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Editor’s Preface

It is my pleasure and honour to introduce the eleventh edition of Hirundo. The journal occupies an essential place amongst undergraduate publications at McGill: because it centres around a region (the Mediterranean) and a time period (antiquity), it provides an opportunity for students in a broad range of disciplines to publish their research and to discover what their peers are doing in other areas. This year’s edition continues the tradition of fostering dialogue between departments, and testifies to the impressive depth of scholarship in which McGill undergraduates engage.

Aaron Golish sets the tone for this year’s edition with an examination of the origins of προφήτης (frank speech) as an object of exchange in Homer’s Iliad. Christina De Longhi moves us forward in time with a survey of different uses of the story of Venus and Adonis in Renaissance England. Theodore Naif picks up on the theme of exchange in a more concrete way, modeling the economy of the Roman Empire using theories drawn from Thomas Malthus. Next, Michael Ostroff treats us to a close reading of the Roman love elegist Tibullus’ Marathus cycle, untangling the shifting and gender-bending characterizations in light of elegy’s generic conventions. From there, Samuel Sigere provides a lively reading of the final moments in the life of Gaius Gracchus, placing Gracchus’ action in the context of the temples of the Aventine and their symbolic resonances. Lewis Innes-Miller takes us back to Greece with a close study of Aristotle’s theories of sensation in the De Anima, while Vincent Marquis picks up the thread of the Greek world much later in history with an examination of the Baths of Zeuxippus in Constantinople. Finally, Lauren Sapić looks at a sinister example of the use of antiquity: Fascist Italy’s appropriation of Roman Imperial imagery for its own ideology.

Thanks are due, first of all, to Professor Michael Fronda, Hirundo’s academic advisor. He has tirelessly supported this journal since its inception, offering guidance, advise, and encouragement. I would also like to note our gratitude to those who have supported us financially, particularly in this year of budget cuts: the Department of History and Classical Studies, the Papachristidis Chair, the Dean of Arts’ Development Fund, the Classics Students’ Association of McGill, the Student Society of McGill University, and the AUS.

But I am most grateful to Hirundo’s wonderful editorial board. Each participant in the journal carefully read submissions, debated their merits cogently and constructively, and put many hours of work into painstaking editing. I cannot cease to marvel at your dedication and creativity. Enormous thanks are also due to the layout editors, and to last year’s editor-in-chief Sarah Binnis, who helped us out of software woes. Without each of these people, you would not be holding this journal in your hands.

Elizabeth Ten-Hove
Editor-in-Chief
Parrhesia before Παρρησία: Emerging Political Culture in The Iliad and Origins of the License to Speak Freely

In analyzing the grammatical nuances of parrhesia in the plays of Euripides, orations of Demosthenes and Isocrates, and even in the dialogues of Plato, it is striking that the term, though often translated as ‘frankness’ or ‘speaking frankly,’ is actually often a direct object of exchange. It is found most frequently in the accusative after verbs such as διδόμενα (to give, grant) or ἐχω (to have, hold), or in the genitive following μετα (with), or in the dative of instrument/manner. One does not normally think of fearless speech as something given, held or granted like a physical object, and yet in the text this is specifically the manner it is figured.¹ For example in Electra: μένῃρο, μήτερ, ὦς ἔλεος ὑπότους / κόμνους, διδόναι πρὸς σε μοι παρρησίαν.² Electra reminds her mother, Clytemnestra, that she agreed to give her parrhesia. This leads to the conclusion that parrhesia does not simply mean ‘all-speaking’ as ‘παρρησία’ would suggest but as a direct object of a verb like διδόμενα it implied a license to speak everything.³ While, this remains generally accurate in Athenian context, the view of parrhesia as a license would show the whole picture, nor reveals its possible origins. Since parrhesia first appears in Euripides, and other associated terms such as ἰσεγορία and ἰσονομία are not significantly older,⁴ in understanding the origins of parrhesia and frank speech we’re left looking for signs of proto-parrhesia. Parrhesia certainly did not exist in the Homeric society. Parrhesia is founded on a very specific political relationship, which only began to emerge along with the Greek polis. Nonetheless, we can see in the Homeric society of the Iliad the immanence of this emerging political culture through the manifestations and symptoms of complex civic and political relationships, and the uniquely political frictions that accompany these emerging relationships. Parrhesia, or rather, proto-parrhesia is but one of these unique political frictions that begins to manifest itself in Homeric society. It will serve here as a synecdoche for the larger emerging politics. We might characterize this ‘Homeric society’ as the “network of social institutions, relations, and norms of the human groups.

² Eur. El. 1055-6. “Remember, mother, that you said, in your / last remark, that you’re giving me liberty to speak freely against you.” All translations are by the author unless otherwise noted
³ The meaning does seem to later take on a more abstract adverbial meaning in the Greek-Roman period, especially with the introduction of the verbal form μαντεπείκαμαι
In analyzing the grammatical nuances of *parrhesia* in the plays of Euripides, orations of Demonsthenes and Isocrates, and even in the dialogues of Plato, it is striking that the term, though often translated as ‘frankness’ or ‘speaking frankly’ is actually often a direct object of exchange. It is found most frequently in the accusative after verbs such as δίδωμι [to give, grant] or ἔχω [to have, hold], or in the genitive following μέτα [with], or in the dative of instrument/manner. One does not normally think of *fearless speech* as something given, held or granted like a physical object, and yet in the text this is specifically the manner it is figured.1 For example in *Electra*: μέμνησο, μῆτερ, οὓς ἔλεξας ὑστάτους / λόγους, διδοῦσα πρὸς σέ μοι παρρησίαν.2 Electra reminds her mother, Clytemnestra, that she agreed to give her *parrhesia*. This leads to the conclusion that *parrhesia* does not simply mean ‘all-speaking’ as ‘παν-ῥησία’ would suggest but as a direct object of a verb like δίδωμι it implied a license to speak everything.3 While, this remains generally accurate in Athenian context, the view of *parrhesia* as a license neither shows the whole picture, nor reveals its possible origins. Since *parrhesia* first appears in Euripides, and other associated terms such as *isegoria* and *isonomia* are not significantly older,4 in understanding the origins of *parrhesia* and frank speech we’re left looking for signs of *proto-parrhesia*.

*parrhesia* certainly did not exist in the Homeric society. *Parrhesia* is founded on a very specific political relationship, which only began to emerge along with the Greek *polis*. Nonetheless, we can see in the Homeric society of the *Iliad* the immanence of this emerging political culture through the manifestations and symptoms of complex civic and political relationships, and the uniquely political frictions that accompany these emerging relationships. *Parrhesia*, or rather, *proto-parrhesia* is but one of these unique political frictions that begins to manifest itself in Homeric society. It will serve here as a synecdoche for the larger emerging politics. We might characterize this ‘Homeric society’ as the “network of social institutions, relations, and norms of the human groups

---


2 Eur. *El*. 1055-6. “Remember, mother, that you said, in your / last remark, that you’re giving me liberty to speak freely against you.” All translations are by the author unless otherwise noted

3 The meaning does seem to later take on a more abstract adverbial meaning in the Greco-Roman period, especially with the introduction of the verbal form παρῥησιάζομαι

depicted in the Homeric epics,” which is internally consistent and coherent in its social and political patterns.⁵ Therefore, while ‘Homeric Society’ may not be an accurate ‘historical’ representation of Greek culture at any point in time, it does preserve aspects of its development.⁶ _Proto-parrhesia_ shows that the scepter, or _skeptron_ [σκήπτρον], in Homeric society does not simply represent authority and the attending privilege to speak, as it is commonly imagined,⁷ but as a sacred object it also creates a sacred space. Moreover in the political realm, that sacred space becomes a _public_ space. The _skeptron_ creates an agora _topos_. Additionally the _skeptron_, as an item that passes from hand to hand thereby granting the privilege to address the assembly, bears similarities to the manner _parrhesia_ is exchanged in speech. Not only can _parrhesia_ expand our understanding of emerging Greek political culture as it occurs in the _Iliad_, but analyzing the _grammar of exchange_ associated with the _skeptron_ also explains the concrete origins of the abstract concept of _parrhesia_. In this paper ‘grammar of exchange’ does not refer to sentence structure in the _Iliad_ that describes the exchange of the _skeptron_, but instead suggests that the social ritual of passing the _skeptron_ involves a specific grammar of performance, unspoken but which nonetheless maintains a consistent syntactic structure. This grammar of exchange might be situated diachronically as the antecedent and origin of the grammar of _parrhesia_ that follows a very similar grammatical structure.⁸ This explains why _parrhesia_ is prefigured as an object of exchange, and why a person speaks _with parrhesia_ [μέτα παρῥησίας] rather than _boldly_

---

⁵ Walter Donlan, “Reciprocities in Homer.” _The Classical World_ 75 (1982), 137

⁶ Drawing on the reverberations of the work of Milman Parry this paper presupposes that a) _The Iliad_ is a work of the oral tradition of many ‘poets’ over the course of a number of a few centuries (Foley 6). b) Insofar as the _Iliad_ is the product of an oral tradition it preserves sociological traits from different periods in the development of pre-classical Greece. c) _The Iliad_ ‘crystallized’ roughly into its present state sometime in or after the 8th century BCE at a critical juncture in the emergence of the Greek _polis_ and with the application of alphabetic writing. d) While _The Iliad_ represents aspects of both 8th century Greece and the centuries prior, and although it is difficult or impossible to distinguish what aspects come from what period, the _Iliad_ maintains within itself and internal consistency that we may characterize as ‘Homeric Society.’

⁷ Frederick M. Combellask. “Speakers and Scepters in Homer.” _The Classical Journal_, Vol. 43 (1948), 209

⁸ In his article “Etymology in the semantic reconstruction of early Greek words:” Michael Clarke acknowledges Saussures’ formulation and Lyon’s ‘the etymological fallacy,’ that “a word’s origin says nothing about its active meaning for a given speaker.” But he also explains that “the situation is different when we turn to a language like ancient Greek.” “Etymology in the semantic reconstruction of early Greek words: the case of ἄνθος” see Michael Clarke, _Hermathena_, No. 179, (2005), 13-37. The semantics of ancient languages are often a mystery to us. Through close introspection of etymologies, however, we might “uncover the semantic structures behind ancient communication.” (Clarke 13-14). _Parrhesia_’s etymology from παρ' and ῥησία is evident enough, but this does not account for its unique usage, therefore I suggest we can trace its diachrony out of spoken language into the grammar of exchange found in the _Iliad_. 
in the adverbial. However, just as speaking boldly-with-\textit{parrhesia} does not guarantee obedience, nor does holding a \textit{skeptron}. The licensing of speech present in both the granting of \textit{parrhesia} and the exchange of the \textit{skeptron} does not open new possibilities of speaking, quite the opposite. Licensing of speech in any form is naturally an attempt to limit freedom of speech to those with \textit{euboulia} [good counsel]. The question of “who should readily speak” is a prime concern in any system of counsel from Homeric society to the Athenian assembly: δίδου παρρησίαν τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσιν, ἵνα περὶ ὧν ἂν ἀμφιγνοῇς, ἔχης τοὺς συνδοκιμάσοντας. διόρα καὶ τοὺς τέχνη ἱκεσίων καὶ τοὺς μετ᾽ εὐνοίας θεραπεύοντας, ἵνα μὴ πλέον οἱ πονηροί. Instead of a discussion of \textit{euboulia} and \textit{kakaboulia}, however, I will discuss the emerging political systems as they manifest through structures of counsel and assembly, and the correspondent licensing/censoring of speech.

\textbf{Parrhesia, Isegoria, and Isonomia}

In the Athenian assembly each meeting began with the customary, ritualistic, invitation: τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται; Theoretically, anyone in the assembly could step forward to raise or address an issue, and from this the term \textit{isegoria} is understood as ‘freedom of speech,’ though in fact it probably suggests the equal opportunity to speak before the assembly. Likewise, \textit{isonomia}, while suggesting “the equality of the distribution of political rights,” in practice the assembly likely was dominated by the elite. Democracy, even in Athens, was only ever an ideal, and the advent of democracy was in no way revolutionary, but rather an expansion of these privileges to speak in the assembly to a larger portion of the population. \textit{Isonomia} after all initially means “equality of distribution,” and only later in the context of Athenian democratic assembly receives the addition of “political opportunity.” The presence of such a concern for the equality of distribution of war-spoils in the \textit{Iliad}

\footnote{Many translators will translate \textit{parrhesia} as ‘speaking boldly,’ regardless of the case it appears in, though especially in the construction \{μέτα παρρησίας\} and in the dative. While this often serves the translator’s purpose, it fails to do justice to the nuances of the world \textit{parrhesia}. Furthermore, \textit{parrhesia} in the dative should be understood as speaking-by-means-of-\textit{parrhesia}, adative of instrument.}

\footnote{Isoc. 2.28. “Give freedom of speech to those with good judgment, so that when you are in doubt you may have those who will help you to decided. See clearly between those who flatter with craft and those with good intentions to do service, so that the wicked do not gain more than the good.”}

\footnote{Arist. \textit{Ach.} 45. “Who wishes to address the assembly?” See also Dem. 18.170: ἠρώτα μὲν ὁ κῆρυξ ὅ τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται παρῄει δ᾽ οὐδέξ, “and then the herald asked, “Who wishes to address the assembly,” but no one came forward.”}

amongst the arestoi confirms that isonomia was initially an aristocratic concept. Similarly with the exception of the Thersites episode, the addressing of the assembly [ἀγορεύειν], is exclusively the office of the arestoi. Thus we see Diomedes in Book 9 address Agamemnon citing his right [themis] to do so: Ἀτρεΐδη σοὶ πρῶτα μαχήσομαι ἀφραδέοντι, / ἣ θέμις ἐστιν ἄναξ ἀγορῆ: σὺ δὲ μή τι χολωθῇς. That Diomedes as a basileis has the right to upbraid Agamemnon indicates that Homeric society is not strictly a monarchical one.

