his devotion to sexual abstinence that he evoked the wrath of Aphrodite by holding her domain in contempt. One wonders, however, if Hippolytus' obsessive aversion to *ta aphrodisia* in his cultivation of Artemis (expressed most vividly in his blunt dismissal of his Servant's admonitions in vv. 88-120 and his misogynistic diatribe of vv. 616-68) is not such an exuberant emulation of Artemis' privileged and unique station as to constitute a form of *hybris* in its own right, pretending to an ethical perfection uncharacteristic of any mortal man, not even characteristic of any god, but only of a goddess. It is as if Hippolytus aspires to be the masculine equivalent of Artemis herself. That complete sexual abstinence was not revered by the Greeks as a particular virtue for males is well-known.¹⁸

It is easy to note the barely suppressed eroticism of Hippolytus' opening prayer to Artemis in vv. 73-87:

¹⁸ See Devereux 1985: 90, and my own observations in Hubbard & Doerfler 2014: 167-73.

σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηράτου
 λειμῶνος, ὃ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω,
 ἔνθ' οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀξιοῖ φέρβειν βοτὰ
 οὔτ' ἤλθέ πω σίδηρος, ἀλλ' ἀκήρατον
 μέλισσα λειμῶν' ἡρινὴ διέρχεται,
 Αἰδῶς δὲ ποταμίαισι κηπεύει δρόσοις,
 ὅσοις διδακτὸν μηδέν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει
 τὸ σωφρονεῖν εἵληχεν ἐς τὰ πάντ' αἰεί,
 τούτοις δρέπεσθαι, τοῖς κακοῖσι δ' οὐ θέμις.
 ἀλλ', ὦ φίλη δέσποινα, χρυσέας κόμης
 ἀνάδημα δέξαι χειρὸς εὐσεβοῦς ἄπο.
 μόνῳ γάρ ἐστι τοῦτ' ἐμοὶ γέρας βροτῶν·
 σοὶ καὶ ξύνειμι καὶ λόγοις ἀμείβομαι,
 κλύων μὲν αὐδῆς, ὄμμα δ' οὐχ ὁρῶν τὸ σόν.
 τέλος δὲ κάμψαιμ' ὥσπερ ἡρξάμην βίου.

To you I bring this woven crown from an uncut meadow,
 having arranged it, O mistress.
 There would no shepherd think it right to pasture his flocks,
 nor has an iron blade ever come, but the vernal honeybee
 passes through the uncut meadow,
 and Modesty waters it with dew from the river.
 Only to those who have learned prudence not, but have it
 as the apportioned lot in their nature for all things always,
 only to those is it lawful to pluck flowers there, not to the wicked.
 But, dear mistress, receive from a pious hand
 this binding for your golden hair.
 For to me alone of mortals belongs this prize:
 I can be with you and exchange words,
 hearing your voice, though not seeing your eye.
 I would finish the end of my life just as I began it.

The image of the 'uncut meadow,' repeated twice in these lines and later invoked by Phaedra in her deluded ravings (vv. 210-11), may, as the psychoanalyst Georges Devereux argued (1985, 10-12), suggest a maiden's unshaven pubic hair (in contrast to a married woman's typically clean-shaven pubis). Moist, warm, and fragrant, it attracts only the

'vernal honeybee,' not crude shepherds and their kine; we may be meant to think here of Sappho's 'mountain hyacinth' bleeding purple after being crushed beneath the feet of an unknowing shepherd (fr. 105(b) V), an evident allusion to trampled virginity, famously echoed in Catullus 11.21-24.¹⁹ This is clearly a very private place, nurtured by *Aidos* ('Modesty/Shame,' from whose name is derived *ta aidōia*, the Greek equivalent of the Latin *pudenda* or German *Schamglied*). Hippolytus asserts that its flowers may never be cut by iron, but only plucked by hand,²⁰ and even that only by those endowed with inborn temperance; all others, including those who have merely learned temperance, are dismissed as *kakoi* ('the wicked') through an aggressively absolutist binarism.

That this imagined *locus amoenus* is a venue for a quasi-erotic encounter is suggested by the earlier literary parallels for the topos: the flowery meadow in which Hera seduces Zeus in *Iliad* 14.347-51, or the setting of Archilochus' seduction of Lycambes' daughter in vv. 42-44 of the Cologne Epode. Hippolytus weaves a crown of this meadow's flowers for Artemis' lovely golden hair; while a crown can be a legitimate dedication to a god, it is also familiar as a love gift in Attic vase painting.²¹ Presenting this crown gives Hippolytus a reward he imagines as available to no other mortal creature, namely the pleasure of being with Artemis and speaking with her one-on-one. He hears her voice without seeing her, an intimacy normally afforded only to lovers or spouses in a darkened bed chamber.

Critics (e.g. Norwood 1954: 90-1, 100-1) have sometimes been surprised by Artemis' non-intervention on behalf of her most devout mortal admirer, particularly in light of Aphrodite's plot against him. She only arrives onstage once it is too late to affect the outcome, and then only to decree that Hippolytus should become an object of ritual devotion to maidens who were laying aside their virginity as they married (vv. 1423-30). It is significant that this cult of renounced virginity does not take

¹⁹ See also the epithalamic Catullus 62.39-47, which Khan (1967: 163-65) believes may draw directly from the *Hippolytus* intertext.

²⁰ Note that the middle form δρέπσθαι (v. 81) is used by Pindar in an explicitly erotic context of plucking the blooms of love (fr. 123.1 S-M), also after an impersonal verb expressing fittingness or lawfulness. Most familiar is the development of this association in the Horatian *carpe diem*. For the sexual overtones of this passage, see Bremer 1975, and Stigers 1977: 95, who says, 'The uncut meadow reflects Artemis' virginity, yet Hippolytus plucks flowers from it, a delicate act of symbolic intercourse. . . . Hippolytus offers up to Artemis again the flowers he has gathered, so that she is never really 'deflowered'; an erotic flow moves between them *via* the flowers without compromising her inviolate nature.'

²¹ Hubbard 2005: 150-1; Lear & Cantarella 2008: 132, 182.

place within Artemis' own precinct at Troezen, but within that of Hippolytus' nemesis Aphrodite (Pausanias 2.32.2). Artemis Saronia did have a cult at Troezen, and it appears to have been within her precinct that Hippolytus raced his horses and met his death by the sea (see Barrett 1964: 190). Could it be that Artemis kept her distance because Hippolytus' delusions of equality and intimacy with her were themselves threatening and hybristic? If so, he may not be so different from the other young male hunters who die after becoming too close, Actaeon, Orion, and Otus. We should keep our minds open to the possibility that the original form of this myth prior to Euripides did not characterize Hippolytus as a sex-phobic Orphic zealot, but as another male hunter who incurs Artemis' wrath for presuming to be too intimate.²² If so, his ritual commemoration within Aphrodite's cult rather than Artemis' would not seem so strange. He might even be paired with another beautiful young male who, in contrast, becomes too intimate with Aphrodite herself: the androgynous, perfumed, super-erotic Adonis, object of cultic devotion by married women, who is promptly gored by a wild boar when he enters Artemis' realm.

Parallel to this set of mythological narratives about male intimates of Artemis who meet with destruction due to sexual indiscretion is an equally rich tradition of female companions who encounter a similar fate. These are mostly elided in Callimachus' hymn, thematically focused as it is on Artemis' encounter with the male gaze. Best known is the story of Callisto, the most favored among all her hunting maids. The fourth-century comic poet Amphis (fr. 46 PCG) is our first certain attestation for the idea that Zeus seduced Callisto by assuming the guise of Artemis herself, thereby attaining a degree of physical intimacy no apparent male could have. This motif becomes standard in later mythographic sources (most notably in Ovid, *Metam.* 2.409-530, but also attested in Apollodorus, *Bibl.* 3.8.2, along with a variant that it was the guise of Apollo he assumed).²³ Although the conceit of Zeus in disguise as another character in the story has comic potential (also exploited in the Amphytrion tradition), it seems unlikely

²² For the little we know of the myth prior to our extant play, see the survey of Barrett 1964: 6-45. Euripides' lost first *Hippolytus* mainly differed in its depiction of a more unscrupulous and conniving Phaedra; her character must also have been the focus of Sophocles' *Phaedra*.

²³ Fontenrose (1981: 79) noted that Apollo appears as Callisto's lover and the father of Arcas in Charon of Lampsacus (262F12b *FGrH*). This is not quite the same thing as Zeus disguising himself as Apollo, but may represent an older story on which Apollodorus' variant was modelled.

that a fourth-century comedy would have been the original for such an influential motif, any more than it was for the Amphytrion story.²⁴ If Amphis did invent Zeus' ruse of disguising himself as Artemis to gain access to Callisto, how did Zeus accomplish it in the earlier tradition? By disguising himself as Apollo? If so, why did this equally salacious version not survive in Ovid and some later writers (other than Apollodorus, who mentions it second)? By disguising himself as an animal or golden shower? Such metamorphoses have no later traces in this story, although a disguise of some sort appears to be involved as a fundamental plot element in nearly every one of Zeus' seductions (Leda, Antiope, Europa, Danae, Aegina, Alcmene).²⁵ At the very least, Amphis probably had a tragic subtext for the form of the seduction, which he turns to humorous ends in a comedy of errors.

Callisto's story was certainly in the epic of Eumelus of Corinth (fr. 10 PEG). Epimenides (3F16 *FGrH*) also knew of Callisto. And of course, Callisto's myth is generally considered to have some relation to the ritual bear-dance performed by the girls at Brauron, even though local etiologies explained it differently.²⁶ Both Homer and Hesiod appear to have known some version of her story: she is alluded to as the constellation Arctos, hunting Orion (a parallel figure), in Homer (*Il.* 18.487-88 = *Od.* 5.273-74), and the Pseudo-Eratosthenic *Catasterisms* attributes its information about Callisto to Hesiod (= fr. 163 MW).²⁷ The later *Certamen* of Homer and Hesiod was comfortable showing both poets contributing verses on the subject of Callisto (vv. 117-18):

Hesiod: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δμήθη γάμφῳ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα
Homer: Καλλιστῶ κατέπεφνεν ἀπ' ἄργυρέοιο βιοῖο.

Hesiod: But since she was tamed in marriage, Artemis who pours forth arrows

²⁴ However, Sale (1965: 14-15) and Henrichs (1987: 262) are dismissive of this version, thinking it was no more ancient than Amphis. The attribution to Amphis is found in one Greek manuscript of the scholia to Aratus and the Latin scholia to Germanicus' translation. Nothing in the scholia insists that Amphis was the only or original source for this information (quite irrelevant to anything Aratus says about the Great Bear); Amphis may have been mentioned here in a rather whimsical manner, because the scholiast was amused by how he handled the motif, having Callisto accuse Artemis directly as if unconscious that a true female could not have impregnated her.

²⁵ Even when Zeus' form is not emphasized, some elaborate story needs to be invented to explain his access to the girl, as with Io's dreams and the Delphic oracle given to her father. Semele's story reveals the danger of Zeus not being disguised.

²⁶ See Henrichs 1987: 265, who cites the long scholarly tradition behind this idea.

²⁷ For a full review of the Hesiodic evidence, see Sale 1962.

Homer: Killed Callisto from her silver bow.

The *Certamen*'s invocation of mythology in these verse riddles is solidly archaic (Trojan War, Argo, Heracles); many of the verse pairs in this section of the *Certamen* derive from genuinely archaic sources (most conspicuously, vv. 78-79, which closely match the wording of Theognis 425-27).²⁸ Indeed, Hesiod's verse, taken by itself, implies a myth in which Artemis was married. Could this be an earlier attestation of the notion that Callisto and 'Artemis' made love (as in Amphis)? Or does it reflect, as Maggiuli (1970) argues, a primeval Arcadian myth in which Artemis Calliste was the mother of Arcas, their eponymous founder?

Fontenrose (1981: 76) reconstructed as the original version of Callisto's story that she provoked Artemis' wrath because she willingly submitted to Zeus' advances. But we still have the question of how Zeus obtained access to her, if she were truly a member of Artemis' highly protected troupe. It may be that the homoerotic inflection of the story was elaborated in Aeschylus' *Callisto*. This interpretation of the myth would not seem foreign to the dramatist who presented the Achilles-Patroclus relationship in explicitly homoerotic terms in the *Myrmidons*. By not only willingly violating the goddess' general interdiction on sexual contact, but doing so by wanton conduct with a partner whom Callisto supposed to be the goddess herself, the tragic heroine would overdetermine her own guilt within the Aeschylean economy of rational theodicy. Mythographic sources differ whether Callisto's ursine metamorphosis was due to Zeus or Hera, and whether her death was due to her son Arcas or to Artemis herself.²⁹ What remains constant is that she fell out of favor with Artemis due to a sexual indiscretion that rendered further intimacy with the goddess impossible, thus making her parallel to the many male hunting companions whose demise we have discussed.

The motif of Callisto's seduction by a transgendered female may

²⁸ That this section was part of Alcidas' *Mouseion* (late fifth-/early fourth-century) has been demonstrated by West 1967: 444-49. Richardson (1981: 1-3) thinks Alcidas may have based his work on a sixth-century contest poem. Nagy (1982: 66), based on a variant reading in the scholia, thinks that *Works and Days* 656-57 already alludes to a tradition of such contests between Homeric and Hesiodic poetry. That such poet contests are an art form deriving from Indo-European tradition has been shown by Dunkel 1979: 254-64, suggesting that their presence in Greek culture was very archaic.

²⁹ For a review of these aspects of the myth, which are not important for my purposes, see Sale 1965 and Henrichs 1987: 254-67.

have been inspired by the story of Leucippus, the son of Oenomaus, who attempted to seduce Daphne by dressing as a maiden and joining her hunting troupe (Parthenius, *Erot.* 15; Pausanias 8.20), but the influence may have also gone the other way. Like the pregnant Callisto, he was discovered when forced to bathe with the other maidens, and duly slain for his intrusion into the female company. As Fontenrose (1981: 49) observed, Daphne was not only associated with Artemis, but Artemis assumed her name as a cult epithet in the Peloponnese, suggesting yet another case of conflation between a pursued maiden connected with the goddess and the goddess herself.³⁰ Apollo's access to Daphne, as to Callisto (in Apollodorus' variant), is understandable.

Callisto was not the sole hunting maid to fall afoul of the goddess for similar reasons. Less well known is the myth of Maera, the daughter of Proetus, whose story is also depicted (along with Callisto and Actaeon) on Polygnotus' mural on the wall of the Cnidian lesche at Delphi (Pausanias 10.31.10). She is one of the women Odysseus sees in the Underworld (*Od.* 11.326); Pausanias 9.30.5 attests that she is also mentioned in the *Nostoi* (= fr. 6 PEG). The *Odyssey* scholia cite the fifth-century genealogist Pherecydes of Athens (3F170 *FGrH*) as their source for her story: despite being a hunting maid of Artemis devoted to virginity, Zeus somehow 'escapes her notice' (λανθάνων) to make love to her. Becoming pregnant, she no longer joins Artemis in the hunt and is slain by the goddess. As in Callisto's case, Zeus appears able to gain access to the maiden only by employing some kind of deceit or trickery, perhaps another female disguise.

Euripides' *Helen* 381-83 compares to Callisto a daughter of Merops and a Titan whom Artemis expelled from her chorus 'because of her beauty' (καλλοσύνας ἔνεκεν) and turned into a golden-horned deer. Helen sings these lines as a lament for the misfortune that her own beauty has brought her; given Helen's own claims of sexual innocence in this play, we can understand why she might elide with a euphemism the actual cause of Artemis' action. The Pindaric scholia (*Schol. Olymp.* 3.53b-e Drachmann) are more explicit: they tell us that her name was Taygeta and she was the daughter of Atlas, and that Artemis changed her into a deer because Zeus 'wished to

³⁰ For syncretism between Artemis and Callisto in the form of Artemis Calliste, attested in both Attica and Arcadia, see Pausanias 1.29.2 and 8.35.8. The latter passage also cites the otherwise obscure poet Pamphos for this cult name. For its epigraphic attestation, see Philadelphus 1927. Their syncretism was already recognized by K. O. Müller (1824: I, 372); cf. Farnell 1896: II, 442-46.

rape her' (*Schol. Olymp.* 3.53c) or 'fell in love with her' and 'pursued her' (*Schol. Olymp.* 3.53d). Presumably this metamorphosis was for her protection. However, the scholia add that she later reverted to human form and even married Zeus, after which she dedicated to Artemis the golden-horned Ceryneian hind as a memorial of her rescue (the last element mentioned by the Pindaric text to which the scholia are attached). Pausanias 3.18.10 reports seeing Taygeta and her sister Alcyone carried off by Zeus and Poseidon on the sixth-century Amyklai throne. Hellanicus (4F19 FGrH) even attests a founder son named Lacedaemon, whose descendants are enumerated in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 129 MW), suggesting that Taygeta's story was the starting point for this section of the work; she is also listed with her six sisters (the Pleiades) in fr. 169 MW. While this narrative has a more propitious outcome for the pursued maiden, perhaps in virtue of her divine genealogy, it shares with the others the motif of Artemis' expulsion of a maiden when she excites the threatening male gaze of the family patriarch. Even the possibility of a seduction makes further intimacy with the goddess inappropriate.

Another twist on the Callisto myth comes with Polyphonte, whose story is related in Antoninus Liberalis 21, citing as its ultimate source the Hellenistic *Ornithogonia* of Boeus. Scorning the works of Aphrodite, like Hippolytus, Polyphonte becomes a companion of Artemis, but Aphrodite seeks revenge by causing her to become overcome with passion for a bear. This zoophilic passion disgusts Artemis, who turns all the other beasts against her. She gives birth to twin giants, Agrius and Orius, perhaps meant to parallel the equally lawless hunters Otus and Ephialtes. Ultimately, she is metamorphosed into an owl.

Artemis' constant surveillance of her hunting maids is not without justification: in addition to the myths we have surveyed, *Iliad* 16.180-86 tells us of Polymele, whom Hermes secretly seduced among Artemis' singing chorus, falling in love (inceptive aorist ἡράσατο) after 'seeing her with his eyes' (16.182 ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδών).³¹ Again, the mere act of seeing is tantamount to sexual consummation. Aphrodite can quite plausibly present herself to Anchises in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 117-29 as a maiden who was plucked by Hermes straight out of

³¹ Janko (1992: 342) speculates that the *Iliad* derived this story from a hymn, which played upon the formulaic invocation of Hermes as ruler of 'Arcadia abundant in flocks' (Ἀρκαδίας πολυμήλου = *Homeric Hymn* 4.2, 18.2). But it is just as likely that the name Polymele was invented by the composer of the *Iliad* as uniquely appropriate to a woman who becomes associated with Hermes.

Artemis' chorus and hand-delivered to the herder tending his cattle on Mt. Ida. Pausanias 6.22.9 tells us that the river-god Alpheius attempted to rape Artemis herself celebrating a *pannychis* with her maids near Letrini in Elis, but was foiled by Artemis and all her companions covering their faces with mud, such that he could not properly recognize (i.e. see) which one was the goddess in the darkness.³² By an inverse principle, denying vision denies sexual consummation. To be sure, Artemis cannot always succeed in blocking sexuality when another god is involved: Hermes fathers a son with Polymele, and Alpheius is foiled, but cannot be punished.³³

Rape or attempted rape of maidens engaged in the worship of Artemis also became the stuff of local mythologies explaining historical rivalries: Plutarch (*Theseus* 31.2) tells us that Theseus and Peirithous' kidnapping of Helen while performing a rite for Artemis Orthia was a basis for future Spartan-Athenian conflict.³⁴ For their part, the Athenians used an ancient story of Lemnians abducting and eventually killing girls assembled at Brauron as justification for Miltiades expelling the Pelasgians from Lemnos in the fifth century (Herodotus 6.137-40). The sexual vulnerability of women on their way to Brauron (Aristophanes, *Pax* 872-75) or at the nearby sanctuary of Artemis Tauropolos (Menander, *Epitrepontes* 471-92) was a topos of Attic comedy.³⁵ Pausanias (4.4.2-3 and 4.16.9) relates two different episodes where Messenians rape Spartan maidens worshipping Artemis at her sanctuaries. In the first instance, occurring at the shrine of Artemis Limnatis, the Spartan version holds that the girls quite properly committed suicide out of shame. In the second, at Karyai, the Messenian king himself puts the rapists to death.³⁶ Susan Cole (2004: 201-3) cogently argues that the estab-

³² This attempted rape is alluded to in Telesilla, fr. 717 PMG. For discussion of Pausanias' story and its ritual significance, see Dowden 1989: 102-5.

³³ The more familiar version of this myth, as found in Ovid, *Met.* 5.493-641, is that Alpheius pursues Arethusa, a nymph in Artemis' retinue. But as we have seen before, pursuing a maiden connected with Artemis is mythologically equivalent to pursuing Artemis herself; see Fontenrose 1981: 57-60 for the conflation of the two figures. Telesilla (fr. 717 PMG), writing from a female point of view, also has Artemis herself as the object of Alpheius' pursuit, and the Pindaric scholia (*Schol. Pyth.* 2.12a, *Nem.* 1.3 Drachmann) explain Pindar's reference to Ortygia as the 'seat of river-formed Artemis' (*Pyth.* 2.7) or the 'couch of Artemis' (*Nem.* 1.3) by conflating Arethusa and Artemis.

³⁴ For other sources concerning this legend, see Kearns 1989: 158. It goes back at least as far as Helanikus (323aF19 *FGrH*).

³⁵ For the most complete treatment of the cult behind the Menander passage, which concerns a rape during the Tauropolia at Halai Araphenides, see Bathrellou 2012, who notes that Menander's *Phasma* also featured a rape at the Brauronia and *Kitharistes* at the festival of Artemis Daitis in Ephesus.

ishment of these shrines to Artemis in remote border regions is an assertion of the state's confidence in its ability to defend (or at least avenge) its most vulnerable citizens, unmarried virgins, from foreign violation.

The goddess becomes more directly involved in punishment in the notorious case of Komaitho, a priestess of Artemis at Patrai in Achaea, who defied the chastity that was obligatory during her term in office by voluntarily submitting to the seduction of a handsome local youth and doing so within the goddess' sanctuary. Pausanias (7.19.2-5) tells us that Artemis sent a plague upon the city, which could only be atoned for, according to the Delphic Oracle, by the public sacrifice of the couple and the subsequent sacrifice of the city's most beautiful boy and girl every year. Komaitho and her boyfriend Melanippus transgress the boundaries in three ways—violating the priestess' period of obligatory purity, violating the sanctity of the goddess' shrine, and enjoying sexual consummation outside the boundaries of marriage, which was opposed by both families. Artemis' wrath is overdetermined, and visits itself upon Patrai by demanding sacrifice of not only the guilty parties, but future generations of youth who might be tempted by one another's beauty. The city is released from this austere and primitive ritual only with the intervention of the more tolerant cult of Dionysus (Pausanias 7.19.6-10).³⁷

Artemis paradoxically shares the roles of protecting childbirth, particularly once conflated with Eileithyia in the 5th century BCE (see Farnell 1891: II, 608-9; Sale 1961: 86; Parker 2005: 223-25; and Budin 2016: 100-2, for references), and killing pregnant young mothers, as in the case of Coronis and others shot by her arrows (Budin 2016: 106-13). Appropriately reconciling with and placating the goddess whose virgin company she abandons was a point of anxiety for any adolescent girl making the perilous transition from girlhood to marriage and adulthood. An inscription from 4th-century Cyrene (SEG 9.72.84-91) obligates married women to pay a 'penalty' (ζαμίαν) to Artemis both before consummating their marriage and before giving birth to their first child.³⁸ The Theocritean scholia (*Sch. ad Id.* 2.66 Wendel) are perhaps correct in interpreting the bear dance of the Brauron ritual as a symbolic placation of the goddess by girls who were about to leave her chorus for a married

³⁶ On these legends and their associated cults, see Calame 1997: 142-56.

³⁷ For the political significance of this cult history, see Redfield 1990. For speculation on its origins in a primeval cult of human sacrifice, see Chirassi 1964: 10-12.

³⁸ On this inscription, see Parker 1983: 244-46, and Perlman 1989: 128-30.

life. Failure to sacrifice to the goddess prior to a wedding could lead to disastrous results, as Admetus and Alcestis discovered upon finding their bridal chamber full of snakes (Apollodorus, *Bibl.* 1.9.15). That Iphigenia is of marriageable age when Artemis demands her sacrifice is not accidental, nor is her being summoned to Aulis on the pretext of a feigned marriage to Achilles (Apollodorus, *Epit.* 3.22, based on the plot of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*). By making Iphigenia her priestess, Artemis again thwarts sexual consummation, but at the cost of turning the girl into a killer like herself. Closeness to the goddess was a double-edged boon even for her female devotees and associates.

We therefore see in the various myths surrounding both Artemis' male devotees and female companions a never-ending sexual tension between the allure of maidenly beauty and the ruin that ensues from attempts to approach it, whether that ruin falls upon the male pursuer or (often when the pursuer is a god) the compromised female victim. Some might see herein the traces of a social control mechanism over youthful sexuality, threatening with destruction maidens or the male pursuers of maidens who step outside the bounds of ritually approved matrimony. Those inclined to Lévi-Straussian structural analysis might find in this array of myths a fundamental contradiction between Artemis' character as an Asian fertility goddess (best preserved in her Ephesian cult) and the untouched virgin of her pubescent Olympian form, mirrored in her ambivalent status as both the protector of animals, young women, and children and the huntress who kills the same creatures for pleasure or whim.³⁹ Both lovely and loveless, her only true intimate, as Callimachus saw, was her equally ambiguous and contradictory brother Apollo, beside whom she takes her seat, united in an eternal but pure union.

³⁹ On this fundamental duality in Artemis' character, see Burkert 1985: 151. Her darker side is already implied in Hera's denunciation: 'a lion to women Zeus has made you—to kill any at your pleasure' (*Iliad* 21.483-84).

References

- Arena, R. 1979. 'Considerazioni sul mito di Callisto.' *Acme* 32: 5-26.
- Barrett, W. S. 1964. *Euripides: Hippolytus*. Oxford.
- Bathrellou, E. 2012. 'Menander's *Epitrepontes* and the Festival of the Tauropolia.' *CA* 31: 151-92.
- Bing, P., & Uhrmeister, V. 1994. 'The Unity of Callimachus' Hymn to Artemis.' *JHS* 114: 19-34.
- Brelich, A. 1969. *Paides e parthenoi*. Rome.
- Bremer, J. M. 1975. 'The Meadow of Love and Two Passages in Euripides' *Hippolytus*.' *Mnemosyne* 28: 268-80.
- Budin, S. L. 2016. *Artemis*. London.
- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Tr. J. Raffan. Cambridge, Mass.
- Calame, C. 1997. *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: Their Morphology, Religious Role, and Social Function*. Tr. D. Collins & J. Orion. Lanham.
- Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton.
- Chirassi, I. 1964. *Miti e culti arcaici di Artemis nel Peloponneso e Grecia centrale*. Trieste.
- Cole, S. G. 2004. *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space: The Ancient Greek Experience*. Berkeley.
- Depew, M. 2004. 'Gender, Power, and Poetics in Callimachus' Book of *Hymns*.' In M. A. Harder et al., eds., *Callimachus II = Hellenistica Groningana* 7. Leuven. 117-37.
- Devereux, G. 1985. *The Character of the Euripidean Hippolytos: An Ethno-Psychoanalytical Study*. Chico.
- Dowden, K. 1989. *Death and the Maiden: Girls' Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology*. London.
- Dunkel, G. 1979. 'Fighting Words: Alcman *Partheneion* 63 μάχονται.' *JIES* 7: 249-72.
- Faraone, C. A. 2003. 'Playing the Bear and the Fawn for Artemis: Female Initiation or Substitute Sacrifice?' In D. B. Dodd & C. A. Faraone, eds., *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives*. London. 43-68.
- Farnell, L. R. 1896. *The Cults of the Greek States*. Oxford.
- Fontenrose, J. 1981. *Orion: The Myth of the Hunter and the Huntress*. Berkeley.

- Gentili, B., & Perusino, F., eds. 2002. *Le orse di Brauron: Un rituale di iniziazione femminile nel santuario di Artemide*. Pisa.
- Guarisco, D. 2001. 'Comparare il comparabile.' Artemide e i riti di passaggio: Brauronia, Mounichia, Orthia.' In D. M. Cosi, ed., *L'Arktea di Brauron e i culti femminili*. Bologna. 65-87.
- Haslam, M. W. 1993. 'Callimachus' *Hymns*.' In M. A. Harder et al., eds., *Callimachus = Hellenistica Groningana* 1. Leuven. 111-25.
- Henrichs, A. 1987. 'Three Approaches to Greek Mythography.' In J. Bremer, ed., *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*. London. 242-77.
- Hopkinson, N. 1984. *Callimachus: Hymn to Demeter*. Cambridge.
- Hubbard, T. K. 2005. 'Pindar's *Tenth Olympian* and Athlete-Trainer Pederasty.' *Journal of Homosexuality* 49.3/4: 137-71.
- Hubbard, T. K. 2009. 'Ephebic Liminality and the Ambiguities of Apolline Sexuality.' In L. Athanassaki et al., eds., *Apolline Politics and Poetics*. Athens. 607-32.
- Hubbard, T. K., & Doerfler, M. 2014. 'From Ascesis to Sexual Renunciation.' In T. K. Hubbard, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Malden, Mass. 164-83.
- Janko, R. 1992. *The Iliad, A Commentary: Volume 4, Books 13-16*. Cambridge.
- Jeanmaire, H. 1939. *Couroi et Courètes: Essai sur l'éducation spartiate et sur les rites d'adolescence dans l'antiquité hellénique*. Lille.
- Kearns, E. 1989. *Heroes of Attica = BICS Supplement* 57. London.
- Khan, H. A. 1967. 'On the Art of Catullus *Carm.* 62.39-58, Its Relationship to 11.21-24, and the Probability of a Sapphic Model.' *Athenaeum* 45: 160-76.
- Köhnken, A. 2004. 'Artemis im Artemishymnos des Kallimachos.' In M. A. Harder et al., eds., *Callimachus II = Hellenistica Groningana* 7. Leuven. 161-71.
- Lear, A., & Cantarella, E. 2008. *Images of Ancient Greek Pederasty: Boys Were Their Gods*. London.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983. 'Artemis and Iphigeneia.' *JHS* 103: 87-102.
- Maggiuli, G. 1970. 'Artemide-Callisto.' In *Mythos: Scripta in honorem Mariae Untersteiner*. Genova. 179-85.
- Merkelbach, R., & West, M. L. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodica*. Oxford.
- Mette, H. J. 1963. *Der verlorene Aischylos*. Berlin.
- Müller, K. O. 1824. *Die Dorier*. Breslau.
- Mulvey, L. 1975. 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema.' *Screen* 16.3: 6-18.

- Nagy, G. 1982. 'Hesiod.' In T. J. Luce, ed., *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome*. New York. I, 43-72.
- Norwood, G. 1954. *Essays on Euripidean Drama*. Berkeley.
- Parker, R. A. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 2005. 'Artemis Ilithyie et autres: le problème du nom divin utilisé comme épiclèse.' In N. Belayche, ed., *Nommer les dieux: théonymes, épithètes, épiclèses dans l'antiquité*. Rennes. 219-26.
- Perlman, P. 1983. 'Plato Laws 833C-834D and the Bears of Brauron.' *GRBS* 24: 115-30.
- Perlman, P. 1989. 'Acting the She-Bear for Artemis.' *Arethusa* 22: 111-33.
- Petrovic, I. 2007. *Von den Toren des Hades zu den Hallen des Olympos: Artemiskult bei Theokrit und Kallimachos*. Leiden.
- Philadelphus, A. 1927. 'Le sanctuaire d'Artémis Kallisté et l'ancienne rue de l'Académie.' *BCH* 51: 155-63.
- Plantinga, M. 2004. 'A Parade of Learning: Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* (Lines 170-268).' In M. A. Harder et al., eds., *Callimachus II = Hellenistica Groningana* 7. Leuven. 257-78.
- Redfield, J. M. 1990. 'From Sex to Politics: The Rites of Artemis Triklaria and Dionysos Aisymnetes at Patras.' In D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler, & F. I. Zeitlin, eds., *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient World*. Princeton. 115-34.
- Renner, T. 1978. 'A Papyrus Dictionary of Metamorphoses.' *HSCP* 82: 277-93.
- Richardson, N. 1981. 'The Contest of Homer and Hesiod and Alcidas' *Mouseion*.' *CQ* 31: 1-10.
- Rose, H. J. 1932. 'De Actaeone Stesichoreo.' *Mnemosyne* 59: 431-2.
- Sale, W. M. 1961. 'The Hyperborean Maidens on Delos.' *Harvard Theological Review* 54: 75-89.
- Sale, W. M. 1962. 'The Story of Callisto in Hesiod.' *RhM* 105: 122-41.
- Sale, W. M. 1965. 'Callisto and the Virginity of Artemis.' *RhM* 108: 11-35.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1988. *Studies in Girls' Transitions: Aspects of the Arkteia and Age Representation in Attic Iconography*. Athens.
- Stephens, S. 2015. *Callimachus: The Hymns*. Oxford.
- Stigers, E. S. 1977. 'Retreat from the Male: Catullus 62 and Sappho's Erotic Flowers.' *Ramus* 6: 83-102.
- West, M. L. 1967. 'The Contest of Homer and Hesiod.' *CQ* 17: 433-50.

What the Cyclops Saw: Self-Knowledge in Theocritus' *Idylls* 6 and 11

Anatole Mori

Like Theocritus' other pastoral poems, *Idylls* 6 and 11 provide readers with glimpses of a hidden, erotically charged landscape. The filiations between the idyllic Cyclops and earlier portrayals by both Homer and Euripides are well known,¹ and while these two idylls are also quite obviously related to each other, they represent Polyphemus in different ways, teasing and provoking the audience with multiple points of view. What Theocritus' Polyphemus sees, or rather what we see through different narrative frames in these two poems, are the fantasies and farcical projections associated with younger, comic doublets of the Homeric Polyphemus. In *Idyll* 6 the sea nymph Galatea serves as a foil for the Cyclops' lack of self-awareness in the songs of two herdsmen, whereas in *Idyll* 11, a 'poetic epistle', as Gow calls it, from an anonymous narrator to a physician named Nicias, Polyphemus' song of seduction is said to show the power of song to cure love sickness.² *Idyll* 11 is

¹ See Hunter 1999: 215-23; Gutzwiller 1991: 60-65, 109-110. The story of Polyphemus and Galatea was the subject of several comic plays and may have originated with Philoxenus' dithyrambic satire (ca. 400 BCE); see Hordern 1999; Mondì 1983: 33 n. 55. On the differences between the two idylls see Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 164-65. Petrain 2003: 364 suggests that Posidippus alludes to the two-sidedness of Theocritus' treatment in an epigram (Austin and Bastianini 2002: 19.6-7 = *P. Mil. Vogl.* VIII 309, col. III.28-41).

² Gow 1952: 2.208 suggests that introductory addresses make *Idylls* 6, 11, and 13 into 'a form of poetic epistle'; cf. Hunter 1999: 261. Gutzwiller 2006: 399 notes Polyphemus' rhetorical weakness; see Gow 1930 on his broad dialect and clumsiness, and Hunter 1996: 28-30 on the metrical weakness of the poem. Also relevant is Hunter 1996 on the Adonis-song in *Id.* 15: "Deliberately bad" poetry can be notoriously difficult to detect. If the charge of being 'deliberately mediocre' is to be upheld against this song, then it can only done so within generic boundaries' (124). Still, the use of certain (unpleasant) sounds may mark its mundane quality; see Clayman 1987

not entirely consistent with *Idyll* 6 in its portrayal of Polyphemus' relationship with Galatea, but both poems *are* consistent in their examination of the impaired (critical) eye of the Cyclops, and exploring, in different narrative frames and from different narrative perspectives, how the limitations of his judgment regularly affect his reliability as a narrator. This essay considers the interaction of identity, perception, and knowledge, particularly self-knowledge, in the construction of Polyphemus' defining characteristic: physical and epistemological blindness. In what follows I concentrate on Polyphemus' conflicted vision and the confusion between what he, as subject, sees, and the way in which he is seen and is described, often by himself, as object, as the suffering subject of his own song. Section I ('Epic Knowing and Seeing') contrasts the blindness of the Homeric poet, which is balanced by divine knowledge, with the Cyclops' blindness, which is emblematic of his limited perspective. Section II ('Odysseus and Polyphemus') compares the narrative frame and context of other performances, primarily those of Demodocus and Odysseus, with Polyphemus' song in *Idyll* 11, which complicates the traditional role of poetry as therapeutic. Finally, Section III ('Polyphemus and Polyphemus') addresses the representation of the Cyclops in the two idylls, arguing that the confused descriptions of Galatea and the dog evoke Polyphemus' misconceptions about his own identity.

I. Epic knowing and seeing

Vision and knowledge are etymological siblings in Greek: what I saw (εἶδον), I now know (οἶδα). Yet perception and judgment are also thought to depend on identity: what we see and know is shaped not only by who we are but also by what it is we think we are looking at. Impaired judgment is a characteristic of otherness in ancient Greece, although poetic tone can be ambiguous, and characters' judgments hard to read. Scholarship is divided as to how seriously to take, for example, the opinions of female viewers in Theocritus' fifteenth *Idyll* and Herodas' fourth *Mime*.³ These two works certainly raise questions about the judgment

on number of highly sigmatic lines in *Id.* 11 and esp. *Id.* 15, which could evoke the Sicilian background of Polyphemus as well as Praxinoa and Gorgo. Sigmatism in Theocritus is higher than other Hellenistic poets and may reflect the influence of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Clayman 1987: 69, 71 n. 10). On song as therapeutic and the influence of the euphonists on Theocritus, see Kaloudis 2013.

³ Goldhill 1994: 222-23; 2007: 10-15; Skinner 2001: 202-6.

of these characters—not in the sense that they are intentionally telling lies, as Odysseus does, but rather that they may not be in control of their judgment because they do not know who they are, or rather the role that they are playing in the poem. Similarly, scholars have questioned the humorous aspects of Theocritus' Polyphemus: is he a naïve, amusing, and ultimately sympathetic figure, or a brutish, undignified parody of a pastoral singer?⁴ With respect to performance we can understand Polyphemus as the antitype of Odysseus. For Odysseus, public performances, his own and those of others, like the *aoidos* Demodocus, provide opportunities both for camouflage and for carefully timed revelation as he works to recover his proper place in society.⁵ He does not, for example, explicitly identify himself when he challenges Demodocus to sing about the Trojan horse, but his emotional response hints at his high status and accordingly works to his advantage when Alcinous notices his tears (8.492-534; cf. 8.93). Odysseus' first-person narrative of his wanderings to the (internal) Phaeacian audience and the epic's (external) audience effectively replaces the Homeric narrator in Books 9-12. The Homeric narrator is still speaking, of course, repeating Odysseus' words, but we, the external audience of the epic, are likely to forget this, and may be surprised by the reference to the Phaeacian context at 11.335-84. Odysseus' fantastic tale likely raises doubts in the mind of (both) his audiences, but the first-person narrative elides the gap between them, and the approving Phaeacian response cues our own.⁶

By contrast, the more compact narrative frames of *Idyll* 6 (song competition) and *Idyll* 11 (unidentified narrator) intensify the (credibility) gap between Polyphemus and the idylls' audiences.⁷ The crucial difference

⁴ Schmiel 1975, e.g. reads the idyll as 'a sly barb directed against Nicias the doctor-poet' (36), arguing against Holtsmark 1966, who takes the poem as an un-ironic celebration of poetry's curative powers; Spofford 1969 favors a lighter reading of the Cyclops' Sappho-like frustration. The tone of Virgil's Corydon, Bion's Cyclops, and Ovid's Galatea, all of which are modeled on Theocritus' Polyphemus, is generally taken as more straightforwardly serious: see Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 184-85.

⁵ Goldhill 1991: 56: 'Tale telling, then, is the means by which Odysseus conceals and describes himself: always telling.'

⁶ See Goldhill 1991: 47-68 on narrative voice and doubts about Odysseus' veracity.

⁷ Theocritus uses narrative frames elsewhere, but the strong contrast with the famous Homeric model sets the Cyclops idylls apart. Payne 2007: 13 notes how frame narrators affect the presentation of mythical material in Theocritus' idylls, Apollonius' *Argonautica*, and other Hellenistic poems: 'Rather than a guarantor of the truth of the story, the narrator of these poems has become a kind of warning sign about the world they represent, a persona that explicitly separates the poet from the storyteller in the poem.'

is that Odysseus' judgment and perception are extraordinary whether or not (and probably because) he is lying, while inconsistencies in the Cyclops' narratives only reinforce the impression that his knowledge and perception are inevitably impaired. Just as the frames of both idylls stylistically and rhetorically distance their audiences from Polyphemos, the content of the songs raises additional questions about his judgment. In *Idyll* 6 Daphnis' singer chides, or mocks, or perhaps deceives Polyphemos, saying that his self-absorption causes him to miss Galatea's flirtatious behavior (6.6-19). It is worth noting that Galatea's portrait in both idylls is largely inconclusive: Theocritus is evidently less interested in portraying her and her 'true' feelings than in the inevitability of the Cyclops' own misjudgment. Damoetas' response then builds on this theme of misperception: in his song Polyphemos explains that he is only pretending to ignore Galatea, but his self-absorption emerges in a different way, in his false belief that he is good-looking (6.21-41). As we shall see *Idyll* 11 raises similar questions about the Cyclops' vision and self-knowledge, accentuating his alienation and shortsightedness, reinforcing his misperceptions regarding his own nature and appearance, showing how the dualities of audience and speaker, pain and remedy—all of which are idealized in Homer—are confounded in Polyphemos' self-centered isolation. The frames and themes of the Cyclops' speeches thus emphasize the limitations of his (self) knowledge. In my view Theocritus' real target is not Polyphemos, but his own external audience. We risk missing the point if we ignore the frames and sympathize or identify too closely with the lovesick Cyclops, or if we too quickly dismiss or distance him as a grotesque and comic fool. What is truly at stake is not simply the Cyclops' blindness, brutality, or self-indulgence. Rather, Theocritus is encouraging the audience to recognize and reject the misjudgment associated with tunnel vision like that of Polyphemos, and to engage the multiple perspectives he misses.

As it was Jenny Clay who introduced me to Homeric Greek, it seems appropriate to begin with her characteristically perceptive discussion of Homer's poetics of vision. The cost of Homer's art is high, she notes, according to the story of his blinding at Achilles' gravesite.⁸

⁸ Clay 2011: 12: 'One of the ancient Lives of Homer recounts a beautiful parable explaining how Homer lost his sight: "They say that he became blind in the following way: when he came to the grave of Achilles, he prayed to behold (*theasasthai*) the hero as he appeared when he went off to battle adorned with the second set of armor. But when he saw Achilles, Homer was blinded by the brightness of the armor. Pitied by Thetis and the Muses, he was honored by them with the gift of poetry' (= *Vita Homeri* 6.45-51 [p. 252 Allen]).'

This stunning vision—literally blinding—of his hero's epiphany henceforth obscures all other sights. The desire to gaze upon—and I emphasize the verb *theasasthai*, 'to be a spectator'—Achilles returned from the dead in all his glory deprives the poet of his sight and darkens his vision of his present surroundings so that he can direct his inner vision to the splendors of the heroic past which he invites us to share.

The story of Homer's blinding, like that of Tiresias, balances knowledge of the divine with the loss of mortal sight, as she explains (Clay 2011: 11):

That the most visual of poets should be portrayed as blind may seem at first paradoxical. Yet the blindness of poets and seers in the Greek tradition insists that their vision is not preoccupied with the world around them, but rather that their gaze is focused on the future or the past to the exclusion of the mundane activities that consume our humdrum attention. It is as if such single-minded concentration precludes a focus on the ordinary events of the unfolding present.

The poet's blindness blocks the typical distractions of mortal existence that would otherwise inhibit his ability both to imagine and to express the world as the gods see it (Clay 2011: 8):

But the pleasure of the internal observer also invites the audience to be entranced by the sheer beauty of the scene and to share momentarily a divine perspective, viewing the Trojan watch fires from afar, where a transient human moment is mirrored in the eternal cosmic phenomena of the heavens. Like the gods, we the audience can witness this interplay of the ephemeral and the timeless, this conversion of the fleeting into the everlasting, that constitutes the transformative power of poetry transcending both time and space and transforming the visual into the verbal, which in turn allows the mind's eye to re-imagine the initial vision.

Clay's analysis helps us appreciate how Theocritus' etiological Cyclops idylls adapt Homer's visual epistemology. Polyphemus is single-mindedly

preoccupied not with the everlasting but with the mundane life of a shepherd; thus, to paraphrase Clay, it is the unfolding present of his ordinary world that illumines his future and his past for us. Where the description of the Trojan watch fires elevates mortal *ephēmēra* into the timeless cosmos, *Idylls* 6 and 11 shift the Homeric contrast of mortal and divine perspectives to a lower register, investigating the uncomfortable proximity of the human to the monstrous. If Homer unveils the sublime vision of the gods, Theocritus discloses the uncanny similarity of Polyphemus' delusions to our own. To be sure, the Homeric Cyclops is also uncomfortably anthromorphic,⁹ and in this way the *Odyssey* necessarily influences and complicates any identification with Polyphemus' younger self. The blind Homeric poet yields a god's-eye view, while the blindness of Theocritus' Cyclops mirrors (and mocks) a limited perspective. Where Homer helps the audience see the cosmos as the gods do, Theocritus' Cyclops mirrors our own potential blindness. At the same time, there is something godlike about our privileged knowledge of his fate. Such knowledge informs the Cyclops' 'idyllic' prehistory; his past interactions with Galatea both explain and are explained by the fateful encounter with Odysseus, which we, like the gods, have already witnessed. Theocritus writes 'pre-histories' of other mythical figures: Helen in *Idyll* 18, the Dioscuri in *Idyll* 22, and Heracles in *Idyll* 24.¹⁰ But irony is more abundant in the Cyclops idylls, and our awareness of what awaits Polyphemus makes us particularly sensitive to the monstrous yet recognizably human self-deceptions of the lovesick pastoral singer.

We could think of Polyphemus as callow and self-centered, like a stereotypical young man. But he is not a stereotypical young man: he is a self-deluding and stereotypical narcissist, as Hunter (1999: 257-58) describes him. The tension arises in the frame of *Idyll* 11, which presents him as a model character who cured his unrequited love through the gift of the Muses. The anonymous narrator tells Nicias that the Cyclops hated the wound (ἔχθιστον ἔχων ὑποκάρδιον ἔλκος) inflicted on him by Aphrodite, but that he discovers a cure (*pharmakon*) by singing and sitting on a rock beside the sea (11.13-18). Scholars generally doubt the

⁹ He is called 'a man of great bulk': ἀνὴρ . . . πελώριος (*Od.* 9.187). Cf. similar descriptions of Agamemnon (*Il.* 3.166) and Ajax (*Il.* 3.229).