In his article Reciprocities in Homer, Walter Donlan draws on the anthropological work of E. R. Service to suggest that Homeric society approximates the societal stage of Service’s ‘chiefdom,’ but in an imperfect or inchoate form. That is, it still exhibits features of the previous structural stage of the ‘tribe.’ Service’s hierarchy ranges from hunter-gatherer ‘bands,’ to modern ‘states,’ with the tribe and the chiefdom situated in the middle. The classical polis would constitute Service’s state, while the tribe is characterized by “settlements of agriculturalist/herders. The larger number of local groups is integrated by “pan-tribal sodalities” (clans, age-sets, military societies, etc.), but political integration is usually for specific purposes only. Hence, as in bands, tribal leadership is largely informal and impermanent, the several groups retaining their autonomy.” In the Iliad we can certainly see this “pan-tribal sodality” in the assembled Achaeans, where the various basileis retain their autonomy, and the assemblage is gathered at Troy for a specific purpose. Chiefdoms on the other hand, “have a formal authority structure, in which a duly constituted, permanent leader holds an “office.” Numbers of local groups are integrated into a single community, under the chief and a proto-nobility.” The key distinction being that “unlike bands and tribes, which are egalitarian, chiefdoms are ranked societies. The chief, his family, and his associates, have structured greater access to prestige.” Here we can also see the limited isonomia of the Iliad. The arestoi alone appear to have access to “prestige” [τιμή], and Agamemnon clearly holds the office of permanent leader. Nonetheless, the sheer scope of civil societies presented in the Iliad extends not through merely these two tiers but a few of the immanent political elements of Service’s states can be seen; “complex and centralized political and economic structures, characterized

---


14 Though Thersites is likely a member of the arestoi albeit a petty-arestoi. Many scholars assume Thersites represents a commoner or the democratic voice in Homer. Abraham Feldman provides a good account for why Thersites is far more likely a low-ranking or disreputable member of the arestoi. See Feldman, “The Apotheosis of Thersites.” The Classical Journal, 42 (1947), 219-220

15 Il. 9.32-33 “Son of Atreus, first I will contend with you since you’re being senseless, since it is my right in the assembly as a king: but do not be angry at this.”

16 Donlan 138.
by the institutionalization of authority: formal legislative and judicial bodies. . .”

Returning to the Diomedes quote, I will explain an important rhetorical aspect of parrhesia. While neither isegoria nor isonomia were rights strictly speaking, certainly not in the modern sense, they were a kind of themis for citizens. Parrhesia on the other hand was the ability to speak with frankness or boldly free from fear or shame, either by license, often following a request, or because the speaker in question was simply disregarding all decorum and spoke boldly without regard to shame or polity. Between these two types of parrhesia, license and licentiousness, also existed an apologetic or rhetorical form. The apologetic parrhesia is a rhetorical ploy that anticipates offence and thus presents the boldness with a prefatory apology, usually citing or implying the necessity of boldness or plain truth. This form is present in the Diomedes quote: σὺ δὲ μὴ τι χολωθῇς, “don’t be angry at this.” This is a measured speech and the sort of language often seen in the highly developed rhetoric of fifth and fourth century Athens: δεηθεὶς ὑμῶν, ἂν λέγω τἀληθῆ μετὰ παρρησίας, μηδὲν ἄχθεσθηναί μοι. Here Demonsthenes prefaces his statements by reminding his audience of the plainness of truth and its necessity. Similarly, Patroclus employs a similar technique before he criticizes Achilles: οὐ Αχιλέως Πηλῆος υἱὲ μεγά φέρτατ᾽ Ἀχαιῶν μὴ νεμέσα. Later this will be compared with the unmeasured [ἄκοσμά] speeches of vulgar parrhesia [κἀμαθεῖ παρρησίᾳ]. For the purposes of this present paper it is important to recognize that parrhesia can be both an object granted upon request, or it may also be assumed and simply held [ἔχω]. In this later form parrhesia might be plain blunt speech or a crafty assuming of license.

Publicity or Creating a Public: Σκῆπτρον as Agora-founding

De-contextualized agora might mean one of two things, either a market-place or a place of political assembly. This conflation of topos is important. That the marketplace was the choice location for the gathering of an assembly indicates something of the improvisational nature of agorasthai [to address the assembly]. Rather than a citadel or palace, the topoi of the preceding Mycenaean monarchies, the pre-existing common location of the agora was chosen for the meeting of assemblies of ‘citizens.’ While many poleis offer monumental evidence for a dedicated agora, such as the

17 Donlan 138-39.
18 See Foucault Fearless Speech, esp. 1-8.
19 Foucault 6.
20 Dem. 10.54 “I ask of you, if I speak the truth with frankness[parrhesia], do not be offended by me.”
21 ll. 16.21 “O Achilles son of Peleus, mightiest of the Achaeans, don’t be angry with me.”
Athenian ekklesia, an agora is “first and foremost the place where assemblies are held, oriented by an altar to the gods; secondly, it is the people in arms forming the assembly of those who deliberate; lastly, it is the speech pronounced in public in this place of debate.”\textsuperscript{22} An agora, as a place where people assemble, may occur anywhere, and in the absence of a monument or altar, the sceptron becomes the orientating focal.

Presumably the Achaeans in the \textit{Iliad} had a selected location in their camp that served as their agora, complete with some sort of temporary architectural monument. Nevertheless the agora could occur anywhere at anytime, merely by the presence of a sceptron or pseudo-sceptron. Thus when in Book 2 Agamemnon chooses to test the soldiers he addresses them holding the sceptron,\textsuperscript{23} but the crowd he is addressing is so great that his words “set the assembly in motion like a great wave of the sea.”\textsuperscript{24} Obviously this assembly is too large to fit in his tent or wherever counsel usually occurs, so Agamemnon establishes an agora-topos with his sceptron. Similarly in Book 23 when Menelaus, feeling unjustly affronted by Antilochus, establishes an assembly in the midst of the funeral games by receiving a sceptron from a herald: τοῖσι δὲ καὶ Μενέλαος ἀνίστατο θυμὸν ἄχευων / Ἀντιλόχῳ ἄμοτον νεχολωμένος: ἐν δ’ ἄρα κῆπους / χειρὶ σκῆπτρον ἔθηκε, σιωπῆσαι τε κέλευσεν / Ἀργείους.\textsuperscript{25} Menelaus feels slighted enough by Antilochus that he requires public recognition of the insult. He invokes the leaders of the Achaeans to come together in an assembly: ἀλλ’ ἄγετ᾽ Ἀργείων ἡγήτορες ἠδὲ μέδοντες / ἐς μέσον ἀμφοτέροισι δικάσσατε, μὴ δ’ ἐπ᾽ ἀρωγῇ.\textsuperscript{26} Employing the legal language of judgment [δικάσσατε] and then a demand for a public oath he coaxes Antilochus into an admission of guilt.

The publicness of an oath is significant. In Book 10 Dolon agrees to sneak into the Achaeans on condition that he receive the prize of the spoils he takes. ἀλλ’ ἄγε μοι τὸ σκῆπτρον ἀνάσχεο, καὶ μοι ὄμοσσον / ἦ μὲν τοὺς ἵππους τε καὶ ἅρματα ποικίλα

\textsuperscript{22} Detienne, From Practices of Assembly to the Forms of Politics: A Comparative Approach, 5. This section is largely indebted to Detienne.

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Il}. 2,101-2

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Il}. 2,142-155. ὡς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσιν ὄρινε / πάσι μετὰ πληθὺν ὄοι οὗ βουλῆς ἑπάκουσαν: / κινήθη δ’ ἄγορη φή κύματα μουρὰ θάλασσης / πόντου Ἰχαρίου, τὰ μὲν τ’ Ἔφυρος τε Νότος τε / ὅφος ἐπὰξα Πατρός Δίος ἐν νεφελῶν. “Thus he spoke, and stirred the hearts in the breasts / of all among the crowd and so many who did not hear / counsel: set the assembly in motion like a great wave of the sea / of the Icarian straight, as when Eurus and Nots / stir them to rush from the clouds of Zeus the father.”

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Il}. 23,566-69. “And then amongst them Menelaus stood up vexed in his heart / And with Antilochus implacably angered: and then into his hands / a herald placed the sceptre, and called for silence / Amongst the Argives:”

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Il}. 23,573-74. “Come all you leaders and rulers of the Argives / and pass judgement between us two in the middle, but judge impartially.”
Dolon does not simply request that Hector promise him these prizes, he asks that he swear an oath, which can only be performed on a staff. By raising the skeptron Hector calls attention to his oath and himself. He creates a temporary agora, even when the terrain is unfavourable. The oath is not merely to the gods to witness, though that is certainly a part of the ritual, it is also to the public. Dolon has public acknowledgement of the oath, therefore Hector cannot pretend never to have sworn the oath. In a pre-literate society, publicity is in the announcement.

“The scepter is almost universally and without qualification believed to be a symbol which gives a speaker something of official authority, and serves as a sign that he has the floor.”

It is necessarily to distinguish that “official authority” is not synonymous with obedience. Achilles most certainly does not obey Agamemnon though he carries the Zeus-descended skeptron. In his discussion on the origins of agorae, Marcel Deteinne raises the intriguing and important comparison to the notion of publicity. Drawing on Kant he says that publicity is “that of making public in the form of a material printing and consequent presentation for free discussion.” Though this definition applies to 18th century publicity through print it carries some truth when applied to this situation. For the Achaean publicity retains the consequence of “presentation for free discussion,” but it is the space of the assembly, “through which all public matters are defined. An agora with the will to assemble signifies direct participation of full citizens in all things political.”

Detienne goes on to mention: “It is in the agora and before the assembled citizens that, in Crete, for example, one announces the adoption of so-and-so and the acceptance of such-and-such goods in the case of a contested inheritance.” This is a fact perhaps lost on us in our written age, where spoken language carries little authority, but for the Achaean publicity does not reside in a document than can be referenced but in the collective memory of those present at an assembly and how the word is spread orally.

‘Public concern’ is however also an important matter to mention. The will to assemble always concerns common affairs, res publica or τι δήμιον. This can be seen in Demosthenes’ defence for the necessity of his bold speech: αἴτιον δὲ τούτων (καίμοι

---

27 Il. 10.321-23. “But come, lift up your sceptre and swear to me, / say that you will grant me the horses and bronze dappled chariot, / those that bear the noble son of Peleus.”

28 Combellask 209.

29 Detienne 13.

30 Detienne 14.

31 Od. 2.31-32. ἥν χ’ ἡμῖν σάφα εἴποι, ὅτε πρότερός γε πῦθοιτο; / ἦέ τι δήμιον ἄλλο πιφαύσκεται ἠδ’ ἀγορεύει; “Might he tell us something plainly, that already he has learnt? Or is there some other public concern that he will make manifest and address?”
πρὸς θεῶν, ὅταν εἴνεκα τοῦ βελτίστου λέγω, ἔστω παρρησία). 32 He establishes a justification within the public interest. Likewise, when Achilles calls the assembly in Book 1 it is again on account of his the concern for the Danaans: κήδετο γὰρ Δαναών. 33

**Passing the σκῆπτρον: Passing Authority-in-Speech**

The authority of the *skeptron* is a meaning vested like any social construction in the ritual of agora. How one officially takes the floor in the agora, or how the participants are arranged in the ceremony or ritual are the rules by which the community establishes its own representation and how official community action occurs. These rules and ritual are in a manner of speaking a grammar of performance. In Homeric society “an assembly takes the form of a circle or semicircle: whoever wishes to speak moves to the middle, seizes the staff, the *skeptron*, which confers authority to his discourse, opinion or advice, necessarily relating” to a τι δήμιον. 34 In *Speakers and Scepters in Homer*, Frederick M. Combellack challenges the traditional belief “that any speaker in a public meeting may be presumed to hold the sceptre.” 35 He suggests instead that the sceptre is reserved for the most austere moments. This question is difficult to prove either way. One the one hand it is quite possible that Homer reserves *mentioning* the handing off of the *skeptron* only at the most significant moments as a way of building up anticipation, or in moments such as Menelaus’ charge against Antilochus in Book 23 to heighten the awareness of publicity. On the other hand Combellack may be correct in saying that “in Homeric society the sceptre was used by speakers only occasionally and for the definite purpose of indicating the special nature of very solemn or important remarks.” 36 I, however, lean towards the belief that the Greek audience would have assumed presence of the *skeptron* in any public assembly. It would have been a necessary part of decorum, especially when architectural or monumental structures were missing. Obviously it would be unnecessary in private instances such as the embassy in Book 9, or in the din of battle. 37 Considering that the bard likely performed with a staff, performing each part holding the staff or leaning on it, it is reasonable that the audience took the *skeptron* for granted.

32 Dem. 8.32.“And for myself, by the gods, since I speak these things for the best, let it be all-spoken”
33 Il. 1.53-58
34 Detienne 6
35 Combellack 209
36 Combellack 215
37 I do not necessarily contend that the Greek’s understood the private/public dichotomy the strict modern sense. The embassy still has a certain publicity to it, but not to the degree of a formal assembly. The embassy is an attempt at persuasion as opposed to deliberation.
The most convincing demonstration of this occurs in Book 2 of the *Odyssey*, when we can see Telemachus move through each step in the decorum of sceptered-assembly:

"ὡς φάτο, χαίρε δὲ φήμῃ Ὀδυσσῆος φίλος υἱός, οὔδ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐτί δὴν ἦστο, μενοίνησεν δ᾽ ἀγορεύειν, στῆ δὲ μέση ἀγορῇ: σκῆπτρον δὲ οἱ ἐμβάλει χειρὶ κηρυξ Πεισήνωρ πεπνυμένα μήδεα εἰδώς."\(^{38}\)

After commanding his heralds to call an assembly,\(^{39}\) and waiting for Aegyptus to finish his address he stands, takes the appropriate position in the middle of the assembly,\(^{40}\) receives the *skeptron*, and then begins his address. Moreover, the purpose of the *skeptron* as a speaking staff ensures orderly assembly so that each speaker has a chance to make their appeal. Since there are few examples of a character interrupting another during an assembly (such as Achilles’ response to Agamemnon in Book 1, and in this case Agamemnon presumably has his own Zeus-descended *skeptron*) it is reasonably safe to assume that the counsellors are obeying the ceremony of passing the staff back and forth. Likewise the Trojan assemblies obey this ceremony as well: ἡτοι δ᾽ γ᾽ ὡς εἰπὼν κατ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐζετό: τοιοῦ δ᾽ ἀνέστη / δίος Ἀλέξανδρος Ἑλένης πόσις ἠὕκόμοι, / ὅς μιν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα.\(^{41}\)

Though Paris is angered at Antenor and responds with *ἔπεα πτερόεντα*, he nonetheless waits for Antenor to sit down before rising and responding.