¹⁰ Interest in tales of the youthful exploits of gods and heroes appear elsewhere in Hellenistic poetry and dates back to the classical and archaic periods. See Dover 1971: 253, who notes: "The motif of the newborn prodigy is a familiar one in the folklore of all parts of the world."

efficacy of this cure,¹¹ given Polyphemus' blinkered perceptions and his inability to evaluate his appetites and desires. It is true, as Gutzwiller (2007: 86) observes, that all of Theocritus' speakers tend to dwell on personal rather than communal concerns, but she adds that Theocritus emphasizes the universality of the Cyclops' experience, noting, 'the mythical Sicilian monster offers a pertinent model for the poet and his friend' (87). Such a reading prompts us to look more closely at the kind of model Polyphemus really provides: is this a paradigm to emulate or one to avoid? 'Grotesque' is the term that most commonly appears in scholarly discussions. Theocritus' Cyclops, as Fantuzzi puts it, is a 'grotesque parodic monster,' bearing little relation, for example, to Bion's Cyclops (Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 184). Bulloch comments: 'The appeal of the Cyclops as a rustic character clearly lies in his nature as a grotesque' (1985: 578). Hutchinson contrasts *Idyll* 6 with *Idyll* 11: 'The idea of reflection in the sea turns into grotesqueness: the Cyclops' tone is loudly confident, not poetic' (1988, 187). Theocritus examines the quality of the Cyclops' judgment in both poems, and Gutzwiller 2006 is surely right that 'Theocritus is working with a culturally predetermined concept of herdsman's song as both beneficial and self-deluding' (399). But whether the anonymous narrator is right to recommend Polyphemus' song as a successful cure is another question; again, these metaphors of blindness and misunderstanding encompass characters that speak as well as audiences (whether internal or external) who hear. In other words, if the Cyclops is like us, then we too are subject to the same kinds of weaknesses, the same self-centeredness, the same grotesque gaps in seeing and knowing, for good or ill. It may be that it is Polyphemus' blindness, rather than his poetry, that serves as *pharmakon*: his inability to see and know things as they are would therefore serve as both the cause and the cure of his desire. If this is so, we have only to contrast Polyphemus' fate with that of Odysseus to know that it is a cure of doubtful value.

II. Odysseus and Polyphemus

I turn now to several representations of the curative powers of poetic performance, a familiar theme in archaic epic (Hes. *Th.* 99-104):

¹¹ For bibliography on the efficacy of the cure, see Gutzwiller 2006: 394. On Polyphemus' failure to cure himself, see, e.g. Hunter 1999: 220, Schmiel 1993. Walsh 1990: 18 observes: 'The unreliability of this poem as a demonstration reflects the special nature of what it demonstrates'.

εἰ γάρ τις καὶ πένθος ἔχων νεοκηδέϊ θυμῷ
 ἄζηται κραδίην ἀκαχήμενος, αὐτὰρ αἰοιδὸς 100
 Μουσᾶων θεράπων κλέεα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων
 ὑμνήσῃ μάκαράς τε θεοὺς, οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν,
 αἶψ' ὃ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται οὐδέ τι κηδέων
 μέμνηται· ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δῶρα θεάων.

A man, freshly grieved in spirit,¹²
 groans, troubled at heart, but the bard, 100
 a servant of the Muses, sings the fame of men in former days
 and the blessed gods who hold Olympus.
 In that moment he escapes his heavy thoughts, nothing of his
 sorrow does he remember: the gifts of the goddesses quickly divert
 him.

In this well-known passage Hesiod tells us that songs about the deeds of men of former days have the power to heal the listener. When the listener happens to be one of those men of former days, the songs of one's own famous deeds may provoke an emotional response. Odysseus suffers, for example, when he hears Demodocus celebrate his personal *neikos* with Achilles (*Od.* 8.75-78):

νεῖκος Ὀδυσσῆος καὶ Πηλεΐδew Ἀχιλῆος,
 ὥς ποτε δηρίσαντο θεῶν ἐν δαιτὶ θαλεῖῃ
 ἐκπάγλοις ἐπέεσσιν, ἄναξ δ' ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων
 χαίρε νόῳ, ὃ τ' ἄριστοι Ἀχαιῶν δηριόωντο.

The quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles son of Peleus,
 how they fought at a rich feast of the gods
 with terrible words, and Agamemnon lord of men
 rejoiced because the best of the Achaeans were fighting.

Odysseus is the only member of the audience who knows how accurate the bard's song truly is; the memory pains him, and he is disarmed by the celebration and public recognition of his past, though he still remains wary of revealing too much too soon to his host Alcinous

¹² All translations my own unless otherwise noted.

(*Od.* 8.83-86):

ταῦτ' ἄρ' αἰδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
πορφύρεον μέγα φᾶρος ἑλὼν χερσὶ στιβαρῇσι
κάκ κεφαλῆς εἵρυσσε, **κάλυψε δὲ καλὰ πρόσωπα**·
αἶδετο γὰρ Φαίηκας ὑπ' ὀφρύσι δάκρυα λείβων.

This was the song of the famous bard. But Odysseus took his great purple cloak with his strong hands, and drew it over his head, **and hid his fine face**, for he feared shedding tears beneath his brows before the Phaeacians.

Demodocus' telling of the truth (rather than pleasing lies) has a cathartic and therapeutic effect: it allows Odysseus to lower his guard by sharing his secrets secretly, to gauge the response of the audience to his deeds, and in this way become part of the communal celebration. Later, after Demodocus sings about Hephaestus' golden net and the Trojan horse, Odysseus praises his skill, likening him to the gods (*Od.* 9.1-11):

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
Ἄλκινος κρεῖον, πάντων ἀριδείκετε λαῶν,
ἧ τοι μὲν τόδε καλὸν ἀκούμεν ἐστὶν αἰδοῦ
τοιοῦδ' οἷος ὃδ' ἐστί, θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιος αὐδήν.
οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γέ τί φημι τέλος χαριέστερον εἶναι 5
ἢ ὅτ' εὐφροσύνη μὲν ἔχη κατά δῆμον ἅπαντα,
δαιτυμόνες δ' ἀνὰ δώματ' ἀκούάζωνται αἰδοῦ
ἦμενοι ἐξείης, παρὰ δὲ πλήθωσι τράπεζαι
σίτου καὶ κρειῶν, μέθυ δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσω
οἶνοχόος φορέησι καὶ ἐγχεῖη δεπάεσσι· 10
τοῦτό τί μοι κάλλιστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶν εἶδεται εἶναι'.

Odysseus, rich in plans, answered him and said:
'Lord Alcinous, well known among all peoples,
I tell you it is truly fine to hear a singer such as this,
one like to the gods in his voice.
In my view there is no more pleasing fulfillment

than when good cheer holds sway over all people,
 and the guests sit lining the hall and hear a singer,
 by tables full of baked breads and cuts of meat,
 and drawing wine from the bowl
 the wine bearer brings it and refills the goblets.

This to my mind is just about the finest thing there is to see.'

Odysseus, or rather the poet speaking self-consciously through him, associates the image of the *aoidos* in performance with the gods, abundance, and communal prosperity. As part of Demodocus' audience, Odysseus is now one of the people (δῆμον ἅπαντα) under the sway of 'good cheer,' εὐφροσύνη, a collective form of happiness that increases rather than diminishes as it is shared. Odysseus' speech to Alcinous is a description of the orderly gathering (so different from what the hero will find at home).¹³ He honors the generosity of his host: there is no τέλος, no realization of hospitality of greater grace or beauty (χαριέστερον) than such a feast; most fair (κάλλιστον) is the wine and song that endlessly flow.¹⁴ Odysseus visually captures the scene for both the internal and the external audience; he, like Demodocus, becomes an avatar of Homer, refashioning the ephemeral in immortal terms—most appropriately for the Phaeacians who, as descendants of Poseidon (*Od.* 7.56-66), regularly dine with the gods.¹⁵ Odysseus here begins to move out of the audience and into the role of the Homeric narrator, as one capable of translating present joy into a glimpse of a feast like those of the gods, unmarred by the quarrels of men. The Phaeacian banquet, with its godlike singer, honored guests, and platters of cooked food, is a far cry from the ugly, raw, and self-indulgent feast of the drunken cannibal—another son, though brutish and ill-favored, of Poseidon.¹⁶ The perversion of *xenia* in the Cyclops' cave is of course yet to befall Theocritus' Polyphemus, but it, together with the Homeric idealization of the *aoidos*, is reworked in *Idylls* 6 and 11.

¹³ Noted by Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989: 12 n. 5-11.

¹⁴ Cf. Archidamus' praise of an orderly army (*Thuc.* 2.9): κάλλιστον γὰρ τότε καὶ ἀσφαλέστατον, πολλοὺς ὄντας ἐνὶ κόσμῳ χρωμένους φαίνεσθαι. Heroic definitions of what is κάλλιστον are famously formulated in erotic terms by Sappho (fr. 16); cf. *Theognidea* 255-6, *Epigramma Deliacum*; I thank the anonymous reader for this reference. What is sweetest to Polyphemus is, of course, his eye (*Idd.* 6.22 & 11.545).

¹⁵ *Od.* 7.203 δαίνυνται τε παρ' ἄμμι καθήμενοι ἐνθα περ ἡμεῖς.

¹⁶ His genealogy differs from the other Cyclopes. Mondy 1983 traces the development of the distinct traditions (Hesiodic vs. Homeric) about the Cyclopes; Seaford 1975 compares the representation of Polyphemus in Homer and Euripides.

Past and future, isolation and community, disguise and revelation, feasting, frustration, and suffering—in mind and body—all are in play in these poems. *Idyll* 11 offers the traditional concept of epic song as cure with a twist: where Hesiod touts the benefits of poetic performance for the audience, Polyphemus performs *every* role: he is poet and audience, doctor and patient. As the hero of his own song, Polyphemus is a counterfeit Odysseus. Like Odysseus on Calypso's shore, he sits alone, singing in the hope of being reunited with his heart's desire; like Odysseus, he has a dog that identifies—and is in a way identified—with him. It is interesting to reverse the comparison and consider the extent to which Odysseus, the broad and ram-like (*Il.* 3.191-98), has a touch of the Cyclops in him, though his bearing is noble and his face is handsome, as Homer points out (καλὰ πρόσωπα *Od.* 8.85). But if, as Hunter 1999 suggests, Theocritus' Cyclops in some ways recalls Homer's Odysseus, we should add that what we see is something along the lines of a fun-house reflection.¹⁷ Clay 1983 observes that Odysseus is motivated by inquisitiveness and acquisitiveness;¹⁸ Polyphemus is likewise acquisitive in both Homer and Theocritus, but he is not inquisitive about anything beyond his own immediate needs. He is both excessive (in appetite) and inadequate (in self-knowledge and self-control); he is identified instead by what he lacks or loses—his eye, of course, but also self-governance. Where the song of Demodocus comforts Odysseus by accurately depicting the past, Polyphemus' deceptive song ends abruptly with the pleasant (but false) expectation that his future holds erotic fulfillment. The mythical skill of Demodocus, like that of Homer, entails compensatory blindness (*Od.* 8.62-64):

κῆρυξ δ' ἐγγύθεν ἦλθεν ἄγων ἐρίηρον αἰιδόν,
τὸν πέρι μουσ' ἐφίλησε, **δίδου δ' ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε**
ὀφθαλμῶν μὲν ἄμερσε, δίδου δ' ἠδεῖαν αἰοιδήν.

The herald came near with the faithful bard,
he whom the muse loved most, but **gave good and bad**:
she removed his sight, but gave sweet song.

¹⁷ Hunter 1999: 236 n. 47.

¹⁸ Clay 1983: 116, citing Stanford.

Demodocus' blindness is balanced by skill and perception, but the Cyclops' blindness is formulated in terms of negation and distortion. Not good and bad, ἀγαθόν τε κακόν τε, but negation piled on negation: ignorance and more of the same. The loss of his eye (to No One) in Homer yields no compensatory gift of sight—apart from a belated recognition that this must be the meaning of the strange prophecy he once heard.¹⁹ The cure of the Cyclops' song is itself predicated on the redoubling of an empty illusion: Polyphemus addresses himself (ὦ Κύκλωψ Κύκλωψ *Id.* 11.72), but neither he nor the narrator accurately sees what he is doing: 'curing' the fantasy of one Galatea with the hope of another (εὐρησεῖς Γαλάτειαν ἴσως καὶ καλλίον' ἄλλαν *Id.* 11.76).

Polyphemus' song of unrequited love echoes others in the idylls, particularly that of his counterpart, the goatherd komast of *Idyll* 3, singing at the door (or rather cave) of the nymph Amaryllis. Like Polyphemus, the goatherd's capacity for self-reflection is limited,²⁰ although he too recognizes that his satyr-like looks (snub-nose, heavy beard) may be displeasing. But where Polyphemus woos Galatea with promises of a comfortable life on land, the goatherd adopts another tactic, casting Amaryllis in the role of a cruel mistress and himself in the role of victim, threatening to take a lover's leap into the sea,²¹ or simply lie down and starve himself to death (*Id.* 3.51-53):

Ἀλγέω τὰν κεφαλάν, τὴν δ' οὐ μέλει. οὐκέτ' αἰδῶ,
 κεισεῦμαι δὲ πεσών, καὶ τοὶ λύκοι ὧδέ μ' ἔδονται.
 ὥς μέλι τοι γλυκὺ τοῦτο κατὰ βρόχθοιο γένοιτο.

My head is aching, but you don't care; I sing no more,
 I'll fall down and I'll stay down, even if wolves devour me,
 sweet like honey down your throat may that be.²²

¹⁹ Clay 1983: 121: 'Polyphemus is thunderstruck: on the basis of an oracle, he had heard that a certain Odysseus would some day blind him. But he had expected a big, strong man, not a little nobody (9.513-15).'

²⁰ Hunter 1999: 109 comments that the goatherd is 'entirely free of self-knowledge' but notes that the audience laughs not at his foolishness but at the cleverness of the script and conceit of the poem as a whole.

²¹ *Id.* 3.25 τὰν βαίταν ἀποδὺς ἐς κύματα τῆνῳ ἀλεῦμαι.

²² Dover 1971: 158 n. 82 notes the association of honey with poetry (cf. *Id.* 1.146; 7.82).

Hunter suggests that the goatherd could be attempting to make the uncooperative nymph jealous. If we accept his interpretation of the 'wolves' in the last line as a reference to prostitutes,²³ then this song, like that of Polyphemus, would end with the possibility of other partners. Be that as it may, Polyphemus clearly consoles himself with the hope that he will find another, fairer, Galatea:²⁴ a second, improbable nymph that mirrors the Cyclops' doubling in this second, improbably successful self. Unlike the goatherd of *Idyll* 3, not to mention Homer, Demodocus, and Odysseus, Polyphemus' gaze is fixed on the everyday and on self-preservation: he is tragically lacking in romantic imagination. The goatherd talks of joining Amaryllis in the sea, a solution that could also, like Hylas' abduction by the water nymph, effectively 'unite' the Cyclops with Galatea. But the thought of living underwater leads him to vague and disingenuous regrets about his lack of gills. Unrequited love will not be the end of Polyphemus, who, like Homer's Cyclops, is closer to wolf than satyr. The Cyclops is at heart a predator: his *paraklausithyron* is an attempt to lure the girl *into* his cave, not *out* of hers.

With respect to *metis* and *kratos*, cunning and strength, Odysseus and Polyphemus are not equally matched. We might more accurately frame this contrast as a difference between not cunning and strength but the presence or absence of self-control.²⁵ The Cyclops' strength is external and directed against others, while Odysseus' cunning calls for the strength to govern his own emotions and desires. It is hardly surprising, then, that Plato's Socrates objects to Odysseus' praise of Alcinous' banquet on the grounds that it presents the hero, whose wisdom Socrates regards as exemplary, as lacking in self-control (*Resp.* 3.390a8-b4):

τί δέ; ποιεῖν ἄνδρα τὸν σοφώτατον λέγοντα ὡς δοκεῖ αὐτῷ κάλ-
 λιστον εἶναι πάντων, ὅταν
 '...παρὰ πλεῖαι ὥσι τράπεζαι²⁶
 σίτου καὶ κρειῶν, μέθυ δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων
 οἶνοχόος φορέησι καὶ ἐγχείῃ δεπάεσσιν,
 δοκεῖ σοι ἐπιτήδειον εἶναι πρὸς ἐγκράτειαν ἑαυτοῦ ἀκούειν νέψ;

²³ Hunter 1999: 129 n. 54.

²⁴ *Id.* 11.76 εὐρησεῖς Γαλάτειαν ἴσως καὶ καλλίον' ἄλλαν.

²⁵ For other examples of Platonic influence on Theocritus, see Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 143-48; Hunter 1999: 145; Murley 1940; Mori 2017.

²⁶ Cf. πλεῖαι ὥσι τράπεζαι with παρὰ δὲ πλήθωσι τράπεζαι in Homer.

What about [when Homer] makes the wisest man say that for him the fairest thing is when
 ‘...before one there are tables full of
 baked breads and cuts of meat, drawing wine from the bowl,
 the wine bearer brings it and refills the goblets...’
 Does this seem useful to you for a young man developing self-control to hear?

Socrates finds an exemplary model of self-control later in the *Odyssey* (20.17-18), when Odysseus resists the impulse—without the aid of Athena, who restrains Achilles in *Iliad* 1—to kill the maidservants for consorting with the suitors (*Resp.* 3.390d1-4).

ἀλλ’ εἰ πού τινες, ἦν δ’ ἐγώ, καρτερίαι πρὸς ἅπαντα καὶ λέγονται
 καὶ πράττονται ὑπὸ ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, θεατέον τε καὶ ἀκουστέον,
 οἷον καὶ τὸ
 ‘στῆθος δὲ πλήξας κραδίην ἠνίπαπε μύθῳ·
 ‘τέτλαθι δὴ, κραδίη· καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ’ ἔτλης’.²⁷

But if, I said, there are acts of endurance in the face of every hardship reported and performed by famous men, these must be seen and heard, like this:
 ‘He struck his chest and reproved his heart with a story:
 ‘Be strong, my heart, for you endured a greater shame once before’.

Plato ends the quotation here, but the ‘greater shame’ Odysseus is talking about is, of course, his endurance of the Cyclops feasting on his men (*Od.* 20.19-21):

ἤματι τῷ ὅτε μοι μένος ἄσχετος ἦσθιε Κύκλωψ
 ἰφθίμους ἐτάρους· σὺ δ’ ἐτόλμας, ὄφρα σε μῆτις
 ἐξάγαγ’ ἐξ ἄντροιο οἰόμενον θανέεσθαι.

That day when the Cyclops, ungovernable in his strength, devoured your stout companions. Yet you endured, until cunning led you from the cave where you expected to die.

²⁷ *Od.* 20.17-18.

At *Idyll* 11.72 Polyphemus echoes Odysseus' self-apostrophe and here, as elsewhere, the contrast is striking: Odysseus escapes through μήτις, but it is Polyphemus' wits (φρένας) that have abandoned him: ὦ Κύκλωψ Κύκλωψ, πᾶ τὰς φρένας ἐκπεπότασαι; ('Cyclops, Cyclops, where have your wits flown?'). Is this a genuine moment of self-awareness for Polyphemus?²⁸ Is the anonymous narrator correct that Polyphemus is now cured by his song, that it has restored his wits, allowing him to recall the practical lessons of a shepherd's life, consoled by the belief that other girls admire him?²⁹ Perhaps, but the parallel between Odysseus' unfaithful maids and Polyphemus' (hypothetical) admirers suggests otherwise. In the earlier passage Odysseus is telling his heart to be strong and to endure the indignity of his own maids laughing as they meet the suitors.³⁰ The sleep-deprived Odysseus' frustration with the serving maids is refigured in the idyll as the sleep-deprived Polyphemus' frustration with Galatea.³¹ Yet we know that Odysseus is right—the maids *are* sleeping with the suitors—while Polyphemus' assumption that other girls are interested in him is unlikely, or at least unanswered in the text. Indeed, Polyphemus is right to think his wits are gone: as a poetic construct his wits are always gone, and it is doubtful whether they were present earlier, or could ever materialize. Our god's-eye view of the Cyclops reveals that in his ignorance he is closer to the maids: like them, and like the suitors, laughing with the jaws of other men,³² he is unaware of what he is doing.

III. Polyphemus and Polyphemus

In this final section I want to examine the narrative contexts of Polyphemus' interactions with Galatea in *Idylls* 6 and 11. The exchange between

²⁸ Hunter 1999: 241 n. 72 notes that such self-addresses are common in New Comedy, and it is of course possible that Theocritus is drawing on both. For several examples see Webster 1965.

²⁹ *Id.* 11.75 τὰν παρῑοῖσαν ἄμελεγε ('milk the one nearby'), a significant phrase, given Galatea's name.

³⁰ The maid Melantho, the goatherd Melanthius' sister, is the only woman whose insults to the disguised Odysseus are quoted (*Od.* 19.65-69).

³¹ That Odysseus as king enjoys sexual authority over the maidservants is an unpalatable aspect of the poem and the culture, but the parallel with Galatea is interesting nonetheless: Polyphemus will kill Galatea's lover, Acis, just as Odysseus kills the suitors. Theocritus makes no reference to Acis, but the reference to the river Akis (*Id.* 1.69) suggests familiarity with story later told by Ovid (*Met.* 13). That Polyphemus is a threat to Galatea (just as Odysseus is a threat to the maids) is a possibility I will discuss in Section III.

³² *Od.* 20.347 οἱ δ' ἦδη γναθμοῖσι γελῶν ἄλλοτρίοισιν. On laughter as a sign of weakness see Colakis 1986.

them is essentially a false duality: she, like the shallow water along the shore, exists primarily to reflect his image back to him and to the audience. Theocritus' Polyphemus is grotesque but also sympathetic, an uncannily familiar anthropomorph, the blurred and distorted reflection of the beautiful. The bulk of both poems is spoken by and directly focalized through him: we see the world from his limited perspective. But unlike Odysseus in *Odyssey* 9-12, Polyphemus is a reliably unreliable narrator, partly because he is constitutionally lacking in self-awareness, and partly because the allusive words and images he uses always betray him.

Idyll 6 portrays a song-contest between Daphnis (an oxherd, a younger instantiation of the Daphnis of *Idyll* 1, who dies of unrequited love), and another herdsman named Damoetas. In his song Daphnis assumes the narrative persona of advisor to the Cyclops, explaining that Galatea is in fact flirting with him by throwing apples at his animals (6.6-14):

βάλλει τοι, Πολύφαμε, τὸ ποίμνιον ἅ Γαλάτεια
 μάλοισιν, δυσέρωτα καὶ αἰπόλον ἄνδρα καλεῦσα·
 καὶ τύ νιν οὐ ποθόρησθα, τάλαν τάλαν, ἀλλὰ κάθησαι
 ἄδέα συρίσδων. πάλιν ἄδ', ἴδε, τὰν κύνα βάλλει,
 ἃ τοι τᾶν οἴων ἔπεται σκοπός· ἃ δὲ βαῦσδει 10
 εἰς ἅλα δερκομένα, τὰ δὲ νιν καλὰ κύματα φαίνει
 ἄσυχ' ἀκαχλάζοντος ἐπ' αἰγιαλοῖο θέοισαν.
 φράζω μὴ τὰς παιδὸς ἐπὶ κνάμαισιν ὀρούσῃ
 ἐξ ἁλὸς ἐρχομένας, κατὰ δὲ χροῖα καλὸν ἀμύξῃ.

Galatea is **hitting your** flock, Polyphemus,
 with apples, and calling you a poor lover and a goat man,
 yes, and you don't see her—loser! loser!—but sit
 sweetly piping. And again, look! It's your dog she's hitting,
 the watchdog that follows your sheep, and she's barking
as she looks at the sea, and the lovely waves reflect her,
running along the gently sounding shore.
 Mind that she doesn't **leap against the legs of the girl**
 coming from the sea and rake her lovely skin.

There are moments of confusion in this indeterminate seaside frolic that hint at a darker future: the verbal play with words of seeing

(ποθόρησθα, ἴδε) alludes to the Cyclops' future blinding; Galatea's flirtatious pelting suggests the blinded Cyclops' cliff-side attack on Odysseus' ship. We might mistake Polyphemus' identification with the dog as a sign of some kind of warmth or fellow feeling, but he is, as ever, misreading the situation. Polyphemus imagines the dog is in sympathy with him, just as his future Homeric self will wrongly imagine that the ram bearing Odysseus is the last out of the cave because it misses his master's eye.³³ Polyphemus is identified to some extent with his dog: his reaction to his image in the water recalls the dog barking at its own reflection, if we read δερκομένα in line 11 that way. Polyphemus sees and judges himself to be beautiful, and his teeth as particularly beautiful: shining white, like marble, or rather the flesh of Galatea, as Hunter 1999 notes: her name and milky whiteness help to explain the Cyclops' desire for her.³⁴ Both the dog and the flock serve in this poem as the Cyclops' surrogates, signaling the confusion of perception and knowledge that defines him. Galatea's playful target is Polyphemus, but she uses his dog (like the flock) as erotic proxy in a game of mimetic desire. We may well lose track of exactly which female subject is being described in lines 10-11: is it Galatea or the dog that runs and is reflected in the water? Then, too, the minor threat posed by the claws of the dog in lines 13-14 suggests the greater danger that the Cyclops poses to Galatea. Her vulnerability in this lighthearted scene brings to mind images of actual violence, such as Homer's description of Antilochus' attack on Melanippus (*Il.* 15.579-81):

Ἀντίλοχος δ' ἐπόρουσε κύων ὥς, ὃς τ' ἐπὶ νεβρῶ
βλημένῳ αἵξῃ, τόν τ' ἐξ εὐνήφι θορόντα
θηρητὴρ ἐτύχησε βαλὼν, ὑπέλυσε δὲ γυῖα

And Antilochus **sprang on him, like a dog** darting
against a wounded fawn, one that leaps from its bed
and a hunter hits, and loosens its limbs.

Galatea's playful antagonism toward the dog accordingly suggests the common metaphorical association of seduction with hunting, an

³³ *Od.* 9.452-53 ἢ σύ γ' ἄνακτος / ὀφθαλμὸν ποθέεις.

³⁴ Hunter 1999: 258-59 nn. 37-38.

association that is reinforced when Daphnis offers Polyphemus the Sapphic recommendation to play hard to get (6.17): καὶ φεύγει φιλέοντα καὶ οὐ φιλέοντα διώκει ('She'll flee if you desire her, and pursue if you do not').³⁵ Although Daphnis frames his song as an address to Polyphemus, this is advice he obviously cannot hear (and would surely ignore if he could): it is intended more for Daphnis'—and Theocritus'—audience. Daphnis' gnomic advice likewise operates on several levels (6.17-18): ἡ γὰρ ἔρωτι / πολλάκις, ὦ Πολύφαμε, τὰ μὴ καλὰ καλὰ πέφανται ('Often to a lover, Polyphemus, what is not fair appears fair'). The not-fair Polyphemus may appear fair to Galatea, but more significantly Polyphemus the narcissist appears fair to *Polyphemus*—an interpretation that is hard to ignore, given his subsequent observation (in Damoetas' song) that his reflection in the sea shows him that he isn't as bad looking as others say he is.³⁶

Damoetas presents a narcissistic Polyphemus whose incorrect judgment of his own image reflects Daphnis' earlier representation of an inattentive, self-absorbed Cyclops who is too busy playing his syrinx to notice what is going on in front of him. His response to Daphnis builds on the mirroring, confusion, and allusive menace of the first half of the poem (*Id.* 6.29-38):

σίξα δ' ὑλακτεῖν νιν καὶ τᾷ κυνί· καὶ γὰρ ὅκ' ἦρων
αὐτὰς ἐκνυζεῖτο ποτ' **ἰσχία ῥύγχος ἔχοισα.** 30
ταῦτα δ' ἴσως ἐσορεῦσα ποεῦντά με πολλάκι πεμψεῖ
ἄγγελον. αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κλαξῶ θύρας, ἔστε κ' ὁμόσση
αὐτά μοι στορεσεῖν καλὰ δέμνια τᾶσδ' ἐπὶ νάσω·
καὶ γὰρ θην οὐδ' εἶδος ἔχω κακὸν ὥς με λέγοντι.
ἡ γὰρ πρᾶν ἐς πόντον ἐσέβλεπον, ἥς δὲ γαλάνα, 35
καὶ καλὰ μὲν τὰ γένεια, καλὰ δέ μεν ἅ μία κώρα,
ὥς παρ' ἐμὶν κέκριται, κατεφαίνετο, τῶν δέ τ' ὀδόντων
λευκοτέραν αὐγὰν Παρίας ὑπέφαινε λίθοιο.

I sicced my howling dog at her too, for when I loved
her the dog whined, **with her snout on her legs.**
Maybe if she sees me doing this often she'll send

³⁵ Noted by Dover 1971 *ad loc.*; see also Hunter 1999: 252 nn. 15-17.

³⁶ See *Id.* 6.34: καὶ γὰρ θην οὐδ' εἶδος ἔχω κακὸν ὥς με λέγοντι.

a messenger, but I will shut the door until she swears
 she'll make her lovely bed with me on this island.
 The fact is that **I don't look as bad as they say I do:**
 and the other day I was looking into the sea, when it was calm,
 fair was my beard, and fair my single eye,
 as I judged it, reflected back, and from my teeth
 a gleam whiter than Parian marble...

Damoetas here repeats the confusion and closeness of Galatea and the dog. My translation of line 30 is intended to retain the grammatical ambiguity of just whose legs the dog is nosing. Possibly they are Galatea's, and we could read the proximity of the dog's nose to the nymph's legs as a variation by Damoetas on the possible threat posed by its claws that was raised by Daphnis. Much depends on whether we take αὐτᾶς in this passage as a possessive with ἰσχία or as the object of ῥρῶν (or both), and whether the antecedent is Galatea or the dog.³⁷ The dog could be whimpering as it puts its nose either on its own legs, or on Galatea's legs as Polyphemos' erotic surrogate. Alternatively, the dog might be jealous and perceive Galatea as a rival for Polyphemos' attention: we can imagine that as Polyphemos 'loves' or feels affection for the whimpering dog it threateningly noses Galatea's legs.³⁸ It makes sense for the dog to leap on Galatea (in Daphnis' song) or even attack her (in Damoetas' song), in other words, if Galatea is, in the dog's mind, competing for Polyphemos' affection—a not implausible scenario in terms of canine psychology.³⁹

Likewise telling is the use of the term ἰσχία, a Theocritean hapax. The ἰσχίον is a specific part of the hip, as Homer says, 'the place men call the cup-socket' (*Il.* 8.306), mentioned in descriptions of wounds on the battlefield (*Il.* 5.305-306; 11.339; 20.170). It also appears in two Homeric

³⁷ See Hunter 1999: 256 n. 30 on the two current interpretations: the dog rests its nose either on its flank or on Galatea's lap.

³⁸ Dover 1971: 133 n. 41f. notes that Theocritus' herdsmen (contrary to humorous stereotypes) do not abuse their animals, and I do not mean to suggest that Polyphemos is actually 'in love' with his dog. The indeterminacy of the verb is part of the confusion of the scene: if the object is Galatea, he is in love with her; if it is the dog, he simply loves her. The verb comprises both connotations; see LSJ ἐράω I.2.

³⁹ Cf. Hunter 1999: 255-56 n. 30: 'the reason (γάρ) why Polyphemos has set the dog at Galatea is to mark the change in circumstances; when Galatea had the upper hand. . . the dog was entirely passive'. See also Dover 1971: 144 n. 30: 'The point is that whereas the dog now barks at her from a distance it used to be so fond of her that it would nuzzle her person'.

similes: Achilles attacks Aeneas like a lion lashing its tail against its sides and hips (*Il.* 20.170), and Hector single-handedly routs the Achaeans like a dog hunting a boar or a lion (*Il.* 8.338-41):

ὥς δ' ὅτε τίς τε κύων σὺς ἀγρίου ἢ λέοντος
 ἄπτηται κατόπισθε ποσὶν ταχέεσσι διώκων
ἰσχία τε γλουτούς τε, ἐλίσσόμενόν τε δοκεύει,
 ὥς Ἴκτωρ ὠπαζε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιούς

As when a dog harries a wild boar or a lion,
 chasing behind in swift pursuit of its
legs and hindquarters, and marks it as it whirls around,
 thus did Hector press the long-haired Achaeans.

Whether we read the *ισχία* as belonging to the dog or Galatea, the association of this term with martial and hunting imagery intensifies the violence latent in the scene.⁴⁰ Also striking is the use of *ισχίον* in the *Odyssey*, where it appears only once. The goatherd Melanthius viciously kicks Odysseus in the hip when they meet on the path (*Od.* 17.233-34): παριῶν λάξ ἔνθορεν ἀφραδίησιν / ἰσχύῳ. Melanthius is unaware (ἀφραδίησιν) of what he is doing: he does not know that he is now at war with his own master, and that his own ignoble wounds will be far worse. The point is not that the legs either of Galatea or the dog are literally like those of Odysseus, but rather that unusual term *ισχίον* creates a parallel between Polyphemos and Melanthius, whose cruelly emasculating punishment by Odysseus is an extreme and explicitly sexualized version of the wound that Polyphemos suffered.

I conclude with the Cyclops' song of seduction in *Idyll* 11 (*Id.* 11.30-53). The passage approximates a ring composition, beginning with the description of Polyphemos' brow (30-34) and closing with unsettling references (51-54) to his hearth—timber, embers, relentless fire (ἀκάματον πῦρ, 51)—and his single, precious eye. This ocular ring forms an internal frame housing images of abundance and fertility; within it Polyphemos describes his large flocks, copious amounts of milk and cheese, young animals, and the *locus amoenus* of the cave itself (35-49):

⁴⁰ Unlike *ισχίον* the word *ρύγχος* ('snout') is not Homeric. It frequently turns up in comic poets (esp. Cratinus, Pherecrates, and Aristophanes) as well as Aristotle's *Historia Animalium*; conflation of high epic and low comic terminology is a good example of the paradoxical contrast of registers in Theocritus.

Still, though I am like this, I feed a thousand grazing beasts 35
 and from them press and drink the finest milk
 and I do not want for cheese in summer or fall
 nor even at the height of winter: my crates are always heavy.
 And piping I know like nobody among the Cyclopes
 singing of you, sweet apple, and myself often, 40
 at odd hours of the night. I am rearing for you eleven fawns,
 all wearing collars, and four bear whelps.
 But come to me and you will not be the poorer,
 leave the grey sea to beat against the shore
 more sweetly in the cave with me will you pass the night. 45
 I have laurels there, and slim cypresses,
 and black ivy, and the sweet-fruited vine,
 and cool water, which to me tree-covered Aitna
 sends forth, an undying drink, from white snow.

What we are seeing in and through the Cyclops' eye is an idyllic vision of his cave, one that has little room for Galatea. Theocritus' herds-men do not, as a general rule, go on at length about the beauty of women;⁴¹ Polyphemus is no exception. He does not flatter her or the salty sea, but heaps praise on his own stores and talents, the natural beauty of his home, and the sweetness of his eye (45-51). It is true that this Polyphemus doesn't go so far as to complement his own appearance, as he does in *Idyll* 6; the Polyphemus of *Idyll* 11 acknowledges that Galatea may find him unattractive (30-33), but he hopes nevertheless to win her over with his riches: he is ill-favored but well-off. We might be tempted to take this observation as an indication that this version of the Cyclops is displaying greater self-awareness, if not empathy. But here too, his focus, for better or worse, is single-minded; it is yet another sign of self-absorption. The Cyclops serves up an image of himself in the midst of a solitary feast, singing his lonely komos, bringing joy to none but himself. His pet name for Galatea, γλυκύμαλον ('sweet apple' 11.40), eroticizes the meal, but then such fruits are literally edible, after all. The cave is indeed an ambush, but not for her. It is not Galatea who will be caught, but Odysseus who will burn the cannibal's

⁴¹ Cf. *Id.* 3.18: the goatherd says that Amaryllis has a beautiful glance ('[maiden] whose glance is beauty' [tr. Hunter 1999: 116 n. 18]), but spends more time condemning her for her cruelty; *Id.* 10.24-37: Bucaeus' praise of Bombyca's dark skin, feet, and voice is an exception.

eye with his own relentless, if not timeless, fire. The trap that Polyphemus is setting is his own, and he is singing about himself, he just doesn't know it yet.⁴²

⁴² It is a pleasure to contribute a chapter to this volume honoring Jenny Strauss Clay. I am grateful to her for guiding my undergraduate studies and teaching me how to do many things, such as write an honors thesis, or memorize the 'Ode to Man' in Sophocles' *Antigone*. Part of this chapter was originally presented as 'The Vision of the Cyclops in Theocritus' *Idylls* 6 and 11' at the 2015 meeting of CAMWS in Boulder, CO. I would like to thank the audience there for their comments, as well as the Luitpold and Barbara Wallach Fund for supporting a research trip to the University of Chicago in April 2016, and the University of Missouri's Campus Writing Program for including me in two writing retreats in April and May 2016. I am also deeply indebted to the anonymous reader for illuminating comments and corrections.

References

- Austin, C. and G. Bastianini, eds. 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*. Milan.
- Bulloch, A. W. 1985. 'Hellenistic Poetry', in P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox, eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Cambridge. 541-621.
- Clay, J. S. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena. Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Clay, J. S. 2011. *Homer's Trojan Theater. Space, Vision, and Memory in the Iliad*. Cambridge.
- Clayman, D. 1987. 'Sigmatism in Greek Poetry', *TAPA* 117: 69-84.
- Colakis, M. 1986. 'The Laughter of the Suitors in *Odyssey*', *CW* 79: 137-41.
- Dover, K. J., ed., 1971. *Theocritus. Select Poems*. Bristol and Oak Park, IL.
- Fantuzzi, M. and R. Hunter. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice. Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- Goldhill, S. 1994. 'The naïve and knowing eye: ecphrasis and the culture of viewing in the Hellenistic world', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, eds., *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge. 197-223.
- Goldhill, S. 2007. 'What is Ecphrasis for?', *CP* 201: 1-19.
- Gow, A. S. F. 1930. 'The Methods of Theocritus and Some Problems in His Poems', *CQ* 24: 146-53.
- Gow, A. S. F., ed., 1952. *Theocritus*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Gutzwiller, K. 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies. The Formation of a Genre*. Madison.
- Gutzwiller, K. 2006. 'The Bucolic Problem', *CP* 101: 380-404.
- Gutzwiller, K. 2007. *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*. Malden, MA, Oxford, and Victoria.
- Heubeck, A., and A. Hoekstra. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume II Books IX-XVI*. Oxford.
- Holtmark, E. B. 1966. 'Poetry as Self-Enlightenment: Theocritus 11', *TAPA* 97: 253-59.
- Hordern, J. H. 1999. 'The Cyclops of Philoxenus', *CQ* 49: 445-55.
- Hunter, R. 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Poetry*. Cambridge.

- Hunter, R., ed., 1999. *Theocritus. A Selection. Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13*. Cambridge.
- Hutchinson, G. O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.
- Kaloudis, N. 2013. 'Restoring Tradition: Verbal Lyricism and Therapeutic Song in Theocritus' Pastoral Idylls,' Diss. Missouri.
- Mondi, R. 1983. 'The Homeric Cyclopes: Folktale, Tradition, and Theme,' *TAPA* 113: 13-38.
- Mori, A. 2017. 'Archives, Innovation, and the Neomorphic Cyclops,' *Aitia. Regards sur la culture hellénistique au XXI^e siècle*. Vol. 7: The Rhetoric of Old and New in the Hellenistic Period. <http://aitia.revues.org/>.
- Murley, C. 1940. 'Plato's Phaedrus and Theocritean Pastoral,' *TAPA* 71: 281-95.
- Payne, M. 2007. *Theocritus and the Invention of Fiction*. Cambridge.
- Petrain, D. 2003. 'Homer, Theocritus, and the Milan Posidippus (P.Mil.Vogl., VIII 309, Col. III.28-41),' *CJ* 98: 359-88.
- Schmiel, R. 1975. 'Theocritus 11: The Purblind Poet,' *CJ* 70: 32-36.
- Schmiel, R. 1993. 'Structure and Meaning in Theocritus 11,' *Mnemosyne* 46: 229-34.
- Seaford, R. 1975. 'Some Notes on Euripides' *Cyclops*,' *CQ* 25: 193-208.
- Skinner, M. B. 2001. 'Ladies Day at the Art Institute. Theocritus, Herodas, and the Gendered Gaze,' in A. Lardinois and L. McClure, eds., *Making Silence Speak. Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton. 201-22.
- Spofford, E. W. 1969. 'Theocritus and Polyphemus,' *AJP* 90: 22-35.
- Walsh, G. B. 1990. 'Surprised by Self: Audible Thought in Hellenistic Poetry,' *CP* 85: 1-21.
- Webster, T. B. L. 1965. 'Self-Apostrophe in Menander,' *CR* 15: 17-18.

The Role of Demeter in Theocritus, *Idyll 7*¹

Benjamin Jasnow

Introduction

Demeter begins and ends Theocritus' seventh *Idyll*. She is there at the start, as the occasion of the poem, and she is there as the laughing vision of the final lines (155-57). She sets the narrative into motion (1-9):

Ἦς χρόνος ἀνίκ' ἐγὼν τε καὶ Εὐκριτος εἰς τὸν Ἄλεντα
εἵρπομες ἐκ πόλιος, σὺν καὶ τρίτος ἄμμιν Ἀμύντας.
τᾷ Δηοῖ γὰρ ἔτευχε θαλύσια καὶ Φρασίδαμος
κάντιγένης, δύο τέκνα Λυκωπέος, εἴ τί περ ἐσθλὸν
χαῶν τῶν ἐπάνωθεν ἀπὸ Κλυτίας τε καὶ αὐτῷ
Χάλκωνος, Βούριναν ὅς ἐκ ποδὸς ἄννε κράναν
εὖ ἐνερεισάμενος πέτρα γόνυ· ταὶ δὲ παρ' αὐτὰν
αἶγειροι πτελέαι τε εὐσκιον ἄλσος ὕφαινον
χλωροῖσιν πετάλοισι κατηρεφές κομόωσαι.

There once was a time when I and Eucritus were going out of the

¹ I would like to express my deep gratitude to Professor Jenny Strauss Clay, with whom it has been a great honor to discuss early versions of this paper and many other things. I owe thanks to her that cannot be repaid. In the bucolic *Idylls* it is common to see two herders exchange their songs, the one creating in response to the other. I hope my little ditty here can serve as a modest token of appreciation in response to the many years it has been my privilege to be a student of Professor Clay's. My thanks as well to Alexander Sens and Richard Hunter, who offered very helpful comments on an early draft of this paper. I am also grateful for the very helpful comments of the referee.

city towards Haleis, and Amyntas came with us as our third. For Phrasidamus and Antigene were offering first-fruits to Deo, the two sons of Lycopseus, noblest remnant of the good men of old, from the stock of Clytia and Chalcon himself, who created the spring Bourina with his foot, having pressed his knee hard against the rock. And about it the poplars and elms wove a shady grove, a thick vault of green leaves.²

Simichidas and his companions leave the city of Cos for the express purpose of celebrating the goddess. Demeter clearly provides the framework for the poem. Yet, on the surface, the beginning and end of *Idyll 7* seem poorly integrated into the whole. The events of the narrative—other than the festival itself—seem to have little relevance to the goddess. Neither the initial encounter between Lycidas and Simichidas nor their subsequent exchange of songs is easily explicable in terms of Demeter. E. L. Bowie puts it well: ‘What has not been asked is why a festival of the deity of arable farming should have been chosen by Theocritus for the culmination of a poem whose main characters are pastoral and whose principal theme is pastoral poetry.’³ Bowie’s question is a good one, and the subject of this paper: I will propose a number of explanations for Theocritus’ emphatic inclusion of Demeter in his programmatic seventh *Idyll*.

Demeter and the Bucolic Pantheon

Bowie’s question presupposes a strong division between the agricultural and pastoral worlds, a division which has also been productively discussed by Charles Segal, who sees an opposition in the poem between the realms of Lycidas and Simichidas, hill and plain, Pan and Demeter.⁴ In Segal’s view, the luxuriant description of Demeter’s festival at the end of *Idyll 7* offers a fleeting glimpse of unison between these divided realms, and the goddess herself serves as ‘a mediator between the natural world

² All translations are my own, unless otherwise noted. The text of Theocritus follows that of Hunter 1999.

³ Bowie 1985: 80, where Bowie himself proposes a good, if partial, answer to his question: that Demeter’s presence in *Idyll 7* alludes to the elegiac *Demeter* of the Coan poet Philitas. I will return to this shortly.

⁴ Segal 1981: 123–25, 148–50.

⁵ Segal 1981: 123–24; 124 (quote).

and nature's tangible gifts.⁵ Despite this vision of harmony, however, Segal contends that the apparently urbane Simichidas—the poetic ego of *Idyll 7* on his way to an agricultural festival instead of the pasture—introduces a fundamentally distancing element into the poem: because we look through Simichidas' eyes onto the events of *Idyll 7*, events that take place far in the past, we, like him, stand at a remove from the bucolic realm of Lycidas.⁶

It may at times be productive to schematize the bucolic world according to such stark divisions; indeed, it frequently seems as if Theocritus invites us to do so. At the same time, however, such notional boundaries may be easily transgressed. Thus, for instance, the ostensibly bucolic song of Lycidas, by repute and appearance a bucolic poet par excellence, contains allusions to an array of archaic poets;⁷ and the premise of Lycidas' song, a *propempticon* anticipating a beloved boy's journey to Mytilene, is not one that fits without irony in the mouth of a rennet-stinking herder from the mountain, or the bucolic realm more generally. *Idyll 7*'s virtuoso display of its many and varied literary forebears warns against any simplistic delimitation of the bucolic realm, and, given its programmatic status, it suggests that a similar approach should be taken to the rest of Theocritus' bucolic poems.⁸ If Theocritus invokes such literary, thematic, and generic boundaries, he frequently does so explicitly to violate them, a characteristic he shares with other Hellenistic poets.⁹

We would be wise to approach the bucolic pantheon with a similar view to irony and complexity. It is not possible here to provide a comprehensive study of gods in Theocritus' bucolic poems, but it is worth remembering that the pastoral realm fashioned in the *Idylls* includes a number of deities whose connection to herding may be considered somewhat tenuous. In the first *Idyll*, for example, Daphnis receives three gods as visitors: Hermes (77), Priapus (81), and Aphrodite (95). The first two are easy to understand in rustic or bucolic terms: Hermes in his guise as Hermes Nomios and Priapus as a rustic fertility deity with functions akin to those of Pan.¹⁰ Aphrodite is a different story. Although there is nothing intrinsically rustic or bucolic about her, there are a number of

⁶ Segal 1981: 125.