The authority of the *skeptron*, however, is derived from more than simply ceremony. It appears to be a direct conduit to heaven: ὡς εἰπὼν τὸ σκῆπτρον ἀνέσχεθε πᾶσι θεοῖς.\(^{42}\)

There is also a precise description of the heavenly descent from which Agamemnon receives his *skeptron*:

\(^{38}\) *Od.* 2.6-38. “Thus he spoke, and the dear son of Odysseus rejoiced at his speech, / and yet he did not stay seated long, but desired eagerly to address the assembly, / and he took a stand in the middle of the assembly: / and in his hand / the Herald, placed the sceptre, Peisenor who was well versed in wise counsel.”

\(^{39}\) *Od.* 2.6-7. αἶψα δὲ κηρύκεσσι λιγυφθόγγοισι κέλευσε / κηρύσσειν ἀγορήνδε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιούς, “Immediately he commanded the sweet-tongued heralds to address the Achaians in the assembly / standing in the middle.” (II.7.416-17)

\(^{40}\) The importance of taking a position is significant, and often even when there is no mention of a *skeptron* we still find the speaker moving first to the centre: Ἰδαῖος: ὁ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἠλθε καὶ ἄγγελῆν ἀπέειπ / στὰς ἐν μέσονοιν...“And [Idaeus] came and declared his message / standing in the middle.” (II.7.416-17)

\(^{41}\) *Il.* 7.354-56. “And thus when he had spoken he sat down, and following / arose godly Alexander husband of lovely haired Helen / who answering addressed him with winged words.”

\(^{42}\) *Il.* 7.412. “Thus [Agamemnon] spoke and held up the scepter to all of heaven.”
The precise descent of authority here should be of particular note. First of all the sketpron doesn’t descend directly from Zeus as is initially implied, but first is passed down to Hermes, the messenger god. Secondly Atreus is characterized as a "shepherd of men," and similarly Thyestes is characterized as "of many sheep." The imagery of sheep-herding suggests a comparison between the sketpron and the staff a shepherd uses to herd sheep. Finally, Agamemnon receives it so that he might "rule his own flock of men. The verb φορῆναι, here is curious since the LSJ states that it is often used in relation to carrying a message or serving as a messenger. Therefore there are two very important instances of the uses of sketprons. First, we see it as a staff to usher sheep or comparatively usher men, like when Odysseus uses it in Book 2. Secondly it is used as the implement of a herald, or sign of a king’s authority passed down through a messenger. The fact that the messenger here is Hermes himself should not be surprising since it follows the conventional passing authority through a herald.

In addition to kings and priests the other, perhaps the most common figures associated with sketprons are heralds. More so than any other figure, heralds serve as agora-founding servants, and by extension publishers. More importantly heralds embody the transference of authority held with the sketpron. In the shield of Achilles ekphrasis from Book 18 they are portrayed as an integral part of the polis, herding men with their sketpron before the authority is passed on to the elders:

λαοὶ δ’ εἶν ἄγορῆς ἔσσαν ἀθρόοι: ἔνθα δὲ νείκος ὠρώμει, δύο δ’ ἄνδρες ἐνείκεσον εἴνεκα ποιήσ

43 II. 2.101-108. “And then Lord Agamemnon rose / Holding the sketpron skilfully made by Hephaestus. / Hephaestus gave it to Zeus the lord son of Kronos, / And then Zeus gave it to the Agros-slaying messenger, / And Hermes the lord gave it to horse driving Pelops, / And then again, Pelops gave it to Atreus, shepherd of men, / But Atreus dying bequeathed it to Thyestes, rich in flocks, / But then Thyestes left it to Agamemnon to carry with him like a messenger / so that he might lord over many islands and all of Argos.”
Here it is evident that peace-time Homeric society appear not at all monarchal, but in fact highly organized and perhaps even institutionalize with judicial bodies. The heralds use their authority to establish the space of the assembly and then pass this authority for speaking to the gerontes [elders]. It is worth noting that the presence of the skeptron as well as the polished stones of the sacred circle announces the agora-space. The architectural element of the sacred circle means this is a permanent place of assembly, and like the skeptron itself, the space is sacred. The grammar of the exchange is the same here as elsewhere, the heralds pass the skeptron off to the elders, who, holding it, pass judgement.

In Book 2 Agamemnon passes the authority of his skeptron onto Odysseus so that he might, in the role of herald restrain the deserting crowd. Although, Odysseus approaches Agamemnon for the skeptron, he is acting perfectly within the office of a “loud-voiced” herald that we have seen elsewhere: αὐτὸς δ᾽ Ἀτρεΐδεω Ἀγαμέμνονος ἀντίος ἐλθὼν / δέξατο οἱ σκῆπτρον πατρώϊον ἄφθιτον αἰεί: / σὺν τῷ ἔβη κατὰ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων. Odysseus does not act as a king here, but by holding the most honoured skeptron, and with the aid of Athena shines as the ideal herald. That he uses the skeptron also to beat some of the soldiers into submission should not be too much of a surprise since we’ve already seen other wielders of this same skeptron characterized as shepherds:

 вес фасав и плетови: а́на δ᾽ о́ птоломеата́с О́дуссе́ус / етат ски́пторов е́хов: парак дè γланаови́с А́треи́н / едоме́нн криму́ сиопан лао́н а́вогей, / вес ама 10 ои про́тей тэ кай усато уи́з А́хайов / мѣ́д лао́н а́сукреиан кай е́пифролося́мо бу́лін: / δ сфин еу фролево́н а́грома́то кай мете́йпев: 46

44 Il. 18.496-506. “And the men were gathered in crowds in the agora. For there a / quarrel had begun, and two men wrangled with each other / on account of the penalty for the murder of a man… / But the heralds restrained the men: and the elders / Sat upon polished stones in the sacred circle, / Then in their hands they held the sceptres of the loud-voiced / heralds: and thereupon each in quick succession stood / and passed judgement.”

45 Il. 2.185-88. “And [Odysseus] himself went to meet Agamemnon son of Atreus / And received the sceptre of his father, ever unfading: / And with it went along the ships of the bronze-clad Achaeans.”

46 Il. 2.278-283. “… so the crowd spoke, but city-sacking Odysseus arose / Holding the skeptron: and beside him bright-eyed Athena / Appeared like a herald she commanded the men be silent, / So that both the nearest
Following typical assembly decorum, Odysseus stands while holding the decorum and the men become silent. Athena’s presence here in the ‘εἰδομένη’ of a herald, however, is slightly confusing. It could signify that Odysseus after silencing the crowd is no longer acting in the capacity as a herald but as a skeptron and themis wielding king addressing the assembly, and thus Athena as a herald is lending him additional authority to speak. Or it could be that heralds as previously seen often work in pairs or more. Odysseus does, however, speak μετέειπεν, in their midst, the proper place for a formal address. Some scholars suggest that in this scene Odysseus is usurping the authority of Agamemnon and acting in his stead on account of Agamemnon’s incompetence as a leader. Such an outlook ignores the social convention of Homeric society. Odysseus performs the role of the herald and receives the skeptron from Agamemnon just as a herald would receive the skeptron and its associate authority. Furthermore, it would surely be very un-kingly for Agamemnon, the commander-in-chief of the Achean army to run up and down the ranks trying to call the men to order. This is the appropriate office of the heralds and thus it is perfectly appropriate for Odysseus, as a particularly decorated and kingly herald, to perform this duty in Agamemnon’s stead.

Aristeia and the New Grounds for Speaking

Detienne, in his comparative analysis of different independent agora-esque assemblies from throughout the ages suggests that often they grow out of warrior cultures. “The right to speak necessary for the advent of a deliberative assembly must be construed along the lines of the right to wage war.”47 The equality of word and deed in the Iliad confuses the right to speak. Diomedes for example in Book 9 declares his right [themis] as a king to address Agamemnon, and relies on his own might rather than holding a skeptron to ensure this might. Likewise, Homer points out that Polydamos and Hector are not equal in euboulia, that Polydamas is wise in counsel while Hector brave in deeds of war:

"ὡς Ἕκτωρ ἀγόρευ᾽, ἐπὶ δὲ Τρώες κελάδησαν / νήπιοι: ἐκ γὰρ σφεων φρένας εἶλετο Παλλὰς Αθήνη. / Ἕκτορι μὲν γὰρ ἐπῄνησαν κακὰ μητιόωτι, / Πουλυδάμαντι δ᾽ ὃ τις ὃς ἐσθλὴν φράζετο βουλῆν."48

and the farthest of the sons of the / Achaeans might hear the matter and know the counsel: / And well minded he addressed them and spoke amidst them.”

47 Detienne 4.

48 ll. 18.311-14. “Thus Hector address the assembly and the Trojans shouted / aloud, like children: for from them Pallas Athena seized their / wits. For all applauded Hector’s poor plan, / But no one praised Polydamas who showed good counsel.”
The Trojans applaud for Hector not only because Athena steals their wits, but also perhaps because Hector holds much more τιμή. This represents the problem of discerning euboulia since the best fighter is not necessarily the best in counsel.

Perhaps it is Achilles himself who points out the arbitrary contrived nature of the skeptron convention in the very oath he makes in Book 1. He at once follows conventional oath practice, employing the skeptron while also establishing his rejection of the practice of assembly, the decorum of the skeptron and the unnaturalness of the staff stripped of its natural state:

δημοβόρος βασιλεὺς ἐπεὶ οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις: ἢ γὰρ ἂν Ἀτρεΐδη νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο.
ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ τοι ἐρέω καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὀμοῦμαι: ναὶ μὰ τὸν σκῆπτρον, τὸ μὲν ὦτοτε φύλλα καὶ ὄζους φόσσε, ἐπεὶ δὴ πῶς τομὴν ἑν ὄρεσσι λέλοιπεν, οὐδ᾽ ἀναθηλήσει: περὶ γάρ ἂρ ὅ ὁ χαλκὸς ἔλεψε φύλλα τε καὶ φλοιόν: νῦν αὐτὲ μὲν νῖες Ἀχαῖων ἐν παλάμῃς φορέουσι δικασπόλοι, οἵ τε θέμιστας πρὸς Διὸς εἰρύαται: ὃ δὲ τοι μέγας ἔσσεται ὄρχις: 49

Achilles swears by the skeptron he is holding, which of itself is of no surprise, but he also draws attention to the artificiality of the skeptron itself. By discussing the stripping of its leaves and bark, and cutting from the mountain, Achilles may be suggesting his awareness of the absence of any natural worth in the skeptron. Stripped by bronze it is a piece of human artifice, and therefore: “now the sons of the Achaeans / carry it in their hands as judges, who draw the decrees from / Zeus,” might be an ironic or even sarcastic statement on the descent of authority from Zeus. Remembering the descent of the scepter to Agamemnon, through Hermes and other intermediaries, Achilles might call attention to the fact that the skeptron is not directly given by Zeus, or that it might be a manmade construction and not the bearer of Zeus-descended themis. More famously, of course, is that when concluding

49 Il. 1.231-239 “People-devouring King, since you lord over men of no account, / For otherwise now this, Atreid, would be your last insult. / But I will speak against you and upon this great oath I swear: / Aye, by this sceptre, that should never again bear leaf and twig / Since it left its stump on the mountain, / Nor will it sprout afresh: for the bronze has stripped the leaves and / bark from around it: and now the sons of the Achaeans / Carry it in their hands as judges, who draw the decrees from / Zeus: and this for you will be a great oath.../ Thus spoke the son of Peleus, and then he threw / the sceptre to the ground, studded as it was with / golden nails, and then he sat himself down.”

50 Though, of course the fact that we are never told when he is given the sceptre suggests that holding the skeptron is something a Greek audience would assume, and it would not have been necessary to mention everytime the skeptron is passed off.
his curse, Achilles throws the *skeptron* to the earth. Thus Achilles is both complicit with
and rejecting the ceremony of assembly. He completes his oath by striking the earth,
but he also throws the *skeptron* away in his anger. After throwing away the scepter he
also does not speak in counsel again until Book 22.\(^{51}\) Therefore, the throwing of the staff
signifies and retirement from public life, either permanently or, as in this case, temporarily.

Achilles is not the only figure in Homer to throw away the *skeptron*. Telemachus
also casts it to the ground in his anger: ὦς φάτο χωόμενος, ποτὶ δὲ σκῆπτρον βάλε γαίη
/ δάκρυ᾽ ἀναπρῆσας: οἶκτο δ᾽ ἐλε ἅλαν ἀπαντα.\(^{52}\) Despite being the son of “wily”
Odysseus, it is not necessarily that Telemachus throws the *skeptron* to the earth and bursts
into tears for the purpose of being pitied. As a young man he has a temper like Achilles’
wrath and is unable to measure his speech like his father. This is, however, also a sign of
*parrhesia*. Throwing down the *skeptron* and thus throwing away traditional authority both
Telemachus and Achilles relocate the truthfulness and therefore value of their addresses
outside the traditional ceremonial realm of the sceptered-assembly, and proper decorum.

**Thersites, Approval and Proto-democracy**

The difficulty with the Thersites episode is that his speech, de-contextualized
from the speaker is quite reasonable. Quintilian discusses this: “The speech against
Agamemnon, when made by Thersites, provokes laughter. Give those words to Diomedes
or someone of his stature, and they will seem to bear witness to a lofty spirit.”\(^{53}\) Some
scholars point to Thersites as a proto-democratic figure. He certainly speaks boldly and
with assumed license, and Achilles would have a hard time berating him for “holding one
thing in his heart while speaking another.” However, beyond lacking both *areastaea* and
a *skeptron*, he does not step forward into the middle of the assembly, nor is there even
mention of him rising, all typical indications of decorum. He also speaks against not only
a *basileis*, but a sceptre-wielding king, in the role of a loud-voiced herald, and one who is
wielding the supreme Zeus-descended *skeptron*. Moreover, Thersites is described in terms
that suggest he lacks craft. His words are unmeasured ἀμετροεπής, they are without order
ἀκοσμά and therefore he speaks with an ignorant *parrhesia*. We find similar language in
Euripides for disparaging an unwanted speaker in this messenger speech from *Orestes*:

\(^{51}\) Achilles does speak again at line 292 when he interrupts and insults Agamemnon, but do not consider a
proper address to the assembly.

\(^{52}\) *Od.* 2.80-81. “Thus furious [Telemachus] spoke, but then he threw the sceptre to the ground and let burst his
tears: and pity seized all the men.”

\(^{53}\) Translation not my own. Quoted from Ahl, The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome, 175.
This Argive character is presented as an unequivocal 

*κακαβουλιαν* [one without good counsel]. He has a doorless-tongue ἀθυρόγλωσσος, that is he cannot control his own tongue, and though described as possessing *parrhesia* it is in the pejorative sense of plain speech, κἀμαθεῖ παρρησία.

*(εὖ)βουλία ἄνευ σκήπρου : (Good) Counsel without a Scepter*

Similarly on the battlefield when no *skeptron* is available the spear also creates an agora-esque space, though of course the realities of the battlefield preclude the possibility of a genuine agora. In battle we often see Hector and others rallying men by waving around their spears. The spears are a suitable battle substitute for the *skeptron*, but the significance is different. The spear doesn’t serve in the same kind of authority as a staff, it is carries a more pressing rallying authority in the midst of mêlée:

54 Eur. *Orest* 898-906. “And next lord Diomedes addressed the assembly. / He advised that they should not kill you or your brother, / But in order to be pious they should punish you with exile. / So many shouted in approval that the words were good, / Still others did not approve, and next stood up / A man who cannot keep his mouth shut, strong in arrogance, / An Argive but not from Argos, forced upon us, / Relying on his booming voice and ignorant plain speech, / Convincing upon them to encompass some evil.”

55 *Il.* 6.102-105

56 *Il.* 8.492-497. “Then from their horses the men dismounted and upon the ground then / listened to the speech that Hector addressed the assembly, Hector dear to Zeus. / And in his hand / He held an eleven-cubit spear: and before him the bronze spear-head shone, / around which gleamed a golden ring, / Leaning on this he spoke his
Likewise the in-battlefield-*boulia* permits far less space for counsel. Therefore battlefield ‘*agoras*’ usually only have time for one or two points of view and they tend to carry a private quality as opposed to the inherently public nature of assemblies. For example, when Helenus or Polydamas express counsel to Hector it does not take the form of an assembly so the lack of *skeptron* is hardly noteworthy. Instead we see them standing beside Hector to offer counsel. On two occasions Polydamas’s counsel to Hector follows similar formulaic lines indicating his proximity, and implying, given the context of the din of battle, that their conversation is relatively private.57

The moveable quality of *parrhesia* as a direct object extends diachronically from the transferable authority physically embodied in the *skeptron*. Both function in a similar way by acting as a form of license that limits who has the privilege to speak and when, and both are often strictly controlled. Euripides includes this sort of control in the Herald’s speech to Pentheus in the *Bacchae*:

> βάκχας ποτνιάδας εἰσιδών, αἴ τῆς δε γῆς
>  οἴστρουσι λευκὸν κώλον ἐξηκόντισαν,
>  ἥρκω φράσαι σοι καὶ πόλει χρήζων, ἄναξ,
>  ὡς δεινὰ δρώσι θαυμάτων τε κρείσσονα.
>  θέλω δ’ ἀνούσα, πότερά σοι παρρησία
>  φράσω τὰ κεῖθεν ἢ λόγον στειλώμεθα:
>  τὸ γὰρ τάχος σου τῶν φρενῶν δέδοικ’ ἄναξ,
>  καὶ τοῦξύθυμον καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν λίαν.58

The herald, fearing for his own person, prefaces his statement with a request for permission to speak freely. Likewise, in the *Iliad* we find one of the most pressing examples of similar *parrhesia*, not represented by a moveable *skeptron* but specifically in its absence. In Book 1, Achilles asks Calchas to reveal the origin of the plague, but Calchas hesitates and asks for protection first:

> speech among the Trojans: / “Hear me, Trojans, Dardanians and friends!”

57 See *il*. 12.60: δὴ τότε Πουλυδάμας θρασὺν Ἕκτορα εἶπε παραστάς, “and then Poullydamas coming near to bold Hector spoke”; and *il*. 13.725: εἰ μὴ Πουλυδάμας θρασὺν Ἕκτορα εἶπε παραστάς, “if Polydamas had not coming near to bold Hector spoken.”

58 Eur. *Ba.* 666-671 “I have come to tell you and announce to the city, lord, / how they do such things mightier than this, / but I wish to hear whether I should speak to you with fearless speech / the situation there, or if I should dispatch the speech? / For I fear the hastiness of your passion, lord, / and your quickness to anger and your exceedingly / kingly position.”
The precise nuance is not the same. The Herald in the \textit{Bacchae} requests \textit{parrhesia} directly from Pentheus, the king whom he fears. Calchas, however, defers this question to Achilles. \textsuperscript{60} Nonetheless the results are nearly identical. The perception of safety is often the first necessity for bold speech, hence why Foucault calls it ‘\textit{fearless} speech.’ However, the need to create a safe environment for counsellors is essential for \textit{euboulia}. Calchas, though well minded, ‘\textit{ἐὖ φρονέων},’ is no \textit{basileis}, he possesses neither \textit{skeptron} nor \textit{aristeia}, nor \textit{themis} in counsel. Still his knowledge and counsel is vital to the war effort.

\textbf{Conclusion}

The \textit{Iliad} crystalized in the 8th century just as the \textit{polis} was forming into its classical form, that the \textit{Iliad} reflects this formation should be of no surprise and many scholars have commented on this. Nevertheless we must remember as well that the \textit{Iliad} and the \textit{Odyssey} were not the only epics available, many have been lost to posterity and while posterity can sometimes be fickle and erratic in what it preserves, that the \textit{Iliad} and the \textit{Odyssey} survived where others did not probably attests to their popularity long after the 8th century. A work like the \textit{Iliad} with such a nuanced discussion of politics, power and the need for good counsel [\textit{euboulia}] would surely remain popular in the highly politicized world of the classical \textit{poleis}. In the Athenian democracy especially where public figures were quite aware of the artifice of rhetoric, they would understand the need to pierce rhetorical art that could make \textit{kakaboulia} look like \textit{euboulia}. Therefore it should be no surprise that certain political elements of the system of assembly should be found immanent and in a

\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Il.} 1.74-79. “Oh Achilles, dear to Zeus, you call on me to explain / the wrath of lord Apollo the far-shooting: / And therefore I will speak, but take heed and swear to me / That readily by your words and by your hands you’ll defend me: / For I anticipate that I’ll anger a man who greatly among all / The Argives rules and whom the Achaean lines obey:”

\textsuperscript{60} Interestingly Calchas asks Achilles for protection because he trusts martial prowess to keep him safe. Therefore just as Odysseus uses the \textit{skeptron} in Book 2 as a cudgel to beat the rank and file into submission, Calchas here uses Achilles similarly as a \textit{skeptron} stand in. Perhaps the \textit{skeptron} tradition itself might represent authority quite literally as the threat of violence the \textit{sceptre-holder} wields in counsel. Zeus too has his own kind of \textit{skeptron} [\textit{σκῆπτρον}] in his \textit{thunderbolts} [\textit{σκηπτός}].
less developed, though still highly complex form within these texts. Nor should it surprise anyone that the highly political plays of Athens should inherit not only the myths but also the political awareness latent within the *Iliad*.

Aaron Golish
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Renaissance Renderings: 
Classical and Christian Conflicts in Elizabethan Portrayals of Venus and Adonis

Modern study often characterizes the Renaissance as a period fostering a resurgence of interest in antiquity. Classical mythology, allusions and influences flourished anew in art, architecture, philosophy, and literature of the time. The motifs of ancient Rome and Greece have come to be seen as the dominant forces in shaping Renaissance art, following a period reputed for its focus on Christianity. Though some intellectuals of the Renaissance, such as the poet Samuel Daniel, believed English literature should develop on its own, creating an entirely new Christian style of poetry, Classical mythology became a very influential part of English letters.¹ Writers of the English Renaissance were faced with the challenge of understanding Classical mythology and texts in their contemporary Christian contexts. Indubitably, the world of Classical literature, with its pantheon of gods and many tales of licentiousness, conflicted greatly with the Christian world of the English Renaissance, and had to be reconciled. Many poets, such as Edmund Spenser, decided to incorporate Classical themes and characters into stories with Christian meanings and morals, whereas others, like William Shakespeare, strayed from the vigorous trend of Christian allegorization, and used Classical texts not only as a source of mythological plots, but also characters, meaning and rhetoric found in their poems.

Both William Shakespeare and Edmund Spenser, as some of the most famous poets of the English Renaissance, demonstrate the tensions between these two ideologies in their interpretations of the Classical myth of Venus and Adonis. The two writers interact closely with both Classical and Christian ideologies – including Ovidian styles of story telling, Neoplatonism, eroticism, and moral allegory – producing poetry that allowed for an amalgamation of contemporary ideas with a long-standing artistic tradition that began long before. In his tract “The Art of Rhetoric”, Thomas Wilson proposed that Classical poets used fables to make statements regarding controversial topics. He saw poets like Ovid as political and moral philosophers.² Perspectives such as these allowed for the poetry of Classical authors to become more widely accepted among Christian readers. Spenser and Shakespeare each approach the tension between Christianity and Classical culture in different ways. Spenser adheres more closely to Christian thought than Shakespeare, who

incorporated more Classical ideas, although both writers maintain a unique combination of Classical and Christian motifs in their writing, which demonstrates the tension between the two streams of thought that dominated English Renaissance literature.

The upbringing and education of both poets provide context for the conflict between Classical and Christian ideas in their works. Spenser and Shakespeare were both raised in Protestant England, and wrote during the period in which Queen Elizabeth I was securing Protestant rule. Due to the emergence of Humanism and its focus on science rather than religion, education in England became modelled on learning Classical languages and texts, particularly Latin. English grammar school boys were expected to learn the art of rhetoric through Aphonius’ fables, found in the Progymnasmata; a series of Classical exercises in rhetoric that were translated from Greek to Latin, and made accessible to English students by Richard Rainolde. This is just one example of how English students encountered Greek texts through Latin translation; many Greek poets’ and prose-writers’ works were translated into Latin as well. Schoolmasters made their students memorize Latin fables then use them to compose their own ‘themes’, which demonstrated their knowledge of rhetoric, and gave them an opportunity to interpret Classical texts in new ways. Rainolde exemplified the Renaissance view of fables quite clearly when he defined one of these stories as “a forged tale, containing in it by the colour of a lie, a matter of truth”.

Renaissance fascination with antiquity included an interest in the compilations of myths and fables, as well as commentaries on the Greek and Latin poets. Many of their Renaissance counterparts, such as Shakespeare and Spenser, used these encyclopaedias and commentaries in addition to the original works to aid in their writing. Some poets, however, simply worked from the newer texts rather than from the Classical compositions themselves. These commentaries, such as the fourteenth century work Ovide Moralisé or Alexander Ross’ Mystagogus Poeticus, presented Ovid’s Metamorphoses as a series of stories that could be read for their moral lessons. Though they were popular, and no doubt influential, not all commentaries were produced with Christian moralization in mind. A continental example includes Raphael Regius’ translation of the Metamorphoses, published in Venice in 1493, which included commentary meant to explain aspects of the text not easily understood by readers, especially the obscure allusions to myths within Ovid’s extensive cast of characters. These readings were neither antithetical to European Christian morality, nor did they directly draw connections between Christian virtue and
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Ovid’s poetry. Even though the influence of moral commentaries was strong and Classical myth was often read through a Christian lens, the education of an English student included separate exposure to the pure Classical texts and to the moral interpretations of these poems. By reading both the original poetry and their Humanist explanations, English Renaissance poets were able to distinguish between ideas found in the Classical and Christian traditions, and to understand the tensions between them.

An examination of Shakespeare’s and Spenser’s interpretations of the story of Venus and Adonis gives excellent examples of how these two poets used allegory differently in their works. The use of allegory is much more prevalent in Spenser’s poetry than it is in Shakespeare, and it is widely accepted that Spenser’s epic, *The Faerie Queene*, can be read entirely as an allegory of Christian virtues. The first narrative of Venus and Adonis found in Spenser’s work serves to support the continual allegory that is presented throughout the poem. The story is told as a description of a tapestry found in Malecasta’s Castle, where Britomart, the warrior maiden whose journey teaches the virtue of Chastity, finds her virtue tested. The tapestry of Venus and Adonis cautions her against the disastrous possibilities of love, and serves as a warning to the maiden who is still quite naïve in her understanding of lust. Britomart mistakes Malecasta’s affection for friendship, but soon learns of its deceptive and dangerous nature when Malecasta attempts to enter the knight’s bed, compromising her chastity.