⁷ Hunter 1996: 26; Hunter 1999: 166–67.

⁸ Hunter 1996: 14–28.

⁹ Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 23–24.

¹⁰ Hunter 1999: 75, 90.

different ways that we might attempt to explain the presence of Aphrodite in *Idyll* 1. Daphnis names Anchises (105-106) and Adonis (110-11) as past lovers of Aphrodite, both with strong roots in the pastoral realm. It is also frequently noted that Daphnis has ties to Near Eastern *paredroi*, male companions of great female goddesses like Inanna and Ishtar, who bear a resemblance to Aphrodite.¹¹ But most importantly, perhaps, and despite the fact that she doesn't belong in a strict way to the bucolic realm *per se*, Aphrodite's presence in *Idyll* 1 helps to define the nature of Theocritus' pastoral world by virtue of her intrinsic qualities as a love goddess: love is of course a fundamental preoccupation of the songs sung by herders in the *Idylls*. Something similar might be said of Dionysus, who, although clearly associated with agriculture, is not connected with herding.¹² Despite lacking an association with herding, it would clearly be wrong to claim that a god associated with agriculture cannot or should not be expected to appear in the bucolic realm. Dionysian symbolism, for example, plays an important role in the first *Idyll*, where it serves in part to link the new mimetic genre of bucolic to tragedy.¹³

We should approach Demeter in a like manner, aware at once of points of opposition and affinity to the world of bucolic. Although it may certainly at times be productive to think in terms of natural tensions between the agricultural goddess and the bucolic world of herder poets (as Segal does), it is also important to be on the lookout for natural connections between the two, and to read Demeter's presence in the *Idylls* in terms of what she may add to the reader's understanding of the pastoral realm.

Theocritus himself at times blurs the line between the worlds of agriculture and herding, as *Idyll* 7 indicates. Another example is to be found in *Idyll* 3, where a goatherd attempting to woo one Amaryllis invokes Demeter and Iasion, an agricultural hero, amidst a catalogue of mythical lovers, alluding at the same time to the goddess' celebration in the mysteries (3.50-51).¹⁴ *Idyll* 3, then, presents at least one instance of Demeter seeming fairly at home in the pastoral world.

¹¹ See e.g. Berg 1974: 13, 17-20; Halperin 1983: 183-200. On *paredroi* in general see Burkert 1979: 105-106; Halperin 1983: 187, 190; West 1997: 57. Such *paredroi* are also known as dying and rising gods, on which see the surveys by Smith 2001: 104-30 and Mettinger 2001.

¹² Gow 1952: vol. 2 368.

¹³ Hunter 1999: 61-62.

¹⁴ See Hunter 1999, Gow 1952: vol. 2 ad loc., and Segal 1981: 193-98.

Demeter plays a more prominent role in *Idyll* 10, where an opposition between bucolic and agricultural realms is strongly invoked, but also in some ways transgressed. On the one hand, *Idyll* 10 stands apart from the bucolics in some matters of style, in that it has fewer Homeric forms, lacks unaugmented past tenses, and breaks the Callimachean metrical rules that bucolic poems tend to follow.¹⁵ Moreover, it depicts reapers instead of herdsmen. On the other hand, it shares a number of features with the bucolic poems: it features an amoebean song exchange on the topic of love-longing in a rustic setting. In *Idyll* 7, moreover, Lycidas is well known as the best syrinx player in comparison not only to the other herdsmen, but to reapers too (7.28-29). Therefore, despite the linguistic and metrical differences between *Idyll* 10 and many of the other rustic mimes, the poet may not intend a thoroughgoing division between this poem and bucolic poetry in general.

Blurring the lines somewhat further is the name of one of the singers in *Idyll* 10: Bucaeus, or 'oxherd.' Bucaeus, lovesick in a way befitting his bucolic name, cannot reap his wheat straight, and lags behind the other reapers (1-6). This unproductive harvester sings a song of love-longing (26-37). Milo, who harvests efficiently and well, responds with, naturally, a hymn to Demeter (42-55). The mode of his response is significant: in the name of Demeter, Milo ironically rebuts Bucaeus' sentimental longing.¹⁶ Here the world of the reapers is clearly brought into contact with the pastoral world, but also placed in opposition to it.

Demeter's role in *Idyll* 10 will be seen to be similar to her role in *Idyll* 7: a figure in some ways at the fringes of the bucolic world, but also useful for defining that world. Much as the references to Aphrodite and Dionysus in *Idyll* 1 inform the reader that the realms of those gods (love and drama) overlap in important ways with the new genre of bucolic poetry, the major role that Demeter plays in *Idyll* 7 suggests that she is central in some way to Theocritus' conception of pastoral. What follows are two sections, punctuated by several subsections, detailing Demeter's role in *Idyll* 7 and her potential importance to bucolic poetry more generally.

¹⁵ Hunter 1999: 200.

¹⁶ Cairns 1970: 38-44.

I. Demeter on Cos

Idyll 7 is part of a long discourse linking Demeter to Coan culture. The poem relates Demeter to Cos by referencing the genealogy of its founding family, her role in local cult, and her importance in local literature.

A. Genealogy

In the opening lines of *Idyll* 7, Theocritus invokes local legend and the genealogy of Simichidas' hosts to remind the reader of Demeter's longstanding connection to the island of Cos and to create an impression of her longstanding importance to bucolic poetry. Phrasidamus and Antigene, the hosts of Demeter's *thalysia*, are descendants of Chalcon, the creator of the spring Bourina, vividly described as a *locus amoenus* at the beginning of *Idyll* 7 (6-9). The spring is a metaphor for bucolic inspiration, as is clear not only from its etymology (*Bourina/boucolicos*),¹⁷ but also by the similarity of its *aition* to that of Hippocrene, said to have been created when Pegasus struck the earth with his hoof. Callimachus situated Hesiod's meeting with the Muses near Hippocrene;¹⁸ that *Dichterweihe*, in turn, serves as the model for Lycidas' bestowal of the bucolic staff upon Simichidas in *Idyll* 7.¹⁹ The opening passage of the *Idyll*, in mentioning both the *thalysia* and Chalcon's creation of the spring Bourina, immediately links Theocritus' hosts both to Demeter and bucolic poetry.

Further investigation of the lineage of Phrasidamus and Antigene reinforces the notion of Demeter's centrality to *Idyll* 7. The Scholia tell us that Chalcon (7.6) and his brother Antagoras harbored Demeter on Cos during her search for Core.²⁰ Chalcon, therefore, is at once the creator of Bourina, a figurative source of bucolic poetry, and the originator of the cult of Demeter on Cos. It is fitting, then, that the descendants of Chalcon host the *thalysia* to which Simichidas travels, where he will enjoy a splendid *locus amoenus* under the laughing gaze of the goddess.²¹

¹⁷ Hunter 1999: 154.

¹⁸ Callim. fr. 2=4 Massimilla; Hunter 1999: 154. Cf. [Asclepiades] *Anth.* Pal. 9.64.

¹⁹ Hunter 1999: 149-50.

²⁰ Schol. Theoc. (Wendel) VII 5-9f. See also Sherwin-White 1978: 307.

²¹ Demeter is also important to the story of Erysichthon, Maestra, and Eurypylus, king of Cos. See Callimachus, *Hymn to Demeter* 24-117; Hesiod, ed. Most 2007: *Catalogue of Women* fr. 79-80; also fr. 70 Most (=43[b] Merkelbach and West); Schol. on Lycophron's *Alexandra* 1393.

B. Cult

It is clear, therefore, that the frame narrative of *Idyll* 7 links Demeter to Phrasidamus and Antigenes, hosts of the *thalysia* and descendants of the Coan founders who originated Deo's cult on the island. In addition, however, the frame narrative makes reference to the manner in which Demeter was worshiped on the island, and very possibly to a previous literary treatment of her Coan cult practice. 'The cult of Demeter and Persephone is especially connected to sacred springs',²² and Demeter was worshiped at springs on Cos.²³ It is appropriate, therefore, that the setting of the *thalysia* includes a spring on the property of Phrasidamus and Antigenes (7.136). This spring has been the subject of some scholarly debate, focused on whether it is identical with Bourina (6).²⁴ Regardless of whether Bourina is identical with the spring of the *thalysia*, both are to be understood as images of bucolic inspiration, linking a bucolic origin-story retrojected deep into the Coan mythical past with the 'present-day' pastoral paradise at the end of the poem.²⁵ Theocritus emphasizes the thematic link between the two bucolic springs and the *locus amoena* in which they are found by repeating the same expression in his description of both. The phrase αἴγριοι πετέλαι τε (poplars and elms) occurs twice in *Idyll* 7, lines 8 and 136, once in the description of Bourina, and later in the description of the *thalysia*. As Spanoudakis has noted, 'the phrase is unHomeric and unique in Hellenistic poetry, in a way paralleled only in Call. *h. Dem.* 27...and 37...in the description of Demeter's grove.'²⁶ The repeated description identifies the astonishing *locus amoenus* at the end of *Idyll* 7 with a metaphor of bucolic origins in the creation of Bourina by Chalcon, who is himself related to the hosts of the *thalysia*. In doing so, Theocritus is making space for Demeter in the bucolic pantheon, just as he does in *Idyll* 1 for Aphrodite and Dionysus.

²² Richardson 1974: 181.

²³ Sherwin-White 1978: 305. Demeter also rests by a well in the *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 99, where she meets the daughters of Celeos.

²⁴ Arnott and Puelma suggested that the spring in the *locus amoenus* at the *thalysia* is Bourina itself, the image of bucolic inspiration at the beginning of the *Idyll* (Arnott 1979: 104; Puelma 1960: 162-63 with n. 58). Others argue forcefully that Bourina is identical with modern Vourina, a spring 5 km southwest of the modern town of Cos. E.g. Hunter 1999: 154; Zanker 1980: 375-77 (with a review of previous arguments); Gow 1952: vol. 2 133.

²⁵ Cf. Hunter 1999: 191-92.

²⁶ Spanoudakis 2002: 246. See also Bowie 1985: 79 n. 53; cf. Puelma 1960: 162 n. 58.

C. Literature

Idyll 7 is partly an account of Demeter's role in Coan culture, as is clear from this account of the goddess' links to the island's genealogy and cult. But Demeter also famously figured in the literary life of the island in the generation before Theocritus, in the elegiac *Demeter* of Philitas. That poet's widespread influence on Theocritus and other Hellenistic poets, as well as his Coan provenance, helps to account for the flattering reference to him at 7.40, where Simichidas claims (perhaps ironically) to be his poetic inferior. Philitas is of importance to *Idyll* 7 not only because of his influence and his connection to Cos, but because his famous elegy *Demeter* probably treated the goddess' advent in and connection to Cos.²⁷ Although it is not possible to know the full extent to which *Idyll* 7 alludes to Philitas' *Demeter*, it is very plausible that the description of Bourina does so;²⁸ Bourina is mentioned by name in Philitas fr. 6 (Spanoudakis). It is plausible, as well, that other portions of the *Idyll* allude to the *Demeter*, although most such connections must remain speculative.²⁹ Besides demonstrating Demeter's connection to the mythic past of Cos, then, it seems that Theocritus is also at pains in *Idyll* 7 to demonstrate his awareness of the goddess' role in near-contemporary Coan poetry.

II. Demeter as Poetic Exemplar

A second major function of Demeter in *Idyll* 7 is to act as an emblem of poetic inspiration, which relates the poem to both contemporary Callimachean discourse and the archaic iambic tradition.

A. Callimachean Aesthetic Discourse

In the same era as Theocritus, Callimachus utilizes Demeter as a symbol of appropriate poetic inspiration and style. Most famously, Callimachus appears to hold up the elegiac *Demeter* of Philitas in his prologue to the *Aetia* as an exemplar of short, well-crafted verse (fr. 1.9-12).³⁰ It is no

²⁷ Spanoudakis 2002: 225-26. Note however that there is vigorous debate over the number of fragments that should be assigned to the *Demeter*. See Sens, A. 2003. Review of Spanoudakis (2002). *BMCR* 2003.02.38: <http://www.ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2003-02-38.html>.

²⁸ Spanoudakis 2002: 144-50.

²⁹ See e.g. Bowie 1985; Spanoudakis 2002: 244-73.

doubt significant to the interpretation of *Idyll* 7 that Philitas' *Demeter* could be held up as a model of Callimachean style.³¹ That Theocritus was aware of such metapoetic overtones is clear from the famous lines spoken by Lycidas (7.45-48):

ὥς μοι καὶ τέκτων μέγ' ἀπέχθεται ὅστις ἐρευνῇ
 ἶσον ὄρευσ κορυφᾷ τελέσαι δόμον Ὀρομέδοντος,
 καὶ Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χίον αἰοιδὸν
 ἀντία κοκκύζοντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι.

Much I hate that builder who strives to make his house as tall as the peak of Mount Oromedon, and however many birds of the Muses who, crowing against the Chian bard, labor in vain.

As Hunter notes, these lines, warning against direct competition with Homer, have 'obvious points of contact with Callimachean aesthetics,'³² especially as exemplified in the *Aetia* prologue, which affirms a dedication to brief, well-crafted verse instead of continuous epic. Lycidas reinforces his Callimacheanism a moment later, when he emphasizes the high level of polish that went into composing his verses (ἐξεπόνασα, 7. 51).

Such metapoetic statements in *Idyll* 7 may be in direct response to Callimachus, or they may reflect the aesthetic debates of the time more generally.³³ If it is the case that the *Aetia* prologue appeared prior to *Idyll* 7, then it may be significant that Lycidas' name itself has Apolline connotations,³⁴ since it is Lycian Apollo who admonishes Callimachus to cultivate a slender muse in the *Aetia* prologue (fr. 1.22-24). In this light, Demeter begins to take on contemporary metapoetic connotations. Since Callimachus uses the *Demeter* of Philitas as an emblem of short, well-crafted verse, and since Theocritus invokes Philitas by name (7.40) and uses language from contemporary aesthetic debates in *Idyll* 7, his own invocation of Demeter may have similar metapoetic connotations. In particular, Demeter may be understood to be a source of the short, well-

³⁰ Harder 2012: vol. 1 31; vol. 2 10-11, 32-44.

³¹ On the connections between Philitas and Callimachus, see Spanoudakis 2002: 42-46.

³² Hunter 1999: 165. See also Spanoudakis 2002: 42.

³³ Hunter 1999: 3, with n. 8; 164-66.

³⁴ See Williams 1971: esp. 138-39, 144-45, who argues that Lycidas is an epiphany of Apollo. For other ways that Lycidas evokes Apollo, see Williams 1971 and Hunter 1999: 148-49.

crafted verse typified by the bucolics. It is no accident, therefore, that the splendid *locus amoenus* at the end of *Idyll* 7 (128-57) situates Demeter in the midst of an apparent image of poetic inspiration: her grove is a surreal bucolic paradise, replete with Nymphs, a flowing spring, abundant flora, and humming fauna.³⁵

Idyll 7 and the *Aetia* prologue are not the only places in contemporary poetry that Demeter becomes a symbol of poetry or poetic inspiration. Jackie Murray, building on the ideas of Carl Müller, has discussed Callimachus' use of the goddess as a symbol of his new aesthetic in his Doric-dialect *Hymn to Demeter*, noting thematic connections between the *Hymn*, the *Aetia* prologue and the *Demeter* of Philitas.³⁶ Some verbal echoes between Demeter's grove in Callimachus' *Hymn* and *Idyll* 7 have already been mentioned.³⁷ Demeter's ability to inspire poetry is on clear display in *Idyll* 10 of Theocritus, as well, where the reaper Milo sings a hymn to Demeter in response to the love-song of Bucaeus. The song of Milo, as is fitting for a hymn in honor of Demeter, is a didactic work-song, about the details of field-work and how the worker should behave. After he's finished, Milo makes his intended audience clear with this hectoring declaration: ταῦτα χρὴ μοχθεῦντας ἐν ἀλίῳ ἄνδρας αἰεῖδεν ('This is what men laboring in the sun should sing', 56). Although Milo insists upon a special connection between Demeter and agricultural work-song in particular, the goddess' centrality to *Idyll* 7 and her metapoetic importance in Callimachus suggest that Theocritus and his contemporaries associated her with poetic inspiration more broadly.

B. The Iambic Tradition

Certain details of *Idyll* 7 suggest that Theocritus invokes Demeter, at least in part, as a way of drawing connections between his new bucolic mode and other, established poetic genres. Here I will focus especially on the iambic aspects of *Idyll* 7.³⁸ Just as Dionysiac imagery in *Idylls* 1 and 7 suggests a link between drama and bucolic,³⁹ Demeter's centrality

³⁵ Hunter 1999: 191-93 discusses how the 'pleasance' and complex artifice of this scene, including 'images for poetic creation,' foster a sense of its paradigmatic status for bucolic poetry.

³⁶ Murray 2004: 212-16, esp. 212-13; Müller 1987: 27-45.

³⁷ Under Cult, p. 237 above.

³⁸ Generic experimentation was characteristic of Hellenistic poets: Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 17-41.

³⁹ Hunter 1999: 61-62, 198, and above, under 'Demeter and the Bucolic Pantheon,' 4, 6.

to the programmatic seventh *Idyll* suggests an affinity between bucolic and iambic. Before delving into the iambic elements of *Idyll* 7 and bucolic, it will be helpful to review Demeter's association with iambic.

The *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* probably offers an aitiology of the use of *aischrologia* in Demeter's Eleusinian rites.⁴⁰ At this point in the hymn, Demeter has been wandering the earth disguised as an old woman and grieving for Core, when she encounters the daughters of King Celeus of Eleusis. She returns with the girls to the palace of Celeus, but refuses to sit down or eat. She sits down only when offered a stool by Iambe (196), the eponymous founder of iambic poetry. Demeter still refuses to break her fast, until Iambe makes her laugh and cajoles her into eating (200–205):

ἀλλ' ἀγέλαστος ἄπαστος ἐδητύος ἡδὲ ποτῆτος
ἦστο πόθῳ μινύθουσα βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρός,
πρίν γ' ὅτε δὴ χλεύης μιν Ἰάμβη κέδν' εἰδυῖα
πολλὰ παρασκώπτουσ' ἐτρέψατο πότνια γέννην
μειδῆσαι γελάσαι τε καὶ ἴλαον σχεῖν θυμόν·
ἦ δὴ οἱ καὶ ἔπειτα μεθύστερον εὖαδεν ὀργαῖς.

But [Demeter], un-laughing, abstaining from food and drink, sat withering with longing for her deep-belted daughter, until considerate Iambe with many a mocking joke caused the holy mistress to smile and laugh and have a cheerful heart. And [Iambe] from that point onwards has pleased her in her spirit.

Iambe's jesting is responsible for Demeter's change of mood. Line 205, moreover, emphasizes the ongoing importance of Iambe to Demeter, highlighting the lasting relationship between the two. Their continuing connection points to the enduring importance of iambic poetry to Demeter's rites.⁴¹ While 'too heavy an emphasis on origins risks obscuring the diversity and flexibility of [iambic poetry] in its historical forms,' the ritual use of the genre does help explain its invective element.⁴²

⁴⁰ Richardson 1974: 213–17; Brown 1997: 16–21 (with qualifications, 18), 40–42; Rotstein 2010: 171–76, 281. Brown 1997: 45–46 details connections between Archilochus' family and Demeter cult. See also Rotstein 2016: 103.

⁴¹ Richardson 1974: 223.

⁴² Carey 2009: 151.

The *Homeric Hymn* connects Demeter and Iambe, regardless of whether that connection reflects the actual historical development of iambic poetry.⁴³ It is this perceived link between Demeter-cult and iambic that will be helpful to the interpretation of *Idyll* 7.

The seventh *Idyll* intersects with iambic poetry both thematically and by means of specific allusions to archaic iambographers; these connections, in addition to the overriding presence of Demeter in the poem, point to the thematic similarities between the bucolic and the iambic realms. The importance of invective poetry as a model for *Idyll* 7 is most apparent in the song of Simichidas, which alludes twice to archaic iambic poets.⁴⁴ In the first instance, Pan is offered a choice: either he may assent to the prayers of Simichidas and bestow a boy named Philinus upon Aratus or else he will suffer (106-114):

κεί μὲν ταῦτ' ἔρδοις, ὦ Πᾶν φίλε, μήτι τυ παῖδες
 Ἀρκαδικοὶ σκίλλαισιν ὑπὸ πλευράς τε καὶ ὤμους
 τανίκα μαστίζοιεν, ὅτε κρέα τυτθὰ παρείη·
 εἰ δ' ἄλλως νεύσαις, κατὰ μὲν χροά πάντ' ὀνύχεσσι
 δακνόμενος κνάσαιο καὶ ἐν κνίδαισι καθεύδοις·
 εἷς δ' Ἡδωνῶν μὲν ἐν ὥρεσι χεῖματι μέσσω
 Ἔβρον παρ ποταμὸν τετραμμένος ἐγγύθεν Ἄρκτω,
 ἐν δὲ θέρει πυμάτοισι παρ' Αἰθιόπεσσι νομεύοις
 πέτρα ὑπο Βλεμύων, ὅθεν οὐκέτι Νεῖλος ὁρατός.

And if you should do this, my dear Pan, may Arcadian boys not flog you on your flanks and shoulders when there's little game. But if you should refuse, may you be bitten and scrape all your skin with your nails and may you sleep in nettles. May you be driven to the Edonian mountains in the middle of the winter, by the river Hebrus near the Arctic, and in summer may you herd your flocks amongst the furthest Ethiopians, beneath the Blemian rock, where the Nile disappears.

⁴³ Rotstein 2016: 111. For a similar *aition*, but set in Syracuse, see Diodorus 5.3.4.

⁴⁴ The influence of iambic poetry upon the song of Simichidas has been discussed before, though its implications for the role of Demeter in *Idyll* 7 have never been investigated, as far as I know. See Henrichs 1980: 26-27 and Hunter 1996: 24-25 for detailed analyses of Simichidas' allusions to Hipponax and Archilochus. Krevans 1983: 212, 217-18 and Hunter 2003: 227-29 point out that Simichidas' engagement with iambic poets sets his song in stylistic opposition to that of Lycidas.

These lines draw inspiration from a fragment of the iambic poet Hipponax (6 W):⁴⁵

βάλλοντες ἐν χειμῶνι καὶ ῥαπίζοντες
κράδησι καὶ σκίλλησιν ὥσπερ φαρμακόν.

throwing him out in winter and flogging him with fig-branches
and squills like a scape-goat.

Theocritus elaborates at length themes which are already present in Hipponax' two lines. In both poems ritual flagellation with squills is threatened.⁴⁶ Such treatment is the fate of the *pharmakos*, as the Hipponax fragment explicitly states; the offending creature is beaten and driven out in harsh weather (χειμῶνι).⁴⁷ Simichidas menaces Pan with the very same fate, envisioning the god himself as a scapegoat, which is appropriate to the bucolic context of Simichidas' song. The Arcadian boys whip Pan as a *pharmakos* when he does not provide enough meat from the hunt.⁴⁸ When they drive him away, they also drive away the famine. Simichidas likewise treats Pan as a source of metaphorical famine: if he will not grant Aratus what he lacks, namely, Philinus, he will be driven to the ends of the earth.⁴⁹

The conclusion to Simichidas' song alludes to iambic invective as well. By this point the rhetoric of Simichidas' song has changed. No longer does the singer urge Pan and the Loves to put Philinus in the arms of Aratus. Instead, Simichidas now attempts to dissuade Aratus from loving Philinus in the first place (120-25):

καὶ δὴ μὰν ἀπίοιο πεπαίτερος, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες,
'αἰαῖ', φαντί, 'Φιλῖνε, τό τοι καλὸν ἄνθος ἀπορρεῖ.'
μηκέτι τοι φρουρέωμες ἐπὶ προθύροισιν, Ἄρατε,
μηδὲ πόδας τριβώμες· ὁ δ' ὄρθριος ἄλλον ἀλέκτωρ

⁴⁵ See also Gow 1952: vol. 2 158; Henrichs 1980: 26-27; Hunter 1996: 24-25.

⁴⁶ On which see Hunter 1999: 83-84. Hipponax 6 W is one of many instances in that poet's corpus that treats or mentions the *pharmakos* (5-10 W, 92 W, 104 W, 118 W, 128 W, and 152-53 W). On fr. 118 and 128, see Faraone 2004: 209-31.

⁴⁷ Cf. Henrichs 1980: 26-27.

⁴⁸ Hunter 1999: 84.

⁴⁹ On the *pharmakos* as a source of plague or hunger, see Steiner 2009: 80; Faraone 2004: 209-31; Burkert 1979: 65.

κοκκύσδων νάρκαισιν ἀνιαραῖσι διδοίη·
εἷς δ' ἀπὸ τᾶσδε, φέριστε, Μόλων ἄγχοιτο παλαίστρας.

And indeed he is riper than a pear, and the women all say, 'Alas, Philinus, the flower of your beauty loses its petals.'⁵⁰ Let us no longer stand guard upon his porch, Aratus, nor wear down our feet. Let the early-crowing cock give another to benumbed grief. Let Molon, my friend, get choked out of this wrestling match by himself.

Since Philinus is no longer beautiful, he is not worth the pain of repeated *paraklausithyra*. Aratus should not bother competing for his affection, but should leave him to Molon, apparently a competitor in love. The model for these lines is Archilochus' 'Cologne Epode,' 196a W (SLG 478.24-31):⁵¹

Νεοβούλη[
ἄ]λλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω·
αἰαῖ πέπειρα δ.[
ἄν]θος δ' ἀπερρύηκε παρθενήιον
κ]αὶ χάρις ἦ πρὶν ἐπῆν·
κόρον γὰρ οὐκ[
..]ης δὲ μέτρ' ἔφηνε μαινόλις γυνή·
ἐς] κόρακας ἄπεχε·

Let some other man have Neoboule; **alas, she is all too ripe...** her **maiden's bloom has lost its petals**; gone is the charm she once had. She can't get enough...a crazy woman. No thanks—let her go to the crows! (trans. Hunter 1999: 188)

In both passages, a potential beloved is attacked and cast off because the prime of youth is past, and in each case the speaker suggests that it would be better to let someone else have them.

⁵⁰ Here I follow Hunter's translation of Archilochus' ἄν]θος δ' ἀπερρύηκε (Hunter 1999: 188; 'Cologne Epode' 27).

⁵¹ Henrichs 1980: 7-27 (esp. 20-27) discusses Theocritus' allusion to the 'Cologne Epode' in detail. See also Hunter 1996: 24-25.

The rest of Simichidas' song may also owe something of its tone and theme to iambic poetry, which from the time of Archilochus has an acute awareness of bodily and sexual functions and incorporates details from everyday life.⁵² While Simichidas' song is not sexually obscene, it is frankly physical, especially in its depiction of the effects of *eros*. The pain of love is mapped onto the body-emotional pain becomes physical pain. Aratus' longing is lodged in his guts (99); it burns in his bones (102). Simichidas asks that the boy be 'pressed into Aratus' hands' (104); if Pan will do him this favor, Simichidas prays that the boys no longer 'whip him on his ribs and shoulders' (107-108): the abatement of Aratus' love will bring freedom from physical pain; if Pan will not grant this wish, Simichidas prays that he 'bite his cheeks with his nails' (109-10) and endure punishing weather (111-14). As Hunter notes about the god's treatment, 'the torments with which Pan is threatened are a wildly exaggerated version of the sufferings of the lover who endures sleepless nights of cold outside the beloved's door (122-24) and emotional anguish on par with 'sleeping on nettles.'⁵³ Simichidas prays to the Loves that they 'shoot' Philinus (118-19), another image of longing as a tangible infliction. The consequence of night vigils at doorframes is that they 'wear out' the feet (123); the cock inflicts 'numbing pain' on the door-watchers (124); love is a wrestling match (125).

The way in which Simichidas conceives of and depicts *eros* may have its foundation in Archilochean poetics. Lesky notes:

a theme becomes prominent in Archilochus which remains dominant in erotic poetry until the end of antiquity: that love is not a blessing to man, but a passion that seizes upon him with the violence of a dangerous disease. It crawls into the heart [ὑπὸ καρδίην], blinds the eyes, takes away the understanding (112 D [191 W]); its piercing anguish strikes to the very marrow [δι' ὀστέων] (104 D [193 W]); it looses the limbs (118 D [196 W]).⁵⁴

⁵² See Hawkins 2016; Carey 2009: 150; West 1974: 25-28, esp. 26. Simichidas' song is full of body parts and bodily functions, and it stays closer to the quotidian than does Lycidas'. Simichidas ends his poem, for instance, with the images drawn from the mundane: the porch at which Aratus sits (122); a crowing cock (123-24); a *palaistra* (125); a spitting crone (126-27).

⁵³ Hunter 1999: 184.

⁵⁴ Lesky 1996: 112. On the role of *eros* in iambic poetry, see also West 1974: 25-28 and Carey 2009: 150. On Archilochus and the body, see Hawkins 2016.

Compare the language of the fragments mentioned by Lesky to the language used by Simichidas: longing for Philinus seizes Aratus in his guts: ὑπὸ σπλάγχχνοισιν (99); love burns in his bones: ὑπ' ὀστέον (102). Simichidas follows Archilochus in depicting love as a physically destructive force that disrupts the body and mind like a disease. The physical pains which Simichidas so vividly catalogues result from erotic longing. To the torture of unfulfilled love, Simichidas explicitly opposes mental peace, *hasychia* (126). Simichidas' song, in the Archilochean tradition, depicts love as a violent mental and physical trauma.⁵⁵

Simichidas is not the only one to employ rhetoric familiar from the iambographers. When the narrator first encounters Lycidas, he is met by some startling jibes. Lycidas accosts Simichidas (19-23) and accuses him of going to a party uninvited (24-26):

ἧ μετὰ δαῖτ' ἄκλητος ἐπείγεται, ἧ τινοσ ἀστῶν
λανὸν ἔπι θρώσκει; ὥς τοι ποσὶ νισσομένοιο
πᾶσα λίθος πταίοισα ποτ' ἀρβυλίδεσσιν αἰεῖδει.

Are you hustling uninvited to a meal? Or do you pounce uninvited
on the wine vat of some townsman? How every stone sings as it
trips off your boots as you go!

This initial outburst of jesting hostility has been noted by scholars.⁵⁶ Of course, such a tone is not intrinsically at odds with the bucolic framework of *Idyll* 7. Bucolic poetry is by nature agonistic, focused as it is upon competitive—if often friendly—song exchange.

A closer reading of these verses, however, reveals their debt to the iambographers. In lines 24-26, when the goatherd mockingly impugns Simichidas' character, he is suggesting that the latter may be a parasite.⁵⁷ The issue of uncontrolled appetite comes up frequently in iambic poetry.⁵⁸ Archilochus 124b W is an attack on the parasite Pericles and uses vocabulary similar to that of *Idyll* 7:

⁵⁵ For a different focus on *eros* in Archilochus, see Swift 2016.

⁵⁶ See e.g. Hunter 1999: 147-48.

⁵⁷ Hunter 1999: 159.

⁵⁸ Steiner 2009: 95 cites several examples, including 124 W and others mentioned here.

πολλὸν δὲ πίνων καὶ χαλίκρητον μέθυ,
οὔτε τίμον εἰσενείκας <—υ—x—υ—>
οὐδὲ μὲν κληθεὶς <υ—x> ἤλθες οἷα δὴ φίλος,
ἀλλὰ σεο γαστῆρ νόον τε καὶ φρένας παρήγαγεν
εἰς ἀναιδείην.

Despite drinking a lot of unmixed wine, you did not pay for your share...nor as an invited guest... did you come like a friend, but your belly misled your mind and wits into shamelessness.

Pericles is not merely frivolous and a drinker, he is shameful and disruptive of the social order. Lycidas also accuses Simichidas of showing up uninvited to get drunk. While the tone is clearly more lighthearted than the Archilochus fragment, the suggestion of a serious charge lurks beneath Lycidas' joke. He insinuates that Simichidas is a shameful, disruptive, parasite.

Apart from 124 W, Archilochus attacks a glutton in 167 W, and inappropriate, socially destructive appetite is an issue in the fable of the Fox and the Eagle (172-81 W). Hipponax attacks gluttons on several occasions (26-26a W, 118 W, 126 W). The most telling comparison is with Hipponax 118 W, where Sannus, a sacrilegious parasite, is punished for his gluttony.⁵⁹ Simichidas understands the social and religious implications of the iambic attacks at the start of *Idyll* 7. After Lycidas accuses Simichidas of parasitism, the latter pointedly counters that he is not a frivolous, socially disruptive wine-moocher; in fact, he is on his way to the *thalysia* (31-34):

ἀ δ' ὁδὸς ἄδε θαλυσίας· ἥ γὰρ ἐταῖροι
ἀνέρες εὐπέπλω Δαμάτερι δαῖτα τελεῦντι
ὄλβω ἀπαρχόμενοι· μάλα γάρ σφισι πίονι μέτρῳ
ἀ δαίμων εὐκριθὼν ἀνεπλήρωσεν ἁλῶν.

But this is the road to the *thalysia*; for my good friends are feasting broad-belted Demeter, giving first-fruits. For indeed, that spirit has filled their rich threshing-floor with a fat measure of barley.

⁵⁹ Steiner 2009: 80 discusses Sannus' gluttony and its sacrilegious implications. See also Faraone 2004: 224-31, who compares Sannus to Erysichthon from Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter*.

Simichidas expressly credits Demeter with the rich harvest reaped by his hosts, giving the impression that they have been well favored by the goddess, and are thus duly pious men. In sum, Lycidas, in an abrasively jesting tone, opens by suggesting that Simichidas is a parasite, a charge that carries generic and ethical connotations. Parasitism is pilloried in the poems of Archilochus and Hipponax, and is associated with sacrilege by the latter. Simichidas counters the accusation of irreligious gluttony by asserting just the opposite, that he is not a parasite. On the contrary, he is going to attend a first-fruits offering at the home of men to whom he bears close ties, his *hetairoi* (31).⁶⁰

Both Lycidas and Simichidas, then, use imagery and language freighted with iambic connotations. Lycidas accuses the narrator of *Idyll* 7 of being a parasite—a frequent charge of the archaic iambographers. Large portions of Simichidas' song pivot about two allusions to iambic poets: one to Hipponax, one to Archilochus. His tone, imagery, and subject matter, moreover, would fit well in the world of the iambographers: Simichidas attacks Pan and Philinus, uses harsh, physical imagery drawn from the real world, and treats love like an insufferable disease, much like Archilochus. These instances of iambic influence help tie the body of *Idyll* 7 (the encounter and song-exchange) to the exterior frame. Both Lycidas and Simichidas employ iambically-tinged language on the feast-day of Demeter, in whose cult iambic poetry was believed to have originated and where it was of continuing importance. The hosts of the *thalysia*, moreover, had a close connection to Demeter and supposedly initiated her worship on Cos. Since the narrator of *Idyll* 7 is on his way to worship Demeter at the home of Phrasidamus and Antigenes, whose family founded her cult, it is fitting that Lycidas and Simichidas should employ language drawn from a genre with ritual connotations for the goddess.

It is worth noting that Theocritus was not the only poet working in Alexandria under Ptolemy II Philadelphus to emphasize Demeter's connection to Iambe, and therefore *aischrologia*, invective, and iambic poetry. Philicus, a near contemporary of Theocritus active in the court at Alexandria, also took up this theme in his adaptation of the events of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.⁶¹ In Philicus' own *Hymn to Demeter* (frr.

⁶⁰ See also Hunter 1999: 160.

⁶¹ For Philicus' dates, see Bowie 2015: 88; Giuseppetti 2012: 117; Furley 2009: 496.

676-80 *SH* = fr. 1-5 Provenziale), Iambe accosts a group of women who are honoring Demeter (fr. 680 *SH* = fr. 5 Provenziale).⁶²

τὴν δὲ γεραῖαν παρ[άπ]λαγ[τον] μὲν ὀρείοις Ἀ[λ]ιμοῦς ἦθεσι, και-
ρίαν δέ,
ἔκ τινος ἔστειλε τύχ[ης]· τοῖσι δὲ] σεμνοῖς ὁ γελοῖος λόγος ἄρ'
ἀκερδῆ[ς]; (55)
στάσα γὰρ ἐφθέγγατ' [ἄφαρ θα]ρσαλέον καὶ μέγα· μὴ βάλλετε
χόρτον αἰγῶν,
οὐ τόδε πεινῶντι θεῷ [φάρ]μακον, ἀλλ' ἀμβροσία γαστρὸς ἔρρισμα
λεπτῆς.
καὶ σὺ δὲ τῆς Ἀτθίδος, ὦ δα[ί]μον, Ἰάμβης ἐπάκουσον βραχύ μου
τι κέρδος·
εἰμὶ δ' ἀπαιδέυτα χέα[σ' ὡς ἄ]ν ἀποικοῦσα λάλος δημότις· αἰ
θεαὶ μὲν
αἰδεθε [...] σοὶ κύλικας κα[ὶ] τελ]έσαι στέμματα καὶ [β]απτὸν
ῥῶδω[ρ] ἐν ὑγρῷ, (60)
ἐγ δὲ γυναικῶν π[έ]λεται, ἦν, βοτάνη δῶρον, ὀκνηρᾶς ἐλάφου δί-
αιτα,
οὐθὲν ἐμοὶ τῶνδε [μέτεστιν] γέρας. ἀλλ' εἰ χαλά[σ]ε[ις] π[έ]νθος,
ἐγὼ δὲ λύσω...(62)

But Halimous despatched the old woman [Iambe], who had lost her way in the mountain haunts, but arrived at a good time as a result of some chance: for solemn occasions can an amusing tale be unprofitable? For she stood and uttered at once in a bold, loud voice: 'Do not throw goat-fodder: it is not this that is [a remedy] for a starving god, but ambrosia is the support for such a delicate stomach. But you, divine one, should give ear to Attic Iambe's little benefit; I am one who has poured out unschooled words, as well might a chatterer living in a distant deme: these goddesses here [] for you cups and garlands and water drawn in a fresh stream; and from the women, look!, there is grass as a gift, a timorous deer's diet. None of these things do I have for my gift: but if you loosen up your grieving, then I shall release... (trans. Bowie 2015: 95, with formatting changes)

⁶² I follow the text of Bowie 2015, who follows *SH* with modifications by Furley 2009.

Iambe's irreverent and dismissive tone here is clearly intended to remind the reader of her association with *aischrologia* and iambic poetry. The papyrus breaks off at line 62, but what follows probably also played off Iambe's associations with *aischrologia* and iambic.⁶³ Beyond invoking these connections, there are a number of other striking parallels between Philicus' *Hymn to Demeter* and *Idyll* 7. Both poems, for instance, link Demeter to springs (*SH* fr. 680.41: βασιλεια κρήνη; *Id.* 7.6, 136). In addition, the song exchange of Lycidas and Simichidas in *Idyll* 7 takes place outside the city in a rustic setting, and the actual or ostensible connection of both poets to the pastoral world is a prominent feature (*Id.* 7.13-19, 36, 51, 92). Philicus also highlights Iambe's distance from the city and notes that she has been lost in the mountains (54, 59). But perhaps most strikingly, Philicus focuses upon the power of Iambe (and iambic poetry by extension) to profit her audience, even in solemn circumstances (ἀκερδή[ς, 55; 58, κέρδος). This profit seems to relate to the abatement of grief (62). In *Idyll* 7, Simichidas also speaks of poetic exchange as a means of potential profit (7.36, τάχ' ὅτερος ἄλλον ὀνασεῖ), and his song will make reference to the iambic tradition. As I will argue below, the profit of which Simichidas speaks is, at least in part, the power of poetry in general and iambic in particular to relieve suffering. It is with Demeter's role as a symbol of poetic relief that I wish to conclude.

Conclusion

To this point, I have suggested a number of roles for Demeter in *Idyll* 7, important not only to that poem but to bucolic as a genre. Demeter is connected to the local legend and cult of Cos, where *Idyll* 7 is set. Moreover, Demeter is a metapoetic symbol, relating bucolic to contemporary, Alexandrian aesthetic debates and to the archaic iambic mode. I want to conclude by dwelling a moment more on Demeter's role in *Idyll* 7 as a symbol of the relief associated with poetic production. Demeter's suffering during the search for Core is famous, and it is in connection with that search that iambic poetry finds its mythical *aition*. Demeter may be seen in *Idyll* 7, therefore, to evoke not only suffering, but poetry as a remedy to suffering.

⁶³ On *aischrologia*, iambic, and Iambe in this poem, see Bowie 2015: 96; Giuseppetti 2012: 120-24; Provenza 2009: 114-17.

Demeter's presence in the frame of *Idyll* 7 provides an appropriate context for the song exchange of Lycidas and Simichidas on the topic of suffering and its alleviation. Lycidas and Simichidas both sing about coping with *pothos*. It has long been recognized that the songs of Lycidas and Simichidas constitute a dialogue on different approaches to longing.⁶⁴ The attitudes of the two men about love have been debated, but whether one believes that Lycidas is a sage and Simichidas a violent fool, or that Simichidas is reasoned and practical in his approach to love, while Lycidas is consumed by emotion,⁶⁵ it is clear that *Idyll* 7 engages in a dialogue about longing and relief. Simichidas, for instance, appears to intend his song as a cure for the longing of Aratus, its addressee. It is *pothos* for an unresponsive lover that grips the guts of Aratus: παῖδός ὑπὸ σπλάγχνοισιν ἔχει πόθον ('he has *pothos* for a boy in his guts,' 7.99). The goal of Simichidas' song is to end the *pothos* of Aratus in any way he is able, whether that means getting his beloved Philinus or another boy to love him (105), or diverting Aratus from love altogether (120-27). *Pothos*, as Simichidas so vividly demonstrates, is painful, so it is better to seek *hasychia* (126).

The story of Iambe and Demeter suggests that poetry itself can cure *pothos*. In the passage of the *Homeric Hymn* quoted above (200-205, in the section on 'Iambic Tradition'), Iambe is able, by means of her jesting, to cheer Demeter up during her search for Core. The vocabulary used here is striking: Demeter struggles with *pothos* when Iambe cheers her up, just as Simichidas attempts to alleviate the *pothos* of Aratus with his song. Iambic poetry is clearly envisioned here as a means of relieving pain and restoring mental balance.

Andrea Rotstein has discussed Iambe's role in the *Homeric Hymn* and concludes that her main function is to cheer Demeter. On this basis, Rotstein draws more general conclusions about the purpose of archaic iambic poetry.

For no matter how we understand Iambe (either belonging to myth and ritual or as a literary personification) [and] her actions (as jests with no target, as abuse directed at Demeter, or as an allusion to epideictic obscenity)...one aspect remains stable. This

⁶⁴ See e.g. Gutzwiller 1991: 167; Segal 1981: 138; Ott 1969: 149-59, esp. 154; Lawall 1967: 100.

⁶⁵ See e.g. Berger 1984: 23, 30, 32; Serrao 1971: 61, 67.

is the specific effect that Iambe's jests and mockery...have on Demeter. They make her laugh, they cheer her up, they mitigate her pain. After Iambe's intervention Demeter is willing to have something to drink...Laughter, a good mood, and a disposition to share food, drink, and conversation, were perhaps the expected effects of *iamboi* upon their audience.⁶⁶

If one function of iambic poetry is to prepare the audience to be good hosts and guests, then the iambic elements of Simichidas' song certainly seem to bring about the intended result. At their initial encounter, Lycidas had accused Simichidas of being an unwelcome guest, a parasite, an accusation made frequently by the archaic iambographers (7.21-26). But Simichidas' song proves that the very opposite is true. By imitating iambic poetry, Simichidas has in fact provided the necessary precondition to the harvest festival of Phrasidamus and Antigenes. The iambic elements of the second song alleviate *pothos* (for Aratus, Lycidas, and, indeed, Demeter), enabling the symbolic fast to be broken at the *thalysia*.

It is fitting, then, that after concluding his song, Simichidas is treated to the full richness of Demeter's harvest festival, over which the laughing image of the goddess presides (131-57).⁶⁷ She has been cheered by Simichidas and is fruitful. By associating his own, novel poetic creation with Demeter and iambic poetry, Theocritus tells us something about the power of bucolic song-exchange: it has the ability to relieve suffering.⁶⁸ *Idyll* 7 replicates the dynamic familiar from the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, where Iambe charms Demeter out of *pothos* by means of *aischrologia*. Simichidas attempts to do the same for Aratus, singing a song including iambic imagery and allusions to break the spell of his friend's love-

⁶⁶ Rotstein 2010: 182. Even the extremely crude poems of Hipponax foster social cohesion in their audience (Ormand 2015: 62). Although modern commentators sometimes say that Hipponax does not aim at larger social purposes in his poetry (e.g. Brown 1997: 42, 87), Theocritus, at least, found both Hipponax and Archilochus to be respectable and edifying. This is clear from Theocritus' *Epigr.* 19 and 21, respectively. *Epigr.* 19 explicitly forbids scoundrels from approaching Hipponax' grave. Both poems are positive in their depictions of the iambographers (Rosen 2007: 469-70). See also Lavigne 2016: 78-79 on *Epigr.* 21.

⁶⁷ Brown 1997: 20 notes that Demeter's smile following Iambe's jests in the *Homeric Hymn* (204) signifies her positive disposition.

⁶⁸ *Idyll* 10 further supports the connection between Demeter and poetic relief from *pothos*. There, Bucaeus cannot reap effectively because of *pothos* (8). Milo rejects *pothos* (9) and rebuts Bucaeus' song of longing with a hymn to Demeter. Poetry as a remedy also occurs at *Idyll* 11.1-4, 80-1.

longing. His song for Aratus serves, moreover, as a response to Lycidas' own attempt to sing about erotic longing. The mysteriously laughing icon of Demeter, surrounded by the yield of a good harvest and the full flower of nature's abundance, should now appear in a new light. It is the image of a satisfied goddess, as gladdened by the *aischrologia* of Simichidas on her festival day as she was when Iambe first cheered her up in the *Homeric Hymn*.

References

- Arnott, W. G. 1979. 'The Mound of Brasilas in Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*.' *QUCC* 32: 99-106.
- Berg, W. 1974. *Early Virgil*. London.
- Berger, H. 1984. 'The Origins of Bucolic Representation: Disenchantment and Revision in Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*.' *ClAnt* 3: 1-39.
- Bowie, E. L. 1985. 'Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*, Philetas and Longus.' *CQ* 35: 67-91.
- Bowie, E. L. 2015. 'Time and Place, Narrative and Speech in Philicus, Philodamus and Limenius.' In A. Faulkner and O. Hodgkinson, eds., *Hymnic Narrative and the Narratology of Greek Hymns*. Leiden. 87-118.
- Brown, C. G. 1997. 'Iambos.' In D. E. Gerber, ed., *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Leiden. 13-88.
- Burkert, W. 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Cairns, F. 1970. 'Theocritus' *Idyll* 10.' *Hermes* 98.1: 38-44.
- Carey, C. 2009. 'Iambos.' In F. Budelmann, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Cambridge. 149-67.
- Fantuzzi, M., and R. Hunter. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Faraone, C. 2004. 'Hipponax Fragment 128W: Epic Parody or Expulsive Incantation?' *ClAnt* 23: 209-45.
- Furley, W. D. 2009. 'Philikos' Hymn to Demeter.' *Paideia* 64: 483-507.
- Giuseppetti, M. 2012. 'Two Poets for a Goddess: Callimachus' and Philicus' Hymns to Demeter.' In M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker, eds., *Gods and Religion in Hellenistic Poetry*. Leuven. 103-129.
- Gow, A. S. F., ed. 1952. *Theocritus*. Vols. 1-2. Cambridge.
- Gutzwiller, K. 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison.
- Halperin, D. M. 1983. 'The Forebears of Daphnis.' *TAPA* 113: 183-200.
- Harder, A., ed. 2012. *Callimachus: Aetia*. Vols. 1-2. Oxford.
- Hawkins, J. N. 2016. 'Anger, Bile, and the Poet's Body in the Archilochean Tradition.' In L. Swift and C. Carey, eds., *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford. 310-339.
- Henrichs, A. 1980. 'Riper than a Pear: Parian Invective in Theokritos.' *ZPE* 39: 7-27.

- Hunter, R. 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hunter, R., ed. 1999. *Theocritus: A Selection*. Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. 2003. 'Reflecting on Writing and Culture: Theocritus and the Style of Cultural Change.' In H. Yunis, ed., *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge. 213-34.
- Krevans, N. 1983. 'Geography and the Literary Tradition in Theocritus 7' *TAPA* 113: 201-20.
- Lawall, G. 1967. *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals: A Poetry Book*. Washington.
- Lavigne, D. 2016. 'Archilochus and Homer in the Rhapsodic Context.' In L. Swift and C. Carey, eds., *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford. 74-98.
- Lesky, A. 1996. *A History of Greek Literature*. Indianapolis.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and P. Parsons, eds. 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin.
- Massimilla, G., ed. 1996. *Aitia: Libri Primo e Secondo*. Pisa.
- Mettinger, T. N. D. 2001. *The Riddle of Resurrection: Dying and Rising Gods in the Ancient Near East*. Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series 50. Stockholm.
- Most, G. W., ed. 2007. *Hesiod*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, Mass.
- Merkelbach, R. and M. L. West, eds. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodica*. Oxford.
- Müller, C. W. 1987. *Erysichthon: Der Mythos als narrative Metapher im Demeterhymnos des Kallimachos*. Stuttgart.
- Murray, J. 2004. 'The Metamorphoses of Erysichthon. Callimachus, Apollonius, and Ovid.' In M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker, eds., *Callimachus II*. Leuven. 207-41.
- Ormand, K. 2015. 'Toward Iambic Obscenity.' In D. Dutsch and A. Suter, eds., *Ancient Obscenities: Their Nature and Use in the Ancient Greek and Roman Worlds*. Ann Arbor. 44-70.
- Ott, U. 1969. *Die Kunst des Gegensatzes in Theokrits Hirtengedichten*. Hildesheim and New York.
- Page, D. L., ed. 1974. *Supplementum lyricis Graecis*. Oxford.
- Provenziale, F., ed. 2009. *Filico di Corcira: testimonianze e frammenti. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*. Dissertation: Università degli Studi 'Roma Tre.'
- Puelma, M. 1960. 'Die Dichterbegegnung in Theocrits "Thalysien."' *MH* 17: 144-64.
- Richardson, N. J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford.

- Rosen, R. 2007. 'The Hellenistic Epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax.' In P. Bing and J. S. Bruss, eds., *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden. 459-476.
- Rotstein, A. 2010. *The Idea of Iambos*. Oxford.
- Rotstein, A. 2016. 'The Ancient Literary History of *Iambos*.' In L. Swift and C. Carey, eds., *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford. 101-121.
- Segal, C. 1981. *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral: Essays in Theocritus and Virgil*. Princeton.
- Sens, A. 2003. Review of Spanoudakis (2002). *BMCR* 2003.02.38: <http://www.ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2003-02-38.html>.
- Serrao, G. 1971. *Problemi di Poesia Alessandrina. Studi su Teocrito*. Rome.
- SH = Lloyd-Jones, H. and P. Parsons, eds. 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin.
- Sherwin-White, S. M. 1978. *Ancient Cos: An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period*. Göttingen.
- Smith, M. S. 2001. *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*. Oxford.
- Spanoudakis, K., ed. 2002. *Philias of Cos*. Leiden.
- Steiner, D. 2009. 'Diverting Demons: Ritual, Poetic Mockery and the Odysseus-Iros Encounter.' *CA* 28: 71-100.
- Swift, L. 2016. 'Poetics and Precedents in Archilochus' Erotic Imagery.' In L. Swift and C. Carey, eds., *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Oxford. 253-270.
- Williams, F. 1971. 'A Theophany in Theocritus.' *CQ* 21: 137-45.
- Wendel, C., ed. 1914. *Scholia in Theocritum vetera*. Leipzig.
- West, M. L. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin.
- West, M. L., ed. 1980. *Delectus ex iambis et elegis Graecis*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry*. Oxford.
- Zanker, G. 1980. 'Simichidas' Walk and the Locality of Bourina in Theocritus, *Id.* 7.' *CQ* 30: 373-77.

Tui plenum: Horace in the Presence of the Gods*

Daniel Barber

The first collection of Horace's *Odes* is a study in the elaboration of structure and symmetry. Fantastical variety radiates out in a rosette pattern from normative centers of length, meter, style and subject, soon returning to or circling close by established tendencies. Augustan visual art, with its passion for filling borders, pedestals and capitals with ornate yet symmetrical decorative elements, finds a curious analogue in the intricate yet artful balance of Horace's lyrical monument.¹ In the odes addressed to gods, a normative approach to divine addressees, deeply informed by philosophical orientation, lies at the center of florid elaboration. In this tableau the gods of reinvigorated state cult remain decorative and marginal figures, prominent but serving primarily to illuminate by contrast those divine presences who symbolize and animate the poet's deeper aspirations.

The personal participation of the *princeps* in the arcane and disused rituals he so ostentatiously revived made a deep impression on Horace's contemporaries.² By frequently addressing the ancient and ancestral

* I am grateful to John Miller and A. J. Woodman for reading earlier drafts of the larger project of which this paper was once a part, and I owe a still greater debt to Jenny Strauss Clay, superlative Horatian and mentor, who set me on the path of this study and expertly guided me along the way. All errors remain my own.

¹ Zanker 1988: 112 : 'The only aspect of a public building in the design of which they (i.e. visual artists) had a free hand was the decorative element. The richness of ornament they evolved had never been seen before and was not constrained by any traditional canon. This was true not only for the ornamental borders of architectural members . . . but for every part of the figural decoration.'

² Zanker 1988: 103-104 (Octavian acting as a *fetialis*), 115, 126-27, 169 (sacrifices to open the Secular Games).

deities, the poet follows an analogous path, even as he, in this first collection of odes, conspicuously separates himself from important aspects of Augustan religion. Lyrical distillations of hymn and prayer substitute for the archaic and magical formulae of state religion, and Horace equivocates masterfully as he approaches Apollo and Jupiter, two preeminent gods of the Augustan pantheon. He gives pride of place instead to Mercury, a peripheral deity in imperial cult, and repeatedly invokes and is overcome by the power of the Muses and Bacchus. In this way he transmutes the spirit of religious revival already in the air after Actium, a spirit his Epicurean sympathies have scarcely prepared him to embrace unambiguously, into the lyrical presence of gods congenial to his thought and poetical instincts.

The vexing topic of Horace and the gods has been surveyed by different scholars under different names—‘Religion and Mythology,’ ‘Cult and Personality,’ ‘Gods and Religion’³—without an overwhelming critical consensus on the key question of what role the gods play in Horatian lyric.⁴ The present inquiry, therefore, in the hope of simplifying the question, will attempt to focus itself, with a few exceptions, on examining in the first collection of odes what Jenny Strauss Clay once called the gods’ ‘mode of being present.’⁵ How does the poet address the gods, and how, when he does address them, do they become present in the world of the poem?

In order to illustrate how modes of address and presence add nuance, dimension and occasionally countervailing meaning to Horace’s lyrical dalliance with the deities of popular cult, I turn first to the ode that speaks most directly to belief in the gods, *Odes* 1.34—a poem which, as it turns out, is not addressed to any of them, nor, indeed, to anyone at all.⁶

³ Oksala 1973, Griffin 1997 and 2007 respectively.

⁴ Cf. Oksala 1973: 16–24, who cites with approval the nuanced view of Fraenkel 1957: 141; there is a more elaborate presentation of Fraenkel’s view at Fraenkel 1957: 163–66. Cf. also Breuer 2008: 33–42, especially 40–42, where he distinguishes a biographical approach, a literary-historical approach (Fraenkel, N-H), and an aesthetic-symbolic approach (Klingner, Pöschl), and concludes that there is no consensus ‘vor welchem religiösen Hintergrund die Gedichte des Horaz zu lesen sind.’

⁵ Clay 1983: 138.

⁶ Very few odes lack an addressee; Heinze 1923 in fact defines the Horatian ode as an address spoken *in propria persona*. Only six odes in the first collection (1.34, 1.36, 2.15, 3.2, 3.5 and 3.9) lack a named or anonymous addressee and these generally either allow a recipient for the poem to be understood (1.36, 3.2, 3.5) or blend lyric with another genre where different *personae* are to be expected (pastoral *amoeban* in 3.9, satire in 2.15). 1.34 is the only ode where the speaker, speaking

The ode opens abruptly (1.34.1-8):

Parcus deorum cultor et infrequens⁷,
 insanientis dum sapientiae
 consultus erro, nunc retrorsum
 uela dare atque iterare cursus
 cogor relictos.⁸ namque Diespiter
 igni corusco nubila diuidens
 plerumque, per purum tonantis
 egit equos uolucrumque currum

A sparing and infrequent worshipper of the gods while I wandered, learned in an insane wisdom, now I am compelled to sail in the opposite direction and travel again courses left behind. For Jupiter who usually divides the clouds with flashing fire led his thundering horses and his flying chariot through a clear sky.

This opening is more complex than it at first appears. *Insanientis* ... *sapientiae* is often taken to refer to the Epicureanism of the poet's youth.⁹ Of course, Epicureanism and traditional religion are not perfect opposites: Epicurus and his followers expended much effort disclaiming atheism, even going so far as to call famous atheists 'insane'.¹⁰ Veneration of the gods is perfectly acceptable to an Epicurean so long as it is free from fear and superstition.¹¹ Is it then, as some commentators suggest, that the speaker is renouncing Epicurus' atomistic explanation of thunder and lightning?¹² This reading would make good sense, but it does not exactly square with the frequentative adverb *plerumque* (7). For 'usually' would seem to indicate

in his customary first person, gives no hint of the direction in which he speaking, unless (as argued in Barber 2012 and elsewhere) it is to be joined with 1.35, which opens with an address to Fortuna.

⁷ The text is from Klingner 1959, except where alternate readings are noted. All translations are my own.

⁸ Keeping the reading of the manuscript (*relictos*) for the popular conjecture of Heinsius and Bentley (*relectos*).

⁹ So K-H 1908: 141 ('Horaz war in jungen Jahren Epikureer ...'), N-H 1970: 377, West 1995: 162 *et al.*

¹⁰ For Epicurean ideas of worship cf. Cicero ND 1.45b=Long and Sedley 23E (*nam et praestans deorum natura hominum pietate coleretur, cum et aeterna esset et beatissima-habet enim uenerationem iustam quicquid excellit* ...); for the insanity of atheists, cf. Philodemus, *Piet.* 112.1-18=Long and Sedley 23H (καὶ [μαίνεσθαι] καὶ βακχεύουσιν αὐτοὺς [sc. Prodicus and Diagoras and Critias]).

¹¹ Admittedly *religio* is difficult to separate from *superstitio* in actual cult practice; cf. Dyck 2003: 120-21.

¹² E.g. West 1995: 162, Breuer 2008: 36 (who does not actually believe the poet is making such a renunciation).

that the speaker always, even while he questioned traditional religious beliefs, regarded lightning as Jupiter, although the appellation may be a mere metonym, a poetic license, innocent of deeper theological implications. Here the reader is confronted with a contradictory mix of personification (Jupiter rides his chariot across the sky) and metonymy (Jupiter is another name for the natural phenomenon of lightning). The linguistic slippage suggests a rather loose adherence to the fine points of Epicurean doctrine, and a lingering interest in the anthropomorphism of popular religious cult.

Or perhaps the traditional interpretation can be redeemed by understanding a further subtext. To paraphrase: 'I had little concern for the gods so long as I believed that Jupiter was just another name for the phenomenon of lightning (which occurs, according to Epicurus, when clouds collide). But when I heard thunder in a clear sky, I was compelled to take Jupiter seriously as a force unto himself.' That the poem continues with a series of mythologies and personifications reinforces this last idea. Land and rivers are shaken, but also the Styx and the underworld (10 *inuisi horrida Taenari / sedes*) and the boundaries of the known world where Atlas holds up the sky (11 *Atlanteus finis*), myths about nature that the Epicureans would no doubt dismiss or explain scientifically.¹³ The poem then turns to an assessment of the god's power; he can strike down the lofty and raise up the lowly, bring light to the obscure and darkness to the brilliant, just as Fortune, with a terrifying shriek (15 *cum stridore acuto*) snatches the crown from one and enjoys giving it to another (13-16).

Yet even as the speaker does not seem to have been an absolutely doctrinaire Epicurean, so too is the depth of his 'conversion' questionable.¹⁴ For if this poem were truly a renunciation of irreligious ways, one might expect an invocation or a prayer: what better way to show oneself a frequent and unsparing worshipper than actual worship? Yet the last stanza offers nothing of the sort, fixing instead on the inconstancy of God and Fortune, in anticipation of the next poem, the Ode to Fortuna. Jupiter's power is inexplicable and capricious; no reason is suggested for thunder in a blue sky, and none for the fall of the mighty or the meteoric rise of the weak.

¹³ Cf. West 1995: 163.

¹⁴ K-H 1930: 142 see, on the other hand, unquestionable sincerity: 'Das Gedicht will durchaus ernsthaft gefaßt sein als Bekenntnis einer religiösen Bekehrung...' For the opposite view, cf. N-H 1970: 377: 'we must not take the recantation seriously ...'

In sum, one may believe in Jupiter's might without believing that he is just or that he heeds the prayers of man; the speaker is willing to commit an Epicurean heresy by admitting that Jupiter does indeed cause thunder, that gods do lie indeed behind natural phenomena, but nevertheless he will not concede that their influence is just or rational, or that the gods' favor can be gained by pious acts. This Jupiter is simply a force beyond reckoning. The speaker fittingly turns aside, addressing his invocation and his prayer instead to Fortuna in the conjoined *Odes* 1.35.

Augustus vowed a temple to Jupiter in 26 B.C. after narrowly escaping a lightning strike; the dedication of the opulent Temple of Jupiter Tonans fulfilled that vow in 22 B.C., a year after the publication of *Odes* 1-3. Yet Apollo, to whom Octavian credited his victory at Actium, had already assumed pride of place in the imperial pantheon. Octavian dedicated the Temple of Palatine Apollo on October 9, 28 B.C. The very next year, when he was granted the title Augustus by the Senate, his doorposts were decorated with laurel trees, a symbol, by happy accident, sacred to his patron deity.¹⁵ Such honors, ostentatious in their modesty, nonetheless lent the house the numinous air of an ancient shrine, further nurturing an association promoted since the days of the triumvirs.¹⁶ Soon the Sibylline books, transferred from the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline, were deposited in gilded cases under the pedestal of Apollo's cult statue, that under such auspices there might begin a messianic age.¹⁷ *Odes* 1.31 is usually thought to celebrate the momentous occasion of the temple's dedication.¹⁸

It is a muted celebration. The poem begins by questioning openly what *Odes* 1.34 merely quietly omits: the expected prayer to the divine dedicatee (*Odes* 1.31.1-3):

Quid dedicatum poscit Apollinem
uates? quid orat de patera nouum
fundens liquorem?

¹⁵ *Res Gestae* 34; cf. also the *aurei* minted in 19/18 and 12 BC depicting the laurels along with the *clipeus uirtutis* and the civic crown at Zanker 1988: 92.

¹⁶ Zanker 1988: 93.

¹⁷ For the transferal of the books, cf. Suet. *Aug.* 31. For the age of Apollo, cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.10 (*tuus iam regnat Apollo*) and Coleman 1977: 134. A statue of Augustus in the attached library was distinctly Apollonian in appearance, as Servius' notes ad loc. in his description of the new age: *ultimum saeculum ostendit, quod Sibylla Solis esse memorauit. et tangit Augustum, cui simulacrum factum est cum Apollinis cunctis insignibus*. Cf. also Galinsky 1996: 314.

¹⁸ K-H 1908: 131, N-H 1970: 347; Veyne 1965 denies the connection.

What does the bard seek from Apollo consecrated (in his new temple)? For what does he pray, pouring new wine from its cup?

There follows a list of benefits the speaker does not seek: he does not ask for the grain of fertile Sardinia (3-4 *opimae Sardiniae segetes feracis*), nor the herds of Calabria (5-6 *grata Calabriae / armenta*), nor gold, nor ivory, nor Campanian estates (7-8 *rura, quae Liris quieta / mordet aqua*).¹⁹ He has no desire for the vines of Cales, nor to make expensive wine so that a rich merchant can gulp it down in fancy cups (10-12 *diues ut aureis / mercator exsiccet culillis / uina Syra reparata merce*).²⁰ This brings the speaker back to the idea of divine favor; this merchant is indeed dear to the gods, not because of his wealth, but because he has managed to escape death despite three or four yearly trips through the straits of Gibraltar (13-15 *ter et quater / anno reuisens aequor Atlanticum / inpune*). Introduced here is the notion that the most valuable thing, more valuable than any material gain, is not losing and having the time to enjoy what one already has. By the grace of the gods, the merchant has kept his life, but the speed with which he drinks his costly wine and the frequency of his long voyages hint that he lacks the *otium* with which to savor his prosperity properly. On the other hand, what use is the favor of the gods to the man with the time and the ability to live in the present? Now the speaker turns to himself (*Odes* 1.31.15-20):

me pascunt oliuae,	15
me cichorea leuesque maluae.	
frui paratis et ualido mihi,	
Latoe, dones et precor integra	
cum mente nec turpem senectam	
degere nec cithara carentem.	20

Olives nourish me, and chicory and mallow, light fare. Son of Leto, I pray that you allow me to enjoy what is present, healthy,

¹⁹ A.J. Woodman suggests to me that *mordet* ('eats away') in line 8 hints that the country estate is situated on a floodplain, and is thus inherently undesirable, just as the occupations listed in 1.1 are described in mostly unflattering terms.

²⁰ Reading *ut* with Bentley rather than *et* favored by N-H. *Culillae* are normally religious vessels, as Porphyrio points out; thus the merchant's use of them for secular purposes is irreligious.

with an intact mind, and not let me live out a wretched old age,
nor one that lacks the cithara.

If we accept the occasion traditionally assigned to this poem, we will find it akin to others in the *Odes* where the speaker offers or advises a more modest offering to the gods.²¹ Here, however, the idea is taken to an extreme. Augustus has dedicated a temple to Apollo, the most magnificent of all his religious buildings;²² the speaker offers only a cup of wine, and he asks only to keep what he already has. This is not just playful variety; the exceptional delay of the invocation and the prayer highlights the contradiction between the poet's philosophy of life and the unthinking piety of those who pray for worldly gain. Certainly it is an Epicurean commonplace to say one ought to enjoy what is at hand, and the *reductio ad absurdum* of the prayer to Apollo here is a gesture, in the guise of veneration, to the Epicurean idea that the gods are indifferent to human affairs.²³

There is perhaps something paradoxical in the idea that the poet, after assuming the solemn mantle of *uates* and pouring out new wine for Apollo in celebration of a newly dedicated temple, might proceed nonetheless to question the need for prayer.²⁴ Yet the paradox of medium and message pointing in different directions on the question of divine attention or indifference is familiar almost from the beginning of the collection. Already in *Odes* 1.2.29-40, with a crisis at hand, the poet contemplates a prayer but declines to address it to the celebrated patron gods of imperial house. Jupiter, then Apollo, then Venus and Mars, future companions in the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Augustan Forum, are all graciously but conspicuously passed over as addressees of the prayer with which the poem ends (45-52) in favor of Mercury—if he is indeed taking the form of Octavian.²⁵ Alternatively, the prayers pass to the man himself. Careful readers have noticed that the decision

²¹ Cf. 2.17.30-32, 3.23, 4.2.53-60.

²² Vell. 2.81 *templumque Apollinis et circa porticus facturum promisit, quod ab eo singulari extractum munificentia est.*

²³ N-H 1970: 348 suggest the first idea and trace the concept of 'propriety in prayer' all the way back to the (ps.?-)Platonic *Second Alcibiades*; this is the argument (as K-H 1908: 131 explain) that you should not pray for earthly goods without knowing whether they are actually 'good', will make one happy, etc.

²⁴ This is noticed by N-H 1970: 347: 'In our ode Horace's solemn appearance as a *uates* might lead one to expect something similarly patriotic and conventional [i.e. similar to Prop. 4.6].'

to pray to a divine man in lieu of a god is anticipated by the question *cui dabit partis scelus expiandi* / *Iuppiter*: a god can scarcely be called to expiate a crime committed by man against another god.²⁶ Thus, though the matter of the poem seems outwardly in keeping with the spirit of religious revival, the speaker in fact holds back on one critical point: he has no intention of praying in a conventional way to the gods of state cult.

In order to settle on Mercury as the god from whom Octavian may derive his magnificence and power, Horace first must pass over a more obvious choice: augur Apollo, in all his cloud-girt brilliance (1.2.31-32 *nube candentis umeros amictus* / *augur Apollo*). The prominence of Apollo in Augustan religion and imagery has already been mentioned; this deity, formerly peripheral in Roman literature and religion, was to become the symbol of the Augustan Age *par excellence*.²⁷ State cult granted no such prominence to Mercury. A *sestertius* depicting the Tiberian Temple of Concordia is perhaps illustrative of a typical arrangement: Mercury is on the steps, next to Hercules, while Concordia and associated deities crowd the rooftop. So we might intuit that Mercury in this instance merely represents the material prosperity (*merces*) afforded by the *principate*, just as Hercules signifies security, and the others peace, harmony, health and the like.²⁸ How could this lowly, materialistic god embody the splendid promises of the Age of the Sun?

Horace soon endeavors to explain his unusual soteriology. A rather different and considerably more learned Mercury appears in *Odes* 1.10,

²⁵ West 1995: 13 points out this caveat, paraphrasing the second half of the poem as follows: "Come, Apollo, or you, Venus, if (*siue*) you prefer, or you, Mars, if (*siue*) you have a thought for . . . (and now comes the sleight of syntax) or if you, Mercury, are imitating Octavian, do not be in haste to return to the sky'. There is a calculated blur in Horace's logic and it is a little crude to say simply, as some scholars do, that he is claiming that Octavian is the god Mercury in human form.' Similarly evasive passages postponing deification can be noted at 3.5.2-4 (Augustus **will** be considered a god on earth [*praesens diuus*] **if** he subdues Britons and the Persians) and 3.3.11-12 (Augustus **will** drink nectar among the deified).

²⁶ K-H 1908: 15 speak ambiguously of 'einen von Jupiter . . . bestellten göttlichen Vermittler', through whom the crime will be expiated; yet if, as N-H 1970: 29 believe, this expiation will come through an expedition against foreign enemies, the choice may be godly, but must also be human. Cairns 1971: 75 calls the implication that one god might make expiation to another god on man's behalf 'impossible theology'.

²⁷ Miller 2009: 3 and n. 17 above.

²⁸ Zanker 1988: 111, who considers the 'web of imagery' here emblematic of the 'typical Augustan temple.' Mercury fulfills this same distinctly Roman role as *lucri repertor* in *Sat.* 2.6.5-15 (cf. Fraenkel 1957: 164) and *Odes* 1.30 (cf. N-H 1970: 344).

a poem which ends the parade of metrical variety of *Odes* 1.1-9 by repeating the Sapphic meter of 1.2. This enigma of an ode thus occupies an important position in the collection. Mercury is praised for his eloquence (1 *facunde*), cunning (2 *catus*, 7 *callidum*), inventiveness and musicality (6 *curuaque lyrae parentem*), his playful deceit (7-12), his ability to guide the living and the dead (13-20), and his affability, which has broad appeal (19-20 *superis deorum / gratus et imis*). Apollo, conversely, though he threatens, is merely the mirthful victim of Mercury's sleight of hand (11-12 *uiduus pharetra / risit Apollo*). Horace himself borrows liberally and playfully from Alcaeus' *Hymn to Hermes* throughout, but his preference for Mercury over Apollo here and in 1.2 is hardly Alcaic; the Alexandrian edition of Alcaeus' hymns opened with a memorable *Hymn to Apollo*, with the *Hymn to Hermes* coming second.³⁰

Another authorial choice has proven equally perplexing. In most of the immediate predecessors of 1.10 (e.g., 1.2, with its allusions to a flood of the Tiber; 1.3, addressed to Virgil's departing ship; 1.4, which seems to place Sestius in a sympotic setting; and 1.9, where Thaliarchus is asked to look out upon Soracte), the dramatic presence of the addressee on a specific occasion or in a certain notional setting gives an important impetus to the unfolding meaning of the poem. Here, however, Mercury is neither summoned nor entreated to take any action, and the culminating request of prayer is avoided entirely;³¹ this is not a kletic hymn, but rather purely a hymn of praise. The god is addressed with the first word, and remains the focus of celebration until the end of the poem. About the occasion or context of these praises no indication is given.

Such an address of an Olympian god, mysterious though it may seem in isolation, is anticipated in 1.2, as it is reemphasized in 1.31 and 1.34, poems which deal much more directly with religious belief. As in those cases, the speaker declines to turn a lyric utterance full of religious content towards traditional prayer; his silence in 1.10 about the context of the hymn and his own place within it is merely a way of qualifying

²⁹ In as much as 1.2 also is addressed to Mercury (as Octavian) and also employs the Sapphic stanza, the two poems are also thought to be thematically connected; Miller 1991: 369 goes so far as to call 1.2 'a hymn to Augustus,' a definition that fits the last two stanzas better than the preceding eleven.

³⁰ Cf. Cairns 1983: 30 concerning the order of hymns and *passim* concerning Horace's allusive technique; also Lyne 2007: 300, who emphasizes the divine brothers as a pair of 'deities special to a lyric poet.'

³¹ N-H 1970: 127: 'a hymn often ended with a prayer ...'

the overtones of devotion and piety inherent in this particular mode of expression. Once again he is a cautious and idiosyncratic participant in revivalism. He has stepped away from the favored circle of august deities to a playful and poetic god, yet to some degree he still keeps his distance. There is precious little spirituality in this unreflective hymn, though some have endeavored to find it there.³² Identifying parallels between Mercury's and the poet's traits and dispositions in order to understand the god symbolically has been in recent years the more common avenue of inquiry; this has the advantage, at least, of emphasizing the idiosyncrasy of the choice of divine addressee and anticipating deities to which he is more proximate.³³

The preference of Mercury over Apollo in 1.2 and 1.10, where Augustan iconography and the poems of Alcaeus both may have favored the latter, is a sign of Horatian religious innovation.³⁴ More critically, the mode of praise and invocation in these four poems is carefully structured to moderate, question and avoid prayer. Epicureanism, a normative center that draws the poet's forays into popular religion back towards the skeptical philosophy of the elite, certainly makes itself felt here.³⁵ Yet other deities, most notably the Muses and Bacchus, are celebrated precisely for their intimacy with the speaker. By examining how this god and these goddesses are addressed and made present, it becomes clear that the unusual emphasis on Mercury is only the first step towards a distinctive fusion of lyrical sensibility and traditional religious imagery.

³² K-H 1908: 52: 'Aus den Anfangsworten der feierlichen Schlußstrophe sollen wir die Hoffnung des Dichters heraushören, der Gott werde auch seine *pia anima* dereinst zu den *sedes laetae* geleiten.' Cf. also West 1995: 49: 'Of course Horace is a sceptic, sometimes. But he seems here to be writing as a believer, of a god whom he loves, a god who is the eternal form of things he enjoys and things he accepts. If this were so, the ode would be an expression of that spirituality which finds the divine in the particulars of daily life.'

³³ N-H 1970: 128 anticipate a symbolic interpretation, speaking generally of 'allegiance': 'In an astrological age, it is at least possible that Horace pretended an allegiance to the god of unassuming poetry, whimsical trickery, and gentle charm, who helped his lucky devotees to fall on their feet.' Cf. also Reckford 1969: 194, Miller 1991: 183, Borzsák 1995: 12, Houghton 2007, Clay 2010: 139.

³⁴ The much-cited *Odes* 2.7 is another potential instance of this preference and substitution: Mercury saves Horace at Philippi (*sed me per hostis Mercurius celer / denso paudentem sustulit aere* 13-14); in the Homeric parallel cited by Fraenkel 1957: 164, it is Apollo who saves Hector: τὸν δ' ἐξήρταζεν Ἀπόλλων ῥεῖα ... (*Il.* 20.443).

³⁵ Cf. n. 9 above.

The Muses are the most familiar divinities of ancient poetry. These goddesses, frequently addressed by poets of all genres, are subject to two competing interpretations. On one extreme are the anthropomorphic deities of Hesiod, daughters of Zeus and Memory. On the other is the 'secular' Muse, unnamed and singular, the mysterious source of inspiration; she is much closer to an abstraction.³⁶ Attempts have been made to impose a progression from the first to the second, from Greek vitality to Latin artificiality and cynicism.³⁷ If there is such a progression, the *Odes* resist it and in fact push back in the opposite direction.³⁸ More precisely, the poet seems to strike a balance, even a vivid synthesis, between the anthropomorphic and the metonymic in order to render these goddesses especially present in the *Odes*.

The poet advances on two fronts toward this ultimate goal. He explores, through the Muses, the idea of inspiration as uncontrollable, as impulsive, even as madness and possession—an idea not found in Greek poetry before the fifth century.³⁹ When he associates the Muses with this force of inspired possession and merges his agency with theirs, he treats them as more powerful and proximate than do his poetic exemplars. Yet he also enhances the goddesses' traditional attributes in order to depict them as other, endowing them with vividly human characteristics and an independent will, not to mention vast tutelary powers. In the three poems addressed to Bacchus (*Odes* 1.18, 2.19 and 3.25), the god is, as the Muses often are, sensibly, even frighteningly, present. Indeed, in the latter two poems we find the idea of prayer not only questioned but

³⁶ Spentzou in Spentzou and Fowler 2002: 1-10 discusses the distinction, and the 'secularization' of the Muses.

³⁷ Cf. Commager 1962: 2-31; to his credit, he admits some uncertainty about the 'objective ... reality' of the Muse of Homer, Hesiod and Pindar, but he is sure about her degradation. Cf. especially pp. 2-3: '... such vitality as the Muse possessed was to pale into an abstraction. One might, indeed, characterize her biography as the history of a fading metaphor.' Other scholars emphasize the complexity of the Muse's 'ontological status' in both Greek and Latin poets: cf. Fraenkel 1957: 281 n. 1 and Laird 2002: 118.

³⁸ Schmidt 2002: 176-78 notes that the Muses are almost entirely absent from the *Satires* and *Epodes*, and yet far more common in *Odes* 1-3 than in the Greek lyric poets or in Catullus, who does not mention the Muses in his polymetric poems (Schmidt argues that *o patrona uirgo* [1.9], itself a much-disputed expression, refers to Charis).

³⁹ Cf. Dodds 1951: 82 and Murray 1981 *passim* but especially 100, where she summarizes her argument: 'the idea of poetic inspiration in early Greece... was particularly associated with knowledge, with memory and with performance; it did not involve ecstasy or possession, and it was balanced by a belief in the importance of craft.'

turned around: the god possesses the speaker and imposes his will, which the speaker can only resist or submit to.

In the first poem of the collection, the favor of the Muses is treated tactfully as a probability (*si neque tibias / Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia / Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton* 1.1.32-34); in *Odes* 3.30, a poem inextricably linked with 1.1, where not aid, but approval for something already completed is requested, the directive is again carefully moderated (*Odes* 3.30.14-16):

sume superbiam
quaesitam meritis et mihi Delphica
lauro cinge uolens, Melpomene, comam. 15

Assume the pride earned by merit and, Melpomene, if you are willing, with a Delphic laurel bind my hair.⁴⁰

The proud declaration of poetic immortality that is the poem's subject achieves with this request a certain complexity. In the first half of the sentence Melpomene seems to be standing in for the poet and accepting honors for his success; she is asked to be proud of his poetic accomplishments, and the question of by whose merit the prize has been earned is left unanswered.⁴¹ Yet in the second half, *uolens* treats Melpomene as a distinct and distant goddess and grants her the power to refuse.⁴²

This double aspect is familiar. A divinity addressed may serve to symbolize a natural or spiritual force, may seem a mere way of speaking, a way to move the poem towards its true subject—in the Muse's case, a way to seek inspiration, to set the poem in motion—while at the same time assuming human characteristics, even corporeal form. It is evident

⁴⁰ N-R 2004: 376 translate *sume* as 'assume,' citing Caesar *BG* 1.35.5 *Ariovistus tantos sibi spiritus ... sumpserat*.

⁴¹ K-H 1908: 385 and West 2002: 266 argue that the merit is Melpomene's; N-R 2004: 377 consider but reject the idea that *meritis* refers to the poet's 'deserts,' which he is dedicating to the goddess. This latter interpretation is suggested by Porphyrio's comments: *adroga, inquit, tibi gloriam ubertate ingenii quaesitam*.

⁴² K-H 1908: 385 take *uolens* as shorthand for *uolens propitius*, an expression common in prayers (N-R 2004: 377 translate 'of thy grace'); e.g., *uti sis uolens propitius mihi liberisque meis* (Cato, *De Agri Cultura* 134.2), cf. also Livy e.g. 1.16.3, 7.26.5, 24.21.10. Servius suggests that *uolens* at *Aen.* 3.457 may abbreviate the same expression.

even from the example of Euterpe and Polyhymnia in 1.1 that the poet prefers to keep the Muses from becoming complete abstractions: in order to symbolize the poet's assumption of Lesbian meters and themes, the two goddesses are assigned the specific tasks of offering musical accompaniment and tuning the lyre.

In some cases (e.g. *spritum ... tenuem* [Odes 2.16.38,], *desit theatris* [Odes 2.1.10]), the goddesses' anthropomorphism can be elided or quite subtly expressed. At other times, it seems to receive deliberate emphasis. In 1.12, for example, the Muse chooses the subject of the poem (1-3):

Quem uirum aut heroa lyra uel acri
tibia sumis celebrare, Clio?
quem deum?

What man or hero do you undertake to celebrate on the lyre or
the shrill flute, Clio? What god?

The lines are a variation of the famous opening of Pindar's second Olympian ode (O. 2.1-2; trans. Race):

Ἀναξίφορμιγγες ὕμνοι,
τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;

Hymns that rule the lyre, what god, what hero, and what man
shall we celebrate?

Horace reverses the order of the potential dedicatees, and also transforms the opening invocation. The emphasis in Pindar is on the primacy of words over music; his words lead, and the *phorminx* follows.⁴³ Horace substitutes Clio for the anonymous 'hymns' and depicts her as already choosing the instrument, with words, presumably the poet's words, poised to follow her lead. Pindar imagines poet and *hymnoi* working in tandem to choose a subject; in the case of Horace's poem the choice belongs more or less exclusively to Clio, who herself chooses both the

⁴³ Cf. Gildersleeve 1885: 143: 'Originally song dominated instrumental music. Music was 'married to immortal verse' as the woman to the man.' He cites Pratinas (= Athen. 14.617D) as evidence.

laudandus and the instrument, and who, if the present of *sumis* is correct and taken literally, has already begun the song.⁴⁴ Horace differs from his model by giving his addressee a specific name, a concrete task and the responsibility for beginning the song, all the more to personify her; yet, at the same time, the subjects she chooses must in some sense be the speaker's subjects, because he quickly shifts into the first person (13 *dicam*). *Odes* 1.24 offers a variation: here the speaker explicitly takes the initiative and asks the Muse to begin (1.24.2-3 *praecipe lugubris / cantus, Melpomene*), but she will both sing and provide the lyre accompaniment (1.24.3-4 *cui liquidam pater / uocem cum cithara dedit*).

It may help to consider one final example of an address to the Muse.⁴⁵ The speaker of *Odes* 3.1 begins by proclaiming himself priest of the Muses (3.1.3 *sacerdos Musarum*), an imaginary office which befits this poem's mixture of religious formulae and poetic individuality.⁴⁶ The assumption of this office is a prelude to the direct address of the Muses—in this case the Muse Calliope, with whom the fourth Roman Ode begins (*Odes* 3.4.1-8):⁴⁷

Descende caelo et dic age tibia
regina longum Calliope melos,
seu uoce nunc mauis acuta,

⁴⁴ The variant *sumes* appears in some manuscripts, but it is difficult to find defenders of this reading; I can cite only Dacier 1709: 182 and Lenchantin de Gubernatis 1945: 17, both of whom favor *sumes* on the basis of the future in Pindar. One could argue that if Clio has already begun, she would not still be deciding whether to play a lyre or a flute: she would have already made her choice. But Bentley 1711: 32 gets around this objection by suggesting that *sumis celebrare* is essentially a future expression: '*Sumis celebrare* habet vim et notationem temporis futuri; idemque valet, ac si dixisset, *celebrabis*.' K-H 1908: 60, N-H 1970: 146 *et al.* in support of the present *sumis* point to a parallel at *Epist.* 1.3.7: *quis sibi res gestas Augusti scribere sumit?*

⁴⁵ The further example of *Odes* 1.26 might plausibly be added: here Horace, innovating on Lucr. 1.927-30, suggests the Muse, rather than the poet, has agency: it is a Muse who delights in pure springs, she who weaves the garland, she and her sisters who will celebrate Lamia with a song both new and old, etc.

⁴⁶ 'At Rome there was an *aedes Herculis Musarum*, but the Muse had no independent priesthood...' (N-R 2004: 8). *Odi profanum uolgus et arceo. / fauete linguis* (3.1.1-2) echoes 'words customary at the beginning of religious ceremonies' (cf. K-H 1908: 250-51); but the first person singular of *odi* and *arceo* strikes a different note, indicating not 'a religious cult but a transposition of such a cult to a different plane, a 'secularization'' (Fraenkel 1957: 264).

⁴⁷ Hesiod singles out Calliope as the most important of the Muses (*Th.* 79 προφερεστάτη; cf. N-R 2004: 57) because she waits upon kings (80 βασιλεῦσιν ἄμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὅπηδεῖ). It is unlikely, however, that the Muses in Horace have the specific functions later assigned to them (cf. Fraenkel 1957: 306 n. 2, N-H 1970: 282-83).

seu fidibus citharaue Phoebi.
 auditis? an me ludit amabilis
 insania? audire et uideor pios
 errare per lucos, amoenae
 quos et aquae subeunt et aerae.

5

Come down from the sky and play on the flute, queen Calliope, a lengthy song, or if you prefer now to sing with a shrill voice, or with a lyre, or with the cithara of Apollo. Do you hear? Or does delightful insanity play games with me? I seem to hear and to wander through sacred groves, which idyllic waters and breezes softly enter.

Once again the Muse is summoned to sing the song, and is asked to choose the instrument of accompaniment. In this case, however, the speaker actually becomes possessed—he has visions of groves and springs, both topoi associated with the Muses.⁴⁸ These are visual hallucinations, but more importantly he hears something, although the object of *auditis* and *audire* is not specified. Could it be the song itself that the speaker hears? If so, this is surely the ultimate expression of the Muse's power over poetry: that the speaker hears his own song as if it were coming from without.⁴⁹ To dramatize the speaker's loss of control, to portray the possession as ongoing and to call on the audience to recognize this, are exceptionally rare moves in the *Odes*.⁵⁰ In addition, the speaker embroiders the claims made for the Muses in 1.26 with expansive detail. The woodpigeons that wove laurel and myrtle over him as an infant in Apulia (3.4.9-20) are *fabulosae*, an epithet which, like laurel and myrtle, associates

⁴⁸ Cf. 1.1.30, 1.26.5-6.

⁴⁹ Cf. Lowrie 1997: 219: '... the asyndetic opening of the narrative in line nine in effect puts a colon at the end of line eight and the rest of the poem is 'her' song.'

⁵⁰ 1.27 and especially 3.25 take a similar approach by making the reader aware of an ongoing situation that is out of the speaker's control; 2.19 has similar elements, but the vision is in the past (2.19.1-2 *Bacchum ... uidi*) and the audience is in the future (2.19.2 *credite posteri*). Fraenkel 1957: 276-85 makes much of the relationship between 3.4 and Pindar, *P. 1* (although this is just one of many potential models and antecedents; cf. Miller 1998: 546-47), but with respect to the opening invocation Horace (as in 1.13) is more ambitious: Pindar merely praises the lyre (1-2 Χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων / σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον), and notes that dancers and singers follow its lead (2-4 τὰς ἀκούει / μὲν βάσις ἀγλαΐας ἀρχά, / πείθονται δ' ᾠδοὶ σάμασιν). Even in this meditation on the magical power of music, there is no intimation of the singer's possession or insanity. Cf. also Commager 1962: 206: 'Χρυσέα φόρμιγξ... descende caelo: Pindar's objective salute is a far cry from Horace's subjective command.'

them with the goddesses of poetry; he proceeds to claim the favor of these goddesses through his childhood and the difficult moments of his adult life (21-24). They protected him when imperiled at Philippi and threatened by the falling tree and shipwreck off Sicily (25-28); they will protect him wherever in the world he travels (29-36). Furthermore, the Muses refresh Augustus between wars, and offer and support counsels of peace and clemency (41 *lene consilium*). Quite apart from simply seeking inspiration and divine sanction for his poetry, the poet seems especially eager to praise the Muses at length, to offer them all the credit for his poetry, to attribute to them anthropomorphic characteristics and expansive powers.

One distinctive tendency of the poems addressed to men and women in the first collection of *Odes* is the frequency with which these poems complicate preconceptions of dramatic context and look beyond the present moment—even in cases where the dramatic context ought to be clear.⁵¹ The *auditis* of the second stanza of *Odes* 3.4, which calls upon the audience to recognize something happening in the present, is almost unparalleled in the *Odes*.⁵² This serves to emphasize the general approach to addressing the Muses, an approach which strives to personalize these goddesses and give them concrete tasks and full responsibility for the creation of the poem. Distance between speaker and addressee is hereby closed and divine presence made manifest.

In *Odes* 3.1, the speaker sets himself as an intermediary between the Muses and his choir of boys and girls; in *Odes* 3.4, he fulfills that function by summoning Calliope into his audience's presence. This is, according to one definition, the essential purpose of a hymn: to negotiate between the goddess and her worshipers, to ensure her presence at the festival.⁵³ But the singer or singers of a hymn do not necessarily limit themselves to this request: often they also specify how the god should appear, usually willingly and in good humor.⁵⁴ More elaborate praise and description of

⁵¹ Barber 2014: 333-34 and *passim*. The tendency is most easily illustrated by questions persistently asked of the dramatic setting of various odes: e.g. in 1.7, is Plancus in Tibur or abroad? Where does the speaker of 1.9 address Thaliarchus and in what season?

⁵² Interestingly, ps.-Acro thinks *auditis* is addressed to Calliope: this is an unlikely interpretation, of course, but it may point out how unusual the gesture to the audience is.

⁵³ Burkert 1994: 14: 'Hymnen gehören zu den Göttern, sie richten sich an Götter: Ihre allgemeine Funktion ist es, die Präsenz des Göttlichen herbeizuführen ...'

⁵⁴ Burkert 1994: 14 'Der charakteristische Gruß auch an einen Gott im Hymnos ist *chaire* 'freue dich' ... der Gott soll 'freundlich' sein. Der Hymnos wird dafür sorgen.'

the god's powers and *aretai* can naturally be traced back to the same purpose: to specify with more precision exactly what kind of god is being summoned, and to please that god in order to obtain the desired goodwill. The hymnic complex of invocation, praise/description, and request formalizes and makes poetic the anthropomorphism of ancient religion, and the lengthy invocation and lavish compliments paid to the Muse here and in *Odes* 1.26 should be understood in this context.⁵⁵ Horace reserves for these goddesses precisely the sort of full-fledged veneration he disdained in the case of Jupiter, Apollo and Mercury.

Dionysus, with his shifting forms and proximity to man, has, not unlike the Muses, an ambiguous and double nature: is he the god of wine or the wine itself?⁵⁶ Or some more primal and mysterious force to which wine is only the gateway?⁵⁷ The two most ambitious odes addressed to Bacchus—2.19 and 3.25—thrillingly synthesize and celebrate both the spiritual and the corporeal, enacting a spiritual possession in which the god's corporality plays a critical role. The potency of divine presence is illustrated by the range and height of the speaker's emotions. The joy of the entranced Bacchant and of the inspired poet soon gives way to dangerous irrationality and weakness of will. Praise of Bacchus mingles with fear of his power to possess, to overtake, to kill.

Odes 2.19 begins with the speaker calling on the audience to recognize his vision of the god, proceeding to demonstrate his own possession and finally addressing himself directly to the god, begging for his mercy (*Odes* 2.19.1-8):

Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus
 uidi docentem, credite posterī,
 Nymphasque discentis et auris
 capripedum Satyrorum acutas.
 euhoe, recenti mens trepidat metu

5

⁵⁵ This is not to say that the hymnic treatment of the Muses is not connected to the other themes of the ode—to the entrance of Apollo (64 *Patareus Apollo*), for instance, who connects the harmony and peacefulness of music to the victory of *uis temperata* and 'order on heaven and earth' (Miller 1998: 551), or to the Augustan settlement, whose association with the Muses shows that 'poetic and political power are derived from the same divine source' (N-R 2004: 56). The point here is rather to put this 'hymn to the Muses' in the context of address in the collection as a whole.

⁵⁶ Cf. Eur. *Ba.* 284-85 with Dodds' note.