Though Spenser treats the story as an allegorical warning against the dangers of love within the larger framework of his epic, taken on its own, Spenser’s narrative segment of Venus and Adonis’ tale can be seen as demonstrating divine love rather than lust. The goddess often treats her love Adonis in a gentle and motherly fashion:

And whilst he slept, she over him would spred  
Her mantle, coloured like the starry skyes,  
And her soft arme lay underneath his hed,  
And with Ambrosiall kisses bathe his eyes

This depiction of the lovers contrasts with the lust portrayed in Book X of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. Ovid places the story of Venus and Adonis immediately after the story of Adonis’ mother, Myrrha. The sequence of narrative might be seen as simply following
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generations of the same family, but elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid separates the stories of families creating a web of myths with seemingly little organization. The story of Myrrha details her disastrous lust for her father, from which Adonis is born. Ovid directly connects the stories of Venus & Adonis and Myrrha with the theme of destructive lust, writing:

> Adonis has become a youth, a man;  
> His beauty now surpasses what he was,  
> Inflaming even Venus’ love, and thus  
> Avenging that dread fire-incestuous-  
> Which Venus made his mother, Myrrha, suffer.  
> And this is how that vengeance came about.11

Ovid depicts Venus’ love as lusty and all consuming, suggesting that the goddess herself is the source of destructive love, and cites her as the cause of Myrrha’s downfall. Spenser, on the other hand, does not mention Myrrha’s tale, deviating from Ovid’s association of the story with lustful love, and portraying Venus’ as a gentler, divine love.

Ovid also excludes Venus’ son Cupid from the narrative, whose arrow sparked his mother’s love for Adonis in the first place. Ovid explains how strongly Adonis resembles Cupid:

> Like the naked Cupid artists paint.  
> And to remove the only difference,  
> Just add a quiver to Adonis or  
> Remove the quiver from the Cupid’s form.12

This similarity between Adonis and Cupid Ovid portrays Venus as the centre of scandalous and incestuous love, emphasizing the eroticism of the story. In contrast to this, Spenser does not include the likeness between Adonis and Cupid, avoiding implications of an incestuous relationship, and thus maintaining a purer love between the mortal and goddess; one that is more compatible with Christian morals. He portrays Venus much differently than the original Classical source from which the story is taken. Spenser’s application of allegory to the story of Venus and Adonis paints it as a tale of divine love; a concept that has precedent in the moral commentaries of the Renaissance. These commentaries often went beyond extracting a valuable moral lesson from the poems, though, and instead saw
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them as stories of Christ.\(^\text{13}\)

To defend the value of Classical texts, some held the view that Classical writers based their works off of Christian ones. The Elizabethan poet Sir Walter Raleigh wrote that ancient poets “did greatly enrich their inventions, by venting stolen treasures of divine letters, altered by profane additions, and disguised by poetical conversions, as if they had been conceived out of their own speculations and contemplations”.\(^\text{14}\) The book of allegorical commentary, *Ovide Moralisé*, mirrors the birth of Adonis with the birth of Christ, depicting the lustful Myrrha being forgiven her past sins by the limitless divine love of God.\(^\text{15}\) Spenser incorporates this idea of God’s divine love into the narrative of the tapestry depicting Venus and Adonis, strengthening the parallel with the Madonna and Child. Spenser describes Venus’ lamentation over the dying Adonis and his metamorphoses:

And by his side the Goddess grovelling  
Makes for him endless mone, and evermore  
With her soft garment wipes away the gore  
Which staines his snowy skin with hatefull hew:  
But when she saw no helpe might him restore,  
Him to a daintie flowre she did transmew,  
Which in that cloth was wrought, as if it lively grew.\(^\text{16}\)

In this passage, Spenser conjures an image similar to that of the Madonna holding the crucified Christ in her arms, a very popular image in Christian Renaissance art. Continental painters reinforced this connection between the figures of Adonis and Christ when they used the form of Titian’s *Adonis* (*Venus and Adonis, 1553*) to model their own representations of the dead Christ.\(^\text{17}\) Other intellectuals of the Renaissance such as the French Humanist, Francois Rabelais, outright denied the moral lessons some saw in Classical texts, writing:

Do you honestly believe that Homer, when he wrote the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, had in mind the allegories which have been foisted off on him by Plutarch, Heraclides, Ponticus, Eustathius, and Phormitus, and which Politian has purloined from them? If thou do believe this, you are
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far indeed from my opinion, which is that Homer could no
time have dreamed of anything of the sort than Ovid in the
*Metamorphoses* could have been thinking of the Gospel
Sacraments.\(^\text{18}\)

Poets such as Rabelais would not approve of allegory being used as a means of reading
Classical texts, nor would he accept it in the Renaissance renderings of Classical myths.

Though the mutilated body of Adonis featured in Shakespeare’s narrative may
be read as the crucified body of Christ by some Christians, in contrast to Spenser it is
far from a Christian allegory, following the interpretation proposed by Rabelais. Instead,
Shakespeare’s characters are firmly rooted in figures from the *Metamorphoses*. Like Ovid’s
portrayal of Venus, the goddess in Shakespeare’s poem is initially seen as an embodiment of
lustful love. Arthur Golding, the Elizabethan translator of Ovid, whose work Shakespeare
is known to have been familiar with, tried to isolate one moral from Ovid’s story: “to
reprove prodigious lusts”.\(^\text{19}\) Shakespeare begins the poem with this theme of lust, depicting
the goddess as licentious, seemingly contrasted by the cold refusal of Adonis. Though the
rejection and disastrous end of Adonis might seem like a warning against the Christian
sin of lust, Shakespeare’s change in tone throughout the narrative makes it impossible to
maintain a single allegorical perspective on the nature of Venus’ love for Adonis. The reader
oscillates between feeling grotesque repulsion for Venus’ relentless and excessive pursuit
of Adonis, and contempt for the boy’s cold and arrogant refusal. He allows sympathy for
Venus’ lust without obviously condoning such behaviour.\(^\text{20}\) By continuously changing the
tone of the poem in this way, Shakespeare is able to create a highly erotic narrative that
pushes the boundaries of what was acceptable in Elizabethan literature.

By removing his work from Christian allegory, Shakespeare remains closely
inspired by characters and ideas portrayed in Ovid, even though he seems to have deviated
from the Latin author at times. One of the most noticeable deviations in Shakespeare’s
story is Adonis’ disdain for Venus. The poet makes this change in order to navigate the
poem away from being a warning of unchecked lust, distancing his story from Spenser’s
allegory. He points to arrogance as the cause for Adonis’ refusal, making this the cause of
the young boy’s downfall rather than lust. Shakespeare’s Adonis rejects Venus:

> ‘Fair queen,’ quoth he, ‘if any love you owe me,

\(^{18}\) Sonia Hernandez Santano, “Shakespeare’s Departure from the Ovidian Myth” in *Spanish Studies in Shake-

\(^{19}\) Katherine Eisaman Maus, “An Introduction to ‘Venus and Adonis’” in *The Norton Shakespeare* (New York:
W.W. Norton, 1997), 602.

\(^{20}\) Hernandez Santano 77
Measure my strangeness with my unripe years:
Before I know myself, seek not to know me.\textsuperscript{21}

Instead of modelling his male protagonist after Ovid’s Adonis, Shakespeare borrows traits from the Ovidian character Narcissus.\textsuperscript{22} Adonis’ refusal bears a strong similarity to Narcissus when the sage Tiresias predicts the cause of his destruction, saying that the boy would live to see old age “if he never knows himself”.\textsuperscript{23} Though this comparison might have been read as allegory by many of his Christian contemporaries, Shakespeare distances from this possibility by focusing it on the character of Venus, and her love and distress, rather than on Adonis.

The form and language of Shakespeare’s poem also have deep roots in Ovidian styles of poetry. Compared to Spenser’s epic style of poetry, (a form that fit in more easily with Christian values) Shakespeare’s \textit{Venus and Adonis} follows the model of Ovid’s amatory poems, creating what became known in the Renaissance as an \textit{epillon} or “little epic.”\textsuperscript{24} Literary Critic William H. Race identifies a rather formulaic narrative sequence, which he terms “the lament,” that is used in Book II of Ovid’s \textit{Amores}, where the poet laments the death of his lover’s pet bird. Shakespeare makes use of the various stages of lament in his own narrative after Venus discovers Adonis’ dead body.\textsuperscript{25} Shakespeare draws not only upon Ovid’s narrative structures, but upon his style of language as well. This is no great surprise, as Ovid’s \textit{Metamorphoses} was incorporated heavily into lessons of rhetoric for English Grammar School boys, meaning that his witticisms would have been taught as ornamental language to Elizabethan poets like Shakespeare. Shakespeare uses similar language to Ovid regarding the pursuit of a disinterested love, and parallels can be seen between Ovid’s story of Polyphemus’ love for the beautiful nymph Galatea, and Shakespeare’s portrayal of Venus’ courtship of Adonis. Both authors make use of a literary technique called the \textit{blazon}, in which a lover describes the beauty of their beloved. Polyphemus and Venus, because their love goes unreturned, are forced to provide blazons for themselves in attempt to win over the object of their desires.\textsuperscript{26} Ovid uses this opportunity
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\item[25] William H. Race, “The Rhetoric of Lament and Consolation” in \textit{Classical Genres and English Poetry} (New York: Croom Helm Ltd 1988), 92. These stages, as identified in both Ovid’s \textit{Amores} and Shakespeare’s \textit{Venus and Adonis}, include 1) a list of mourners 2) disfigurement of the mourners or corpse 3) praise of the deceased 4) a contrast of past and present 5) a description of the last day 6) remarks on the finality of death 7) complaints.
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to mock Polyphemus, creating a tone of levity in his work, whereas Venus’ blazon evokes the reader’s sympathy for her unrequited love. His narrative identifies more with Ovid’s praise of human lust and love than with the Christianized divine love and disapproval of sexual attraction, which is what Spenser focused his narrative around.

One of the most obvious reasons for the moralization of Ovid’s myths during the Renaissance is the highly erotic nature of his writings. In providing an ekphrasis (a detailed description of a work of art) of the tapestry, Spenser avoids eroticism by making the love between Venus and Adonis divine love. Even in his next representation of the couple, in “The Garden of Adonis” (Book II of The Faerie Queene), Spenser turns what might be read as erotic into a Christian virtue. He portrays the perpetual lovemaking of Venus and Adonis as an act sanctioned by the command of God. Adonis and Venus enjoy what Spenser presents as ‘Chaste’ love. This definition of chastity does not necessarily imply celibacy, but rather a loyal and married love that allows for the creation of children, who will grow up to be chaste and honourable themselves. This vision of Chastity encourages Spenser’s reader to uphold their Biblical duty to perpetuate the human race through a monogamous love between two people. He fits Venus and Adonis into this mould by pairing their union with Venus’ adoption of Amoretta, who is raised in the Garden of Adonis. Amoretta grows up to be the paragon of chaste love, and an exemplary standard of Christian morality.

Shakespeare, on the other hand, maintains the eroticism of Ovid, even in his Christian context. Remarkably, with its risqué content, five editions of the poem were printed before 1600 without any censorship. Perhaps Elizabethans did not see Classical eroticism as scandalously as one might expect. Though the Christian public might not have rejected Venus and Adonis, it is still far from meeting the standards of Protestant virtues. Shakespearian scholar Katherine Eisaman Maus argues that by setting the poem clearly in the Classical world, Shakespeare is able distance his characters from the boundaries of contemporary Christian morality. Spenser, because his depictions of Venus and Adonis are found within a story set in Arthurian England, is not able to achieve this separation. Eisaman Maus also proposes that though the setting and characters may be Classical, many elements of the story come from the Renaissance tradition.

Throughout the 16th century, the motif of the ‘pining lover’ grew in popularity, particularly influenced by the poetry of Petrarch, whose writing set the standard for love poetry. He included in his works such techniques as the ‘blazon’, but is known most famously for his trope of the unrequited lover, whose desire only grows as his lady
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continually refuses to reciprocate his affection. This device is not strictly unique to the Renaissance, however; Ovid himself notes the effect that separation has on desire. In Book II of the *Amores*, Ovid’s lover figure addresses the guardian of his beloved:

> You may not feel any need (and the more fool you) to guard that<br>Girl of yours—but it sharpens my desire…<br>Let me have the girl<br>And there’s an end to my passion³¹

Though Shakespeare’s motif of unrequited love is a quite radical break from the Venus and Adonis stories told in Spenser and Ovid, this Petrarchan understanding of desire is still deeply rooted in Ovidian poetics itself.

Shakespeare takes this trope of erotic poetry one step further as he reverses the gender roles within the couple, depicting Venus as playing the role of male pursuer, and Adonis of the beloved lady.³² This serves to create a comedic effect where both figures clumsily trying to play roles they do not understand in a relationship that cannot be consummated, but the situation also evokes pity for the characters in their confusion. Still, Shakespeare makes light of eroticism and invokes a feeling of mystery and intrigue surrounding it. This is far from a moralized Christian telling of a fable, and falls in much more closely with the attitude of Ovid. Even though Spenser’s scene of “The Garden of Adonis” allows for the consummation of Venus and Adonis’ affection, he treats love in a more serious manner than Shakespeare, who plays with the conventions of courtship throughout the narrative of his poem.

If Shakespeare’s Classical setting helps him to distance his poetry from Christian thinking, Spenser’s does the opposite. “The Garden of Adonis” bears many influences from Platonic philosophy, and Spenser adopts the points of Platonism and Neoplatonism not only through his depiction of a divine world that sustains life, but with the love of Venus and Adonis. The Garden is a place of rebirth for souls, a story sourced from *The Republic* in which Socrates describes the creation of new life and transition of souls from another world to the human one. The Garden of Adonis is fashioned to be a world separate from the one of human beings; a paradise. Though many aspects of Platonic philosophy conflicted with Christian belief, the idea of two worlds, one human, the other divine, appealed to Christians. Peter Burke describes how the “idea of the Idea” played a significant role in Renaissance thought. He explains that this created a vision of art and a form of the Idea.