⁵⁷ Cf. Dodds 1960: xii, who paraphrases Plut. *Is. et Os.* 365A : οὐ μόνον τοῦ οἴνου Διόνυσον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης ὑγρᾶς φύσεως Ἕλληνες ἡγοῦνται κύριον καὶ ἀρχηγόν ...

plenoque Bacchi pectore turbidum
laetatur: euhoe, parce Liber,
parce graui metuende thyrsos.

I have seen Bacchus teaching songs on distant cliffs—believe it, posterity—and the Nymphs learning and the sharp ears of goat-footed Satyrs. Euhoe, my mind trembles with fresh fear and rejoices confusedly with a heart full of Bacchus. Euhoe, have mercy, Liber, have mercy, O god feared for your weighty thyrsus.

Here, as in *Odes* 3.4, the speaker calls on the audience (presumably readers rather than listeners) to recognize a miraculous epiphany. The speaker suspects that his audience will be incredulous that he has seen Bacchus in the flesh—and he is right.⁵⁸ Thus the calm declarative tone of the first stanza gives way to a state of excitement: the epiphany may have already taken place, but the act of possession is ongoing. Joy at the sight of this wondrous apparition mixes with fear as Bacchus enters into the speaker.⁵⁹ Now in his apprehension the speaker begs the god to spare him the full brunt of his power; the thyrsus can indeed inspire but also madden or kill.⁶⁰ Despite this ambivalence, the speaker, just as in *Odes* 3.4, launches directly into a description of miracles associated with Bacchus—springs of wine, streams of milk, honey falling from trees (9-12)—and moves on to mythology: Dionysus' marriage to Ariadne and his punishment of Pentheus, the Thracians and Lycurgus (13-16). The next stanza (17-20) emphasizes the god's power to change the course of rivers, to calm the sea, and to weave snakes harmlessly into the hair of his worshippers. A striking anecdote follows in which Bacchus turns back the giant Rhoetus with a lion's claws and terrifying jaw (23-24 *leonis / unguibus horribilique mala*). Both the text and the meaning of these lines are disputed, and the story does not have an exact parallel in extant literature, but the symbolism is clear: this god can pacify natural phenomena or turn them to violent use

⁵⁸ E.g. N-H 1978: 317 ('Horace's vision seems as literary as those of other Roman poets ...'), Quinn 1980: 236 ('a transposition of some quasi-visionary experience or wholly fanciful ...'). Both commentators take *credite posteri* as ironical, as an admission that the vision is imaginary, but cf. *Epod.* 9.11 (*posteri negabit*) with Mankin's note.

⁵⁹ Cf. 3.4.5-6 *amabilis / insania*.

⁶⁰ N-H 1978: 320 see the thyrsus as 'an instrument of poetic inspiration'; at Eur. *Ba.* 762-64 *thyrsos* are used as weapons by the Maenads against armed men. Cf. also Apollod. 1.37.3 Εὐρυπτον δὲ θυρσὶ Διόνυσος ἔκτεινε.

against his enemies.⁶¹ This message is further refined in the stanza that follows, which returns to the image with which the poem began, Bacchus as a teacher of songs (*Odes* 2.19.25-28):

quamquam choreis aptior et iocis
ludoque dictus non sat idoneus
pugnae ferebaris; sed idem
pacis eras mediusque belli.

Although you were said to be more apt for dances and fun and play and you were rumored not exactly to be suited for a fight, nevertheless you were alike in the middle of peace and war.

Bacchus was often called a peaceful god, a lover of dances and games, but as he is at peace, so he is in the midst of war. The final stanza perhaps suggests the god's preferred approach to conflict: Cerberus submits meekly to Bacchus (29 *te uidit insons Cerberus*) on account of his extraordinary appearance (29-30 *aureo / cornu decorum*). Thus his power even in conflict is essentially pacifying, and this final image argues that the violent punishments he meted out to Pentheus, Lycurgus, and Rhoetus were extreme expedients and do not make him a warlike god.

The assimilation of speaker and addressee is not limited to the striking presence of Bacchus within the speaker. In fact, this god appears to have been in some sense created in the poet's image. The role of teacher of songs, which the god assumes at the beginning of the poem, is elsewhere taken by the speaker himself.⁶² *Idem pacis eras mediusque belli* is a difficult phrase to unravel: does it mean equally powerful and energetic in war and in peace?⁶³ Or occupying a middle point between the two, and drifting as circumstances urge to the one or the other?⁶⁴ Or central to both in different ways, bringing joy to peace, and calm and equanimity

⁶¹ Bentley 1711: 129-30 conjectured *horribilisque* in order that the Latin clearly state that Bacchus himself has been transformed into a lion. But Pöschl 1991: 312-13 keeps *horribiliq*, and argues that lion is merely in Bacchus' retinue, a tool and an emanation of the god who would not so exert himself physically: 'Die Götter kämpfen nicht, sondern siegen durch ihre geistige Gewalt.' Others favor *horribilemque*, suggesting that Rhoetus is the lion; cf. N-H 1978: 328.

⁶² Cf. 1.21.1-4, 3.1.1-4, 4.6.41-44, *Carmen Saeculare* 6.

⁶³ So Porphyrio and many others.

⁶⁴ Dillenburger 1875: 156.

to war?⁶⁵ In this last case Bacchus could be a projection of the soldier/poet persona, or the wine with which both soldier and poet fortify themselves.⁶⁶ Yet the poet does not connect Bacchus to wine in this poem and, in fact, resists this equation by making the extraordinary claim to have seen the god in the flesh.

In *Odes* 3.25, the last of the poems addressed to Bacchus, the god seems much closer to a force or an emotional state. This ode also begins with a possession (1-2):

Quo me, Bacche, rapis tui
plenum?

Where are you taking me, Bacchus, full of you?

The speaker imagines that he is being carried away into groves or caves to sing the apotheosis of great Caesar (2-6); what he will sing will be remarkable, new, before now unheard of (7-8). Here, however, the poet introduces a simile comparing the speaker's experience with that of a Maenad (8-14):⁶⁷

non secus in iugis
exsomnis stupet Euhias
Hebrum prospiciens et niue candidam 10
Thracen ac pede barbaro
lustratam Rhodopen, ut mihi deuio
ripas et uacuum nemus
mirari libet.

Just as the sleepless devotee of Euhius gazes in wonder looking from mountain ridges onto the Hebrus and Thrace white with snow and

⁶⁵ Cf. 1.18.5 (*quis post uina grauem militiam . . . crepat?*), 2.7.5-8, *Epod.* 9.35-36 (*quod fluentem nau-seam coerceat / metire nobis Caecubum*), *Epist.* 1.5.17 ([*ebrietas*] *ad proelia trudit inertem*). Pöschl 1991: 314 puts the emphasis on *idem*, and notes that *idem . . . medius belli* may allude to the godlike equanimity of philosophers; cf. 3.21.11 *prisci Catonis / saepe mero caluisse uirtus*.

⁶⁶ Commager 1969: 339 and Lowrie 1997: 209 note the analogy between Bacchus and Horace. A similar persona is ascribed to Alcaeus in 1.32.5-12. Archilochus also claims to be a warrior, a poet and a servant of Dionysus (cf. *frr.* 1, 2 and 120; *fr.* 4 mixes drinking and guard duty).

⁶⁷ Cf. Fraenkel 1957: 257: 'So intense is the poet's vision of what is happening to the Maenad that he almost identifies himself with her.'

Mt. Rhodope, danced across by barbarous foot, so too I delight in this remote place to marvel at river banks and the empty grove.

No longer summoned from a distance, the god is already present within the speaker and actually carrying him away. Nor has the speaker precipitated some action for which he begs divine assistance—he merely marvels passively at the miraculous wilderness through which Bacchus is transporting him. Inspiration in this case means the disavowing of any poetic initiative, just as the Bacchant acts entirely under the god's power. The description of the god is once again tinged with fear of Bacchus' awesome power. The Naiads and Bacchants over whom he holds sway can uproot tall trees (14-16), and the reader who recalls the punishment of Agave will recognize that this superhuman strength can bring misery to worshippers and profaners of rites alike. Indeed, the opening question of the poem could be read as a variation on the cries for mercy in 2.19 (2.19.7-8 *parce, Liber / parce*); in this poem as well there is a chance that the speaker is seized against his will. The final stanza expresses the quandary perfectly (16-20):

nil paruum aut humili modo,
 nil mortale loquar. dulce periculum est,
 o Lenae, sequi deum
 cingentem uiridi tempora pampino.

. . . nothing small or in a humble mode, nothing mortal will I say.
 It is a sweet danger, O Lenaeus, to follow a god, binding my
 temples with a green vine.

The speaker is caught up in the excitement of the god's powers, but fear lingers. There is no request for the god's support, but rather the confident and repeated statement that a remarkable song is imminent (4 *audiar*, 6 *dicam*, 18 *loquar*). Just as the future tense leaves the impression of something unfinished, so too does the abrupt beginning veil the exact origin of the inspiration in mystery.

Why should this Bacchus not be a metonym for wine? This fits *tui plenum*, and binding one's temples with leaves of the grapevine could be a polite and figurative way to allude to intoxication. *Dulce periculum* also seems apt in this sense: the loss of inhibition and pain is sweet, the loss of control dangerous. And the association of wine and poetic inspiration is a

well-known theme in Horace and other poets; a humorous treatment elsewhere does not necessarily preclude a serious treatment here.⁶⁸

Nevertheless, critics have scrupulously avoided this interpretation.⁶⁹ The cause is not simply that the conjunction of wine and political panegyric is too jarring to entertain seriously. It is rather the fact that Bacchus, although he begins the poem as a spiritual force transporting the poet, is still very much the anthropomorphic god of myth. His habitat is groves, river banks and caverns; he holds sway over Naiads and Bacchae. The central metaphor of the poet as a Maenad, who sleepless and astonished gazes over snowy Thrace, gives poetic inspiration a striking mythical and ritual character. From this perspective, the final image may retreat somewhat from the full *enthusiasmos* of the opening lines; here the speaker is not borne quite so wildly away, but follows with some consciousness the footsteps of the god.

Each poem of the Bacchus odes is susceptible to allegorical interpretation, which would equate Bacchus to wine or irrationality personified. In 2.19, Bacchus has already possessed the speaker, who trembles with joy and fear. The god himself is both peaceful and warlike, just as wine, companion of song and dances, fortifier of the soldier's nerves. In 3.25, the speaker is again possessed with poetic inspiration, again aware that the god's power may expose him to danger, but this time he does not resist, rather submitting fully, putting himself in the god's hands, and allowing the experience to happen to him, so full of the god that he has lost all his moderation.⁷⁰ Yet Bacchus still manifests himself in an unavoidably corporeal fashion. In 1.18, he is the god of the Bacchic rout, with its ritual secrets and instruments of wild music, the very ritual which the vivid depiction of the ritual landscape and the extended metaphor of the Maenad of 3.25 seem especially to recall. And the Bacchus

⁶⁸ Cf. Archilochus fr. 120, who sings once his wits have been 'blasted' with wine (ὥς Διωνύσου ἄνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος / οἶδα διθύραμβον οἶνῳ συγκεραυνωθείς φρένας), 3.19.14-15, 3.21.13-14, *Epist.* 1.5.19, 1.19.1-11.

⁶⁹ K-H 1908: 358: 'Der Dithyrambus ... ist durch das mit erschütternder Gewalt plötzlich auftretende Bewußtsein von Cäsars Göttlichkeit eingegeben ...' Fowler 2002: 151, noting the analogy of the Bacchant, puts this possession in the context of gender: 'Horace figures himself as feminized by the process of inspiration.' This is again paralleled by his awe of Augustus: 'The poet loses control and feminized before the mighty force of the patron's power ...' N-R 2004: 299: 'Horace is not referring to intoxication ...'

⁷⁰ So too in *Odes* 1.18, the speaker asks Bacchus to hold his more unruly and disgraceful followers in check; is he thus proposing moderate drunkenness, mild forgetfulness, and less than full submission to irrational desires and emotions?

who is glimpsed in 2.19 teaching songs to nymphs is even more anthropomorphic than these other two.

Just as hymn and prayer claim for the lyric voice the power to reach the distant and invisible, apostrophe claims the power to reach the mute and unhearing.⁷¹ Just as hymning or praying characterizes the speaker as pious, as the sort of person to whom the gods might respond, so too does apostrophizing characterize the speaker as a mystic, as the sort of person to whom the natural world might respond. The poet of the *Odes* therefore approaches inanimate objects in much the same way he approaches his favored divinities and personifies them creatively and elegantly. *Odes* 3.21, the famous ode to a wine jar, offers an example in the form of a parody of a hymn (*Odes* 3.21.1-8):

O nata mecum consule Manlio,
 seu tu querellas siue geris iocos
 seu rixam et insanos amores
 seu facilem, pia testa, somnum,
 quocumque lectum nomine Massicum 5
 seruas, moueri digna bono die
 descende Coruino iubente
 promere languidiora uina.

O born with me when Manlius was consul, whether you bring complaints or jests or a quarrel or insane love or, devout jar, easy sleep, by whatever name you guard the choice Massic, worthy to be brought out for an auspicious day, come down when Corvinus asks that a mellower wine be produced.

It has long been recognized that this poem has many of the features of a hymn.⁷² *Descende* recalls the invocation of Calliope in *Odes* 3.4 (3.4.1 *Descende caelo et dic age*). But the basic similarity between this poem and poems addressed to the Muses and to Bacchus, for example, is the animation of the addressee, by which process the addressee, paradoxically, begins to resemble the speaker. That the jar was ‘born’ in the same year as the speaker anticipates this move. The jar, not its devotee,

⁷¹ Cf. Culler 2002: 135-54.

⁷² Norden 1913: 143-63, Commager 1962: 126-28, Grant 1977: 22, Nisbet 2002: 82.

is pious.⁷³ Furthermore, what it contains is almost the full range of the drinker's emotional life: laughter, quarrels, love and sleep. Like Calliope, the jar will come out from the storeroom under its own power. Similar anthropomorphic touches are found in the *Odes*' other apostrophes. The ship of 1.3 is addressed as a business partner to whom the speaker has made a loan (1.3.5-6 *tibi creditum / debes Vergilium*). The ship of 1.14 is capable of bringing herself back to port (1.14.2-3 *o quid agis? fortiter occupa / portum*), but she is the daughter of an illustrious family (1.14.12 *siluae filia nobilis*) who puts inordinate trust in her lineage (*iactes et genus et nomen inutile* 1.14.13); nevertheless the speaker finds himself passionately concerned for her well-being (1.14.18 *nunc desiderium cura-que non levis*). The lyre of 1.32 is called upon not just to accompany, but in fact to sing the song (1.32.3-4 *age dic Latinum / barbite, carmen*). The tree of 2.13 is a prodigal son, begotten or raised by a sacrilegious father (2.13.2-3 *sacrilega manu / produxit*), and destined to bring disgrace to his family and hometown (2.13.3-4 *in nepotum / perniciem opprobriumque pagi*). Even the Fons Bandusiae of 3.13 is a chatterbox (3.13.15-16 *unde loquaces / lympae desiliunt tuae*).⁷⁴

Such touches are admittedly very light, but they indicate an interest in exploring the possibilities of address, in thinking imaginatively about how objects might be animate, or more precisely, in ascribing to the addressee characteristics proper to the speaker. It has already been shown that the Muses and Bacchus may stand in for aspects of this same self. Different gods or objects may symbolize the same emotional state. The lyre of 1.32 lightens labors (1.32.14-15 *o laborum / dulce lenimen*), just as wine puts cares to flight (1.18.3-4 *neque / mordaces aliter diffugiunt sollicitudines*), just as the Muses refresh Augustus (3.4.37-40 *Caesarem ... finire quaerentem labores / Pierio recreatis antro*). Calliope brings with her pleasant insanity (3.4.5-6 *amabilis / insania*), just as the wine jar is a mild instrument of torture (3.21.13 *lene tormentum*), just as to follow Bacchus is a sweet danger (3.25.18 *dulce periculum*). Wine makes the drinker forget war (1.18.5 *quis post uina grauem militiam ...*

⁷³ A god may be *pious*, though the usage is rare: cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.536, 4.382, 5.688-89 and N-R 2004: 248. The examples from Virgil are all conditions asking whether the gods will reciprocate human devotion, so N-R prefer to translate 'kindly.' I have kept 'devout' because I think 'kindly' flattens the personification somewhat; cf. Grant 1977: 24, who argues that Horace plays with the idea that the jar is a woman and *pia* suits a lover, and Syndikus 1973: 189 ('dem Dichter getreu').

⁷⁴ Cf. Commager 1962: 324, Fitzgerald 1999: 196-98.

crepat), just as Bacchus is commonly considered a god of peace (2.19.26-27 *non sat idoneus / pugnae ferebaris*; 3.3.13-14 *tuae / uexere tigres indocili iugum / collo trahentes*), just as the lyre is peaceful (1.6.10 *inbelisque lyrae*) and just as the Muses offer gentle advice (3.4.41 *lene consilium*). These parallels are all the more reason to interpret all such addresses as addresses of the irrational sphere of the speaker's soul, as ways of speaking to that unresponsive yet liberating impulse whose nature can seem uncontrollable.⁷⁵

How can this manner of address, which presumes to internalize external objects and divinities, to make them part of the speaker, coexist with the strong tendency, evident throughout the *Odes*, to individualize and personify non-human addressees? It may be simply that this tendency toward extremes of anthropomorphism, heretical to Plato and Epicurus but characteristic of Greek poets from the time of Homer and Sappho, is imitated by Horace in order to make his divine addressees as lifelike as his human addressees.⁷⁶ Yet there is an additional dimension to the apostrophe of the wine jar: the paradox of this object endowed not only with individuality and will, but also made responsible for the drinker's actions, vividly dramatizes the weakness of the will in the face of irrational impulse, by illustrating, in particular, how this impulse may seem to come from something or someone else. Once the jar descends and releases its latent power, anger, laughter, violence, love and sleep fall upon the speaker as if from without.

The impulse as personified other, hailed and feared as uncontrollable and divine—this is the most spiritual and most proximate deity in the *Odes*. The Muses, Bacchus and their instruments of power are almost interchangeable instances of this same thought and feeling. It should be no surprise, then, that some of the most striking demonstrations of the addressee's presence—namely the speaker's possession by Calliope in 3.4 and Bacchus in 3.25—and the most complex gestures to the audience (2.19.2 *credite posteris*; 3.4.5 *auditis*) occur in poems addressed to these interrelated gods. On the other hands, the principal gods of state cult,

⁷⁵ Schmidt 2002: 179 compiles a similar group of 'göttlichen Kräfte, die in den Oden das Musische interpretieren.'

⁷⁶ Cf. Burkert 1985: 182-89; he argues that the early Greek poets, especially Homer, take the anthropomorphism of the Near Eastern pantheon to a new extreme: 'the gods as the poets introduce them are human almost to the last detail. They are far from purely spiritual. Vital elements of corporeality belong inalienably to their being ...' (183).

Apollo and Jupiter, are approached cautiously and kept at a distance. Mercury occupies a middle point: he shares the characteristics of the poet, pointing the way from the distant and impassive Olympians of Epicurean doctrine to the immediacy of divine presence that inheres in the poems addressed to Bacchus and the Muses. Yet he is the first step only, not the culmination, of Horace's poetic negotiation of the divine.

Of central importance to the Augustan program of religious revival was the restoration of the 82 temples in need of repair during his sixth consulship (28 BC).⁷⁷ Some gods, however, received more favorable treatment than others. The Temple of the Dionysiac Triad (Liber, Libera and Ceres) on the Aventine, for instance, burned to the ground in 31 BC and was not fully restored until AD 17, when it was rededicated by Tiberius. Though the *princeps* could claim to have passed over no temple, the inferior status of this ancient but plebeian cult in the hierarchy of Augustan religion was nonetheless made clear.⁷⁸ Horace, who was inspired to speak prophetically in favor of the rebuilding program, enforced his own hierarchy of divinity through lyric address and varying modes of divine presence.⁷⁹ Apollo and Jupiter are kept at a respectful distance; Mercury draws closer, a minor deity symbolically elevated above the others. The Muses and Bacchus are not only summoned, but actually appear; in a sense, they are with us always, slumbering embers of expanded consciousness, waiting to be awakened by the sudden gust of poetic sensibility.

⁷⁷ *Res Gestae* 20.

⁷⁸ Zanker 1988: 109-10.

⁷⁹ *Odes* 3.4.1-2 *Delicta maiorum inmeritis lues / Romane, donec templa refeceris ...*

References

- Barber, D. T. 2012. 'Address and the Continuity of Horace, *Odes* 1.34-35', *Hermes* 140: 505-513.
- Barber, D. T. 2014. 'Presence and the Future Tense in Horace's *Odes*', *CJ* 109: 333-61.
- Bentley, R., ed. 1711. *Q. Horatius Flaccus, ex recensione et cum notis*. 3rd ed. New York.
- Borzsák, S. 1995. 'Superis deorum gratus et imis (Zu Horaz C. 1,10)', in G. Alföldy et al., eds., *Römische Lebenskunst*. Heidelberg. 11-19.
- Breuer, J. 2008. *Der Mythos in den Oden des Horaz: Praetexte, Formen, Funktionen*. Göttingen.
- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Burkert, W. 1994. 'Griechische Hymnoi', in W. Burkert and F. Stolz, eds., *Hymnen der alten Welt im Kulturvergleich*. Göttingen. 9-17.
- Cairns, F. 1971. 'Horace, *Odes* 1.2', *Eranos* 69: 68-88.
- Cairns, F. 1983. 'Alcaeus' Hymn to Hermes, *P. Oxy.* 2734 Fr. 1 and Horace *Odes* 1,10', *QUCC* 13: 29-35.
- Clay, J. S. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Clay, J. S. 2010. 'Horace and Lesbian Lyric', in Gregson Davis, ed., *A Companion to Horace*. Chichester. 128-46.
- Coleman, R. 1977. *Vergil: Eclogues*. Cambridge.
- Commager, S. 1962. *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*. New Haven.
- Culler, J. 2002. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. 2nd ed. Ithaca.
- Dacier, A., ed. 1709. *Oeuvres d'Horace en latin et en français avec des remarques critiques et historiques*. Paris.
- Dillenburger, W., ed. 1875. *Q. Horatii Flacci opera omnia*. 6th ed. Bonn.
- Dodds, E. R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.
- Dodds, E. R. 1960. *Euripides: Bacchae*. Oxford.
- Dyck, A. R., ed. 2003. *De natura deorum: Liber 1*. Cambridge.
- Fitzgerald, W. 1999. 'Horace, Pleasure and the Text (Part 2)', in W.S. Anderson, ed., *Why Horace? A Collection of Interpretations*. Wauconda, Ill. 196-204.
- Fowler, D. P. 2002. 'Masculinity under Threat? The Poetics and Politics of Inspiration in Latin Poetry', in E. Spentzou and D. P. Fowler, eds.,

- Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*. Oxford. 141-59.
- Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.
- Galinsky, K. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton.
- Gildersleeve, B. L., ed. 1885. *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York.
- Grant, J. N. 1977. 'The Winejar as Lover in Horace, C. 3.21', *CJ* 73: 22-26.
- Griffin, J. 1997. 'Cult and Personality in Horace', *JRS* 87: 54-69.
- Griffin, J. 2007. 'Gods and Religion', in S. Harrison, ed., *Cambridge Companion to Horace* Cambridge. 181-94.
- Heinze, R. 1923. 'Die Horazische Ode.' *Neue Jahrbücher* 51: 153-68.
- Houghton, L. B. T. 2007. 'Horace, *Odes* I,10—a Very Literary Hymn', *Latomus* 66: 636-41.
- Kießling, A., and R. Heinze, eds. 1908. [N-H] *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Oden und Epoden*, with 'Nachwort und bibliographische Nachträge' by E. Burck. 11th ed. Berlin.
- Laird, A. 2002. 'Authority and Ontology of the Muses in Epic Reception', in E. Spentzou and D. P. Fowler, eds., *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*. Oxford. 117-40.
- Long, A. A., and D. N. Sedley. 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. Cambridge.
- Lowrie, M. 1997. *Horace's Narrative Odes*. Oxford.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 2007. *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry*. Oxford.
- Mankin, D. 1995. *Horace: Epodes*. Cambridge.
- Miller, J. F. 1998. 'Horace's Pindaric Apollo (*Odes* 3.4.60-4)', *CQ* 48: 545-52.
- Miller, J. F. 2009. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge.
- Miller, P. A. 1991. 'Horace, Mercury, and Augustus, or the Poetic Ego of *Odes* 1-3', *AJP* 112: 365-88.
- Murray, P. 1981. 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece', *JHS* 101: 87-100.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. 2002. 'A Wine-Jar for Messalla: *Carmina* 3.21', in A. J. Woodman and D. C. Feeney, eds., *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Cambridge. 80-92.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and M. Hubbard. 1970. [K-H] *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and M. Hubbard. 1978. [N-H] *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*. Oxford.

- Nisbet, R. G. M., and N. Rudd. 2004. [N-H] *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book III*. Oxford.
- Norden, E. 1913. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig.
- Oksala, T. 1973. *Religion und Mythologie bei Horaz. Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung*. Helsinki.
- Pöschl, V. 1991. *Horazische Lyrik: Interpretationen*. 2nd ed. Heidelberg.
- Quinn, K., ed. 1980. *Horace: Odes*. London.
- Reckford, K. 1969. *Horace*. New York.
- Schmidt, E. A. 2002. *Zeit und Form: Dichtungen des Horaz*. Heidelberg.
- Spentzou, E., and D. P. Fowler, eds. 2002. *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*. Oxford.
- Veyne, P. 1965. 'Quid dedicatum poscit Apollinem?', *Latomus* 24: 932-48.
- West, D. A. 1995. *Horace Odes I: Carpe diem*. Oxford.
- West, D. A. 2002. *Horace Odes III: Dulce periculum*. Oxford.
- Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor.

Psychopompoi in Horace's Odes

Blanche Conger McCune

The various and unusual roles of Mercury in Horace's *Odes* have received much scholarly comment, particularly his appearance at the end of 1.2 when Horace invites Mercury to come to Rome incarnate as Octavian.¹ As a god who, in mythological narratives, often interacts directly with mortals through his role as the divine messenger,² he is appropriately one of the few gods who interacts directly and personally with Horace in the *Odes*.³ In 2.7 he is credited with saving Horace at Philippi, and in 2.17 the poet claims that it was Faunus, the 'protector of Mercury's men' (*Mercurialium | custos uirorum*, 2.17.29-30), who saved him from the nearly fatal falling tree of 2.13.

In this paper, however, I will discuss a different aspect of Mercury's direct interaction with mortals: his role as the guide of souls to the realm of the dead. The *Mercurialis uir*, too, is a sort of poetic psychopomp in the *Odes*, imaginatively leading mortals to the underworld through his poems. Seeing this connection between Horace and his patron god reveals another facet of Horace's self-description as one of 'Mercury's men' and adds to our understanding of the relationship between the god and the poet, who both shares the god's attributes and partners with him in accomplishing his aims.

¹ Recently, Clay 2016 has shown how Mercury's connection to restraint and reconciliation make him, for Horace, a suitable model for Octavian as he seeks to be Rome's savior.

² Buisel 2008: 51 points out that Hermes is particularly close to mortals for an Olympian; see Hom. *Il.* 24.334-35, *h. Merc.* 577-78 (Hermes' closeness to mortals is not *always* a benefit for them).

³ The other gods who are depicted as interacting personally with Horace are Faunus (1.17, 2.17), Venus (e.g. 1.19), Bacchus (e.g. 3.8, 3.25), and the Muses (e.g. 3.4).

I. Mercury as Psychopomp

One of the primary functions of Mercury in the *Odes* is that of psychopomp. His role as shepherd of souls is mentioned specifically in three out of the seven poems which refer to him, including the end of the Hymn to Mercury, *Odes* 1.10. This grim task might seem an odd choice for a hymn in praise of a god described from the beginning as a benefactor to mortals and a humorous trickster.⁴ Horace himself depicts the serious side of Mercury's involvement in bringing souls to the afterlife at the end of 1.24, the ode to Vergil upon the death of his friend Quintilius (1.24.13-18):

quid si Threicio blandius Orpheo
auditam moderere arboribus fidem?
num uanae redeat sanguis imagini,
quam uirga semel horrida,

15

non lenis precibus fata recludere,
nigro compulerit Mercurius gregi?⁵

What if you played your lyre, heard by the trees, more pleasingly
than Thracian Orpheus? Blood wouldn't return to the empty
shade, would it, once Mercury, who does not leniently open the
gates of death because of prayers, has driven the dark herd with
his terrible wand?⁶

From the standpoint of the bereaved, Mercury's task is horrible, emphasized by calling his wand (elsewhere *aurea*, as below in 1.10) *horrida*. Here there is no mention of the Elysian Fields,⁷ nor does Horace hint at any rest for the departed: the focus is on the fact that for those still living the dead

⁴ Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 133 suggest that 'a hymn to Hermes might appropriately end with a prayer for a peaceful death' and explain that Horace departs from the usual form here (he does not actually ask for a peaceful death, but only lists shepherding souls to the underworld as one of Mercury's attributes) because he is 'a rationalist and a sceptic.' However, there is perhaps a more specific reason why Horace emphasizes Mercury's role as psychopomp rather than praying for a peaceful death: the ode is about Mercury as a mediator between cosmic realms (Clay 2016: 291-92) as well as a god of boundaries, and in the final stanza of 1.10 (quoted below) we see Mercury going between heaven, earth, and the underworld and specifically placing pious shades in the location specially set apart for and allotted to them (Kiessling and Heinze 1955 *ad loc.*).

⁵ The text of the *Odes* used throughout is that of Shackleton Bailey 2001 unless otherwise noted.

⁶ All translations are my own.

⁷ Cf. Mayer 2012: 173.

friend is inaccessible.⁸ However, elsewhere in the *Odes*, when the viewpoint is not that of the bereaved but of the souls of the dead, Mercury's shepherding is portrayed as a relief for some leaving this life (2.18.32-40):

. . . aequa tellus

pauperi recluditur
 regumque pueris, nec satelles Orci
 callidum Promethea 35
 reuinxit auro captus. hic superbum

Tantalum atque Tantalī
 genus coercet, hic leuare functum
 pauperem laboribus
 uocatus atque non uocatus audit. 40

The earth opens the same for a poor man and the sons of kings, and the attendant of Orcus [i.e. Mercury] did not, bribed with gold, untie clever Prometheus.⁹ He corrals proud Tantalus and Tantalus' kind [i.e. impious rulers or, literally, Tantalus' offspring]; when called to free a poor man from the labors he has finished, and when not called, he hears him.¹⁰

⁸ Cf. Buisel 2008: 60.

⁹ Shackleton Bailey 2001 prints *reuexit* and explains that *satelles Orci* refers to 'Charon, non Mercurius;' so also Kiessling and Heinze 1955: 238. Both *reuinxit* and *reuexit* are manuscript readings. There is some scholarly dispute over just who the *satelles Orci* is and, therefore, as Harrison 2017: 219 points out, what verb should be used. Kiessling and Heinze 1955: 238 suggest that the myth of Prometheus attempting to bribe Charon to convey him back (*reuexit*) may come from Maecenas' *Prometheus*. Allen 2003 proposes that *satelles Orci* ought to be emended to *satelles Orcus*—'nor, like a minion, bribed by gold, did Orcus release . . .' (618)—in which case the appropriate verb would most likely be *reuinxit*. The primary objections to identifying the *satelles* as Mercury are that *satelles* is too negative a word to apply to the god and that there is no myth in which Prometheus tries to bribe Mercury to release him (*reuinxit*); however, the latter objection could also be made about the Charon/*reuexit* theory. For arguments in favor of Mercury/*reuinxit*, see Nisbet and Hubbard 1978: 311-12 and West 1998: 135, and for Mercury/*reuexit*, see Harrison 2017: 219. The description of the duties of the *satelles* in lines 36-40 sound more like those of Mercury than Charon (cf. Harrison 2017: 219); furthermore, the use of the verb *coercet* in line 38 echoes its use in 1.10.18, quoted below (note also the use of *recludere* and *recluditur* in 1.24.17 and 2.18.33, respectively). Additionally, as Harrison 2017: 220 points out, 'Mercury is perhaps the most suitable divine target for bribery as the main divinity concerned with financial gain.'

¹⁰ *laboribus* is taken *apo koinou* with both *leuare* and *functum*. For the translation of *uocatus* with the infinitive see OLD s.v. *uoco* 1b, 'to call upon, invoke (gods, etc.).'

For those who have lived impiously, like Tantalus, no matter how rich they have been in life, the underworld is a place of confinement (cf. *coercet*, 38, and *coerces*, 1.10.18, quoted below) apart from the pleasures their money once afforded;¹¹ however, for the pauper in line 39 (who is presumably pious rather than impious, since he is not included in the *Tantali genus*, which can mean both ‘race’ and ‘ilk’¹²) the underworld Mercury guides him to consists of a pleasant release, a lightening (*leuare*, 38) as he leaves behind the burden of his labors.¹³ In the Hymn to Mercury, *Odes* 1.10, Horace specifically mentions the ‘happy abodes’ of the ‘pious souls’ which Mercury leads them to (1.10.17-20):

tu pias laetis animas reponis
sedibus uirgaque leuem coerces
aurea turbam, superis deorum
gratus et imis.

You place the pious souls in happy abodes and with your golden wand you corral the insubstantial crowd, pleasing to the gods above and below.

For the pious dead, the Olympian gods, and the gods of the underworld, Mercury’s role as psychopomp is beneficial and welcome, and therefore, although this job seems gloomy and severe to those who have just lost a loved one as in 1.24, it is appropriate to celebrate it in a hymn to the god.¹⁴

¹¹ The wealth of Tantalus is mentioned at Strabo 14.5.28; this wealth eventually belonged to Attalus and his heirs, mentioned in this ode in lines 6-7. Womble 1961: 548, points out that Tantalus’ famous punishment parallels the rich man’s greed: like a rich man who stops at nothing to acquire more and more land (2.18.20-28), Tantalus suffers from an unending craving for what he does not have.

¹² Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard 1978 ad loc.

¹³ Cf. Harrison 2017 *ad loc.*, who also notes that the verb *leuare* ‘is also used of Mercury-inspired alleviation at the end of the previous poem (2.17.29 *leuasset*)’.

¹⁴ Just who are these ‘pious’ who get to enjoy Elysium? In the *Odes* Horace seems to apply *pietas* broadly to those who worship the gods appropriately (2.14.2) and to himself as a poet whom the gods favor because of his piety (1.17.13; cf. Thomson 1997 on *pium poetam* at Catull. 16.5); elsewhere in the *Odes*, *pious* and *impius* seem to mean generally good or god-fearing versus wicked or hubristic. This seems to suggest something like the dualistic depiction of the afterlife—punishment for the wicked, reward for those who avoided wrongdoing—cf Pindar in *Ol.* 2.57-83, where, after three repeated virtuous lives, the non-sinners gain a permanent home among the blessed; cf. Pl. *Grg.* 524a.

II. Leading Lyde to the Underworld

Mercury and the underworld appear together in another ode as well, 3.11. In that poem, Horace first invokes the god and the lyre he invented (see 1.10.6) and then asks the lyre to play a song specifically for a girl named Lyde who is refusing to enter into a relationship with a man (3.11.1-8):¹⁵

Mercuri (nam te docilis magistro
mouit Amphion lapides canendo)
tuque, testudo, resonare septem
callida neruis,

nec loquax olim neque grata, nunc et
diuitum mensis et amica templis,
dic modos Lyde quibus obstinatas
applicet auris.

5

Mercury (for with you as master teachable Amphion moved stones with his singing) and you, tortoise-shell, who cleverly resound with your seven strings, once neither speaking nor pleasing, now a friend to both the tables and temples of the gods, speak measures to which Lyde might apply her obstinate ears.

In these stanzas Horace elegantly merges together the god, the instrument, and the poet who uses the lyre. The first stanza includes two vocatives, but the imperative *dic* at line 7 is singular: presumably he is addressing only the lyre at this point,¹⁶ but one wonders why he calls upon Mercury when the task in question is to be performed by the tortoise-shell. In fact, Horace has taken the attributes of the lyre's maker from his Hymn to Mercury (which begins with the same word, *Mercuri*, and continues in the same meter, Sapphic strophe) and given those attributes to the lyre: *callida* (3.11.4) echoes *callidum* (1.10.7), *loquax* (3.11.5) recalls *facunde* (1.10.1), *grata* (3.11.5) echoes *gratus* (1.10.20), *diuitum mensis et amica templis* (3.11.6) loosely corresponds to *superis deorum* | *gratus et imis* (1.10.19-20).¹⁷ Mercury gave

¹⁵ On the nature of the relationship desired, see, e.g. Bradshaw 1978: 156, 164-65 and Quinn 1980: 264 (marriage to a husband), and Cairns 1975: 133-34 and West 2002: 111 (affair with Horace).

¹⁶ West 2002: 106.

¹⁷ Simply reading from left to right, 3.11.5-6 might be read as *nec loquax olim neque grata, nunc [grata] et diuitum mensis et amica templis*, with *amica* unanticipated since *grata* could be understood from

the previously mute tortoise-shell its voice, and, as lines 5-6 show, that voice is itself Mercurial.¹⁸ The *testudo* of 3.11 is a Mercurial lyre which functions as a physical extension of the god and can act in his sphere of authority.¹⁹ Just as Mercury taught Amphion to use the lyre to move stones to build the walls of Thebes (1-2), in Horace's hands the Mercurial lyre will play a song that will move Lyde and her obstinate ears (7-8).²⁰

This song, the song Mercury and the lyre partner to produce through the poet,²¹ consists of a descent into the underworld,²² led by the poet/lyre/god, a fitting task for Mercury the psychopomp (3.11.13-24):

tu potes tigris comitesque siluas
ducere et riuos celeris morari;
cessit immanis tibi blandienti
ianitor aulae, 15

Cerberus, quamuis furiale centum
muniant angues caput aestuetque
spiritus taeter saniesque manet
ore trilingui. 20

quin et Ixion Tityosque uultu
risit inuito, stetit urna paulum
sicca, dum grato Danai puellas
carmine mulces.

earlier in the line. It should additionally be noted that these lines also echo 1.32.13-14, *O decus Phoebi et dapibus supremi | grata testudo Iouis*, and that Horace likely means the reader to recall both.

¹⁸ Even the fact that Horace mentions that the lyre has seven strings—thereby allowing a greater number of notes and harmonies—reflects the multifaceted nature of the clever god as depicted in *Odes* 1.10 (in a mere twenty lines Horace mentions that that he gave humans speech, made the rules for wrestling, is the messenger of Jupiter, invented the lyre, stole Apollo's quiver when Apollo approached him about the cattle-stealing, led Priam to Achilles' tent, and leads the dead to their eternal homes—in addition to depicting him, in turns, as eloquent, clever, beneficent, sneaky, thieving, humorous, and well-liked).

¹⁹ Cairns 1975: 132 suggests that 'Mercury is being asked to supply the words while the lyre will provide the tune. The theme is the underworld which Mercury as psychopomp and the lyre as a former visitor in the hands of Orpheus are well qualified to treat.'

²⁰ Cf. Quinn 1980: 264.

²¹ Cf. West 2002: 106, who compares the opening of this poem to the opening lines of an epic where poets 'ask the Muse to sing, to utter, to speak, the poems which flow from the lips of the poet.'

²² Lowrie 1997: 277, for whom the *katabasis* which showcases the power of poetry is one of the elements of the poem that suggest a metapoetic reading.

You are able to lead tigers and forests as your companions and to delay swift rivers; he yielded to your coaxing, the doorkeeper of the huge hall, Cerberus, although a hundred snakes defend his Fury-like head and his foul breath boils out and bloody discharge oozes from the three-tongued mouth. Moreover, both Ixion and Tityos laughed though their faces were unwilling, and the urn stood dry for a little while, while you soothed Danaus' girls with your pleasing song.

Following the path of Orpheus (alluded to in lines 13-14), the reader or listener is made to see, first, the 'huge hall' and the 'doorkeeper,' Cerberus. As we get closer to Cerberus we see his head writhing with a hundred snakes; a moment later we are closer and can feel the heat and smell the stench of the 'foul breath' coming from his three, gore-slaverling mouths (poetically singular in their effect),²³ with their three tongues grotesquely lolling. Past Cerberus, on whom the lyre has had a neutralizing effect, we enter the underworld proper and see two famous sinners. Although we have been thinking of Orpheus, when we see Ixion and Tityos not merely stunned (as Ixion at Verg. G. 4.484) but *laughing* (*risit*, 22) against their will (*uultu ... inuito*, 21-22), we are reminded that the lyre in the ode is not in the hands of Orpheus but in those of Horace, who has invoked Mercury to aid him in the song, Mercury who, with a 'jocular theft' (*iocosus ... furto*, 1.10.7-8), could make Apollo *laugh* even in the midst of his anger: *te ... puerum minaci | uoce dum terret, uiduus pharetra | risit Apollo* (1.10.9-12).²⁴ Finally we reach the Danaids, and Horace asks the lyre (3.11.25-34),

audiat Lyde scelus atque notas
uirginum poenas et inane lymphae
dolum fundo pereuntis imo
seraque fata,

25

quae manent culpas etiam sub Orco.
impiae nam (quid potuere maius?),

30

²³ Nisbet and Rudd 2004: 158.

²⁴ Houghton 2007: 640-41 notes a literary aspect to these lines from 1.10: in Mercury's 'playful theft' we can see a reference to Horace's own 'playful appropriation' of other authors in that ode; see also Clay 2016: 292-93.

impiae sponso potuere duro
perdere ferro.

una de multis face nuptiali
digna ... fuit ...

Let Lyde hear about the crime and the well-known punishments of the maidens and the urn empty of the water that leaked through at the very bottom and the slow fate which remains for crimes even below in Orcus. For the impious women (what more impious thing could they do?), the impious women were able to destroy their bridegrooms with hard iron. One out of the many women was worthy of the marriage torch ...

Why should Lyde hear about these women and their eternal punishment? Horace is implying that Lyde, by refusing to enter a relationship with a man (as Horace makes clear in lines 9-12), is committing a sin like that of the Danaids, who all (but Hypermnestra) killed their bridegrooms on their wedding night and therefore remained 'virgins' (*uirginum*, 26). This is obviously extremely hyperbolic,²⁵ a tone appropriate to the laughing, Mercurial lyre. Furthermore, the suggestion that Lyde should emulate Hypermnestra is absurdly mismatched to Horace's purposes: Horace presumably wants Lyde to enter into a long-lasting relationship, but Hypermnestra, in the speech which takes up the rest of the poem, exhorts her husband to flee and leave her behind and imagines that she will die before they can be reunited (37-52). Like the hyperbole, the absurdity of this inapt model is suited to Mercurial humor.²⁶ Horace has dragged a listening Lyde down into the underworld to show her the Danaids and, he hopes, through his joke to convince her to give in.

In *Odes* 3.11, we have seen that lines 17-32 constitute a descent into the underworld. This descent is led by Horace, Mercury, and the Mercurial lyre, and the mortals he is leading are his audience, both the intended listener Lyde and his wider readership. The *katabasis*, furthermore, has a didactic purpose: to get Lyde to stop refusing men. Horace is jokingly teaching her that women who refuse men meet no good end, and

²⁵ Or, as Otis 1970: 167 observes, 'this is of course both a superficial and an awkward moral (Lyde is no criminal)'; cf. Syndikus 2001: 123.

²⁶ Cf. West 2002: 108-10.

his hope seems to be that, like Ixion and Tityos, she will laugh in spite of herself and, like the good Danaid Hypermnestra, embrace a man (but of course not, like Hypermnestra, tell him to run for his life).

III. The *Mercurialis uir* as Psychopomp

3.11 is actually one of a larger set of odes in which Horace acts as a Mercury-like psychopomp leading his audience into the underworld on a didactic *katabasis*. The longest and fullest examples of this are a pair of poems in the middle of Book 2, *Odes* 2.13 and 2.14.²⁷ In 2.13, having just narrowly escaped death from a falling tree, the poet takes his audience down into the underworld he nearly visited. One of the effects of this is to underscore the moralizing of lines 13-20. After railing against the planter of the nearly-fatal tree, Horace generalizes, *quid quisque uitet numquam homini satis | cautum est in horas. . . . improvisa leti | uis rapuit rapietque gentis*, 'No one is ever cautious enough about what he should avoid from one hour to the next . . . the unforeseen force of death has snatched away and will snatch away the human race' (13-14, 19-20), and then, to emphasize his own brush with unexpected death, he begins the imagined trip to the underworld in line 21, *quam paene furuae regna Proserpinae | et iudicantem uidimus Aeacum*, 'How nearly I saw the realms of dark Proserpina and Aeacus sitting in judgment!' (21-22). He goes on, taking his audience on a journey past the queen and her judges (21-22), past the *sedes piorum* (23), down to where the *turba of umbrae* (29-32) listen to Sappho and Alcaeus—two non-mythological, real-life dead whom he includes with an odd touch of realism—whose playing, we see, also soothes Cerberus, the Furies' snakes, and three famous sinners, Prometheus, Tantalus, and Orion (33-40). This lengthy and extremely vivid depiction of the underworld which blends mythical and historical figures helps drive home the point that death is *real*, that it *really* happens even when you do not expect it. Sappho and Alcaeus, once living lyric poets, are now in the land of the dead; Horace, currently a living lyric poet, might likewise at any time find himself, crushed by a tree, playing along with his long-gone models. The overall tone of the poem is light, but there is nevertheless some earnestness about it.²⁸

²⁷ Harrison 2017: 156 observes 'a strong interest in Book 2 in the theme of *katabasis*', which he connects to Vergil's 'narrative of Orpheus' descent to the underworld in *Georgics* 4, which is echoed in no fewer than four poems' in *Odes* 2 (14).

²⁸ On the blending of a melodramatic and a matter-of-fact tone, of humor and seriousness, in 2.13, see Connor 1987: 67-69.

The following poem, 2.14, continues, with a more serious tone, on this same theme as Horace warns of coming death—this time emphasizing the inevitability of it rather than the unexpectedness of it—and takes his audience down into the underworld again.²⁹ In the first four stanzas (lines 1-16) Horace develops the idea that it is impossible to delay or escape death with piety or money or the avoidance of war, sailing, and sickness: eventually it comes to everyone. He then begins to describe what we all, and especially his addressee Postumus, must eventually see (2.14.17-20):

uisendus ater flumine languido
 Cocytos errans et Danaï genus
 infame damnatusque longi
 Sisyphus Aeolides laboris.

You must visit black Cocytos, wandering with its sluggish river,
 and the infamous race of Danaus, and Sisyphus son of Aeolus,
 condemned to a long labor.