³⁰ Eisaman Maus 601.
³² Eisaman Maus 602.
found in a divine world.\textsuperscript{33} Platonism suggests that the love of an individual’s beauty could lead to the love of general beauty, which in turn would eventually lead to one’s love of moral beauty and gradually to an understanding of the ideal form of beauty. This idea is quite compatible with Christian morality, and endorses the role of art and beauty in the search for virtue, which Renaissance artists could appreciate.\textsuperscript{34} Though Shakespeare was influenced by Renaissance art and the popular trope of the blazon, these Platonic ideas, fairly compatible with Christianity, are not found in his narrative poem.

William Shakespeare and Edmund Spenser’s different interpretations of the myth of Venus and Adonis show the different renderings of Classical influence in the Renaissance. While Spenser imbued his work with Christian morality, Shakespeare tended to stay true to the Classical origins. Both poets drew on a variety of sources of Classical and Christian thinking in penning their works, and used them to varying extents. Spenser’s representations maintain aspects of Christian allegory and morals as well as depictions of divine love, rather than the lustful attitudes of Ovid’s myth. He incorporates elements of Classical philosophy, but only to the point at which it was reconcilable with Christian virtue. In contrast, Shakespeare draws heavily on Ovid, not just for his plot outline and a few mythological references, but also for ideas of characters, rhetoric, eroticism, and love. Though his work is not outright antithetical to Christian morality, it should not be read as an allegory and represents a very different understanding of appropriation of Classical texts in the Renaissance than Spenser. The two poets, both living and writing in a time of strong Protestant Christian power in England, exemplify two different solutions to the challenge of reconciling the ideas of Classical literature and mythology.
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The Malthusian Empire: A Malthusian Model of the Roman Economy

Introduction: Roman ‘oiakonomikos’

‘Economics’ is a term of Greek origin, combining oikos, meaning ‘a household’, and the semantically complex root nemos, used in the sense of ‘regulate, administer, organize’. The first conventionalization of the term economics comes from Xenophon’s Oikonomikos, which served as a guide for the gentleman landowner of the ancient Mediterranean world. However, neither Xenophon nor any succeeding Roman author concerned themselves with the maximization of societal material welfare (in modern terms, the maximization of Gross Domestic Product) but rather with proper management of estates and personal wealth. Indeed, where concerned with the marketing of goods, it seemed more a result of common sense rather than systematic economic analysis. For example, Varro’s advice for cultivation of flowers on a farm near the city indicates an understanding of the profitability of specialized agriculture but not necessarily an understanding of comparative advantage. Given the limited understanding of economic phenomena at the time, it is perhaps not surprising that today the Roman economy is perceived as primitive.

This perception is not new; as economist David Hume observed, “I do not remember a passage in any ancient author where the growth of a city is ascribed to the establishment of a manufacture. The commerce, which is said to flourish, is chiefly the exchange of those commodities for which different soils and climates were suited.” The modern classicist Moses Finely blames this primitivism on the lack of economic thought among Romans, citing a lack of “an economic system that was an enormous conglomeration of independent markets”. To what extent, then, was the Roman Empire the primitive economy described by Finely? The Roman economy was primitive, in large part because it was subject to the Malthusian Constraint. Despite this, the Roman economy of the high empire (roughly 27 BC to roughly 211 AD) still managed to achieve growth, in part because the early Roman Empire coincided with a remarkable period of climatic stability but also because Rome,
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whether intended or not, expanded trade and monetization across the Mediterranean world.

A Brief Description of the Malthusian Model

The model presented herein is an expansion on observations contained in Thomas Robert Malthus’s work, *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. The observation most central to understanding the Roman economy, is that while subsistence resources grow arithmetically, human populations grow exponentially. From this “Malthusian model,” two implications are derived. First, that arable land is a constraining variable in long-term growth of not only population but of output and consumption. Second, Malthus’s variable $z$, which represents total factor productivity (TFP), drives shifts in the equilibrium in this model. Importantly, TFP includes a wide range of influences of the production function including climate, trade, and most importantly technology; it was the inability of Rome to influence this variable $z$ that defined the primitiveness of its economy.

A Malthusian Specification for the Roman Economy

From the Malthusian perspective (in contrast to Finely’s), it is the lack of economic and technological understanding that forms the basis for the primitiveness of the Roman economy. Specifically, with regards to agriculture, Roman policy promoted oligopoly power resulting in the stagnation of agriculture production. The Romans took the view that agriculture was the most socially acceptable means of accumulating wealth. Cicero noted, “of all the occupations by which gain is secured, none is better than agriculture, none more profitable, none more delightful, none more becoming to a free man.” Yet from the Malthusian model, it is recognized that if land is constant over time, it is highly susceptible to oligopolistic competition. Pliny the Elder argued that this policy was the ruin of Italy, noting “[I]f truth be told
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large estates have been the ruin of Italy and are now the ruin of the provinces too. Six owners possessed half the province of Africa when the princeps had them killed.”

Pliny argues thusly because, following the advice of Virgil, he correctly believed that large estates (Latifundia) were less efficient. Given the shift toward the production of specialized staples that occurred under oligopolists, his conclusion is highly credible.

There was a consensus among Roman observers that the most profitable crop available to a landowner was grape vines. Cato places it at the top of his list of profitable crops. Columella, using crop yields and pricing, demonstrates very large profits from grape vines, and Pliny goes so far as to argue that the practice is even more profitable than trade with the Far East. However, the problem with such specialized production is that Italian Peninsula itself produced little of its own wheat. Indeed, conventional estimates of wheat yields, based on seed production, are 1:4 for Roman Italy compared to 1:10 for Egypt, a near three-fold difference in yield per seed ratios. A Malthusian interpretation of these conditions implies that the Malthusian constraint could only be withstood insofar as harvests were good and Egypt remained a viable exporter. It is revealing that Domitian’s edict forbidding the planting of further vines came only “when a bumper vintage followed a poor grain harvest.” Moreover, this type of specialization would make Italy, and those regions which were more climatically isolated, more susceptible to climate shocks. On the other hand, the very reason these shocks caused such economic havoc was in large part due to population changes within the Empire.

The Malthusian model predicts that population will grow faster than productive resources and then stabilize following mass starvation and war or what Malthus terms
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“preventive checks” on population. Our best estimate for the population of the Roman Empire at its zenith under the Aurelians is 50 to 60 million people (roughly the population of the UK today). Of this figure, roughly 20% (10-12 million) lived in urban areas with Rome as the largest with a population of about 1 million, followed by Carthage and Alexandria at 500,000 each. However, the extent of population growth from the late Republic to the Empire would appear enormous as the number of Roman citizens grew from 318,823 in 131 BCE to 4,063,000 in 28 CE. It is clear that the Emperors did not understand that they faced a “Malthusian constraint” under any terms; indeed, the Emperors fostered population growth through the use of alimenta – loans to encourage an increase in birth rate. Pliny notes, in his Pangyric, that Trajan’s benefactions for the support of children were designed as a source of future demographic increase and consequent prosperity. The reason for this thinking reflects the prosperity of Augustus’ reign, which occurred during a time of extensive demographic growth; the Romans of Trajan’s age saw a correlation between these two events. Yet, in all likelihood, this policy aggravated circumstances when the temperature began to cool in the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

On Industry, Climate, and Growth in Roman Empire

Despite its Malthusian nature, the Roman economy in the early Empire was almost certainly more productive than in those periods which immediately followed it. Indeed, though industrial production was probably not a major component of the Roman economy, ice core samples taken in Greenland suggest that lead and silver smelting under Rome caused pollution levels which would not be matched until the Industrial Revolution. As previously discussed, increased productivity in the Malthusian
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model occurs with increases in TFP. However, in the case of the Roman Empire, these increases were more by accident than by design. For example, it is possible to increase productivity through more efficient technologies. Yet, a passage from Suetonius on Vespasian is revealing: “An engineer offered to haul some huge columns up to the capitol at moderate expense by a simple mechanical contrivance, but Vespasian declined his services: ‘I must always ensure,’ he said, ‘that the working class earn enough money to buy themselves food.’”31 In other words, this example suggests that one of the primary reasons why the Roman economy did not become more productive is that the Romans themselves either did not take an interest in productivity increasing technologies or were somehow politically constrained. The same concept can be applied to agriculture as well.

In talking about land under the Malthusian model, the primary question for the purpose of TFP relates to the actually yields per unit of input. Due to the expanse of the Empire, the yields from land would vary depending on the region. However, on aggregate, while technical development in agriculture wasn’t uncommon in the Empire, innovations remained rare.32 For example, whereas in one passage Pliny describes the use of a kind of threshing machine in Gaul, earlier in the same book Pliny quotes Cato in saying that land must lie fallow for two years.33 Thus, while there were potential advances in harvesting, the Roman landed gentry in general still followed farming techniques limiting the land yield and were set in their agricultural methods.34 This tendency would serve them poorly as the climate began to change in the mid-2nd century.35

The primary reason for the phenomenal growth of the Roman economy before 180 CE was the warming which occurred during this period. Researchers at Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule in Zürich have shown, using the growth of tree rings in oak trees in Germany, that from roughly 50 BCE to 120 CE temperature anomalies were consistently above average.36 These higher temperatures shifted TFP upward, meaning higher yields for agriculture. However, around 120 CE the climate began to cool and TFP decreased,

---

31 Suet. *Vesp.* 18


33 Plin. *HN* 18.72; 18.3

34 See Sherk 199 for a Roman farmer’s almanac which rigidly describes planting conditions

35 Büntgen et al. 2011

36 Ibid. 578 See Appendix 5 for the time series associated with this argument.
leading to a massive subsistence crisis.\textsuperscript{37} Such crises typically occur in two stages.\textsuperscript{38} First, the climatic shock leads to a series of bad harvests which weaken the human immune system. This consequence can be seen in the work of Philostratus, who noted that, after several successive bad harvests in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE, the poor were reduced to surviving on vetches and “whatever else they could get.”\textsuperscript{39} Second, this weakened state leads to greater susceptibility to plague, in turn leading to an increase in the death rate. Indeed, Galen notes that as a result of poor nutrition, many peasants became severely ill after bad harvests.\textsuperscript{40} This pattern continued until the population declined sufficiently to arrive at the new equilibrium around the middle of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century. Roman failure to augment agricultural productivity allowed for attainment of the Malthusian constraint. Yet Rome was still able to temporarily achieve growth thanks to trade and the exceptional monetization of the Empire.

**On Roman Trade and Money**

As noted previously, agriculture in Italy had become heavily oligopolistic and specialized, which meant that much of the wheat for Rome and other major cities had to be imported from abroad. If we take the number of shipwrecks by century as a metric for early trade, we find that, as compared to succeeding centuries, the last two centuries BCE and the first two centuries CE of the Roman Empire exhibit exceptionally higher levels of trade throughout the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{41} In economics, trade is viewed as a form of productivity increasing technology (\textit{i.e.}, it has the same effect as increasing \( z \)). Unfortunately, trade did little to alleviate the Malthusian crisis when it came for the Empire.

There are two key reasons for this. First, despite the specialization of agriculture in Italy, foodstuffs were still produced locally in most of the Empire. An archeological study by Cavallo et al.\textsuperscript{42} indicates that Roman legions on the Rhine traded scarcely at all with the locals, instead importing most of their foodstuffs. Second, imports of grain to Italy, which

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid. 578  
\textsuperscript{38} Dionysus Stathakopulos, \textit{Famine and Pestilence in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Empire: A Systematic Survey of Subsistence Crises and Epidemics} (Burlington VT, 2004), 36 for a more detailed description  
\textsuperscript{39} Philostr. \textit{Vd} 1.15  
\textsuperscript{40} Gal. \textit{Nat. Fac.} 1.1-7 (See Appendix 6 for a more in depth description of this shock)  
\textsuperscript{41} Wilson 220 from Bowman et al. 2009; See Appendix 7 for a graph of the number shipwrecks by century which clearly shows a spike in the number of shipwrecks corresponding to the High Roman Empire.  
\textsuperscript{42} Cavallo et al., 75 from Stallibrass et al., \textit{Feeding the Roman Army} (Oxbow, 2008); see Appendix 8 for full description of the study which clearly shows that military settlements primarily used less common grains for that region like wheat and barley avoiding more common native grains like rye.
came from Africa for eight months of the year and Egypt for four months of the year, were shipped by private individuals. This meant that, while the Emperors did employ a number of schemes to try and encourage grain merchants, during the subsistence crises of the second and third centuries it likely would have been unprofitable to finance such voyages. Reported interest rates on such voyages were 20% per voyage, well above the legal maxima. With the additional risks associated with a subsistence crisis this rate likely would have increased even more. Indeed, during times of economic contraction, those businessmen who would ordinarily grant loans for shipping were supplanted by elites and professional money lenders who were less willing to take on such risk. However, the Romans also exacerbated this unwillingness to trade due to the imperial practice of seigniorage.

To their credit, Roman economic agents did understand the concept of pricing. More precisely, they understood that the price of an object is related to its relative scarcity. What this suggests is that at least some citizens would be aware when the Roman currency was being debased as the need for military expenditures increased (which accounted for over 50% of government expenditure). The acquisition of precious metals, which were required to back the monetary system of the Empire, was traditionally done through conquest (see citation below). As a result, the Romans never endeavored to develop exploration techniques for new sources of precious metals and instead availed themselves of ores uncovered by surface mining. When the subsistence crisis (as Malthus points out) forced barbarians onto Roman lands, the military needed to be paid to deal with these invasions, even if there was not sufficient precious metal to back the currency. Simply put, in times of crisis, the government minted new coins with less precious metal in order to pay the troops. This debasement of coinage would have a drastic consequence in an Empire as widely monetized as Rome’s.