Horace takes Postumus down into the underworld on a poetic *katabasis* to show him the impossibility of avoiding death. Danaus ordered his daughters to kill their husbands because previously, afraid of those same men (who were the sons of his brother Aegyptus), Danaus and his daughters had gone into exile, and now he distrusted them when they came seeking peace.³⁰ However, although Danaus' and his daughters' attempt to avoid death at the hands of the sons of Aegyptus may have bought them some time, they eventually died and are now suffering an everlasting punishment. Similarly Sisyphus famously tried to trick his way out of death; nevertheless we see him in the underworld continually trying to roll his boulder up the hill. The message is simple: you cannot avoid death, and if you try to do so by illicit means you will end up suffering a long (*longi*, 20) punishment in the long (emphasized here by the 'sluggish' and 'wandering' river, 17-18) hereafter.

In the following stanza, Horace brings Postumus and his readers back up to the upper world to see what must be left behind when we descend to the underworld (2.14.21-24):

²⁹ On the pairing of 2.13 and 2.14, see Harrison 2017: 167.

³⁰ Apollod. 2.1.4-5.

linquenda tellus et domus et placens
 uxor, neque harum quas colis arborum
 te praeter inuisas cupressos
 ulla breuem dominum sequetur.

You must leave the earth and your home and your pleasing wife, and of these trees which you cultivate none will follow you, their brief master, except the hated cypress [i.e. the wood used for the funeral pyre].

'You can't take it with you,' Horace says, concluding in the final stanza that it is Postumus' *heres* who will enjoy the wine he saved for later (25-28). By taking Postumus down into the underworld and back up again to show him what he will not have with him after he dies, Horace is encouraging Postumus to enjoy those things—his home, his wife, his orchards, his wine—while he has life. The ultimate message of the ode is '*carpe diem*.' In 2.13-14 Horace uses a didactic *katabasis* to encourage his audience to enjoy life in light of the unpredictability and inevitability of death.

Elsewhere in the *Odes* Horace uses snapshots of underworld imagery to spirit his audience briefly away to the land of the dead, and every time it is to make a point, usually *carpe diem*. In 1.4.16-17 a brief, two-line image of the underworld flashes on the mind's eye near the end of the ode: *iam te premet nox fabulaeque Manes | et domus exilis Plutonia*, 'Now night will press you and the *Manes* of legend and the meager house of Pluto.' As in 2.14, what comes after this look into the world below is a description of what it does *not* have: drinking parties and attractive, available young men (17-20). With these lines the ode ends with the implicit exhortation to enjoy those things before 'pale death knocks' (*pallida Mors ... pulsat*, 13) at your door.

A similar case of the snapshot didactic *katabasis* comes in 2.3: Horace exhorts Delliis to join him in outdoor drinking (13-16) on the grounds that he is 'going to die' (*moriture*, 4) whether he enjoys himself or not (5-8). As in 2.14, Horace mentions that his addressee must leave his land and his house and that an heir will own whatever he has worked so hard to pile up (17-20). He concludes (2.3.21-28),

diuesne prisco natus ab Inacho
 nil interest an pauper et infima

de gente sub diuo moreris,
uictima nil miserantis Orci.

omnes eodem cogimur, omnium
uersatur urna serius ocus
sors exitura et nos in aeternum
exsilium impositura cumbae.

It does not matter whether you are a rich man descended from ancient Inachus or a poor man and from the lowest stock under the sky, you will die, a victim of Orcus who has no pity. We are all driven to the same place; everyone's lot is shaken in the urn, about to come out sooner or later and to put us on the boat to eternal exile.

The images of the shades driven (presumably by Mercury)³¹ together to the realm of the dead, of the lots in the urn, and—most vivid of all—of the shades boarding Charon's boat about to cross to (as Hamlet put it) 'The undiscovered country from whose bourn / No traveller returns' have the effect of taking what was previously an abstract idea—death will come—and making it visual and therefore more concrete. Horace's *carpe diem* message therefore has more impact as he leaves us mentally standing down on the shore of the Styx. Having glimpsed our destiny, our choice should be to go and join him at the bank of the shady 'winding river' (*obliquo ... riuo*, 11-12) where he has just urged Dellius to enjoy wine and perfume and roses with him.

Throughout the *Odes* Horace uses descents into the underworld—in both extended scenes and brief moments of imagery—in order to change his readers' minds and thereby improve their lives. In all of the instances we have considered—3.11, 2.13-14, 1.4, and 2.3—Horace has in mind the benefit of his addressee and audience when he takes them down to see with the eyes of the imagination what exists in the world below. His goal is that, with the knowledge that life can be over before they know it, they will enjoy the pleasures of wine, nature, and sex in the present and stop worrying about saving up for the future or about taking precautions against certain kinds of death. The goal of the *katabases* is that, having

³¹ Cf. *cogimur* (2.3.25) with *compulerit* (1.24.18), *coercet* (2.18.38), and *coerces* (1.10.18) (all quoted above); Harrison 2017 *ad loc.* notes that *cogimur* 'suggests the traditional group herding (OLD s.v. *cogo* 1) of the souls of the dead by Hermes/Mercury' as in Hom. *Od.* 24.1-5.

returned, the readers will henceforth lead lives that are *happy*: *dona praesentis cape laetus horae, | linque seuera, 'happily take the gifts of the present hour; abandon serious things' (3.8.27-28).*

IV. Patron and Poet as Partners

In the first section of this paper it was observed that, although the be-reaved grieve their own loss, Mercury's shepherding of souls is a welcome and beneficial act for the souls of those who did not lead impious lives; similarly, Horace's role as a poetic psychopomp benefits those who follow him on the journey. Mercury establishes the pious dead in 'happy abodes' (*laetis ... sedibus*, 1.10.17-18); Horace, using his Mercurial lyre, helps his audience enjoy a happy life in this world by using a poetic *katabasis* to teach them how to live well. At times, as in 3.11 and 2.13, the *katabasis* is couched in a humorous context; this, too, echoes Mercury's divine attributes, specifically his association in the Hymn to Mercury with cleverness, wit, and sly, disarming humor (1.10.3, 7-8, 11-12). This humor is also part of Horace's goal of helping his audience be happy, for, as he points out elsewhere, laughter is a hallmark of a person who is 'happy' and living in the moment: *laetus in praesens animus quod ultra est | oderit curare et amara lento | temperet risu*, 'A mind *happy* for the present should hate to be anxious about what is further ahead and should temper bitter things with an easy *laugh*' (2.16.25-27).

Twice in the *Odes*, as mentioned above, Mercury is credited with saving Horace: once on the battlefield at Philippi and a second time, through Faunus' agency, from the falling tree. In 2.17, when Horace mentions Faunus' rescue, he calls that god *Mercurialium | custos uirorum* (29-30), thereby labeling himself as a *Mercurialis uir*. This title has many resonances—astrological, commercial, poetic, political³²—which re-echo throughout the *Odes*. Additionally, Jenny Strauss Clay has shown that, just as in the Hymn to Mercury Horace celebrates Mercury's role as civilizer of humanity and mediator between immortal and mortal (and between Priam and Achilles), 'Le poète aussi, en tant que *Mercurialis uir*, possède des vertus civilisatrices et peut servir de médiateur entre les dieux et les hommes; sa lyre, invention de Mercure, peut même pénétrer jusqu'aux enfers et en apaiser les habitants.'³³

³² See e.g. Nisbet and Hubbard 1978: 286, Miller 1991, Buisel 2008: 63-64, Clay 2016; Fraenkel 1957: 163-65 argues against seeing a special relationship between Mercury and Horace.

³³ Clay 2016: 292.

In addition, as a *Mercurialis uir*, Horace not only shares in the god's attributes, but he also, inasmuch as he mirrors Mercury the psychopomp, partners with the god and acts as his agent. In the *Iliad*, immortals rescue heroes from the battlefield for a variety of reasons—kinship (Aphrodite and Aeneas), favoritism (Aphrodite and Paris), or strategy (Apollo and Agenor)—why does Mercury similarly rescue Horace at Philippi (2.7.13-14)? In *Odes* 1.17, Horace says that the gods protect him because of his piety and his poetry—*di me tuentur. dis pietas mea | et Musa cordi est* (13-14). In that same ode we see an example of that protection in the protection Faunus (the 'protector of Mercury's men' from 2.17)³⁴ gives to Horace's goats: *Faunus ... igneam | defendit aestatem capellis | usque meis pluuios uentos*, 'Faunus continuously keeps the fiery summer and the rainy winds from my goats' (1.17.2-4); also in the valley in which Faunus plays his 'sweet pipe' (*dulci ... fistula*, 10), the goats do not have to worry about violence from snakes or wolves (5-9). It is this same protection which Horace, in turn, offers to Tyndaris in the ode: protection from heat (*uitabis aestus*, 18) and protection from violence (22-28).³⁵ In 1.17 Horace and Faunus have a sort of partnership where Horace, protected by the gods, himself offers protection to a fellow mortal. We also saw a similar partnership in 3.11 where Mercury and the Mercurial lyre and Horace together take Lyde on a poetic and somewhat humorous trip to the underworld to convince her to enter into an erotic relationship. Horace elsewhere uses his poetic talents to take his audience to the underworld to convince them to enjoy a happier life in the moment. Whether he is offering protection or a 'happy' state of being, Horace shares not only his patron god's traits but also his methods and goals. To departed souls, Mercury can only give *laetae sedes*, but, by protecting the poet and inspiring his lyre with both humor and eloquence, Mercury can aid the *Mercurialis uir* in accomplishing this for the living.

³⁴ Cf. Hemingson 2008: 71-72, 90-92, on the tie between Mercury, Faunus, Horace's Sabine estate, and *Odes* 1.17.

³⁵ Putnam 1994: 362-63.

References

- Allen, A. 2003. 'Horace's *Satelles Orci* (Odes 2.18.34)', *CQ* 53: 616-19.
- Bradshaw, A. 1978. 'Horace and the Therapeutic Myth: Odes 3, 7; 3, 11, and 3, 27', *Hermes* 106: 156-76.
- Buisel, M. D. 2008. 'Horacio, *Vir Mercurialis*', *Auster* 13: 51-71.
- Cairns, F. 1975. 'Splendide mendax: Horace Odes III.11', *G&R* 22: 129-39.
- Clay, J. S. 2016. 'Horace et le frère cadet d'Apollon', in B. Delignon, N. Le Meur, and O. T. Hévenaz, eds., *La poésie lyrique dans la cité antique. Les Odes d'Horace au miroir de la lyrique grecque archaïque*. Paris. 285-94.
- Connor, P. 1987. *Horace's Lyric Poetry: The Force of Humor*. Berwick, Australia.
- Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.
- Harrison, S. J. 2017. *Horace, Odes Book II*. Cambridge.
- Hemingson, T. L. 2008. 'Custos viri Mercurialis: Faunus in the Odes of Horace'. Diss. Wisconsin.
- Houghton, L. B. T. 2007. 'Horace, Odes I,10—A Very Literary Hymn', *Latomus* 66: 636-41.
- Kiessling, A., and Heinze, R. 1955. *Q. Horatius Flaccus I. Oden und Epen*. Berlin.
- Lowrie, M. 1997. *Horace's Narrative Odes*. Oxford.
- Mayer, R. 2012. *Horace, Odes Book I*. Cambridge.
- Miller, P. A. 1991. 'Horace, Mercury, and Augustus, or the Poetic Ego of Odes 1-3', *AJP* 112: 365-88.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book I*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and M. Hubbard. 1978. *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book II*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and N. Rudd. 2004. *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book III*. Oxford.
- Otis, B. 1970. 'The Relevance of Horace', *Arion* 9: 145-74.
- Putnam, M. C. J. 1994. 'Structure and Design in Horace Odes 1.17', *CW* 87: 357-75.
- Quinn, K. 1980. *Horace. The Odes*. Bristol.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., ed. 2001. *Q. Horati Flacci opera*. 4th ed. Munich and Leipzig.

- Syndikus, H. P. 2001. *Die Lyrik des Horaz. Eine Interpretation der Oden*. Vol. 2. 3rd ed. Darmstadt.
- Thomson, D. F. S. 1997. *Catullus. Edited with a Textual and Interpretive Commentary*. Toronto.
- West, D. 1998. *Horace Odes II: Vatis Amici*. Oxford.
- West, D. 2002. *Horace Odes III: Dulce periculum*. Oxford.
- Womble, H. 1961. 'Repetition and Irony: Horace, *Odes* 2.18', *TAPA* 92: 537-49.

Antiquam exquirite matrem: Apollo, Ceres, and the Trojans' Search for a New Home*

Stephen C. Smith

Unlike several of the other major Roman gods—Jupiter, Juno, Venus, Apollo, Neptune, even Vulcan and Diana—Ceres plays no active role in the *Aeneid*, a reflection in part of Demeter's absence from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which is understandable because there is no real part in epic for the goddess of agriculture. Unlike Demeter, however, Ceres is not really absent from the *Aeneid*; her role is instead obscured, relegated to a few passing references or instances of metonymy, but it is noteworthy. Alone among the goddesses of Olympus, Ceres/Demeter is significantly a mother: Juno is first and foremost Jupiter's wife; Minerva, Diana, and Vesta are virgins, whether daughters or sister; Venus' role as a goddess of fertility is at odds with whatever familial relationships she might have.

For Ceres/Demeter, on the other hand, her most important relationship is with her daughter, and her most important myth is the story of the loss of that daughter and their subsequent reunion. It is this relationship that informs her presence in the *Aeneid*: the last significant site in the Troad is Ceres' temple, it is she who marks the Trojans' arrival in Latium, and the journey itself is an inversion of Ceres' search for her daughter, as the Trojans

* I have known Jenny Clay as both my teacher and my friend for many years now. As a teacher, she was, by turns, both indulgent—she would comment approvingly on some of the more fanciful observations in my papers—and demanding—entire pages with a single, top-to-bottom, red slash, and in class, the dreaded Look, given to students who were getting too far afield or who were unable to support their arguments from the text (or a student who, on one occasion, was simply getting tongue-tied drawing a parallel between Achilles and Aeneas in the *Iliad*). It is from Jenny that I learned that one of the most important scholarly questions is the seemingly simple 'so what?'

search for their mother. Ceres' presence in a poem on the prehistory of Rome, including the first of the foundations eventually leading to Rome, is perhaps less surprising if we recall the connection that some near-contemporaries of Vergil, including Cicero and Varro, drew between Ceres and city-founding, and also the associations which Augustus was making between himself (and Livia) and the goddess.¹ In this paper I will trace two intertwining threads—one consisting of explicit references to the goddess (and some implicit references to her absence), which mark the Trojans' progress to Italy; the other consisting of scenes touching on the motif of separated mothers and children, especially in the context of the fall of Troy and the wandering of the survivors, which underscore the nature of the journey that Aeneas and his people are making—the search for their mother.²

I will begin not with the first instance of either thread, but with a scene which ties the two together. In Aeneas' narrative of the flight from Troy in *Aeneid* 2, there is, almost in passing, a reference to a temple of Ceres outside the city, where Aeneas' family and servants are to gather in case they are separated (713-16):³

'est urbe egressis **tumulus templumque uetustum**
desertae Cereris, iuxtaque antiqua cupressus
 religione patrum multos seruata per annos;
 hanc ex diuerso sedem ueniemus in unam.

715

¹ Cic. *Ver.* 2.5.187: *Ceres et Libera, quarum sacra, sicut opiniones hominum ac religiones ferunt, longe maximis atque occultissimis caerimoniis continentur, a quibus initia uitae atque uictus, morum, legum, mansuetudinis, humanitatis hominibus et ciuitatibus data ac dispersita esse dicuntur.* ... Spaeth 1996: 23 summarizes some of the connections between Augustus' household and Ceres, noting 'his consecration of the altar of Ceres Mater and Ops Augusta, his initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries, and his restoration of the Temple of Ceres, Liber, and Libera. ... More commonly, we see Augustus' wife Livia identified with Ceres in Roman art. She appears on several gems and coin types of the Augustan period and later wearing the corona spicea or holding wheat stalks and poppies.'

² Hardy 1996: 7 sees a similar pattern extending through the first half of the poem: '[t]he lessons gleaned from this 'interpreting episode' [i.e., Anchises' interpretation of Apollo's prophecy in Book 3] thus emphasize a large thematic pattern, recurring in the epic's first half, of the desertion of the female. As in the case of Creusa in Book 2, and the rest of the *matres* in Book 5, the literal mother must be left behind in this quest for a metaphorical one.' Hardy 1996 discusses, among other things, Anchises recalling Teucer but not Batea, Teucer's wife and Dardanus' daughter, who can be construed as the mother of the Trojan race.

³ All quotations from the *Aeneid* are taken from Mynors 1969. All translations are my own.

‘As you leave the city there is **a mound and the old temple of deserted Ceres**, and nearby an ancient cypress, protected through many years by our ancestors’ reverence; from different directions we will come together in this one spot’.

In his note on 2.714, Servius offers three possible interpretations of the phrase *desertae Cereris*: (1) Ceres’ temple has been abandoned because her priest has been killed, (2) it has been abandoned because of the long siege, or (3) it is dedicated to Ceres ‘abandoned’ by her daughter.⁴ Among modern scholars, Heyne accepts the second interpretation, but Wagner rejects this view in his revision of Heyne’s commentary and, following Vitruvius, explains that the temple is simply set in an out of the way spot; this explanation has been accepted by most succeeding commentators.⁵ On the other hand, Servius’ third possibility—that Ceres herself has been abandoned—has either been dismissed or simply ignored by most critics.⁶

Wagner argues that *desertae* should be regarded as an instance of transferred epithet, properly belonging to *templum*, and leaves us with a secluded temple which provides a safe location where the Trojan refugees might assemble; that it is Ceres’ temple would then simply be added color, as would the presence of a venerable cypress. That tree’s traditional funereal associations, however, put the audience in mind of death and the underworld, which, juxtaposed with Ceres, in turn reminds us of Proserpina.⁷ The epithet *desertae* itself supports this line of reasoning: of its four earlier uses in the *Aeneid*, only one carries the connotation of

⁴ *DESERTAE CERERIS utrum a sacerdote, qui in sexto <484> extinctus inducitur, ut Cererique sacrum Polyboeten: an ‘desertae’ belli tempore propter decennalem obsidionem? an ‘desertae’ a filia, ut nec repetita sequi curet Proserpina matrem* [G. 1.39]. ‘OF DESERTED CERES: by her priest, who at 6.484 is introduced as a dead man (‘and Polyboetes, consecrated to Ceres’), or ‘deserted’ in time of war on account of the ten year siege, or ‘deserted’ by her daughter (‘nor does Proserpina care to follow her mother, although she is sought’)?’

⁵ Cf. Forbiger 1873, Henry 1878, Conington-Nettleship 1884, Page 1894, Cartault 1926 (‘un ancien temple abandonné de Cérès’) and Austin 1964 ad loc. Horsfall 2006 ad loc. suggests that it the temple has been abandoned on account of the long war, and that the idea of a neglected or even abandoned temple would not be unfamiliar to the Romans: ‘It seems clear enough that we have enallage, and the epithet should be referred to the **templum**...; that said, a Rom[an] reader of the Aug[ustan] age would think naturally of temples abandoned on account of neglect...’

⁶ Exceptions are Page 1894 and Williams 1972, who in his commentary notes the presence of cypress near the temple. Panoussi 2009: 159 seems to accept this interpretation as well, remarking that ‘[t]he goddess, a mother who lost her daughter, exemplifies the dangers of excessive mourning. The story, however, concludes with the the reunion of mother and daughter as symbolic of life triumphing over death.’ See also Connors 1992: 2-3.

⁷ Cf. the cypress’s next appearance in the poem, at the funeral rites of Polydorus (3.64).

'out of the way' (*deserto in litore condunt*, 2.24), while three suggest the idea of abandonment (*desertosque ... locos litusque relictum*, 2.28; *deserta Creusa*, 2.562; *deserti coniugis iras*, 2.572).

The image which Aeneas' description of the temple brings to mind, then, is of a mother and child, and more specifically a mother separated from her child—an image which both has already been suggested in Book 2 and will in fact be realized during the flight out of Troy. In the *Aeneid*, however, the first occurrence of this motif is found in Book 1. Venus has disguised herself as a young Carthaginian huntress in order to advise her son about the situation in that city, and he recognizes her only after she turns to leave (407-09):

'quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis
ludis imaginibus? cur dextrae iungere dextram
non datur ac ueras audire et reddere uoces?'

'Cruel one, why do you mock your son so often with false appearances? Why can't we join our right hands, and hear and reply in our own voices?'

The separation of Aeneas from his mother Venus differs from other such separations in the poem, which are usually involuntary on both sides, but he makes it clear that he is upset by the seeming lack of a familial bond.⁸ This is not to say that *Venus* feels the same way; she does attempt to help her son, but she rarely does it openly. Aphrodite in the *Iliad* tries to protect him from death at the hands of Diomedes, only to drop him and run to her own mother in tears when the Greek wounds her (*Il.* 5.318-80); this attempt itself becomes remarkable if we consider her attitude in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, where, newly pregnant, she says that she really wants nothing to do with Aeneas as he grows up (*h. Ven.* 198-99, 248-58). The fact that, in his encounter with Venus outside Carthage, Aeneas overlooks that she aided him more or less openly during the fall of Troy suggests that that instance is perhaps an exception to a general history of benign neglect.

⁸ Cf. Austin 1971 *ad* 407: *crudelis* is 'a borrowing from *E.* 8.50...; there it is part of a rhetorical conceit, here it is a real and bitter protest.'

This attitude is thrown into sharper relief in Book 2 when Aeneas mentions the two most famous examples of bereaved mothers. As he makes his way through the burning city, Aeneas comes to the back of Priam's palace and the passage which Andromache used when bringing Astyanax to visit his grandparents (2.453-57):⁹

limen erat caecaeque fores et peruius usus
 tectorum inter se Priami, postesque relict
 a tergo, infelix qua se, dum regna manebant, 455
 saepius Andromache ferre incommitata solebat
 ad soceros et auo puerum Astyanacta trahebat.

There was the threshold, the hidden door, the familiar way through the house of Priam, and the columns in back, where, while the kingdom stood, unhappy Andromache used to go, unaccompanied, to her in-laws and where she used to drag the child Astyanax to see his grandfather.

Even as Aeneas recalls those happier times, he calls Andromache *infelix*; *incommitata* strictly refers to the fact that she has no attendants with her, but it carries a further sense of separation from others, especially Hector, without whom she has no family (*Il.* 6.410-30), and *trahebat* suggests the seizure and murder of Astyanax.¹⁰ (This last is perhaps underlined by Aeneas' own actions at this point: he climbs *ad summi fastigia culminis* [2.458], 'to the very top of the wall,' a phrase which may remind the audience that the Greeks threw Astyanax down from the walls of Troy.)

As Aeneas watches what happens in the palace, culminating in Pyrrhus' slaughter of Polites and Priam—a scene underlining the relationship between fathers and sons—he sees another witness to that scene, Priam's wife Hecuba, who sits by the altar with her daughters and chides her husband (2.518 -24):

⁹ Austin 1964 *ad* 453 stresses the intimacy of Aeneas' description: this is a door 'known to the family,' not the public.

¹⁰ Cf. Austin 1964 *ad* 457: 'Virgil never mentions the fate of Astyanax. ... But the child's death, so brutally compressed, was one of the most notorious incidents in the tale of Troy. ... [I]n art it was closely linked with the murder of Priam.'

ipsum autem sumptis Priamum iuuenalibus armis
ut uidit, 'quae mens tam dira, miserrime coniunx,
impulit his cingi telis? aut quo ruis?' inquit. 520
'non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis
tempus eget; non, si ipse ipse nunc adforet Hector.
huc tandem concede; haec ara tuebitur omnis,
aut moriere simul.'

When she saw Priam himself, who had taken up the arms of a young man, she said, 'What insanity, my poor husband, drives you to be armed with such weapons? Where are you rushing to? This time needs neither such help nor such defenders, not even if my Hector himself were here. Come over here—this altar will protect us all, or we will die together.'

She makes this brief appeal as a wife to her husband (*miserrime coniunx*), but her words look back to a similar appeal to Hector, as he was going forth to his final meeting with Achilles (*Il.* 22.79-89):¹¹

μήτηρ δ' αὖθ' ἐτέρωθεν ὀδύρετο δάκρυ χέουσα
κόλπον ἀνιέμένη, ἐτέρηφι δὲ μαζὸν ἀνέσχε· 80
καί μιν δάκρυ χέουσ' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα:
"Ἑκτορ, τέκνον ἐμόν, τάδε τ' αἶδεο καί μ' ἐλέησον
αὐτήν, εἴ ποτέ τοι λαθικηδέα μαζὸν ἐπέσχον·
τῶν μνησαι, φίλε τέκνον, ἄμυνε δὲ δῆϊον ἄνδρα
τείχεος ἐντὸς ἐών, μηδὲ πρόμος ἴστασο τούτῳ, 85
σχέτλιος· εἴ περ γάρ σε κατακτάνη, οὗ σ' ἔτ' ἔγωγε
κλαύσομαι ἐν λεχέεσσι φίλον θάλος, ὃν τέκον αὐτή,
οὐδ' ἄλοχος πολὺδωρος· ἄνευθε δέ σε μέγα νῶϊν
Ἀργείων παρὰ νηυσὶ κύνες ταχέες κατέδονται.'

On the other side, his mother grieved, shedding tears as she opened her robe with one hand and displayed her breast with the other. Weeping, she addressed him with winged words: 'Hector, my child, show respect for this and pity me, if I ever gave you the breast which

¹¹ Austin 1964 *ad* 522: '[w]ith his sure touch Virgil shows Hecuba in this dreadful hour thinking of her dearest son. ...' The *Iliad* quotation is taken from Monro-Allen 1920; the translation is my own.

eases care. Remember this, dear child; ward off the enemy from within the walls and do not meet him in the first rank, cruel one. If he kills you, I will not mourn for you on your bier, dear child whom I bore, nor will your richly dowered wife, but far away from us, the swift dogs will eat you by the ships of the Achaeans.’

Even when Hecuba acts as wife, we are reminded of her role as mother—perhaps, more specifically, as the mother who loses countless children in the Trojan War.

Aeneas sees the royal family of Troy fall in the person of Priam—a sight which reminds him of his own family, whom he imagines at the mercy of the Greeks (2.560-63, especially *deserta Creusa*), but he is distracted by the sight of Helen at the temple of Vesta and decides that she must die.¹² The initial words of his outburst paint a picture of Helen as queen, wife, and mother (2.577-80):

‘scilicet haec Spartam incolumis patriasque Mycenae
aspiciet, partoque ibit regina triumpho?
coniugiumque domumque patris natosque uidebit
Iliadum turba et Phrygiis comitata ministris?’ 580

‘So this woman, unharmed, will look upon Sparta and ancestral Mycenae, and she will go in triumph as a queen? She will see her marriage, her father’s house, and her children, attended by a throng of Trojan women and by Phrygian servants?’

The mention of Helen’s *children* is somewhat odd, given that the *Odyssey* tells us that she had only one child, Hermione, but it is but one part of an image which contrasts strongly with that of Andromache earlier in the book: Andromache would take Astyanax to see Priam and Hecuba, unaccompanied by attendants (*incomitata*, 456), whereas Helen is about to return in triumph to her house and children, accompanied by a throng of Trojan slaves (*Iliadum turba et Phrygiis comitata ministris*, 580).¹³ In Aeneas’ eyes, Helen abandoned

¹² The authenticity of the Helen episode is, of course, widely doubted; see Conte 2006 and Horsfall 2006. Something like the Servian text, however, is needed to fill the lacuna resulting from its removal.

¹³ Austin 1964 *ad* 579 notes that in other traditions Helen also had a son Nicostratus and points out that ‘*natos* is a natural convention’ as well.

where Aeneas begins the foundation of Aeneadae. While sacrificing, he tries to gather some myrtle to cover the altars, only to find that the myrtle is growing from the body of the murdered Polydorus. Polydorus' spirit warns him of Thrace's treachery and tells him to flee (3.44-46):

'heu fuge crudelis terras, fuge litus auarum:
nam Polydorus ego. hic confixum ferrea texit
telorum seges et iaculis increuit acutis.' 45

'Alas, flee this cruel land, flee this greedy shore: I am Polydorus.
Here an iron crop of missiles has covered my pierced body and
grown from the sharp javelins.'

This revelation, like the rendezvous point in Book 2, brings our two threads together—it is the news of Polydorus' death that finally drives Hecuba insane in her grief for her lost children, and Polydorus describes the myrtle growing from his body as a crop of iron—a common enough image in Latin poetry, but a crop in which Ceres can have no part.¹⁷ Unlike Italy, Thrace is not blessed by Ceres' presence, and so no city can be founded.

The Trojans' next stop is the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos, where they learn that they are to seek their ancestral homeland (3.94-98):

'Dardanidae duri, quae uos a stirpe parentum
prima tulit tellus, eadem uos ubere laeto
accipiet reduces. antiquam exquirite matrem.
hic domus Aeneae cunctis dominabitur oris
et nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis.' 95

'Tough Dardanians, the land which first brought you forth from
your ancestral stock will receive you in her happy bosom when
you return. Seek your ancient mother. Here the house of Aeneas,
its grandsons, and their descendants will master all the world.'

¹⁷ On Hecuba's madness, cf. Ovid, *Met.* 13.533-75 and Servius on A. 3.6: *alii a Polymestore [Polydorum] occisum dicunt post euersam Troiam et in maria praecipitatum. cuius cum mater Hecuba agnouisset cadauer, cum captiua duceretur, flendo in canem conuersa est, cum se praecipitare uellet in maria.* Gowers 2011: 97 concludes that this version of the Polydorus story is Vergil's own invention.

Apollo's response, as ever, is somewhat ambiguous, but memorably phrased: *antiquam exquirite matrem*. The Trojans' arrival in their new homeland is thus cast as a joyous reunion between a long-separated mother and children.¹⁸ Anchises, however, misinterprets Apollo's words as a reference to Crete, the homeland of the Trojans' ancestor Teucer and the original home of Cybele (103-15):

'audite, o proceres,' ait 'et spes discite uestras.
 Creta Iouis magni medio iacet insula ponto,
 mons Idaeus ubi et gentis cunabula nostrae. 105
 centum urbes habitant magnas, uberrima regna,
 maximus unde pater, si rite audita recordor,
 Teucus Rhoeteas primum est aduectus in oras,
 optauitque locum regno. nondum Ilium et arces
 Pergameae steterant; habitabant uallibus imis. 110
 hinc mater cultrix Cybeli Corybantiaque aera
 Idaeumque nemus, hinc fida silentia sacris,
 et iuncti currum dominae subiere leones.
 ergo agite et diuum ducunt qua iussa sequamur:
 placemus uentos et Cnosia regna petamus.' 115

'Listen, my lords, and learn where your hopes lie. Crete, the island of great Jupiter, lies in the middle of the sea; there is the Idaean mount and the cradle of our race. From there (if I remember correctly what I have heard) our most distant ancestor, Teucer, was first carried to the shores of Rhoeteum, and he chose that place for his kingdom. Troy had not been established, nor the Pergamean citadel; the inhabitants dwelled in low valleys. From this Crete came the Mother who haunts Cybelus, the bronze of the Corybantes, the Idaean grove, the faithful silence of our rites; from here the team of lions submitted to their lady's chariot. So come, and let us follow where the orders of gods lead: let us propitiate the winds and seek the realm of Cnossus'.

¹⁸ Cf. Fletcher 2014: 100-101: 'The definition of Italy [at 3.94-98] through its richness takes on a new dimension with the characterization of Italy as mother. This metaphor introduces an additional genealogical aspect to the Trojan journey and is an essential part of the process whereby the Trojans—and Aeneas in particular—begin to form an emotional attachment to Italy even before they arrive. ... This genealogical aspect of the oracle radically changes the Trojans' perception: their journey is no longer an exile but a homecoming [*reduces*].'

The symmetry of Crete and the Troad is appealing: at the very beginning of Anchises' narrative is *mons Idaeus* (3.105), recalling the site where the Trojan fleet was built, *sub ... montibus Idae* (3.5-6); the fleet's destination is its ancient starting point, and the Trojans are indeed returning home—indeed, to the cradle of their race. This revelation gives a new color to Aeneas' words at the beginning of the book (4-5): *diuersa exsilia et desertas quaerere terras / auguriis agimur diuum*, 'we are driven by the omens of the gods to seek distant exile and remote lands.' Apollo, like Creusa, sends the Trojans onward, but, for Aeneas, knowing that his goal is his people's ancient home, 'remote lands' are now 'lands we abandoned'—the ancestors of the Trojans, in other words, had abandoned their mother, who has long been waiting for them to return.

The Trojans took their leave of Ceres, abandoning the mother bereft of her child, and now, following Anchises' advice, they seek their own mother in Crete. The island seems promising at first glance (3.121-23):

Fama uolat pulsum regnis cecis paternis
Idomenea ducem, desertaque litora Cretae,
hoste uacare domum sedesque astare relictas.

A rumor flies to us—the prince Idomeneus, routed, has withdrawn from his ancestral kingdom, the shores of Crete have been deserted, the home is without an enemy, their seats stand abandoned.¹⁹

But Anchises' confidence is misguided: *mater cultrix Cybeli* (3.111) has left behind (*hinc*) the cradle of the Trojan race; she is in Asia, not Crete. The island itself, the supposed *prima tellus*, welcomes the Trojans not with the prosperity implied by *ubere laeto* but with a year of death (3.135-41):

Iamque fere sicco subductae litore puppes,
conubiis aruisque nouis operata iuuentus,
iura domosque dabam, subito cum tabida membris

¹⁹ And it is a strange coincidence that Crete is now like Troy. Aeneas' description recalls his words from the beginning of Book 2 (27-28): *iuuat ire et Dorica castra desertosque uidere locos litusque relictum*, 'it is pleasing to go and look at the Greek camp, the site they deserted, the shore they left behind.' But at that time the abandonment was a ruse; it was the Trojans who were actually about to abandon the area.

corrupto caeli tractu miserandaque uenit
 arboribusque satisque lues et letifer annus.
 linquebant dulcis animas aut aegra trahebant
 corpora; tum sterilis exurere Sirius agros,
 arebant herbae et uictum seges aegra negabat.

Now the ships had been drawn up on the dry shore, the young men were busy with their new marriages and new farms, and I was assigning homes and making laws—when suddenly, from a corrupt part of the sky, there came a plague, pitiable, wasting limbs and trees and crops, a year which brought death. The people were giving up their sweet souls, or dragging their sick bodies around; sterile Sirius burned the fields, the grasses dried up, the sickly crops denied us sustenance.

In Thrace the crops were perverted; in Crete they wither under the heat which Sirius brings. The phrase *letifer annus* perhaps looks back to the grief of Demeter after the kidnapping of Persephone: the goddess caused an αἰνότατον ἐνιαυτόν... καὶ κύντατον (*h.Cer.* 305-09), where κύντατον could allude to the Dogstar.²⁰ There is no mother, whether Cybele or Ceres, for the Trojans in Crete—they have been told that Cybele left long ago, but for a second time they find that Ceres is not present at their new settlement.²¹

As Aeneas prepares to return to Delos, the Penates appear to him in a dream, clarifying Apollo's words: the god had sent them to Italy, not Crete (3.161-71), and it is specifically the plowlands of Crete, *Dictaea arua*, that are denied to the Trojans. They again set out, but a storm drives them to the Strophades, the current home of the Harpies. After they set upon a herd of cattle, they are immediately attacked by the Harpies, whose leader, Celaeno, confirms the words of the Penates but adds what appears to be a curse (3.255-57):

²⁰ Modern scholars, such as Armstrong 2002: 324-25 and Fletcher 2014: 107, tend to emphasize the plague in this scene, rather than the withering of the crops, and thus focus on the possible role of Jupiter or Apollo, but not that of Ceres.

²¹ Armstrong 2002: 324 notes the similar circumstances under which Idomeneus was forced out of Crete and suggests that '[i]t is ironic, not to say suspicious, that the pious Trojans find themselves suffering a fate similar to a Greek aggressor.' On the other hand, if this episode is alluding to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* as well, we should recall that the humans 'punished' by Demeter's famine are innocent of any wrongdoing, as the Trojans in Crete seem to be.

'sed non ante datam cingetis moenibus urbem
 quam uos dira fames nostraeque iniuria caedis
 ambasas subigat malis absumere mensas'. 255

'But you will not encircle with a wall the city granted to you, until
 accursed hunger and the unjust slaughter against us compel you
 to consume your half-eaten tables.'

The Harpies' constant companion is hunger (*pallida semper ora fame*, 3.217-18), and, according to Celaeno, hunger will attend the Trojans as well, all the way to their new home. This accords with what we have seen of their attempts to settle in Thrace and Crete: the crops are perverted or simply fail. On the other hand, we already know that Latium is the fated, and thus proper, home of the Trojans; if Ceres' absence marks a 'wrong' settlement, then she *will* be present in Latium (as Creusa has already hinted), and Celaeno's *dira fames* will be nothing of the sort. We should also remember that Celaeno is not *cursing* the Trojans, but instead prophesies (her information comes from Apollo, and ultimately from Jupiter), fitting her words to the current situation: the Trojans' actions do not set that fate in motion.²²

Setting out for Italy again, the Trojans stop en route at Buthrotum on the west coast of Greece, where Aeneas has heard that survivors of Troy rule. What he encounters there is a ghost town whose hollowness is first represented by the image of Andromache attending a cenotaph dedicated to Hector (3.301-305). Andromache is a counterpart to Creusa, the only one of her family not 'held back' in Asia by the gods, but whereas Creusa pointed Aeneas to his future, Andromache remains anchored in her past as *Hectoris Andromache*.²³ After explaining to Aeneas how she and Helenus came to rule in the midst of Greece, she briefly asks him about himself (3.337-38) before concluding with a series of questions about his motherless son (3.339-43):²⁴

'quid puer Ascanius? superatne et uescitur aura?
 quem tibi iam Troia— 340
 ecqua tamen puero est amissae cura parentis?
 ecquid in antiquam uirtutem animosque uirilis
 et pater Aeneas et auunculus excitat Hector?'

²² Polyphemus' curse in *Odyssey* 9, on the other hand, is just that, and sets in motion most of the action of the poem. Cf. Bright 1981: 42.

²³ Cf. Grimm 1967: 158 and West 1983: 258-59.

²⁴ Cf. Heyne 1832 and Conington-Nettleship 1884 ad loc.

‘What of the boy Ascanius? Does he survive, nourished by the air? He whom in Troy once—Does the boy have any care for his lost mother? Do his father Aeneas and uncle Hector stir in him ancestral courage and a manly spirit?’

Although Andromache is then absent from much of the Buthrotum episode, she reappears as Aeneas and his followers prepare to set out for Italy. At this point, as Andromache presents Ascanius with a gift of embroidered garments, the possibility arises that her earlier curiosity about him was perhaps the result of her thinking of him as a substitute for her own lost son, Astyanax (3.486-91):²⁵

‘accipe et haec, manuum tibi quae monimenta mearum
sint, puer, et longum Andromachae testentur amorem,
coniugis Hectoreae. cape dona extrema tuorum,
o mihi sola mei super Astyanactis imago.
sic oculos, sic ille manus, sic ora ferebat; 490
et nunc aequali tecum pubesceret aeuo.’

‘Take these too, to be reminders from my own hands, child, and bear witness to the long love of Andromache, the wife of Hector. Take these last gifts of your people, you who are the only image of Astyanax left to me. His eyes were like yours, his hands like yours, his face like yours; and now he would be growing up, the same age as you.’

Andromache represents the possibility of reunion, of rejoining the separated mother and child, but the embrace she would offer, like that of Crete, is accompanied by death: to remain with her in Buthrotum is to dwell in the cenotaph of Troy.²⁶

In the midst of the emptiness, however, Helenus gives another sign of the true *antiqua mater*, which the Penates have already identified as Italy. The site of the Trojans’ new home, their ancient mother, is marked by the appearance of a mother nursing her young (3.389-93):

²⁵ Cf. Heyne 1832 ad loc. and Grimm 1967: 160.

²⁶ Cf. West 1983: 258-59.

'cum tibi sollicito secreti ad fluminis undam
 litoreis ingens inuenta sub ilicibus sus 390
 triginta capitum fetus enixa iacebit,
 alba solo recubans, albi circum ubera nati,
 is locus urbis erit, requies ea certa laborum.'

'When, in the midst of your troubles, you find, under the ilexes
 on the shore of a hidden river, a great sow who has just given
 birth to thirty young, lying white on the ground with her white
 offspring around her breast, this will be the site of your city, the
 sure rest from your toils.'

The sow, who will have just given birth and whose young will be nursing
 at her breast, *ubera*, will be a manifestation of the *antiqua mater* wel-
 coming her long separated children home with her *ubere laeto*. Italy and
 the Trojans will at last be reunited.

It will be quite a while, however, before that reunion, with lengthy
 interludes in Africa and Sicily. The episodes in Sicily—the rescue of
 Achaemenides in Book 3 and the funeral in Book 5—contain no explicit
 references to Ceres; given the associations that several Sicilian cities,
 and the Romans after them, made between the goddess and the island,
 this may seem odd, except for the fact that Aeneas makes no attempt to
 found a city here. The Trojans themselves have no reason to associate
 Ceres with Sicily, and its agricultural wealth is irrelevant to them.

Africa, the setting for Books 1 and 4, is a different matter. Like Sicily,
 it was an important region in terms of agriculture, but in the course of
 the *Aeneid* it is more important as the site of the recent (and still ongoing)
 foundation of Carthage, and it is here that Ceres' connection with such
 foundations is most prominent. In a scene early in Book 4, Dido makes
 a sacrifice to a number of important gods (56-59):

principio delubra adeunt pacemque per aras
 exquirunt; mactant lectas de more bidentis
 legiferae Cereri Phoeboque patrique Lyaeo,
 Iunoni ante omnis, cui uincla iugalia curae.

First they approach the shrines and pray for peace at the altars;
 then they slaughter, in accordance with tradition, chosen sheep

to Ceres the lawgiver, Phoebus and father Lyaeus, and above all Juno, who is concerned with the bonds of marriage.

Ceres is described here, for the first time in Latin literature, as *legifera*, apparently a calque on Demeter's title of *Thesmophoros*.²⁷ She is present in Carthage as goddess not so much of agriculture as of foundations.

The initial reference to Ceres in Africa and the *Aeneid*, on the other hand, is a metonymic description of grain (1.177-79):

tum Cererem corruptam undis Cerealiaque arma
expediunt fessi rerum, frugesque receptas
et torrere parant flammis et frangere saxo.

Then, tired by circumstances, they bring out the grain, ruined by seawater, and the implements of Ceres, and they prepare to toast the recovered grain in the fire and to grind it with a rock.

Ceres is present here, more so than she was in Thrace or Crete, but she is described as *corrupta undis*: this grain may be serviceable as food, but the Trojans cannot plant it in the hopes of a new crop. This foreshadows the fact that Carthage, no matter how tempting it may be, cannot be a new home for the Trojans—Ceres is there for the Carthaginians, but not for them.²⁸

Leaving Africa, and then Sicily behind, the Trojans finally reach Latium, their *antiqua mater*, at the beginning of Book 7, as is marked by the fulfillment of Celaeno's 'curse' at 3.255-57, the table-eating prodigy (7.107-21):²⁹

²⁷This epithet may look back to Calvus fr. 6 Courtney, as Servius Danielis suggests *ad* 4.58: *alii dicunt fauere nuptiis Cererem, quod prima nupserit Ioui et condendis urbibus praesit, ut Caluus docet: et leges sanctas docuit et cara iugavit / corpora conubiis et magnas condidit urbes*. Courtney 1993 notes that through Demeter Thesmophoros Ceres is concerned with women and the family; the Greek epithet is widely assumed to signify concern with laws as well, but this is in not reflected in cult.

²⁸See, however, Austin 1971 *ad* 177: '[a]t this special moment the poet honours the goddess who brings sustenance and comfort to men, and through him the Trojans are shown to be grateful to her in their need.'

²⁹Helenus referred to the white sow as the sign of the *antiqua mater*, and Harrison 1985: 135-40 points out the appearance of the sow was traditionally associated with the table-eating prodigy. Vergil separates them, letting the eating of the tables alone indicate the end of the Trojans' wanderings; the sow herself does not appear until 8.81-85.

Aeneas primique duces et pulcher Iulus
 corpora sub ramis deponunt arboris altae,
 instituuntque dapes et adorea liba per herbam
 subiciunt epulis (sic Iuppiter ipse monebat) 110
 et Cereale solum pomis agrestibus augent.
 consumptis hic forte aliis, ut uertere morsus
 exiguum in Cererem penuria adegit edendi,
 et uiolare manu malisque audacibus orbem
 fatalis crusti patulis nec parcere quadris: 115
 'heus, etiam mensas consumimus?' inquit Iulus,
 nec plura, adludens. ea uox audita laborum
 prima tulit finem, primamque loquentis ab ore
 eripuit pater ac stupefactus numine pressit.
 continuo 'salue fatis mihi debita tellus 120
 uosque' ait 'o fidi Troiae saluete penates. ...'

Aeneas and his chiefs, and handsome Iulus, settled themselves beneath the branches of a tall tree; they started their feast, setting up spelt-cakes in the grass under the food (as Jupiter himself advised) and supplementing the grain-platters with rustic fruits. When by chance the other things had been consumed, and hunger drove them to turn their teeth to the meager bread, to violate with hand and bold jaw the round crusts foretold by fate, and not to spare the broad cakes, Iulus said jokingly, 'Hey, are we eating our tables too?' and nothing more. These words, once heard, were the first to put an end to their troubles; the boy's father snatched them as soon as he spoke them and, astonished at the sign, stopped the boy's mouth. At once he said, 'Greetings, land owed to me by fate, and greetings, you gods faithful to Troy. ...'

The circumstances of this first meal, the scarcity of the provisions, lead the Trojans to eat the bread on which the rest of the food was served, and Ascanius asks, as an innocent joke, whether they are eating their tables. This is the answer to Celaeno's riddle, as Aeneas realizes, and he stops Ascanius from saying anything that might render the sign unfavorable. The Trojans are hungry, but not so hungry that they are reduced to eating wood, as might have been inferred from the Harpy's *mensas*; for Ceres herself is at last present, perhaps meager (*exigua*), but her

grain does not consist of iron, is not withering on the stalk, and is not ruined by seawater.³⁰ Aeneas realizes that his wanderings are over (*laborum finem*) and that he is, finally, 'home': *salve fatis mihi debita tellus* (7.120).

Significant moments in Aeneas' journey, from the fall of Troy to his arrival in Latium, reflect separation from Ceres, the most famous of bereaved mothers, an image underscored, especially in Books 2-3, by references to other mothers—Venus, Andromache, Hecuba, Helen, Creusa—separated from their children. The Trojans 'abandon' the goddess at her temple in Asia; Polydorus, whose body has produced a crop of iron, tells them to flee from Thrace; an attempt to settle in Crete is marked by the crops withering under the heat of Sirius; the Harpy Celaeno seemingly promises that famine will indicate the end of the journey; the Trojans' first meal in Africa consists of grain ruined by seawater. Appropriately, the finding of the *antiqua mater* is signified, not by fearsome hunger, but by a figurative reunion with Ceres. And just as that goddess's reunion with her missing daughter marks the beginning of a new cycle of fertility for the land, so too does her reunion with the Trojans, whose leader (like Proserpina) has returned from the Underworld, mark the beginning of a new age in human history.

³⁰Note the odd epithet *exiguam* for Ceres, the goddess of abundance; it and *penuria* suggest hunger. Is Vergil (unlike Ovid, *Met.* 8.785-86) trying to avoid references to both Ceres and Fames in the same line?

References

- Armstrong, R. 2002. 'Crete in the *Aeneid*: Recurring Trauma and Alternative Fate', *CQ* 52.1: 321-40.
- Austin, R. G., ed. 1964. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus*. Oxford.
- Austin, R. G., ed. 1971. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus*. Oxford.
- Bright, D. F. 1981. 'Aeneas' Other Nekyia', *Vergilius* 27: 40-47.
- Cartault, A. 1926. *L'art de Virgile dans l'Énéide*. Paris.
- Clay, J. S. 1989. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. Princeton.
- Conington, J., and H. Nettleship, eds. 1884. *The Works of Virgil with a Commentary*, vol. 2. 4th ed. London.
- Connors, C. 1992. 'Seeing Cypresses in Virgil', *CJ* 88: 1-17.
- Conte, G. B. 2006. 'Questioni di metodo e critica dell'autenticità: discutendo ancora l'episodio di Elena.' *MD* 56: 157-74.
- Courtney, E., ed. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Fletcher, K. F. B. 2014. *Finding Italy: Travel, Colonization, and Nation in Virgil's Aeneid*. Ann Arbor.
- Forbiger, A., ed. 1873. *P. Vergili Maronis opera*, vol. 2. 4th ed. Leipzig.
- Gowers, E. 2011. 'Trees and Family Trees in the *Aeneid*', *CA* 30: 87-118.
- Grimm, R. E. 1967. 'Aeneas and Andromache in *Aeneid* III', *AJP* 88: 151-62.
- Hardy, C. S. 1996. 'Antiqua mater: Misreading Genre in *Aeneid* 3.84-191', *CJ* 92: 1-8.
- Harrison, E. L. 1985. 'Foundation Prodigies in the *Aeneid*', *PLLS* 5: 131-64.
- Henry, J., ed. 1878. *Aeneidea, or Critical, Exegetical, and Aesthetical Remarks on the Aeneis*, vol. 2. Dublin.
- Heyne, C. G., ed. 1832. *P. Vergilius Maro*, vol. 2. 4th edition by G. P. E. Wagner. Leipzig.
- Horsfall, N. 2006. *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Hughes, L. B. 1997. 'Virgil's Creusa and *Iliad* 6', *Mnemosyne* 50: 401-23.
- Monro, D. B., and T. W. Allen, eds. 1920. *Homeri opera*, vol. 2. 3rd ed. Oxford.
- Mynors, R. A. B., ed. 1969. *P. Vergili Maronis opera*. Oxford.
- Page, T. E. 1894. *The Aeneid of Virgil, Books I-VI*. London.

- Panoussi, V. 2009. *Greek Tragedy in Vergil's 'Aeneid': Ritual, Empire, and Intertext*. Cambridge.
- Spaeth, B. S. 1996. *The Roman Goddess Ceres*. Austin.
- Thilo, G., ed. 1881. *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, vol. 1. Leipzig.
- West, G. S. 1983. 'Andromache and Dido', *AJP* 104: 257-67.
- Williams, R. D., ed. 1972. *The Aeneid of Virgil, Books 1-6*. Basingstoke.

Hercules, Hylas, and the Nymphs: Heroic Myth and Homosocial Poetics in Propertius 1.20*

Christopher Nappa

Like Lévi-Strauss' animals, gods and heroes are good to think with. They allow us to explore human life and human social relationships in a laboratory where the mundane concerns and limits of culture can be relaxed. Latin poets certainly found in the characters and stories of heroic mythology a way to characterize the sometimes suspect relationships they describe in their works. The language of goddesses becomes a way of talking about the uncomfortable yet undeniable power women, such as Catullus' Lesbia and the women of elegy, hold over men who should be respectably in the stronger position, and heroic myth is used as a language to talk about the complexities of relationships that cannot be described in standard social and political language. So, for Catullus, the fall of Troy and the exploits of Theseus become the touchstones in a personal mythology of family lost and the imperfect *domus* established adulterously with Lesbia. For Propertius, heroic myths define the poet-lover's lot from his first poem onward, where the hunter Milanion is diverted

* In the almost three decades I have known Jenny Strauss Clay as her student and friend, I have learned more from her than I can record here or anywhere else. This essay tries to pay tribute to her influence in three ways. The first is its examination of the use of myth and poetry in combination to talk about the poet's world and society; the second is a method based first and foremost in reading a text to try to determine what it does say as opposed to what is said about it; the third is a willingness to advance what I take to be a bold argument that a familiar text has long been misread. I hope I have not in this case done her too much of an injustice. Finally, I have to record, since I begin with Lévi-Strauss' totemic animals, a recollection from which I still take comfort. Someone had brought up the idea of the totem animal, and I, a somewhat overwhelmed graduate student at the time, opined that mine was probably the lowly dung beetle, at which point Jenny reminded me that by such means one can even reach heaven.

from the purposeful activity of the hunt to a life of wandering in desolate wastes by his encounter with a woman. The use of myth in such contexts ennoble the subject but also suggests that even amid the sophistication of late-republican and Augustan Rome, human relationships respond to atavistic impulses that stand in tension with the highly developed culture in which our poets lived. Myths are good—not necessarily comfortable—to think with.

Propertius 1.20 takes up the topic of the poet's friend Gallus and his relationship with a *puer*.¹ The centerpiece of the text is a retelling of the myth of Hercules and the loss of Hylas.² Most approaches to poem 1.20 have involved either an investigation of literary predecessors or a metapoetic reading. These studies have offered much insight, but my project here is different.³ Instead, I want to use the poem as a window on an aspect of the Roman world usually kept hidden. In short, I argue that poem 1.20 suggests the possibility of a sexual and romantic relationship between two Roman freeborn males that might (a) be looked on with

¹ Five poems of Propertius' first book, the *Monobiblos* (a term I retain for sheer convenience, despite Heyworth 2007: xii n. 4), concern a character explicitly named Gallus (1.5, 10, 13, 20, and 21) and one more (1.22) is often taken to refer to one of these texts and thus perhaps also to Gallus. This list does not include poems in which allusions to the elegist Cornelius Gallus may occur but that do not explicitly refer to Gallus. The dissonance between several of these poems long led most scholars to posit multiple Galli behind the addressees, but more recent work tends to read the poems as a sequence concerning only one character; on this question, see Pincus 2004: 169. For Janan 2001: 24 and 33-52, especially 33-36, the dissonance is part of the point. Holzberg 2001 maintains that the Gallus of 1.21 is separate from that of 1.5, 10, 13, and 20. Recent critics tend to see the poem as more closely connected to Propertius' major themes and concerns; see especially Newman 1997: 353: 'Once again the apparently objective and dispassionate poem, with its equivalence between drowning and the erotic experience, jibes with some of the poet's deepest preconceptions'. See also Keith 2008: 124-25.

² The fullest discussions of the Hylas myth in classical literature are Mauerhofer 2004, who discusses this poem and its likely models at 122-62; and Heerink 2015, who traces the use of Hylas as a metapoetic figure. On sources also see Bramble 1974: 82-86, Diller 1975, Fedeli 1980: 454-58, and Ingleheart 2015: 127-30. Ross 1975: 74-81 sees 1.20 as the first fully Gallan composition in the *Monobiblos*; see also Cairns 2006: 222-35. On the possible importance of Parthenius as a lost source for Propertius 1.20, see Cairns 2006: 235-49. Newman 1997: 352 has suggested that Varro Atacinus inspired Propertius' treatment. On the possibility of the legendary character Polyphemus as a model for Apollonius' Heracles and thus for Propertius, see Ingleheart 2015: 133-43.

³ Such readings fall broadly into two categories: studies that focus on Propertius' relationship to predecessors and those which see poem 1.20 as in some way dramatizing or allegorizing Propertius' self-construction as a poet. Since the latter process is often envisioned as involving allusion and intertextuality, the two categories significantly overlap. Important metaliterary analyses are Ross 1975: 74-81, J. King 1980: 227-29, Oliensis 1997: 161-62, Petrain 2000, Pincus 2004, Cairns 2006: 219-49, Keith 2008: 120-26, and Heerink 2015: 83-112. Of these, Pincus focuses on 1.20 only as part of the Gallus sequence more generally. Ingleheart 2015 takes the homoeroticism of the poem seriously but is still concerned mainly with its relationship to the literary elegiac.

favor by at least some respectable Romans and (b) be hoped to endure even as the younger partner matured.⁴ In other words, poem 1.20 gives us a glimpse, however veiled under the story of Hylas and Hercules, of what we have come to call a same-sex couple, and Propertius both acknowledges this fact and does not seem to think that the relationship must end because the younger male is reaching maturity. Past scholarship on 1.20 does not present such a view, arguing, or more usually assuming, that all same-sex behavior among members of the Roman elite was universally condemned and that the most conventional models of acceptable same-sex activity (those with slaves and, even so, structured along the lines of Athenian pederasty) were the only ones.⁵

It is somewhat obvious that Augustan society, as that of the Republic before, and Propertian poetics depend profoundly on what we have come to call homosocial (a term to be explored more fully later in this essay) relationships between men. That is, relationships between males that, while they might make use of women (such as marriage alliances), were essentially bonds in a male order.⁶ It is important not to regard such relationships as simply homoerotic; many, if not most, will not have been. Propertius, for his part, places high value on his male friendships without necessarily expressing any desire for erotic contact. Nevertheless, we should recognize that the homosocial operates on a scale part of which includes homoeroticism, and thus language appropriate to one end of the scale can bleed over and be used of the other, as we shall see below.

Since I treat elements of 1.20 out of order in what follows, it will be useful at the outset to give the whole of the poem in prose translation.⁷

For our uninterrupted love, Gallus, I give you this warning—let it not flow out of your idle mind. Fortune often blocks the path of a

⁴ Good overviews of sexual matters in Augustan Rome can be found in Hubbard 2003: 344-47 (with a useful compilation of translated sources at 347-82) and Skinner 2014: 280-310. Gordon Williams has suggested that all Augustan homoerotic verse about boys was both inspired by Greek literature and fictional, since it would have been unacceptable to most Romans otherwise; see G. Williams 1962, especially 39-43. Subsequent scholarship on ancient sexuality, especially on the vexed question of the *Lex Scantinia*, has rendered such a view untenable.

⁵ Athenian pederasty itself, obviously, does not necessarily constitute a simple model of behavior. Even scholars who acknowledge a sexual aspect to it often tend to see it as following the contours outlined in Plato's *Symposium*.

⁶ On Roman friendship, including the words *amicitia* and *amor* and their complex ambiguities, see especially C. Williams 2012.

⁷ The text of Propertius followed throughout is Fedeli 1994. All translations are my own.

lover who doesn't watch out: so cruel Ascanius might tell the Minyae. You have a passion not lesser in beauty, not unequal in name, very near to Hylas son of Theiodamas. Whether you scan the streams of the shady forest or the Anio's waters wet your feet, or you wander the edge of the Giants' shore, or anywhere you enjoy the flowing fickle hospitality of a stream, defend him always from the lustful predations of the nymphs (the Ausonian Dryads have no less a passion): otherwise you come upon the harsh mountains and chill rocks, Gallus, and always unfamiliar pools. Such had the wretched wandering of Hercules endured and lamented on unknown shores by unconquered Ascanius.

For they say that once upon a time, after it had left Pagasa's shipyards, the *Argo* went far off on the long journey to Phasis, and now, sailing on (Athamas' daughter's waves had already been passed by) it headed for the Mysian cliffs. Here the band of heroes set foot upon the calm beach and covered the shore with soft foliage. But the companion of the unconquered youth had gone on ahead to seek the remote water of a secluded spring. Him two brothers pursued, the offspring of the North Wind. From above, wings treading the air, both Zetes and Calais were pressing down to snatch kisses and carry off kisses from below, taking turns in flight. Dangling from a wingtip, he shields himself and fends off the flying ambush with a bough.⁸ At this point the progeny of Pandion's Orithyia left off. What grief! Hylas went on, went on to the Hamadryads. Here was Pege, under mount Arganthus' peak, a water home pleasing to the Bithynian nymphs; above it, from lonely trees hung dewy fruits owed to no cultivation, and white lilies sprang up here and there in the well-watered meadow, mixed with scarlet poppies. Now boyishly plucking these with his tender fingernail, he put flowers ahead of his assigned task, and now bending over the beautiful waters unaware, he prolongs his straying with pleasant reflections. At last he prepares to draw up water

⁸ This sentence has caused endless difficulties, and the text is suspect. As transmitted, line 29 reads *ille sub extrema pendens secluditur ala*, which yields sense only with difficulty. The most recent Loeb (Goold 1990) and Oxford Classical Text (Heyworth 2007) print Heinsius' emendation and read *ille sed extrema pendentes ludit in ala* ('but he teases the hovering ones at wing's end'). This is clearer Latin, but it would be easier to explain the corruption of the transmitted reading into it than vice versa, and I prefer to retain the transmitted text, which has been defended in various ways. For the translation printed here, see Fedeli 1980: 473-74.

with his lowered hands, leaning on his right shoulder and drawing full drafts. When the Dryads, enflamed by his fairness, abandoned their accustomed dances in awe, they nimbly pulled him in as he fell forward through yielding waters. Then Hylas made a noise when his body was pulled down. To this, Alcides replied from afar again and again, but the breeze brought him back the name from the farthest mountains.

If you take this warning, Gallus, you will preserve your love, you who've seemed to entrust beautiful Hylas to the nymphs!

I want now to focus on details in the interest of answering several questions, above all, the question of what kind of actual person the Hylas of this poem may allude to and that of the role of women in the fantasy world constituted by Propertius' version of the myth of Hercules and Hylas.⁹

Social scientists use the term 'homosocial' to describe relationships between members of the same sex that are generally not sexual or romantic in nature, but others see such relationships as always potentially erotic, even if the erotic potential is never realized. Scholars like Sedgwick, who have explored homosocial relationships among men in literary texts, emphasize the frequent presence of one or more women around whom the male-centered relationship revolves.¹⁰ In some cases, a woman becomes the focus of a rivalry that seems, in fact, to exist for its own sake. In other words, the woman serves as an apparent, perhaps socially necessary, cause and focal point for a relationship between two men, but the important relationship—again, whether or not it becomes sexual—is the homosocial bond between the men.¹¹ Sedgwick's most useful example for our purposes comes from Shakespeare's sonnets, in which

⁹ Most treatments of the poem do not address the potential reality of the situation. Some clearly take seriously the idea that the poem could allude to an affair that is either real or at least plausible. In this group, I would place Camps 1961: 93 (quoting an unnamed friend), Curran 1964: 292-93, Bramble 1974, and Diller 1975. Enk 1944: 175 and Richardson 1977: 201 clearly do not think the framing situation has much reality to it, and Hodge and Buttmore 1977: 202-09 think, at the very least, that the relationship between the outer frame and the inner narrative is unclear. More recently Cairns 2006: 220-22 seems disinclined to believe that such a relationship could have existed.

¹⁰ Sedgwick 1985, especially 21-27. Sedgwick draws on the concept of imitative desire outlined by Girard 1965: 1-52. The homosocial nature of Propertian poetics is outlined by Keith 2008: 115-38.

¹¹ In her discussion of the *Monobiblos*, Keith 2008: 115-30 stresses the declining presence of Cynthia. On 1.20 in particular, she has this to say (125): 'Dispensing with Cynthia altogether in elegy 1.20, Propertius lays bare 'the real hierarchy of desire' in the homosocial relations of rivalry and desire that structure both elegiac love and elegiac composition.'

the speaking voice of 'Shakespeare', a youth, and the dark lady interact in ways not unlike 'Propertius', Gallus, and Cynthia.¹² In Propertius' Gallus poems, I suggest, women are important for much the same reason—that is, the women involved serve to define the relationship between Gallus, Propertius, and other men, whatever other roles they may also play. In 1.21, in which the dying Gallus asks for a message to be sent to his *puella*, the woman in question links two men not only because she is to be the recipient of a message given by one of the men (Gallus) and carried by the other (an anonymous soldier), she is also a kind of kinship connection, since she is the beloved of one man and the sister of the other. She and Gallus are thus set into a framework that would seem to form part of Propertius' complex identifying sphragis, since poem 1.21 is taken up by the poet's concluding statement of his own identity in 1.22. It is perhaps worth noting that the Gallus of poem 1.21 is dying because he was unable to escape 'unknown hands', *ignotas...manus*, a phrase that recalls the emphasis on what is unknown and unfamiliar that was present in 1.5 and 1.20 when Gallus (hypothetically) gains Cynthia or loses his boyfriend. In 1.21, the dying Gallus is on the verge of perpetual separation from the *puella* he loves.

I am not proposing anything about the historical Propertius and Gallus or the nature of their relationship with one another, but the rhetoric of poem 1.20 is interesting for what it suggests about relationships among Roman men generally. Recent work on Latin poetry has explored the use of erotic language to describe the relationship between poets and other adult men, including patrons. The best-known example is Catullus 50, in which that poet recalls a session of versifying in terms that recall sex and love poetry alike, but, as Oliensis and others have pointed out, the phenomenon occurs also in Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid.¹³ Thus erotic language becomes a way of talking about another kind of social relationship, and the otherwise neutral use of *amor* fits right into this pattern. In other words, the fact that *amor* can indicate a homosocial bond as well as a specifically erotic one also allows the word to play a role in the system of metaphors that allows all relationships with poets to be described in erotic terms.

¹² Sedgwick 1985: 28–48.

¹³ In particular, see Oliensis 1997 and R. King 2004.

Scholars generally assume that Gallus' boyfriend is a *puer delicatus*, and thus probably a slave, but lines 5-6 provide good reasons for doubting this.¹⁴

est tibi non infra speciem, non nomine dispar,
Theiodamanteo proximus ardor Hylae
[1.20.5-6]

You have a passion not lesser in beauty, not unequal in name,
very near to Hylas son of Theiodamas.

The comparison in beauty tells us nothing of the boy's status, but the phrase *non nomine dispar* is suggestive and has been the subject of debate. The two most prevalent views hold either that Gallus' boyfriend is also named Hylas, a fitting name for a *delicatus*, or that he has a similar reputation to Hercules' Hylas.¹⁵ Each of these possibilities strikes me as highly improbable. The first requires that we take the phrase *non nomine dispar* to mean 'not different in name' which seems to strain the Latin, since it requires both that *non dispar* mean 'the same' as opposed to 'not unequal', and *nomen* to mean a name in general and not the name of a family. The second possibility acknowledges that *non dispar* is likely to refer to status rather than identity, but it would also seem to require special pleading.

More importantly, both of these interpretations have already prejudged what kind of relationship Gallus and Hylas have. If we proceed from the text and not assumptions about the relationship, we will notice an extremely important fact: line six begins with Hylas' very impressive patronymic, *Theiodamanteo*. It is hard to believe that the phrase *non nomine dispar* followed immediately by a patronymic would suggest anything other than 'not unequal in family name (*nomen*) to Hylas, son of Theiodamas'. Thus, the text at least opens up the possibility that Gallus' *puer* is not a slave at all but a youth of distinguished family—especially since the patronymic reminds us that Hylas was a prince by birth.¹⁶

¹⁴ Even as work on Roman sexuality has shed a great deal of light on the cultural construction of the passivity of penetrated males, surprisingly little has been done to investigate the reality of the *puer delicatus* as a specific category of person within Roman sexual discourse. The best starting points for such boys (and Roman attitudes toward the use of male slaves for sex more generally) are C. Williams 2010: 31-40 and Skinner 2014: 260-61.

¹⁵ Same name: Curran 1964: 287, La Penna 1977: 27, Fedeli 1980: 460, and Heerink 2015: 86; similar reputation: Rothstein 1920: 188, Butler and Barber 1933: 183, Enk 1944: 178, Diller 1975: 427 n. 22, Richardson 1977: 202, and Hodge and Buttimore 1977: 203 n. 8.

¹⁶ Theiodamas was king of the Dryopians. Though details vary from author to author, Hylas comes

This possibility instantly recalls the Juventius poems of Catullus. Whether or not we take them as records of that poet's biography or as a different kind of literary project, Juventius is not a likely name for a slave.¹⁷ If Gallus' boyfriend is a slave, he has no need of a patronymic, but Propertius seems to imply that he has one, and a good one at that.¹⁸ A patronymic would be irrelevant even if Gallus' boyfriend were the prominent Augustan mime actor named Hylas whom Macrobius (2.7.13) describes. On this reading, the Roman boy, like the mythical one, must have been freeborn, a fact to which we will return soon.¹⁹

The characterization of Hylas in the mythic narrative also deserves some attention. It is worth noting that the focus of Propertius' concern is entirely on Gallus, and the emotions of his boyfriend must be inferred from the presentation of Hylas in the myth. Critics have different opinions here. Diller, for example, sees a sympathetic Hylas; he points out that Propertius' Theocritean model emphasizes Herakles whereas Propertius 1.20 lets brief mentions of Hercules bracket a narrative that focuses entirely on Hylas.²⁰ For Bramble, however, Hylas is perhaps less appealing and more of a fickle narcissist.²¹ Readings like Bramble's tend to emphasize both a certain self-involved quality in the boy's gazing into the water and also the statement in line 33 that Hylas put picking flowers before his *officium*, a word which itself can have connotations of sexual service and which, in elegy, can suggest non-sexual gratification of the mistress as well.²² Metaliterary readings have sometimes seen Hylas as a stand-in for Propertius himself.²³

to Hercules when Theiodamas denies him an ox that he requested. For a discussion of the sources, see Galinsky 1972: 109-11.

¹⁷ See, e.g., Wiseman 1985: 130-31 on the social status implied by the name Juventius. One can also make a case similar to that made here about the use of a patronymic about the address to Juventius at the beginning of Catullus 24, *O qui flosculus es Iuuentiorum / non horum modo, sed quot aut fuerunt / aut posthac aliis erunt in annis...* ('O you who are the bloom of the Juventii, not only of the current ones, but of all who have either been or will be in years to come...'). Unless such an address is ironic, and the text gives us no reason to think so, it could not plausibly refer to a slave, freedman, or even a boy of the lower classes. The idea that Juventius must have been a slave still crops up; see, for example, Hurley 2004: 43.

¹⁸ I might note that some editors, like Goold in the Loeb text, punctuate so that the patronymic and the phrase *non nomine dispar* are in separate sentences. Even if there are good linguistic grounds for punctuating in that way, the text still juxtaposes the phrase with the patronymic, and so, I argue, the suggestion is still present.

¹⁹ For the problems attaching to relationships with freeborn males, see C. Williams 2010: 103-36.

²⁰ Diller 1975: 428-30.

²¹ Bramble 1974: especially 90-91.

²² See Bramble 1974: 90 and Platter 1995: 215-24; on *officium*, see Ingleheart 2015: 166 with references in n. 88.

²³ J. King 1980: 227-29 and Newman 1997: 353.

I tend to see in Propertius' youth the sympathy regularly afforded the young when they are in danger, even if that danger is partly brought on by themselves. For, while I think Bramble's analysis of Hylas' character is too negative, he is on firmer ground when he states that 'Propertius' Hylas is a disguised version of Gallus' favourite, described in such a way as to show that the addressee should not harbour illusions about youth and simplicity. Whim is the dictating factor in the boy's behaviour, the thing which causes him to be heedless of the feelings of his lover'.²⁴ Yet while we may perhaps assume from the text that Hylas, and thus Gallus' beloved, is liable to wander, I think we must avoid assuming that, because of his age, he must wander toward women in particular. Whatever fickleness or fecklessness Propertius attributes to Hylas or his Roman counterpart is a matter of individual character.

I want now to consider the implications of the incident with the sons of Boreas.²⁵ Since Propertius is warning Gallus to keep Hylas away from one set of erotic rivals, the nymphs, we might expect the Boreads to function as other men who also want the boy and thus threaten Gallus' relationship.²⁶ This analogy, however, will not hold. Like that of the nymphs, Zetes and Calais' behavior is aggressive and erotic, but, in contrast, it is not really dangerous to Hylas. In this poem, the danger to Gallus' relationship is from women, not other men. Support for this view comes from other poems addressed to Gallus.²⁷ For example, when it is revealed in poem 1.5 that Gallus has shown an interest in Propertius' mistress Cynthia, the poet does not react with the outrage we might expect.

infelix, properas ultima nosse mala,
et miser ignotos uestigia ferre per ignis, 5
et bibere e tota toxica Thessalia.
non est illa uagis similis collata puellis:
molliter irasci non solet illa tibi.
quod si forte tuis non est contraria uotis,
at tibi curarum milia quanta dabit! 10

²⁴ Bramble 1974: 87.

²⁵ See Ingleheart 2015: 129-43 on this incident and what she sees as Propertius' multiplication of homoerotic connections in poem 1.20.

²⁶ Cf. Curran 1964: 282 and Krókowski 1926: 86. The latter takes the warning in poem 1.20 to refer primarily to Gallus' male friends, a reading that strikes me as perverse.

²⁷ My reading of the Gallus sequence owes a great deal to Janan 2001: 41-52, Keith 2008: 120-26, Miller 2004: 60-94, Oliensis 1997: 158-62, and Pincus 2004.

non tibi iam somnos, non illa relinquet ocellos;
 illa feros animis alligat una uiros.

[1.5.4-12]

Unhappy man, you are hurrying to know the most extreme troubles and, wretched, to walk through unfamiliar fires and drink poisons from all of Thessaly. She is not like the fickle girls to whom you have compared her: she's unaccustomed to vent her anger at you gently. But if by chance she is not opposed to your wishes, how enormous the thousands of cares she'll provide! Now she'll not leave your sleep, not leave your eyes. She alone reins in men who are wild at heart.

Propertius warns Gallus not so much of his own anger or vindictiveness as of the dangers of an entanglement with Cynthia. In other words, the relationship that the poet is protecting in this poem is that with Gallus. In fact, later in the poem (29-30) it becomes clear that, if Gallus takes up with Cynthia, Propertius will at last have a companion who understands what he has been going through. Poem 1.5 also participates in a nexus of connections operative between 1.20 and 1.1. In 1.20, Gallus/Hercules is warned that losing his boyfriend will send him into the harsh mountains where, *miser*, he will encounter *neque expertos...lacus*, 'unfamiliar pools' (1.20. 14). This is also an aspect of the fate of Propertius/Milanion in 1.1. In 1.5, desire for Cynthia will send *miser*, 'wretched', Gallus *ignotos per ignis*, 'through unfamiliar fires' (1.5.5). Again loss of a boyfriend and desire for (or contact with) Cynthia are dangerous in the same way: wretchedness and wandering in harsh, unknown places.

Two other poems, 1.10 and 1.13, also comment explicitly on Propertius' knowledge of Gallus' affairs with a woman, or perhaps two different ones; it has been suggested that Cynthia is the woman in each case, but that is not relevant here. Poem 1.10 recalls a night of passion between Gallus and his *puella* that Propertius witnessed. Poem 1.13 seems almost to be a darker meditation on the same event, though it may represent a different affair altogether. In the earlier poem, Propertius celebrates not only Gallus' passionate love but also the *uoluptas* that he himself has gained by witnessing it (1.10.3). The later elegy gives us an embittered Propertius, whose friend has turned out to be both scornful of the poet's

problems with Cynthia and a womanizer too.²⁸ Still, Propertius wishes Gallus well and tries to participate in Gallus' erotic relationship with the *puella* by publicizing it.

In all three of these poems, 1.5, 1.10, and 1.13, Propertius' relationship with Gallus revolves around *amor* and, in particular, around the shared knowledge of *amor*; it is mediated through erotic relationships with women. In each case, however, that erotic relationship is itself problematic or potentially so, one that Propertius seeks to regulate and control for his friend's sake. Poem 1.20, by contrast, abandons the theme of how a woman might hurt Gallus if he himself has a relationship with her. Instead, women now threaten his relationship with a boy. Here too the relationship between Gallus and the boy has implications for his relationship with Propertius, since the poet issues his warning about the dangers of women *pro continuo amore*, 'for our uninterrupted love'. Some take *pro continuo...amore* to refer primarily to the relationship between Gallus and his boyfriend; e.g. Bramble with his translation 'so may your love continue'.²⁹ It seems to me, however, that this is possible only as a secondary meaning, since the existence of that *puer* is not established until line 5. Presented with the phrase coupled with the first-person verb *monemus* and no other context, the ellipse of a possessive adjective must first be filled in with a first-person form. Only as the poem proceeds do we realize that two *continui amores* are at issue.³⁰

Hoc pro continuo te, Galle, monemus amore
 (id tibi ne uacuo defluat ex animo):
 saepe imprudenti fortuna occurrit amanti...
 [1.20.1-3]

For our uninterrupted love, Gallus, I give you this warning—let it not flow out of your idle mind. Fortune often blocks the path of a lover who doesn't watch out.

²⁸ For the homosocial triangles of the *Monobiblos*, especially where Gallus is concerned, see Keith 2008: 115-30, Oliensis 1997: 158-62, Miller 2004: 66-73, and Pincus 2004. Like the present study, the analyses by Pincus and Keith draw on Sedgwick's notions of the homosocial (well summarized at Pincus 2004: 178).

²⁹ Bramble 1974: 87.

³⁰ On the links between these, see Oliensis 1997: 161. See also Richardson 1977: 202.

Certainly *amor* can be used of a relationship between men that has no explicitly erotic overtones.³¹ In the *Monobiblos* of Propertius, however, it is difficult not to find in the phrase *continuus amor* traces of its erotic meaning, since Propertius links his *amor* with Gallus to Gallus' role as a lover, an *amans*.³² In 1.20 Propertius is still trying to help regulate Gallus' *amores* with others, this time by promoting, almost publicizing, a relationship with another male. In the myth of Hercules and Hylas, the loss of Hylas not only ends Hercules' relationship, it also isolates him from the other Argonauts. Propertius tells Gallus to keep his Hylas because, in the system of metaphors he has established, the loss of his boyfriend may also sever his *continuus amor* with Propertius.

To the extent that it is a protreptic, poem 1.20 has a very simple argument: keep your boyfriend away from women or lose him and be miserable. Gallus' own relationships with women—past, present, or future—are left to be inferred from other poems or from social norms. Poem 1.20 is striking in its exclusion of women.³³ The lover who loses Hylas is male, and the community to which they belong, the Argonauts, is also exclusively male. The nymphs who destroy Hylas are the main female characters, joined only by the personified Fortuna of line 3, herself responsible for thwarting lovers. The fact that 1.20 is the first and only poem in the *Monobiblos* that mentions Gallus by name without linking him closely to a woman highlights Propertius' creation of a fantasy of a virtually all-male world here, as does the fact that Propertius' nymphs are undercharacterized compared to their models in Theocritus (*Id.* 13) and Apollonius (Bk. 1). And this is a fantasy that, like so much in this poem, resonates with the first poem of the collection:

fortiter et ferrum saeuos patiemur et ignis,
sit modo libertas quae uelit ira loqui.
ferre per extremas gentis et ferre per undas,
qua non ulla meum femina norit iter.

[1.1.27-30]

Bravely I'll endure both blade and savage fire, provided I have the
freedom to say what anger demands. Take me among far-flung

³¹ See Hellegouarc'h 1963: 146-47.

³² The 'productive ambiguity' of *amor* here has been discussed by C. Williams 2012: 209-10.

³³ See, however, Ingleheart 2015, for whom the poem ultimately heteroeroticizes the Hylas story inasmuch as the female nymphs get him in the end.

peoples and take me across waves, where no woman might know
my route.

Let us return to the narrative of Hylas with all of this in mind. Because of their own relationship, Propertius warns his friend Gallus not to lose his relationship with a youth comparable in beauty, desirability, and perhaps social status to Hercules' beloved Hylas. The most significant threat to this relationship, at least as this poem presents things, is not other men but women, and this recalls other poems in which the relationship between Gallus and Propertius is centered around *amor* with women that is observed, commented on, and even finally corrected by Propertius.

An all-male world has been created here, one in which women are a dangerous interruption.³⁴ Homosocial relationships and erotic possibilities define this world. Gallus and the boy share *amor*; so do Gallus and Propertius, an *amor* that is ideally uninterrupted, *continuus*. Other men intervene, if only briefly, with erotic, but harmless, designs on this Roman Hylas. What causes problems is the inclusion within this closed circuit of Woman. Just as Cynthia can be presented as constituting a threat within the relationship between Propertius and Gallus, so in poem 1.20 the real danger comes from the female nymphs, whose erotic attentions are also lethal.

Just as his own relationship with Gallus has been *continuus*, so does Propertius recommend that Gallus make sure that his relationship with his boyfriend remain *continuus*. If, as I have argued, 'Hylas' is a freeborn youth, here we would have another homosocial bond among elite men that is also a bond of *amor*. This poem, at least, elides the distance between homosocial relationships that are not erotic and those that are. The eroticization of elite *amicitia* that this suggests is not surprising given Propertius' representation of women, above all Cynthia.³⁵ Nor is it surprising at a time when the behavior of women was coming under increasing scrutiny, a process that would only accelerate under Augustus.

Poems 1.5, 10, and 13 show us a Propertius who uses Gallus' relationships, potential and real, with women to reinforce (or at least nego-

³⁴ See Miller 2004: 80 on the way poem 1.20 evokes 'a lost ideal of immediate masculine mirroring and homoerotic desire in the closed world of the Argonauts'. Miller points out too that even this fantasy is already failed 'for Hylas is ultimately lost to the nymphs'.

³⁵ My understanding of how, in 1.20, women constitute a dangerous interruption of an all-male system is indebted to Janan 2001: 24, where she discusses the relationship between Woman and Law in Lacanian terms. See also Miller 2004: 60-94, especially 94: 'She [Cynthia] is both a substitute for Hylas and one of the nymphs who take him away'.

tiate) a homosocial relationship—but it is clear that the *eros* of those poems is not entirely between Gallus and a woman. In 1.5, as we have seen, contact with Cynthia is envisioned as potentially linking the two men in their shared knowledge of erotic experience and disillusionment; poem 1.13 represents an act of voyeurism that produces pleasure for Propertius. In poem 1.20, Propertius speaks from one *continuus amor* to maintain another. We need not look for the distinction between the two: Propertius' *amor* with Gallus may have been literary, social, or even political, but it was always in some way erotic. The homosocial as it is conceived of in the *Monobiblos* consists in Propertius' transformation of *eros* and sex between males and females (as in poems 1.5, 10, and 13) to a relationship among males. Poem 1.20 emphasizes this primacy of male bonds and relationships and hopes that they might, in this case, be *continuus*.

By using the myth of Hylas in this way, however, the poem also sheds light on two other related phenomena. The first is the (supposedly) inevitably short-lived nature of a relationship between an adult male citizen and a boy. Whereas there is evidence in Catullus and other authors that such relationships were seen as necessarily temporary, Propertius would seem to suggest that they need not be.³⁶ Maturation and moving on to sexual relationships with women are presented not as the inevitable and natural order of things but as a danger to be avoided. It is unclear how far we should take this. On my reading of the poem, Propertius' advice to Gallus derives in part from the idea of excluding women from this comfortable, all-male world. In the terms of the poem's rhetoric, then, a relationship like that between Gallus and his Hylas must be considered durable or there can be no long-term erotic relationships at all, since the poem envisions a world in which such relationships do—or at least should—exist primarily among men. Yet all this would seem to suggest, too, that in some cases such relationships were valued precisely *as* relationships. In other words, for poem 1.20 to have any force, it must be obvious enough to its audience that Gallus does not want to let go and move on to another *puer* or at least that Propertius does not want him to. *This* Hylas is important, and, Propertius suggests, such a relationship

³⁶ See Catullus 61.119–43 (though even here the emphasis is on the husband's behavior rather than that of his *concupinus*) and Martial 1.31, 5.48, 9.36, 11.78, and 12.18.22–25. Although the Romans did not have any sort of institutionalized pederasty as, for example, the Athenians did, there does seem to have been a general idea that younger males (at or just after the onset of puberty) were more attractive sexual partners for most Romans. For some exceptions, see C. Williams 2010: 84–93.

need not always fade. What is perhaps most surprising is not that Gallus might wish to maintain his relationship but that his friend Propertius gives him explicit encouragement to do so.

The second matter in which Propertius 1.20 challenges conventional wisdom has to do with the gendered dynamics of same-sex relationships in ancient Rome. It is conventional in work on ancient sexuality to talk about slaves, freedmen, and other males who were sexually penetrated as playing a culturally female role, even if it was, in some cases, winked at. *Pueri delicati*, in this scheme, are effeminized boys, usually servile, who may or may not mature toward more normative masculine behavior. Indeed, a well-known strain of political rhetoric tried to brand grown men with the taint of effeminacy by hinting that they had been penetrated by older men, whether for profit or pleasure or both.³⁷ Yet in Propertius' poem, Hylas—like Propertius and Gallus—belongs in the world of men.³⁸ The sons of Boreas may have annoyed him and their attentions may have been unwanted, but he remained safe during their attack. In fact, his ability to fight back and fend off the Boreads makes an interesting contrast with the ease with which the nymphs pull him into the water. It is his attractiveness to the world of the feminine, the world outside of Propertius' closed circle of men, that is potentially lethal.³⁹

As I have argued, two things are especially striking about the homosocial and homoerotic as they are depicted in Propertius 1.20. First is the suggestion, however indirect, that Gallus' 'Hylas' is a citizen youth and not a servile *puer delicatus*. Second, Propertius would seem to be suggesting that a relationship that is both homosocial and homoerotic can, or, to his mind at least, should, endure, but Propertius' use of the Hylas myth is interesting in another way too. The most distinctive inter-

³⁷ See Krenkel 2006: 479-86 and Richlin 1992: 96-104. One thinks particularly of Cicero's description of Marcus Antonius as a kind of male bride to Curio (*In Ant.* 2.44); see C. Williams 2010: 192.

³⁸ In a similar vein, see Nikoloutsos 2007 on Priapus, *pueri*, and Marathus in Tibullus 1.4.

³⁹ This is not the place to reflect on what Propertius 1.20 and poems like it can tell us about Roman masculinity and its complexities. Nikoloutsos 2007 gets at some of these issues especially in relation to Tibullus 1.4. Such poems help highlight (77) 'the precarious position of a Roman male in gendered, artistic, social, and economic hierarchies'. See also 78-79: 'In 1.4 Tibullus justifies his choice of pederasty as a subject worth pursuing because it offers another means to reflect on the relationship of an individual to society, that is, how a male can (or is forced to) play 'the boy' in both the private and public domain'. This idea has affinities with Nappa 2001: 104-105, where I see in Catullus' descriptions of the effeminization of men seeking career advancement not simply denunciation of such men but scrutiny of a social system which promotes, even requires, such behavior (or at least behaviors that can be described through metaphors of sexual passivity).

action between the heroic myth and its frame in first century BCE Rome is what matters above all here. At least in the most famous versions of the myth, the loss of Hylas not only severs Hercules from a homoerotic connection but also leads to his permanent separation from his homosocial bonds to the other Argonauts. By turning Gallus and his *puer* into Hercules and Hylas, Propertius highlights the threats that their relationship faces, but by couching his warning to Gallus in terms of their own *continuus amor*, he also suggests a potential re-writing of the Hercules and Hylas narrative, one that does not end in the loss of Hylas or the severing of social bonds with other men.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ I am grateful to a number of people who have discussed Propertius and this paper with me over the years. I single out especially Nita Krevans (and the students in her elegy seminar), M. Christine Marquis, and Stephen C. Smith. An early version of this paper was given at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association in Montreal; I am grateful to members of that audience for their questions and feedback.

References

- Bramble, J. 1974. 'Cui non dictus Hylas puer? Propertius 1.20', in A. J. Woodman and D. West, eds., *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*. Cambridge. 81-93 and 150-51.
- Butler, H. E., and E. A. Barber, eds. 1933. *The Elegies of Propertius*. Oxford.
- Cairns, F. 2006. *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist*. Cambridge.
- Camps, W. A., ed. 1961. *Propertius Elegies I*. Cambridge.
- Curran, L. C. 1964. 'Greek Words and Myth in Propertius 1.20', *GRBS* 5: 281-93.
- Diller, H. 1975. 'Herakles und Hylas—Theokrit und Properz', in E. Lefèvre, ed., *Monumentum Chiloniense: Studien zur augusteischen Zeit*. Amsterdam. 419-31.
- Enk, P. J., ed. 1944. *Sex. Propertii elegiarum liber I (Monobiblos)*, Part 2. Leiden.
- Fedeli, P. 1980. *Sesto Properzio: Il libro primo delle elegie*. Florence.
- Fedeli, P., ed. 1994. *Sexti Properti elegiarum libri IV*. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- Galinsky, K. 1972. *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Oxford.
- Girard, R. 1965. *Deceit, Desire and the Novel: Self and Other in Literary Structure*. Baltimore.
- Goold, G. P., ed and trans. 1990. *Propertius: Elegies*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Heerink, M. 2015. *Echoing Hylas: A Study in Hellenistic and Roman Metapoetics*. Madison.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. 1963. *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République*. Paris.
- Heyworth, S. J., ed. 2007. *Sexti Properti elegos*. Oxford.
- Hodge, R. I. V., and R. A. Buttimore. 1977. *The 'Monobiblos' of Propertius*. Cambridge and Ipswich.
- Holzberg, N. 2001. *Die römische Liebeselegie: Eine Einführung*. Darmstadt.
- Hubbard, T. K. 2003. *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Hurley, A. K. 2004. *Catullus*. London.
- Inglehart, J. 2015. "Greek' Love at Rome: Propertius 1.20 and the Reception of Hellenistic Verse', *Eugesta* 5: 124-53.

- Janan, M. 2001. *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Keith, A. 2008. *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure*. London.
- King, J. 1980. 'The Two Galluses of Propertius' *Monobiblos*', *Philologus* 124: 212-30.
- King, R. J. 2004. 'Male Homosocial Readership and the Dedication of Ovid's *Fasti*', *Arethusa* 37: 197-223.
- Krenkel, W. 2006. *Naturalia non turpia: Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Hildesheim.
- Krókowski, G. 1926. 'De Propertio ludibundo', *Eos* 29: 81-100.
- La Penna, A. 1977. *L'integrazione difficile: Un profilo di Propertio*. Turin.
- Mauerhofer, K. 2004. *Der Hylas-Mythos in der antike Literatur*. Munich and Leipzig.
- Miller, P. A. 2004. *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton.
- Nappa, C. 2001. *Aspects of Catullus' Social Fiction*. Frankfurt.
- Newman, J. K. 1997. *Roman Propertius: The Recapitulation of a Genre*. Hildesheim.
- Nikoloutsos, K. P. 2007. 'Beyond Sex: The Poetics and Politics of Pederasty in Tibullus 1.4', *Phoenix* 61: 55-82.
- Oliensis, E. 1997. 'The Erotics of *amicitia*: Readings in Tibullus, Propertius, and Horace', in J. P. Hallett and M. B. Skinner, eds., *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton. 151-71.
- Petrain, D. 2000. 'Hylas and *silva*: Etymological Wordplay in Propertius 1.20', *HSCP* 100: 409-21.
- Pincus, M. 2004. 'Propertius' Gallus and the Erotics of Influence', *Arethusa* 37: 165-96.
- Platter, C. L. 1995. 'Officium in Catullus and Propertius: A Foucauldian Reading', *CP* 90: 211-24.
- Richardson, L., ed. 1977. *Propertius Elegies I-IV*. Norman, Okla.
- Richlin, A. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. Oxford.
- Ross, D. O. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome*. Cambridge.
- Rothstein, M., ed. 1920. *Propertius Sextus Elegien*. Berlin.
- Sedgwick, E. K. 1985. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York.

- Skinner, M. B. 2014. *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*. Malden, Mass. and Oxford. Second edition.
- Williams, C. A. 2010. *Roman Homosexuality*. Oxford. Second edition.
- Williams, C. A. 2012. *Reading Roman Friendship*. Cambridge.
- Williams, G. 1962. 'Poetry in the Moral Climate of Augustan Rome', *JRS* 52: 28-46.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1985. *Catullus and His World, A Reappraisal*. Cambridge.

Flora, Ovid, and Augustus

John F. Miller

Augustus' reputed aim to restore Roman religion after the evident neglect and disruptions during the long civil wars finds no more powerful expression than in his own *Res Gestae*, that summary of his achievements posthumously inscribed on bronze tablets outside his Mausoleum. Near the top of the fourth column of that spectacular document, Augustus famously declared that in the year 28 BC, that is, three years after his decisive victory over Antony at Actium, and one year before he as Octavian assumed the name Augustus, he 'restored 82 temples of the gods in the city, in accord with a resolution of the senate, and passed over *none* which needed repair at that time' (RG 20.4 *duo et octoginta templa deum in urbe consul sex[tu]m ex [auctori]tate senatus refeci, nullo praetermisso quod e[o] tempore [refici debeba]t*). The concluding blanket clause (*nullo praetermisso*) suggests a grand, comprehensive approach to religious renewal, and is echoed in characterizations by contemporaries. Livy, for instance, writing in the years right after 28 BC, calls Augustus *templorum omnium conditorem ac restitutorem*, 'the founder and restorer of all the temples' (4.20.7).¹

One should perhaps not press politicians too hard on their exaggerations but in this case we may note that there were venerable temples in the heart of Rome that Octavian conspicuously did *not* restore at this time. I would draw particular attention to the Temple of Flora, the agricultural goddess of all blooming plants, whose shrine seems to have been damaged by the fire that ravaged the northwestern end of the

¹ Cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 2.63 *templorum positor, templorum sancte repostor*.

Circus Maximus in 31 BC, along with another important foundation adjacent, the Temple of Ceres, Liber, and Libera.² Augustus did begin to rebuild these shrines late in his rule, probably after the famines in Rome during the years 5 through 8 AD,³ but according to Tacitus the project was completed only after Augustus' death by the next emperor, Tiberius, in 17 AD.⁴ Thus, the Temple of Flora lay in ruins for about forty years, in fact for much of the Augustan age. Augustus could have clearly seen these ruins every day from his residential complex on the northwestern side of the Palatine Hill, which had a direct sight line to the two Temples of Flora and Ceres at the foot of the Aventine, where their annual festivals apparently continued to be celebrated in the Circus.