Trade is only efficient when conducted through some medium of exchange. This is because, unlike exchanges in kind, using a medium of exchange (like coinage)

43 Joseph. BJ 2.383-5
44 William Harris, Rome’s Imperial Economy, (Oxford, 2011), 162
45 Suet. Aug. 41-42; Gaius, Institutes 1.32c
46 Sidney Homer, A History of Interest Rates (New Brunswick NJ, 1977), 49
47 Bowman et al. 2011 11:782
48 Tac. Ann. 15.42 where Tacitus notes that gold and jewels had lost value due to their commonness; Tac. Agr. 19
49 Richard Duncan-Jones, Money and Government in the Roman Empire (Cambridge, 1994), 45
50 T. Rickard, Man and Metals (Cambridge, 1974), 402; For techniques see HN 33.21
51 Malthus 12
eliminates the double coincidence of wants.\(^{52}\) Hopkins has demonstrated, using a sample of 90,000 coins from various eras and places, the economy of the Empire was indeed widely monetized.\(^{53}\) However, any medium of exchange functions only insofar as the population believes the medium has value and will retain its value. That seigniorage was destroying Roman monetization can be seen by precious metal content in the coins of different emperors: the mean silver weight of the denarii minted in Rome decline dramatically from the reign of Nero onwards and most dramatically under the Severans.\(^{54}\) Another measure which more directly reflects the devaluation of Roman currency is the fact that Egyptian coin hoards from the Empire’s zenith and afterward are typically composed of coins minted from Nero’s reign or before.\(^{55}\) This suggests that the monetization of the Empire enabled trade and expansion during times of prosperity but subsequently crippled trade during the subsistence crises of the later Empire.

**Conclusion: The Malthusian Empire**

Despite the fact that the Roman Empire was more productive than the economies that succeeded it, it remained subject to the Malthusian constraint; the Empire only achieved ‘growth’ due to a favorable climatic period and its remarkably monetized economy which promoted trade. However, the Roman economy did not fail to develop because of its primitiveness, in contrast to Finely’s argument. Rather, the Roman economy was primitive as a result of a lack of economic understanding that might have permitted it to escape the Malthusian trap. This review also highlights one of the flaws found in empirical economic studies: the Romans did have ideas about how to promote prosperity, as the *alimenta* demonstrates but that the policy was based on correlation instead of causation. As Albert Einstein once said “It is quite wrong to try founding a theory on observable magnitudes… It is theory which decides what we should observe.” In other words, the fundamental problem of the Roman economy was a lack of thought but rather

---

52 In other words, if everyone accepts a certain coinage then one can exchange one’s goods for coins and then buy what one needs. However, if exchange is in kind, then one has to find another person who has the goods one wants and who wants to buy one’s own produce. Stephen Williamson, *Macroeconomics* (Boston, 2008), 564


54 Richard Duncan Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1982), 374; See Appendix 9 for the graphs and table which clearly show a decline in the mean weight both of the overall coin and the silver included.

55 Erik Christiansen, *Coinage in Roman Egypt* (Aarhus, 2004), 198; See Appendix 10 for a table of all hoards. These clearly show that the overall number of hoards increase over time and that those of Nero’s reign (which had a higher gold content) were increasingly hoarded over time.
a lack of method for scientifically determining how to address economic problems.

Theodore Naff
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Appendix 1: The Malthusian Model

We can examine Malthus’ observations in a dynamic model where output (Y) is produced using the factors of land (L) which is held constant and labor (N) which can adjust. This will take the functional form Y = zF(L, N). Additionally, assume that population growth depends on the quantity of consumption per worker, or N^'/N = g(C/N) where N^' is future population, g is an increasing function, and C is aggregate consumption (which will equal Y in the long run since all goods will be consumed). Steady state in this model is the point when N = N^'(i.e. it is the point when LR population equals today’s population). The key property of this is that even production technology and increases in the quantity of land will not affect the long run standard of living but it can have effects of on what the steady state will be. Such changes in total factor productivity (z) shift our production curve upwards thus increasing the possible population that the land can sustain.
From Williamson (2008) p.192

Appendix 2: Extent of Alimenta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Towns by region</th>
<th>Towns with stone</th>
<th>stone as % of all towns in region</th>
<th>Area of regions in km squared</th>
<th>Average area per town in km squared</th>
<th>Inscriptions (CIL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regio I</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15500</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>8523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio II</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio III</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>27500</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio IV</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>2895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio V</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio VI</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio VII</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>31000</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>4624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio VIII</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>19500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio IX</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51000</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>5858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regio XI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32000</td>
<td>2667</td>
<td>2159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>39.090912</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>22727.27</td>
<td>861.3636</td>
<td>2991.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>32907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3: Greenland Ice Evidence

From Hong et al. (1994)
Appendix 4: Temperature Anomalies in Europe

From Büntgen et al. (2011)

Appendix 5: Subsistence Shocks in the Malthusian Model
Appendix 6: Shipwrecks by Century in the Ancient World

From Wilson p.223 in Bowman et al. (2009)

Appendix 7: Food Supply to the Roman Army in the Rhine Delta

From Stallibrass et al. (2008) p.75
Appendix 8: On the Silver content of Denarii

Change in Overall Weight by Emperor

Change in Silver Weight by Emperor

Mean Silver as a percentage of late Nero
Appendix 9: All Hoards

From Christiansen (2004) p.197
Marathus the Chameleon:
How Tibullus Uses Marathus’ Changing Faces to Redefine a Genre

In Latin Love Elegy, unlike in some other genres, we have been lucky enough to have some of the greats survive to us. There is no escaping the gaping absence that is Gallus, but despite this we still have works by Sulpicia, Propertius, Ovid, and Tibullus, along with others. Amongst these Tibullus stands out as being a titan of subtlety, and an expert at brilliantly bending and circumventing rules that would have scared off a lesser poet. As much as it seems that Gallus defined the genre in its birth, Tibullus was the one who ushered it into a ripe state of maturity, and who added depth with artful precision. When considering Love Elegy, one inevitably falls into the issue of categorization of style, and of characters. The style can be loosely defined as being a compilation of verbose lovers’ laments, as being the platform for the unrequited lover and the absent one who is the object of the desire. It is a genre that generally has fairly defining and specific roles. There are three main roles that characters tend to fall into within the framework of the poems, that of the lover, the female beloved, and the teacher. There is also the existence of a fourth role which comes and goes which could be termed as the ‘guardian’, which is often assumed by a door, and it can be defined as an obstacle which stands between the lover and his goal. Within the framework of these roles, Love Elegy can do remarkable things, however, it is when these boundaries are pushed and prodded that the true masters can be seen.

Tibullus’ 1.4, 8, and 9 are commonly referred to as the Marathus cycle, because they deal specifically with a different object of Tibullus’ attention, and that is the *puer* (boy). Marathus. This character is one of the most interesting in all of Love Elegy, because of his diversity. This paper will examine how Marathus jumps between Elegiac and gender roles, and how Tibullus uses him to completely turn the genre on its head. It will break down the cycle by poem, look at the role that Marathus inhabits in each one, and bring to light the ways in which these changes affect Marathus, Tibullus, and the genre as a whole. In doing this it will attempt to bring forward the significance of this character and his changing faces, as well as to discuss other interpretations and their possible validity.

First, to understand Marathus’ role in 1.4, one must examine the poem as a whole and establish the various roles that each player inhabits, and what that signifies. 1.4 starts with Tibullus asking the god Priapus, or more appropriately, a statue of Priapus for advice on how to have boys fall in love with him.

*Quae tua formosos cepit sollertia? certe non*
Tibullus says this to the god. This line sets up the tone for the rest of this poem. 1.4 centers around Tibullus beseeching the god Priapus to learn about the art of cepit formosos, capturing alluring boys. It is only at the end of the poem, in the last ten or so lines that the goal behind this is revealed. Tibullus admits that he is seeking this information for his friend Titius. In the final few lines Marathus is revealed and yet another layer of intent is brought into the mix, as Tibullus unveils a boy who he is vying for. The lines describing this end section will be discussed further in the paper in more detail. Now to return to these introductory lines of the poem, this section is not only notable because it introduces what the poem will discuss, but it also stands as a marked change from the first three poems. Immediately, this poem differentiates itself by stating that the focus of infatuation will be boys. This simple change of an “a” to an “o” in formosos (beautiful [boys]), gives a profoundly different and new feel to this poem. It not only breaks up the monotony of the pining for the same lover without success of the first few poems, but it introduces another potential side of Elegy. However, what is possibly more interesting, is the fact that Tibullus presents this change as being merely more of the same.

Before continuing it seems pertinent to briefly discuss the language of Elegy, specifically the adjectives that are used prominently to describe the love interests in general, and Tibullus’ love, Delia, specifically. In 1.1 Tibullus imagines a Delia who’s heart is not hard as iron (duro ferro, 63) but is tender (tenero corde, 64). These lines are remarkably representative of the powerful connotation behind the vocabulary choices that are used throughout the first book. Book one is all about the difference between duritia (hardness) and teneritas (softness), this would seem to primarily apply to Delia, however it also applies to Marathus, as will be discussed in more detail.²

Poem 1.4 is particularly concerned with the breaking down of gender assigned roles. This begins with Priapus, and ends with Marathus. As Nikoloutsos aptly puts it, “in the figure of Priapus gender stereotypes collapse. He is both superior and inferior, both powerful and vulnerable.”³ This gender blurring, and general role inconsistency that appears with the descriptions of Priapus serve as an appropriate introduction for Marathus to be brought in. However, there is in fact more intricacies of roles which are introduced before

---

¹ Tib. 1.4.3. “What skill of yours captures the beautiful boys? Certainly your / beard does not shine, and your hair has not been groomed.” All translations are the author’s unless otherwise noted.


³ Ibid, 64.
Marathus is, to further complicate the situation. This refers to when Tibullus introduces, near the end of the poem, that he is in fact the one telling his friend these things.

> Haec mihi, quae canerem Titio, deus edidit ore,
> Sed Titium coniunx haec meminisse vetat.
> Pareat ille suae; vos me celebrate magistrum,
> Quos male habet multa callidus arte puer.
> Gloria cuique sua est: me, qui spernentur; amantes
> Consultent: cunctis ianua nostra patet.
> Tempus erit, cum me Veneris praecpta ferentem
> Deducat iuvenum sedula turba senem.\(^4\)

This section introduces an interesting further level to what has been described so far, and that is that Tibullus describes himself as being the teacher here. In fact, all along it was Tibullus who was giving the advice, although it was the god speaking through him. This sets up both Tibullus and Priapus as being the teachers for this section, all the while Tibullus also inhabits the role of the one being instructed, as in his description he is listening to what the god tells him. The elegiac roles are then completed when Tibullus, in the last lines of the poem, introduces the fact that in truth he also has to learn the art of making boys fall in love with him, as he is pleading with Marathus who is torturing him, all while describing himself as teacher.

> Heu heu quam Marathus lento me torquet amore!
> Deficiunt artes, deficiuntque doli.
> Parce, puer, quaeso, ne turpis fabula fiam,
> Cum mea ridebunt vana magisteria.\(^5\)

Here Tibullus opens up about the fact that his credibility relies entirely on his relationship with Marathus. That if he is not successful with this *puer* (boy) that no one will take him seriously, and that he will go down as a *turpis fibula* (shameful bind). In these phrases the keystone of the entire poem is revealed. Marathus stands as being the turning

\(^4\) Tib. 1.4.73-80. “This, which I was singing for Titius, that the god spoke from my / mouth, but Titius’ wife forbade this to be remembered. / He ought to obey her; you all praise me as teacher, / the sly boy has many which are with evil skill. / His glory is to each of them: the lovers who have been spurned / consult me: my door stands open for all. / It will be the time, the sedulous crowd of youths, having been / taught by Venus, lead me down as an old man.”

\(^5\) Tib. 1.4.81-84. “Marathus twists me with slow love! / Skills fail, tricks fail. / Spare me, boy, I beg you, lest I become an ugly tale, / when they laugh at my false instruction.”
point for all of this. Without him Tibullus is nothing more than a languid lover, and one who pines after these unreachable boys. As such, Tibullus’ role-defying jump is entirely reliant on the existence and love of this boy. In these few lines Marathus’ importance is made abundantly clear. The fact that he is himself a role-defying character opens Tibullus up to do the same thing.

This poem in its entirety stands as an opening for Tibullus to begin redefining the Elegy. He begins this journey simply, by showing that the beloved need not always be a *puella* (girl). Boy and girl become interchangeable in 1.4. There is the change of asking how to make boys fall in love with you, when he is pleading with Priapus in the beginning. This is as opposed to the common elegiac trope of pleading with a teacher to teach you how to get girls to love you. Which one can see in all of Ovid’s *Ars Amatoria*, in that he places himself as the teacher who teaches love to the ignorant masses. It can also be seen when, in Propertius 1.1, love teaches him what to do, teaching him not to like chaste girls. This change is further enhanced by Marathus’ being described in the same way as are the girls who are normally sought after. He describes the boys as “*teneri pueri*” (soft boys), an adjective commonly attributed to women.⁶ This is taken a step further in that the same attractions that are described when discussing the *teneri pueri* are those which are generically given to the *puella*.⁷ This continues in lines 81-84, which are pivotal because Marathus spurns Tibullus’ love, which goes hand in hand with the idea of a *dura puella* (hard girl). “This is a *puer* who both acts in a manly manner and displays feminine characteristics.”⁸

The decision to describe Marathus in the same way as a normal *puella* makes it in some way more acceptable to do what he did, but makes it a statement in its own right. The use of the same adjectives and such amounts to Tibullus showing that Marathus is just as acceptable as is any other beloved in Elegy. This establishes a new framework, in which anything is possible within the poetic universe, and retroactively supports the role changing and integration of both Priapus and Tibullus himself.

These same themes and ideas are furthered and intensified in 1.8. The eighth poem in Tibullus’ first book is easily one of the most interesting of his corpus, given that it occupies a unique place in its ideas and story. In this poem Marathus falls in love with a girl, then tries to be with her. Most of the poem is comprised of Tibullus talking about how he has helped and is helping Marathus. From the very start this poem emphasizes the gender ambiguity that is introduced in 1.4.