We can only speculate on why Augustus chose not to repair these shrines. A restoration of Liber's Roman home may have awakened memories of Mark Antony's association of himself with that god, the Roman Bacchus, and spoiled the sight line from the new shrine of the great Augustan god on the Palatine, Apollo.⁵ In Flora's case, the regime may have felt that her notoriously lewd theatrical games, including stripteases by prostitutes, may have been out of keeping with the atmosphere of moral reform it was trying to promulgate. Let the people have the Floralia's raunchy mimes and festive entertainments in the Circus, but no need to furnish the feast's featured goddess with a sparkling new temple. Whatever the reason for Augustus' apparent indifference to Flora, it is striking that when, around the turn of the millennium, Ovid wrote his poetic version of Rome's religious calendar, the *Fasti*, he lavished particular attention on the Floralia. This is one of the poem's liveliest and most extensive panels; the feast is clearly imagined to be *the* greatest festival in the month of May. For the last day of the Floralia, May 2,⁶ Ovid stages a lengthy conversation between himself as curious calendrical poet and the gorgeous goddess of flowers, who all the while fantastically breathes forth roses as she answers his questions about her identity, the history of her cult in Rome, and some particulars of her festival then taking place

² Fire: Dio 50.10.3-4.

³ See Wiseman 2000: 295-97; on the famine, Dio 55.22.3, 26.1-3, 27.1, 31.3-4, 33.4.

⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 2.49.1 *Isdem temporibus deum aedis vetustate aut igni abolitas coeptasque ab Augusto dedicavit, Libero Liberaeque et Cereri iuxta circum maximum, quam A. Postumius dictator voverat, eodemque in loco aedem Florae ab Lucio et Marco Publiciis aedilibus constitutam.*

⁵ See Miller 2002: 205.

⁶ Implicitly the last day in Ovid's presentation, although contemporary evidence (F. Ven.; Degrassi 1963: 56) tells us that Flora's festival ended on May 3.

(5.183-378). At the end of this encounter Ovid distinctly marks this feast's prominence in personal terms, when for the *only* time in the six-book poem he inscribes his own name into the text, punningly suggesting an affinity between the odiferous divinity of blooms and himself, Publius Ovidius Naso, Mr. Nose (5.375-78):

omnia finierat: tenues secessit in auras,
 mansit odor; posses scire fuisse deam.
 floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aevo,
 sparge, precor, donis pectora nostra tuis.

She finished, and then vanished into thin air. Her fragrance lingered: you could know a goddess had been there. Scatter, I beg you, goddess, scatter your gifts upon my breast, so that the poem of Naso may bloom forever.

T. P. Wiseman (2004: 308) has suggested that Ovid's expansive and lovingly detailed treatment of Flora and her festival is a tacit reproach to Augustus for his evident neglect of her worship. Others, like Carole Newlands (1995: 104-10; 140-43) and Alessandro Barchiesi (1997: 133-37), see Ovid's Floralia as part of an overall anti-Augustan stance expressed in the *Fasti*, as one source of the undercurrents that move against the poem's expressed aim of praising the imperial family. Still other scholars, like Elaine Fantham (1998 and 2009) and Geraldine Herbert-Brown (1994), take Ovid's compliments to the emperor at face value—those compliments include, by the way, Augustus' massive restoration of Rome's temples (see note 1 above)—and tend to view the poem's depictions of earthier traditional festivals as in counterpoint, rather than in politically charged contrast, with more solemn ritual events, whether these be new Augustan anniversaries or older festivals. In the proem to the *Fasti*, addressed to Germanicus Caesar, Ovid promises to sing of both the feasts unearthed from the ancient annals, *sacra recognoscens analibus eruta priscis* (1.7), and the feasts of the imperial family, the *fešta domestica* recently added to the calendar (1.9). As regards his presentation of the Floralia—one of the traditional feasts, established along with Flora's temple at the foot of the Aventine in the mid-third century BC—I think that there is more room for exploration against the background of Augustan ideology, even if, in some respects, certainty about an

long; and may the house live long wreathed with the oak [This refers to the honorific laurels and oaken crown decreed by the senate in 27 BC and displayed at the house door]. One house holds three eternal gods.

Barchiesi (1997: 133-37) interprets this passage as revealing the pressure that the new Augustan feasts put on the regular round of sacral celebration and, therefore, on Ovid the calendrical elegist. Fantham in her commentary responds that 'there is no need to read political significance into O's courteous gesture of making way for the *grandius opus* of honouring Augustan Vesta. The *Fasti Praenestini* had given her the same precedence' (1998: 273). This is, indeed, one instance in Ovid's *Fasti* where we can compare with the remains of the marble calendar that the scholar Verrius Flaccus, tutor to Augustus' grandsons, erected at his native Praeneste. However, the issue of precedence is not absolutely clear in the entry for April 28:

Ludi Florae. feriae ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) quod eo di[e] et [ara] | Vestae in domu imp(eratoris) Caesaris Augu[sti po]ntif(icis) ma[x(imi) | dedicatast Quirinio et Valgio co(n)s(ulibus). eodem | die aedis Florae quae rebus florescendis praeest | dedicata est propter sterilitatem frugum.

Games of Flora. Festival according to a decree of the senate because on that day . . . [there is a textual lacuna] an altar for Vesta was dedicated in the house of emperor Caesar Augustus the pontifex maximus when Quirinius and Valgus were consuls [12 BC]. On the same day a temple was dedicated to Flora, who presides over the blooming of things, on account of a failure of the crops [that was in 238 BC].

As in Ovid's entry, the traditional feast of Floralia is named first, or rather the games at Flora's festival, *ludi Florae*. But in mentioning the two dedications, Vesta's more recent installation is given primacy over the temple of Flora. A different sort of reason is stated for each foundation, for Flora the crop failure that needed to be remedied, for Vesta the official enactment by the senate. Likewise the two deities are identified differently, Flora in terms of her sphere of influence, Vesta in association

with the house of Augustus the pontifex maximus. Even before Augustus, more than one feast sometimes took place on the same day and there is usually no need to see festivals thus overlapping as being in competition with one another. One can read the Praenestine notice as emphasizing either one of the two celebrations: the Floralia is mentioned first and twice, but the dedication of Vesta's recent shrine is put before the temple erected centuries ago.

Ovid clearly sees a tension between the Vestal commemoration and the Floralia. His entry for April 28 goes out of its way to contrast the two feasts. In place of the bare reference in the Praenestine Fasti, *ludi Florae*, Ovid singles out the stage games which are said to have (4.946 *habet*) licentious activity—he omits for now the games in the Circus. This public lewdness in the theater is set against the more private space of the imperial house, which has (4.954 *habet*) three gods living in it. *Tres deos* (4.954) on the Palatine versus a single *dea* (4.945) at the sacrum Florale—the floral goddess is herself not directly mentioned, while all the inhabitants of the Augustan *domus* are, Vesta herself three times and the first time in direct address. In the first instance festive floral crowns cover the goddess (4.945 *dea nexa coronis*), in the latter the oak of the honorific *corona civica* covers the house—*praetextaque quercu* (4.953). These contrasts evoke other, unspoken oppositions: the *patres* authorizing Vesta's feast (4.950)—this repeats the Praenestine Fasti—versus the plebs with whom Flora is traditionally associated;⁷ the imperial Palatine versus the festive Circus below it; and the *iocus liberior* of Flora (4.946) versus the unstated but indelible *gravitas* and propriety of Vesta, the chaste divinity of the hearth. Faced with the convergence of Vesta's new feast and the first day of the Floralia—usually a festival's most important day⁸—the calendrical poet decides to defer the riotous celebrations in Flora's honor, for the imperial anniversary is more important, a *grandius opus*, Ovid calls it (4.948), that pressures him to privilege Vesta. He strikingly tells the newcomer to the Palatine to take away the day—*aufer, Vesta, diem* (4.949)—that is, to take away the day from Flora. Ovid is, in effect, reading the Augustan anniversary as preempting the standing annual feast for the goddess of flowers. Flora's festival seems to have been demoted by Augustus, which should perhaps not surprise in view of his neglect of her ruined temple.

⁷ *Fasti* 5.287–94; Wiseman 2000: 196.

⁸ See Wissowa 1912: 455 on the first or last day as the 'Haupttag' of a festival.

When Ovid does welcome her to her jocund feast, on May 2, what he presents as the important final day of the Floralia, he takes pains to make up for the previous slight (5.183-94). The poet apologetically notes that he postponed her share of calendrical honors from the previous month: *distuleram partes mense priore tuas* (5.184). *Partes* can mean 'part' or 'role' in a drama (OLD 9) as well as 'share' (OLD 8) and so glances at her famous theatrical entertainments, as if she is on stage herself. Here the games in the Circus are also mentioned (5.190). As if by way of compensation for the deferral in April, the poet attributes to her the somewhat dubious distinction of owning the borderland (*confinia*) between the two adjacent months (5.187). He is trying hard. Once again, Flora is at the outset not mentioned outright. Ovid addresses her as *Mater . . . florum*, the Mother of flowers (5.183). The maternal figuration is not uncommon for a goddess of fertility.⁹ The appellation perhaps recalls the juxtaposition *florum dea* at 4.945 and definitely evokes the regular (and dignified) cult-title of Flora found in Cicero and Lucretius, namely *mater*.¹⁰ What is more, the opening collocation of Ovid's summons, *Mater, ades* 'Come, Mother' (5.183) recurs from an address to none other than Vesta late in *Fasti* 4 (verse 828: *et genitor Mavors Vestaque mater, ades*)—the phrase is found only in these two verses; and in both cases the honorific title applies to a goddess who is not, mythologically speaking, a mother. The verbal echo in effect reverses the earlier preferential treatment given to Vesta at Flora's expense even as it recalls it. Now the stately figure being summoned is not the Augustan hearth goddess but the mother of blooming plants.

For all of the stateliness and dignity in the opening phrase (5.183 *Mater, ades, florum*), the racy dimension of Flora's games is duly acknowledged at the start. On April 28 Ovid spoke of the habit of freer jesting on the stage (4.946): *scaena ioci morem liberioris habet*. With similar language he calls the divinity to be celebrated by her jocund games, *ludis celebranda iocosis* (5.183). These were the licentious stage-games featuring naked actresses, sometimes styled prostitutes, that emblemized the Floralia in the public imagination. A famous story¹¹ concerns the severe moralist Cato the Younger watching Flora's games. In his presence the people hesitated to ask the mime-actresses

⁹ In the *Fasti* see 1.671 *placentur frugum matres, Tellusque Ceresque*; cf. *Met.* 6.118 (Ceres) *frugum mitissima mater*.

¹⁰ Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.36; Lucr. 5.739.

¹¹ Val. Max. 2.10.8; Mart. 1 praef. 6-8.

to strip naked until a friend sitting next to Cato told him of the problem and he left the theater so that the customary stripteases could proceed. Martial makes this scene programmatic for his sometimes risqué epigrams. In his introduction (Mart. 1 praef. 7) the epigrammatist says 'let no Cato enter my theater, or if he enters, let him watch' (*non intret Cato theatrum meum, aut si intraverit, spectet*). Elsewhere (1.35) Martial justifies the appropriateness of licentiousness to his epigrams—*carmina iocosa* he calls them (10)—by appeal to Flora's feast: *quis Floralia vestit . . . ?* 'who puts clothes on the Floralia' (8), a festival that Ovid characterizes by its *ludi iocosi*.

When Flora next proceeds to explain at length to Ovid her own nature and the origin of her powers (5.195-274), we may be surprised that the theme of sexuality is somewhat muted. The goddess explains that originally she was a nymph named Chloris whose name got corrupted in Latin (5.195-96). Nymphs are sexually charged creatures, and Flora acknowledges her own great beauty and that it was her attractiveness that caught the eye of the god Zephyrus, the West Wind, who seized and deflowered her (5.199-202). Here Flora's identity is thrown into relief by *comparison* with her sister-in-law Oreithyia rather than by contrast as in the case of Vesta. Flora says that the wind-god of the North, Boreas, when he carried away the Athenian girl, gave his brother Zephyr the right to rape (5.203 *et dederat fratri Boreas ius omne rapinae*). Ovid tells that tale in Book 6 of the *Metamorphoses* (682-713). Flora's description of the event, however, differs markedly from the Ovidian Oreithyia, and from all of many other rape scenes found in Ovid's poetry. First of all, she passes over the event very quickly, in a single couplet (5.201-202): *ver erat, errabam: Zephyrus conspexit, abibam. / insequitur, fugio: fortior ille fuit*. She omits a standard element in such scenes, the victim's fear. Boreas, for example, swoops down upon a trembling victim, *pavidam . . . metu* (*Met.* 6.706).¹² We may also compare Botticelli's illustration of Ovid's story in his magnificent *Primavera*, where the painter recasts the tale in the more familiar terms of the typical Ovidian rape scene of the *Metamorphoses*. While the story is indubitably taken from the *Fasti* narrative—the roses emanating from the girl's mouth occur before this only in Ovid (5.194)—we are just as apt to think of Daphne pursued by Apollo in Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses*—there too the fleeing girl's fluttering garments, the amorous god's breath upon her streaming hair, her trans-

¹² Other examples: *Met.* 1.525 *timido . . . cursu*; 4.228-9 *pauet illa / metuque . . .*; 5.396 *terrata*.

formation when on the verge of being seized. And her fear. Botticelli has, as it were, put back this element onto the nymph's face whereas Ovid's narrating Flora airbrushed it away.¹³ Against this generic background, what is most astonishing of all is that Flora excuses the violation, now that she has ended up as the wind-god's honored wife. Zephyrus has compensated for his violence (5.205 *vim . . . emendat*) by granting her the name of bride, a garden filled with flowers, and—the crowning glory—control of flowering as a goddess (5.205-12). Marital imagery runs throughout this section, occurring even before she gets to the initial encounter with Zephyrus.¹⁴ To single out the victim's stunning beauty (5.199) is a familiar motif in rape-narratives,¹⁵ but to pitch that attribute not as motivation for the male's attack but as winning her mother a god as a son-in-law (5.200 *sed generum matri repperit illa deum*) is to adopt the settled familial perspective urged by Jupiter upon Ceres at *Fasti* 4.598 after Pluto carried off their daughter, namely that they have a *non pudendus gener*, a son-in-law not to be ashamed of. Having in effect won divinity in exchange for her virginity—like Virgil's Juturna (*Aen.* 12.139-41) or Cranae in *Fasti* 6.127-28—Flora downplays her suffering and highlights her present elevated status as wife of the mighty West Wind. In terms of the polar opposites of divinity on display in Ovid's entry for April 28, solemn Augustan Vesta on one side and on the other multi-colored Flora with her racy games, the Flora at the start of Ovid's entry for May 2 seems to be somewhere in between, both respectable matron and the honorand of *ludi iocosi*. Botticelli overall captures something of the same duality in figuring two versions of Flora, on the far right the nymph Chloris, diaphanously clad like the dancing Graces—Botticelli's equivalent to the naked mime girls—and immediately to the left the stately, robed full-fledged goddess of flowers.

Carole Newlands (1995: 109) characterizes this dual perspective as Flora mediating between *matrona* and *meretrix*. In post-classical times the goddess was often called a prostitute rather than simply visited by a troop of obscene female players at her disreputable games.¹⁶ In the late-ancient *Carmen contra Paganos*, for instance (112-14), she is branded a *meretrix*, a base originator of games, and a teacher of Venus, i.e. of sex.

¹³ See Barolsky 2000.

¹⁴ 5.200 *generum*; 205 *nuptae*; 206 *toro*; 209 *dotalibus*; 210 *maritus*.

¹⁵ E.g. *Fasti* 2.763; *Met.* 1.488-89, 2.724-26, 5.580.

¹⁶ See Held 1961.

In art the most dramatic instance may be a painting by Giambattista Tiepolo in the mid-18th century (*The Empire (or Triumph) of Flora*), where a particularly voluptuous Flora arrives in triumph attended by her raunchy mime players—there are many earlier examples. Ovid may hint at the legend of Flora's own promiscuity (found as early as Lactantius, *Inst.* 1.20.5-10) when he first invites her to identify herself (5.191): *ipse doce quae sis. hominum sentential fallax*, 'teach us yourself who you are; the opinion of humans is fallacious.'¹⁷ This could be taken to imply that all those stories of her loose morals are dubious. In the many following verses spoken by Flora, about her nature and festival, there is no hint of Flora's meretricious affiliations—*until*, near the end of the long conversation, Ovid at line 331 gets up the nerve ('I was trying,' he says—*conabar*) to ask her why there is considerable salaciousness in her games, that the subject arises. It occurred to me, he continues, that she is not an austere divinity, that her floral gifts befit *deliciae* (5.333-34), that is, the convivial and erotic merrymaking that he goes on to detail. The negative expression *numen non esse severum* (5.333) as much as calls Flora *lasciva*.¹⁸ Note, however, that the talkative goddess is not allowed to answer this question herself, as if (somewhat paradoxically) to preserve decorum. Likewise, in what follows, Ovid claims to need no supernatural help in understanding why prostitutes throng her games—*non ex difficili* (5.350). He can see for himself that 'she is not among the stern and grandiose' (5.351 *non est de tetricis, non est de magna professis*). When Flora does speak again, after 32 verses, the conversation seems to be back on safer ground as she fields the question about lights at her festival, for which she gives three alternative reasons (5.361-68). The final cause—the true one, she says—returns the topic to the feast's merriment. 'Because nocturnal license is appropriate to my *deliciae*' (367-68 *vel quia deliciis nocturna licentia nostris / convenit*). Notice the echo of Ovid's words above, uttered to us, about the appropriateness of Flora's gifts to *deliciae* (5.334 *aptaque deliciis munera ferre deam*). The goddess is made to follow the poet's lead in finally acknowledging the racier side of her festival. In plotting the whole conversation, then, Ovid dramatizes two sides of Flora's character. The sexuality and merriment muted at the entry's start have been reserved as a kind of punchline. There her characterization

¹⁷ See Wiseman 294.

¹⁸ For the opposition *severus* vs. *lascivus*, see Hor. AP 107, Ov. Am. 2.11 & 22, Mart. 3.20.6, and Tac. Ann. 16.5.1.

was shaded towards a dignified *matrona*, a goddess worthy to occupy the same pantheon as Augustan Vesta perhaps; here Ovid makes Flora reaffirm the erotic values and merrily naughty spirit of his own earlier elegiac poetry. Remember that he will soon close the whole entry (5.377-78) by asking her to immortalize his poetry, the *carmen Nasonis*.

A personality and mythology for Flora are all but unknown before Ovid—likewise with the kindred fruit-goddess Pomona seen in *Metamorphoses*. Even images of Flora are few and do not tell us all that much about her identity. In a coin from the 50's BC (RRC 512), Flora's head is decorated with plants and fruits as well as flowers, thereby pointing to her broad associations with plant fertility and not just with ornamental flowers. In some wall paintings women with flowers are at times called Flora, but could also be personifications of Spring. The only literary visualization of Flora before Ovid occurs in a brief passage of Lucretius (5.737-40), where she strews flowers in a procession honoring Venus and (apparently) personified Spring:

it Ver et Venus et Veneris praenuntius ante
pennatus graditur, Zephyri vestigia propter
Flora quibus mater praespargens ante vias
cuncta coloribus egregiis et odoribus opplet.

Spring and Venus come forward, and Venus' winged harbinger walks in front, then Zephyrus and mother Flora a step behind him strewing the whole path in front of them all and filling it with brilliant colors and scents.

The company of Zephyr is interesting but does not absolutely prove that the story of her rape by and marriage to Zephyr existed before Ovid, who, as we have seen, points to the parallel tale of Oreithyia and Boreas. In an insightful article Barbara Boyd (2000: 76) speaks generally of Ovid's Flora 'creating a past for herself, building history out of analogies with long-familiar stories.' Boyd mentions Oreithyia and the story that Flora tells of Juno parthenogenetically producing Mars (instead of the more usual Vulcan in that role) with the help of a magic herb from Flora's garden. But other mythological analogies emerge in the long dialogue between divinity and poet.

Most obvious perhaps are the parallels with the famous erotic ab-

duction of Proserpina featured in Book 4 of the *Fasti* on the occasion of the Cerialia. Already noted above was Flora's echo of Jupiter's comment on the rapist Pluto as a noble son-in-law (5.500; cf. 4.598). Flora's most extensive tale concerns the agricultural crisis that she created by withholding all blooms when the senate neglected her worship—this precipitated her annual festival (5.295–330). The particular form of divine punishment clearly recalls the well-known myth of Ceres ending the growth of all crops until her abducted daughter Proserpina was returned. One wonders, too, if Augustan readers would have seen a contemporary relevance, given the long lack of imperial attention to Flora's ruined temple (as well as to that of Ceres). At the start I quoted the emperor's inaccurate declaration not to have passed over any temple in the rebuilding boom of 28 BC—*nullo praetermisso* (RG 20.4). Ovid's Flora uses similar language in reporting the Roman authorities' past neglect of her cult (5.312)—*me quoque Romani praeteriere patres*.

The Roman deity whom Ovid's Flora most resembles is Venus, an Olympian divinity widely acknowledged as the greatest goddess of springtime—as we recall from the proem to Lucretius' *De rerum natura*, or from the hierarchy in his procession of vernal deities (5.737–40, above), or from the centrality of Venus in Botticelli's *Primavera*, which alludes to the scene in Lucretius. In the *Fasti*, although Flora rules over all blooming plants, she locates herself especially within the ornamental garden, which is traditionally under Venus' care. At the start of Varro's *Res rustica*, for instance, Venus is characterized by her *procuratio ... hortorum* in comparison to Minerva's well-known care of the olive grove.¹⁹ Ovid's Flora defines herself in terms of the *fecundus hortus* located in the fields that were her dowry (5.209–10), a garden that her husband Zephyrus filled with flowers (5.211); later Flora notes that her floral remedy for Juno came from her garden (5.251–52), and, when she punished the Romans for neglecting her, it was first of all the *fertilis hortus* from which she withheld her power (5.316). As she speaks to Ovid, Flora wondrously breathes forth spring roses (5.194 *dum loquitur, vernas efflat ab ore rosas*), which in antiquity were sacred to Venus.²⁰ Elsewhere (5.215–20), when she explains to Ovid that the vernal flower-gathering and wreath-plaiting by the Graces and Hours is all set in

¹⁹ Varro, RR 1.1.6 *Item advenior Minervam et Venerem, quarum unius procuratio oliveti, alterius hortorum*.

²⁰ Paus. 6.24.7 ῥόδον μὲν καὶ μυρσίνην Ἀφροδίτης τε ἱερὰ εἶναι; cf. Eur. *Med.* 841; Bion 1.65–66.

motion by *munera nostra*, by her own gifts, she comes close to appropriating Venus' mythical entourage to herself. What is more, she expands her sphere to include the 'bloom' of human youth at the close of her list of powers (5.273-74)—a connection between Flora and human flourishing or coming of age found only here, and that recalls the sexual stirrings in youth prompted by Venus. Some editors bracket this couplet as an interpolation, but the idea does cohere with the spirit of the Ovidian Flora. Later in the dialog Ovid himself similarly notes that Flora advises us to enjoy the time of youth while it is in bloom (5.353 *et monet aetatis specie, dum floreat, uti*). It is hard to say whether in all this we should take the self-assertive Flora to be implicitly claiming her equivalence with the preeminent divinity of springtime in rivalry or rather dutifully imitating her superior. Or whether Ovid is simply modeling Flora on Venus.

The lattermost is clearly the case at the end of the long entry, when Flora's leave taking and Ovid's closing prayerful response both evoke Venus, if in different ways (5.375-78):

omnia finierat: tenues secessit in auras,
mansit odor; posses scire fuisse deam.
floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aevo,
sparge, precor, donis pectora nostra tuis.

She ends the interview with the calendrical poet by vanishing into thin air but leaves her divine fragrance behind, much as Venus in Book 1 of the *Aeneid* departs from her son while exuding *divinum odorem*.²¹ Ovid then prays that Flora grant the eternal flowering of his poem—*flo-rere* in yet another sense—punningly stating his nasal name (*Nasonis*) in the powerfully olfactory context. This corresponds to nothing as much as the start of *Fasti* 4, where he asks the goddess of the previous month, Venus, for her favor upon his present work. In response she touched Ovid's temples with her sacred myrtle;²² Ovid would to similar effect have Flora scatter upon his breast her characteristic floral gifts. The momentousness of this gesture in the entire poem is further underscored

²¹ *Aeneid* 1.402-404 *dixit, et avertens rosea cervice refulsit, / ambrosiaequae comae divinum vertice odorem / spiravere . . .*

²² 4.1-18 *'Alma, fave' dixi 'geminorum mater Amorum' . . . / mota Cytheriaca leviter mea tempora myrto / contigit et 'coeptum perfice' dixit 'opus.'*

by the well-known intertextuality with Callimachus' closural prayer to the Graces for his elegies' immortality in the first section of the *Aitia*, the *Fasti*'s most important literary model.²³ Ovid's couplet may also refer to an evident imitation of Callimachus' lines by Theocritus, where the sweet-smelling bosom of Berenice is the focal point of a beautifying, and implicitly immortalizing, touch of Aphrodite.²⁴ Another neglected reference is to the end (again) of Catullus 13, where the powerfully fragrant unguent which the poet promises will make his friend pray to the gods to make him all nose—*totum nasum*—was a gift of Venuses and Cupids.²⁵ Naso himself prays for the fragrant Flora's immortalizing gifts, which he earlier situated firmly in sympotic contexts like that of Catullus' poem.

In the big picture of the *Fasti*, the venereal accents of Flora can be read as complementary linkage, or as tension, between divinities. On the latter score, Venus was of course a great dynastic deity of the Caesars, much like Vesta, while Flora was all but neglected by Augustus for much of his long rule, as we noted at the outset. If Ovid made the Floralia one of his calendar's most spectacular festivals to repair that Augustan negligence, the repeated comparisons with Venus could have enhanced that political point.

²³ Callim. *Aet.* fr. 7.13-14 (to the Graces) ἔλλατε νῦν, ἐλέγοισι δ' ἐνιψήσασθε λιπώσας / χεῖρας ἐμοῖς, ἵνα μοι πολὺ μένωσιν ἔτος. 'Come now and wipe your anointed hands upon my elegies that they may live for many a year.'

²⁴ τᾷ μὲν Κύπρον ἔχοισα Διώνας πότνια κόυρα / κόλπον ἐς εὐώδη ῥαδινὰς ἐσεμάξατο χεῖρας. 'Into whose sweet-smelling bosom the revered daughter of Dione who owns Cyprus pressed her slender hands.'

²⁵ Cat. 13.11-14 *nam unguentum dabo, quod meae puellae / donarunt Veneres Cupidinesque, / quod tu cum olfacies, deos rogabis, / totum ut te faciant, Fabulle, nasum.*

References

- Barchiesi, A. 1997. *The Poet and the Prince. Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley.
- Barolsky, P. 2000. 'Botticelli's *Primavera* and the Poetic Imagination of Italian Renaissance Art', *Arion* 8: 5-35.
- Boyd, B. W. 2000. 'Celabatur auctor: The Crisis of Authority and Narrative Patterning in Ovid's *Fasti* 5', *Phoenix* 54: 64-98.
- Degrassi, A. 1963. *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13.2. *Fasti Anni Numani et Iuliani*. Rome.
- Fantham, E. 1998. *Ovid Fasti Book IV*. Cambridge.
- Fantham, E. 2009. *Latin Poets and Italian Gods*. Toronto.
- Held, J. 1961. 'Flora, Goddess and Courtesan', in M. Meiss, ed. *Essays in Honor of Edwin Panofsky*. New York. 1.201-18.
- Herbert-Brown, G. *Ovid and the Fasti. An Historical Study*. Oxford 1994.
- Miller, J. F. 2002. 'Ovid's Liberalia', in G. Herbert-Brown, ed. *Ovid's Fasti. Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*. Oxford. 199-224.
- Newlands, C. E. 1995. *Playing with Time. Ovid and the Fasti*. Ithaca, NY.
- Wiseman, T. P. 2000. 'Liber: Myth, Drama and Ideology in Republican Rome', in C. Brun, ed. *The Roman Middle Republic: Politics, Religion and Historiography c. 400-133 BC*. Rome. 265-99.
- Wiseman, T. P. 2002. 'Ovid and the Stage', in G. Herbert-Brown, ed. *Ovid's Fasti. Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*. Oxford. 275-99.
- Wiseman, T. P. 2004. *The Myths of Rome*. Exeter.
- Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. 2nd ed. repr. 1971. Munich.

Index

- abduction
217, 183, 353
- Achilles
79, 138, 195, 200, 208-209, 212,
218, 224, 297, 290, 301, 306
- Actaeon
183-186, 189, 193, 196, 203
- Admetus
200
- Adonis
193, 205, 232
- Aeacus
293
- Aegyptus
294
- Aeneas
20, 224, 301-302, 304-310, 312,
313-316, 318-320
- Aeolus
294
- Aeschylus
4, 12, 17, 96, 115, 119-120, 126,
130-132, 134-136, 140, 142-143,
145-146, 156, 177, 184-186, 195
- Agamemnon
53, 68, 141-142, 183, 210, 212
- Agave
142, 275
- Agenor
298
- Alcaeus
263-264, 274, 281, 293
- Alcestis
11, 155, 200
- Alpheius
198
- Amaryllis
216-217, 225, 232
- Amphion
289, 290
- Amphis
193-195
- Amphitryon
193-194
- Andromache
11, 305, 307, 314-315, 319-321
- Antigone
5, 17, 137-157
- Antoninus Liberalis
197
- aoidos*
207, 214
- Aphrodite
73, 83, 111, 183, 190, 192-193, 197,
210, 231-232, 235, 298, 304, 356,
- Apollo
6, 13, 17, 20, 53, 55-56, 73-74, 79, 81,
83-88, 92-98, 104, 108, 110-111, 113,
115-116, 142-144, 156, 162, 165, 167,
182-184, 190, 193-194, 196, 200, 237,
256, 259-264, 269, 271-272, 280, 282,
290-291, 294, 298-299, 301-302, 310-314,
344, 346, 350
- Apollodorus
184, 187-190, 193-194, 196, 184, 200
- Aratus
188, 198-194, 240-244, 249-251
- Archilochus
48, 52, 54, 239-240, 242-246, 250,
253-254, 274, 276
- Ares
17, 91, 123, 135, 183, 189

Aristophanes

6, 11, 17-18, 69, 84, 100-101, 115,
117, 159-163, 165-167, 169-171-173,
175, 177, 179, 198, 224

Artemis

6, 18, 181-196, 198-201, 203

Atalanta

183, 185

atē

17, 137, 155

Athena

31, 35, 48, 52, 57, 60, 74-75, 77,
109-110, 144, 183-184, 218, 227, 281

Atreus

141

Attalus

288

augur

262

Augustus

6, 13, 259, 261-263, 270, 276, 278,
282-283, 299, 301-302, 335, 343-349,
351, 353, 355-357

authority (choral)

14, 17, 81, 84, 88, 91-93, 96, 100,
102-106, 110-111, 113

authority (poetic)

14, 17, 84, 88, 111, 113

Bacchus

20, 97, 256, 264-265, 271-280, 285, 344

Bacchylides

83

beauty

27, 196, 199-200, 209, 214, 225, 242,
326, 329, 335, 350-351

blindness

18, 159, 206, 208-210, 215-216

Boreads

317, 337

Boreas

188, 331, 337, 350, 353

Bourina

230, 234-236, 254

Brauron

182, 194, 198-199, 202-203

Britomartis

183

bucolic

229, 231-235, 238-241, 244, 248, 250

Callimachus

18, 181-184, 186, 188-189, 200-203,
234, 236-238, 245, 252-253, 356

Callisto

185, 193-197, 201-203

Carion

6, 18, 159-167, 169, 171-173, 175, 177,
179-180

Cassandra

141, 144

Catasterisms

187, 194

Catullus

11, 14, 19, 21, 30, 53, 192, 202-203, 265,
300, 323, 328, 330, 336-337, 339-341,
356,

Cerberus

273, 290-291, 293

Ceres

6, 20-21, 280, 301-303, 308-310,
312-314, 316-321, 344, 349, 351, 354,

Chalcon

230, 234-235

charis

160, 161, 166, 172

- Charon
 287, 296
- Circus
 344, 348-349
- Clytaemestra
 141
- Clytia
 230
- Cocytos
 294
- Contest (Homer & Hesiod)
 54, 203
- Corinna
 189
- Coronis
 184, 199
- Cos
 230, 232, 234-236, 246, 248, 254
- Creon
 18, 137-140, 145-154
- Crete
 4, 7, 70, 187, 311-313, 319-320, 312
- Creusa
 302, 304, 307-309, 312, 314, 319-320
- Cronus/Kronos
 58-64, 69-70, 72, 74-75, 105, 109, 125,
 128, 130, 132-133
- cult
 11, 15, 18-20, 98-99, 104, 159, 162-166,
 188, 192-193, 196, 198-200, 234-236,
 239-240, 246, 248, 255, 257-259, 262,
 268, 279-280, 317, 344, 349, 354
- Cupid
 356
- Cyclopes
 58, 61-64, 73, 78, 172, 183, 214, 225, 228,
- Cyclops (Polyphemus)
 18, 172, 205-211, 214-217, 219-226,
 228, 314, 324
- Damoetas
 52, 208, 220, 222-223
- Danaids
 291-292
- Danaus
 291, 294
- Daphne
 106, 196, 350
- Daphnis
 208, 220, 222-223, 231-232, 252
- Delian maidens/Deliades
 98, 116
- Delos
 96-97, 115, 188, 203, 310, 313
- Delphi
 53, 81, 83, 110-111, 113, 142-143,
 182, 196
- Demeter
 6, 19-20, 202, 229-241, 243, 245-247,
 249-253, 301, 308, 313, 317
- Demodocus
 206-207, 212-217
- Dike
 5, 17, 119-136, 170
- Diodorus
 186, 240
- dreams
 194
- dynasties (destroyed)
 154
- Elysian Fields / Elysium
 286, 288

Epicureanism
257, 264

Epimenides
194

Erinyes, Erinyes
142, 148-149

Eros
150

eros
243, 244, 336

Eteocles
142, 145-146, 148, 157

Eumelus of Corinth
194

Euphorion
188

euphrosyne
213, 214

Euripides
11-13, 17, 84, 96-99, 101, 114-116,
126-127, 134-136, 138, 140, 142, 144,
155, 157, 177, 185, 190, 193, 196,
200-201, 214, 205, 228, 281

Europa
23-25, 194

Faunus
15, 285, 297-299

festival
19, 22, 87, 96, 110-113. 198, 201,
230-231, 250-251, 270, 344-348, 350,
352, 354

Floralia
22, 344-350, 356

Furies' snakes / Fury-like
291, 293?

Gaia
5, 16, 54, 57-59, 61-79

Galatea
23, 205-208, 210, 216-217, 219-225

Gallus
21, 324-338, 340

gaze (male)
18, 183, 185-186, 193, 197, 209, 217,
228, 234

Gods as fellow celebrants (συνεορτασταί)
84, 87, 92, 96-97, 101, 106

Gods as fellow-choreuts (συγχορευταί)
87, 92, 96-97, 98, 101, 106, 111

Haemon
149-154

Hamadryads
326

hasychia
244, 249

Hecate
52, 64, 308

Hecuba
11, 138, 305-307, 310, 319

Helen
11, 66, 125, 196, 198, 210, 307, 309, 319

Helios
33, 183, 308

Hellanicus
188, 197-198

Hephaestus
109, 183, 213

Hera
66, 73-74, 122-123, 129, 183, 189,
192, 195

Heracles
61, 84, 96-98, 114-116, 123, 142, 144,
183, 195, 210, 324

Hercules
6, 21, 262, 323-327, 329-335, 337-339,
341

- Hermes
6, 13-14, 18, 33, 47, 52, 126, 155-157,
159-167, 169, 171-173, 175, 177,
179-180, 197-198, 231, 252, 263, 281,
285-286, 296, 299
- Herodas
206, 228
- Herodotus
30, 104, 137, 157, 188, 198
- Hesiod
14, 16-17, 20, 48, 53-55, 57, 60, 62,
67-68, 74, 76-80, 87, 136, 167-168,
170-172, 176-177, 187-188, 194, 203,
212, 215, 234, 253, 265, 268, 361
- Hestia
182
- Hippolytus
11, 142-143, 190-192-193, 197, 201
- Hipponax
164, 169, 240-241, 245-246, 250, 252,
254
- Homer
20-21, 28-30, 34, 36, 46-49, 52-53, 55,
59, 67-69, 74, 80-81, 87-88, 113, 144,
194, 203, 205, 208, 210, 214-218, 223,
228, 237, 253, 265, 279, 339
- Horace
5-6, 11, 13, 19-20, 23, 25, 30, 48-49,
53-56, 255-257, 259, 261-265, 267-269,
271, 273-279, 281-283, 285-286,
288-300, 328
- Hundred-Handers
58, 60-64, 70-71, 73
- hunt
28, 185-186, 196, 241, 324
- Hyginus
186-187, 189-190
- Hylas
6, 21, 217, 323-327, 329-331, 333-341
- hymn
14, 18, 20, 53, 65, 73-74, 81, 84, 93-98,
104, 108, 111, 113, 116, 150, 160-163,
165-167, 171, 180-184, 186, 188-189,
193-197, 201-203, 233-235, 238-240,
245-246, 248-253, 256, 263-264, 270-271,
277, 281-282, 286, 288-289, 297, 299, 304,
308, 313
- Hypermetra
292-293
- Iambe
239-240, 246-251
- iambic
160, 162, 236, 238-241, 243-246,
248-250, 253
- iambos
19, 252, 254
- Inachus
296
- inconsistency of character
5, 17, 137, 139, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149,
151, 153, 155-157
- Iphigenia
115, 138, 142, 200
- Ismene
137-139, 145-146, 148, 150, 153
- Ixion
290, 291, 293
- Jupiter
20, 25, 256-259, 261-262, 271, 280, 290,
301, 311, 313-314, 318, 351
- katabasis*
290, 292, 293 294, 295, 297
- Komaitho of Patrai
199
- Labdacus
18, 146, 148, 150, 154

- Laius
17, 139, 142-143, 145-146, 150, 153-154
- Letrini
198
- Leucippus
195
- Liber
272, 275, 280-281, 302, 320, 339, 344, 357
- locus amoenus*
192, 224, 234-235, 238
- Lucretius
46, 349, 353-354
- Lycidas
230-231, 233-234, 237, 240, 243-246,
248-251
- Lyde
19, 289-292, 298
- Maecenas
287
- Maera
196
- Manes
295
- mantis*
103
- Mark Antony
344
- marriage
46, 48, 150, 181-183, 185, 194,
199-200, 272, 289, 292, 307, 317, 325,
353
- martyrdom
17, 140, 149, 156
- master of truth
88
- Medea
11, 143, 155
- Melanippus
199, 221
- Melanthius
219, 224
- Menander
198, 228
- Mercurialis uir*
19, 285, 293, 297-298
- Mercury
13, 15, 19-20, 180, 256, 261-264, 271,
280, 282, 285-293, 296-299
- Metis
48, 52-53, 57-58, 60, 62, 69, 75, 77-78,
116, 217
- Miltiades
198
- monotheism
254
- Muses/Muse
18-17, 20, 22, 52, 78, 81, 83-88, 92-93,
95-98, 101, 108, 110-113, 144, 208, 210,
212, 215, 234, 237, 256, 264-271,
277-280, 282, 285, 290
- narcissism
210, 222, 330
- neikos*
212
- Nicander
188
- Nicias
205, 207, 210
- Niobe
242
- Nonnus
186, 188
- Nymphs
6, 21, 24, 33, 103, 183, 238, 272, 277,
323, 325-327, 329, 331, 334-335, 337,
339, 341, 350

- Octavian
14, 255, 259, 261, 263, 285, 285, 343
- Odysseus
18, 28-30, 32-34, 36, 46, 53, 57, 162, 172,
186, 196, 206-208, 210-221, 224-225,
254
- Oedipus
80, 84, 102-104, 115-116, 139, 142-145,
148, 150, 154-157
- Oenopion of Chios
187
- Olympian
53, 58, 63-64, 70, 77, 79, 83, 107, 114,
127, 177, 182, 200, 202, 263, 267, 282,
285, 288, 346, 354
- Olympus/Olympos
16, 48, 52, 65-67, 72, 76, 78, 80, 95-96,
111, 115, 128-130, 144, 178, 182-183,
212, 301, 308, 320
- omniscience
17, 82, 84, 103, 108, 109
- Opis/Oupis
188
- Orcus
287, 292, 296
- Oreithyia
350, 353
- Orion
24, 181, 184, 186-189, 193-194, 201, 293
- Orpheus
286, 290-291, 293
- Otus & Ephialtes
181, 184, 186, 189-190, 193, 197
- Ovid
6, 11, 22, 187, 193, 194, 198, 219, 253,
309-310, 319, 328, 343-357
- Palatine
259, 344, 346, 348
- Pan
12, 103-104, 183, 230-231, 240-241,
243, 246
- paraklausithyron*
217
- Paris
8, 21, 31, 41-42, 45, 56, 79, 81, 114, 178,
281, 298-299, 320, 339
- Parthenius
187, 196, 324
- Pausanias
184, 188, 193, 196-199
- performance
11-12, 44, 81-84, 88, 93, 96, 98, 103, 105,
106-107, 109-110, 112-117, 143, 145,
180, 207, 211, 214-215, 265
- Phaedra
142, 191, 193
- Pharaoh
141
- pharmakos*
241
- Pherecydes of Athens.
196
- Philicus
246, 248, 252
- Philippi
264, 270, 285, 297, 298
- Philitas
19, 230, 236-238, 254
- Pindar
54, 82-83, 104-106, 109-113, 115-117,
183-184, 187-190, 192, 265, 267-269,
282, 288
- Plato
65, 84-90, 92-93, 96, 98, 108, 110-114,
116, 203, 218, 279

Pleiades

188, 197

Plutus

6, 18, 159-180

Plutarch

198

Pluto

180, 295, 351, 354

Polymele

197-198

Polynices

137-139, 142, 145-148, 150-153, 156

Polyxena

138

Poseidon

182, 188, 197, 214

Postumus

294-295

pothos

249-250

prayer

20, 23, 25, 88, 105, 160-162, 166, 171,
190, 256, 258-259, 261, 263-265, 277,
286, 356

Priam

66, 290, 297, 305-307

Prometheus

62, 64, 144, 162, 167, 170, 287, 293

Propercius

6, 11, 21-22, 323-325, 327-341

prophet of the Muse

83, 103, 105, 151

Proserpina

293, 303, 319, 354

psychopomp / psychopompoi

6, 19, 285-291, 293, 295, 297-299

Rhea

63, 70

ritual

5, 16-17, 19, 81, 84, 89, 91-92, 96,
100-102, 104-106, 111, 113, 115,
163, 166, 178, 192-194, 198-199, 201,
239, 241, 246, 249, 252, 254, 276, 321,
345

Rome

8, 14-15, 22, 44, 49, 54-55, 81, 134, 201,
203, 254, 268, 285, 302, 324-325,
337-341, 343-344, 357

Sappho

11, 48, 53, 207, 214, 279, 293

self-knowledge

6, 18, 205, 207-209, 211, 213, 215-217,
219, 221, 223, 225, 227

Semele

99, 107-108, 184-185

Servius

20, 187, 259, 266, 303, 310, 317

Simichidas

230-231, 234, 236, 240-241, 243-246,
248-251, 254

Sisyphus

294

Socrates

140, 217-218

Sophocles

5, 13, 17, 84, 102, 104, 115-116,
137-141, 143, 146, 149-151, 153-157,
187, 193, 226

Statius

186

Stesichorus

184

Strabo

187, 288

- Styx
 64, 258, 296
 suicide
 145, 150, 152, 154, 198
 Tantalus
 287-288, 293
 Tartarus/Tartaros
 61-65, 70, 72-77
 Teiresias
 138-139, 144, 146, 151, 153, 184
 thalysia
 234-235, 245-246, 250
 theater
 44, 49, 54-55, 108, 141, 227, 348, 350
 Thebes
 99, 135, 138, 145-146, 155, 290
 Theocritus
 11, 18, 19, 205-211,
 213-215, 217, 219-239, 241-243,
 245-247, 249-254, 334, 356
 Theognis
 195
 Theseus
 61, 138, 190, 198, 323
 Thyestes
 141
 Tiresias
 183, 209
 Titanomachy
 17, 60, 62-64, 70, 72-73, 75, 132
 Tityos
 291, 293
 Troezen
 192, 193
 Tyndaris
 298
 Typhaon
 58, 60-64, 69, 72-75, 77
 Typhaonomachy
 62, 74
 Underworld
 19, 20, 72, 186, 196, 258, 285, 286,
 288-296, 298, 303, 319
 Uranus/Ouranos
 58-62, 64-70, 73-76
 Venus
 22, 25, 261, 262, 285, 301, 304, 308,
 309, 319, 346, 351, 353-356
 Vergil
 19, 54, 188, 281, 286, 302, 309, 317,
 319
 Vesta
 301, 307, 346-351, 353, 356
 virginity
 181, 182, 188, 192, 196, 203, 351
 Wealth
 115, 159-161, 165, 167, 169-174,
 176-177, 179-180, 260, 288, 316
xenia
 214
 Zephyrus
 350-351, 353-354
 Zeus
 5, 16, 53, 55-79, 83, 94-95, 107,
 121-123, 125-136, 141, 145, 155-156,
 159, 162, 167-172, 182-184, 187-188,
 192-197, 200, 265

Gods and Mortals in Greek and Latin Poetry is a tribute to Jenny Strauss Clay in recognition of her scholarly achievements and of the guidance, inspiration, and friendship she has generously given to her students and colleagues over her long and distinguished career. The volume opens with Diane Svarlien's English translation of Horace's Odes 3. 27, Daniel Mendelsohn's vivid memoir of Clay's mentorship, and Ward Briggs' biography and bibliography. It continues with thirteen scholarly essays that respond to Clay's main scholarly interests. Nancy Felson, Lucia Athanassaki, Zoe Stamatopoulou, David Kovacs, Athanassios Vergados, Thomas K. Hubbard, Anatole Mori, Benjamin Jasnow, Daniel Barber, Blanche Conger McCune, Stephen C. Smith, Christopher Nappa, and John F. Miller explore a wide range of aspects of the representation and interaction of gods and mortals in Greek and Latin poetry, topics to which Jenny Strauss Clay has repeatedly come back.

Cover image:

Golden gorgoneon from the tomb of Philip II.

Museum of Royal Tombs of Aigai (Vergina)

© Ministry of Culture and Sports

ISSN 2653-9608 (ebook)

ISSN 2623-4726 (hard copy)

ISBN 978-618-82229-4-6 (ebook)

ISBN 978-618-82229-2-2 (hard copy)