---

⁶ Tib. 1.4.9, 11.
⁸ Ibid, 70.
Nine lines into the poem Tibullus introduces an intriguing ambiguity, in that in these lines there is no gender stated outright for the “you” being discussed. This intentional lack of clarity continues with the theme from 1.4, about the blurring of gender lines. This is especially poignant because further on in the poem the reader finds out that this “you” is, in fact, talking about Marathus. Not only is there an implied genderless pronoun in these sentences, but the actions described are ones that are profoundly feminine. The fixing of “displaced hairs” and the pearing of nails are most certainly female activities. Even in the earlier poems Tibullus only talks about hair in conjunction with Delia. Marathus goes through what can be described as ‘transvestite transformations’ here (gets hair done, puts on makeup etc), by doing this he further blurs the lines between gender roles, and shows that they are not so clear cut. This is made especially noticeable in this poem as he is the one who is going after the girl, and not the other way around. In every way Marathus blurs these lines and shows that nothing need be so exact, that nothing is so concrete as some may have it seem. This passage is then put in sharp contrast to the lines that come shortly thereafter.

Illa placet, quamvis inculto venerit ore
Nec nitidum tarda compserit arte caput.

The juxtaposition that is achieved here is powerful in its force. The gender roles have now not only been blurred, but essentially reversed. Despite this, the roles have not entirely been transferred, as it is still Marathus who is doing the chasing in the poem. Though Marathus here inhabits the role of the lover, he is still being portrayed in a way that makes him stand out, and that allows him to stretch the definition of the conventional male lover in Elegy. Here Marathus steps out of the role of the beloved, and the much

---

9 Tib. 1.8.9-12. “Why is it useful for you to have tended to soft hairs / and often to have displaced shifting hairs? / Why do you decorate your cheeks with shining dye, why do you / pear the nails of an artist with skilled hand?”

10 An example of this is Tib. 1.1.68, there are others strewn throughout though.


12 Tib. 1.8.15-16. “She is pleased, although she may come with an uncultivated mouth / she will not arrange a shining head with slow skill.”
sought after love interest and instead takes the place of the hunter, or one could go so far as to say even the place of the elegist (which will be discussed more shortly). This new position change then allows Tibullus to once again take a step back from his own longings, at least superficially at first, and take the place of the teacher once again. As such, Marathus is once again not only used for his own gender-bending impact, but also to allow the poet to alter his own position in the poems, and so provide a new perspective and feel in Elegy. Marathus is then asked if he has been put under the spell of a witch, and Tibullus goes on a long tirade about the effects and power of such a song.

\begin{verbatim}
Num te carminibus, num te pallentibus herbis
Devovit tacito tempore noctis anus?
Cantus vicinis fruges traducit ab agris,
Cantus et iratae detinet anguis iter,
Cantus et e curru Lunam deducere temptat
Et faceret, si non aera repulsa sonent.
Quid queror heu misero carmen nocuisse, quid herbas?
Forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis:13
\end{verbatim}

This section is important for what it implies about the new position that Marathus now occupies. With the inclusion of the witch, and the talk of him being enchanted, as well as his introduction as one who is fruitlessly attempting to win over a girl, this passage takes further steps to place Marathus as being the poetic-lover in this poem. This role has hitherto only been occupied by the poet himself, and is a sort of ‘breaking the fourth wall’ type of idea. It is so extreme because it implies that all of a sudden one of the characters has potentially become the poet, as opposed to merely being a fictional turning post around which the poem operates – the character can now become the driving force behind the poem as a whole. This idea is firmly cemented when, in one of the most evocative moments in all of book one, Marathus actually speaks.

\begin{verbatim}
‘Quid me spernis?’ ait. ‘poterat custodia vinci:
Ipse dedit cupidis fallere posse deus.
Nota venus furtiva mihi est, ut lenis agatur
Spiritus, ut nec dent oscula rapta sonum;
\end{verbatim}

13 Tib. 1.8.17-24. “Now does the witch enchant you with songs, now with pale herbs /in the silent time of night? / The song brings across the fruit from the neighboring fields, / and the song holds down the path of the angry snake, / the song tries to lead down the moon from its chariot / and it makes it, if the gongs having been struck do not sound. / Why do I lament this song having harmed the wretched, why do I lament the herbs? / Beauty uses no magic help.”
This passage is powerful not because of its excellent and subtle wording, given that it is full of relatively common Elegiac tropes, but because it firmly establishes Marathus as an elegist. What was only teased earlier in the poem comes to full fruition with Marathus’ speech on the position that he finds himself in. This, more than the actual advice that Tibullus has given Marathus, evinces the feeling that Tibullus has truly been his teacher, his praeceptor amoris (teacher of love). This complete switch is possibly one of the most poignant examples of Tibullus’ complete over-ruling of the common standards of Elegy. With this section the reader is then watching a poet be born and operate, within the universe of a poem. It is a moving moment in poetry, it shows that there can be change in Elegy, and in a way, it gives a glimpse into at least the emotional side of the genesis of an elegist.

Tibullus then completes the poem by showing Marathus his side of the situation, and trying to make him understand what this looks like from an outside perspective. “He reminds the boy that the one who is shedding tears over a puella dura (hard girl) used to be a puer durus (hard boy) himself.” That he used to derive pleasure from having others chase after him, and now the roles are reversed. Tibullus does this arguably to attempt to ground Marathus again, and to bring him back into where he is meant to be. Many of these situations, where he is pleading with Marathus, have the feel that Tibullus is almost the Elegiac moderator, and that he is attempting to reassert, or assert at all, proper order upon the poetic world that he finds himself in. Meanwhile, he, ironically, while attempting to control things in this way ends up stepping outside of the rules that he is trying to enforce.

14 Tib. 1.8.55-67. “Why do you spurn me?” he says, “the guard is able to be defeated: / the god himself gave the ability to deceive to the passionate ones. / Secret love’s known to me, just as the light spirit has been urged, / just as stolen kisses are given without a sound: / and I am able, though it’s midnight, / to open the gates secretly, with no loud sound. / What use are skills, if she spurns her wretched lover / and, savage girl, flees from the bed itself? / Or when she promises, but suddenly treacherous girl deceives, / and night too is a vigil of many sorrows for me. / While I imagine she will come to me, whatever has been stirred, / I believe to have been the sound of her feet.”

15 Nikoloustos 2007, 78; Tib. 1.8.67-78.
being chased.

Tibullus, in his poems, is playing within the rules of Elegy in order to show that the rules are unnecessary in a way, and one could even go so far as to say that he is implying that they are wrong. His choice to make characters jump between roles, and to alter what can be considered to be the standards for each of these should be viewed as both a statement about the genre, as well as something larger, and more poetic. It can also be seen to have been a commentary on the nature of love itself. Tibullus could be trying to imply that the confines of Elegy do not properly encompass the ideas and changing nature of love. All of this serves to allow Tibullus to show that nothing is sacred in Elegy, and that there should be no clearly defined roles. It is unreasonable to say that any one person would only be in a specific role in life, or in love, and so Tibullus attempts to show this, first by Priapus, who is a conflicting figure, who justifies Tibullus’ own changes, which introduce Marathus, who is the epitome of this idea that Elegy and love should not be so exclusive. His elegiac role is never properly set, from one poem to the next, arguably reaching its climax in 1.8 where he himself becomes the poet.

The Marathus cycle completes its story in 1.9, when the boy begins seeing an older rich man. This makes Tibullus quite unhappy, to say the least, and so he spends the entire poem attempting to show Marathus the error of his ways. This poem is intriguing in that it both represents an endpoint, and a change, while at the same time coming back full circle in other ways. Verstraete points out that 1.9 belongs to “a well-recognized type, announcing the end of an affair.” In this way it is the end, and something new; this poem marks the cutting off of relations between Tibullus and Marathus, as the boy has moved on, and becomes merely another love interest for Tibullus to pine after. However, there are things which have come back around in this poem as well. First is that Marathus has returned to being a homosexual character, given that in the last poem he had a brief foray into heterosexuality. The second is that though it is not with Tibullus, Marathus has nonetheless gone back to the same situation which he started in. He began as someone for an old man to pine over, and then in 1.9 he begins the cycle anew, just with a different man. In this poem Tibullus discusses his having taught Marathus, and returns himself to the role of elegist proper in his lamenting.

\[\text{Haec ego dicebam: nunc me flevisse loquentem,} \]
\[\text{Nunc pudet ad teneros procubuisse pedes.}\]


17 Tib. 1.9.29-30. “This I said to you: now I’m ashamed that I wept / as I spoke, and stretched myself out at your feet.”
In this passage it can be seen that Tibullus begins receding back into himself, and into the role of the love-sick poet. He is referring to the previous sections where he is quoting what he had taught to Marathus concerning the importance of not being taken in by wealth. This is more important for the fact that he is regretting what he has taught, more so than what was actually in the lesson. Here it can be said that Tibullus is expressing serious feelings of remorse for having been Marathus’ teacher, but this can be taken a step further to say that perhaps he even regrets having stepped out of his role as elegist.

In 1.9 Marathus has found someone to replace Tibullus, and so at the end of the poem, in Tibullus’ anger, he threatens that he will then find someone to replace the boy.

*Tum flebis, cum me vinctum puer alter habebit*  
*Et geret in regno regna superba tuo.*  
*At tua tum me poena iuvet, Venerique merenti*  
*Fixa notet casus aurea palma meos:*  
*‘Hanc tibi fallaci resolutus amore Tibullus*  
*Dedicat et grata sis, dea, mente rogat.’

These threats can be taken in two ways, one is that, although Tibullus is angry, that Marathus is in fact quite easily replaceable, and that as such not only will the cycle continue with Marathus and another man, but the same will happen for Tibullus. The other possibility is that in fact Marathus is unique, and the poet is speaking out in such fury because of the unique nature of the boy, and so they are empty threats, because he knows that they are not true, even to his own ears. There is no doubt that both arguments have profound implications for the *puer*’s (boy’s) role in Elegy and in this poetic cycle in particular. The first would imply that this treatment of Elegies as a whole should not be viewed as being a different thing, and although powerful and painful to see it move on, that it is in fact reproducible. The other is more poetically sound, as a grander idea, but has more pitfalls in actual interpretation from the words because of the amount of extrapolation involved. The idea that Marathus is unique, and as such cannot be replaced, certainly has value for the reader given how much they have interacted with him, and how much he has come to redefine the genre and poems.

“The later Marathus cycle [is] dominated by a perception of amor (love) as an especially unstable and unpredictable enterprise in which happiness easily gives way to
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18 Tib. 1.9.79-84. “Then you will cry, when another boy has me bound / and bears his proud reign in your kingdom. / But then your punishment pleases me, and to deserving Venus / a golden palm shall be affixed marking my fate: / Tibullus, whom the goddess freed from faithless love / offers this and asks her to be grateful to him in spirit.”
pain.” This ties into the idea of Marathus being representative of the ever-changing aspect of love, love as a fickle thing, that can change us, and that itself changes often. These poems fall into a grander idea of changes in love, as they are intermixed with poems about Delia, and so this becomes a more ‘meta’ idea of changing love, because it is not only doing so within the Marathus poems themselves, but also throughout the book, which is jumping around between love interests.\footnote{Nikoloutsos 2007, 77.}

In a more general sense the character of Tibullus can be interpreted in multiple different ways. Nikoloutsos argues that Marathus’ gender fluidity can be used to shed more light on that same aspect of Tibullus’ own way of being.\footnote{Nikoloutsos 2010.} This is to say that perhaps this is more of a reflection on the real Tibullus, and that this is an outlet for these feelings. This argument certainly has some validity, although it is an issue that really has little to back it. It could be argued that his feelings of rejection and anger in 1.9 could contribute to this argument. However, this merely serves to lessen the role of Marathus and has no real impact aside from that. One must also note that given Marathus’ prominence this seems unlikely to be merely a question of sexual confusion.

Another intriguing theory regarding Marathus, and the adjectives used to describe him, is that much of the character modelling of Marathus circles around the difference between tener (soft) and durus (hard), adjectives which can also represent Elegy, and Epic, and the difference therein.\footnote{Ibid.} The fact that he is changing between these two perhaps then can be taken to mean that a poet may go back and forth between them. However, Tibullus’ portrayal of Marathus as being better suited to being tener may be indicative of the fact that he believes that love belongs more in elegy, or even more so that Elegy is a superior form of poetics.

It can also be argued that Marathus, in truth, does not change roles at all, his role is just expanded, and altered, while still remaining essentially the same. In the first poem he is the beloved, the one who is torturing Tibullus with his love. In 1.8 he is still the beloved, however he has become the lover as well. In this he becomes a new type of elegiac character, one who is both sought after, and who is seeking another. This allows Marathus to be the elegist and Tibullus to step out of the love-sick shoes and to become the teacher. In the 1.9 it is again different because Marathus’ love situation has changed, but this time it is for the reason that he has found someone to replace Tibullus, he has found a new Tibullus in the form of an old rich man. In so doing he becomes the object of affection for two characters at the same time. With all this in mind, one can see that although Marathus changes, at the core he remains one who is sought after throughout the entirety of the cycle.
When discussing the interpretation of Marathus, and the Marathus cycle, one can also consider its impact from a more historical point of view. One must consider the following question, “is it significant to look at the issues in poetry as being indicative of the views regarding these same concepts in Rome at the time?” This is unlikely, because that assumes that ideas and events in poetry represent the world outside the poet as would a mirror. However, this is not the way of things, it could potentially be, but this is not something that can be assumed to be the case because it is not so by necessity, it merely depends on the poet and style. And especially in a style so deeply entrenched in love and gender roles as Elegy is, it is difficult to countenance the idea that these can be interpreted as being applicable outside of the poetic universe itself.\textsuperscript{22}

Despite this inherent distance between poetry and reality, some have argued that the Marathus poems can be used to learn about the functioning of pederasty in Rome at this time. It seems difficult to countenance that the Marathus cycle is indicative of the general functioning of pederasty in the ancient world. Its nonchalant inclusion, and seeming fluid entry into the book (along with all of the other poetry, by others, with homosexual aspects) is perhaps indicative of the level to which the practice is widespread and perhaps how accepted these acts were. However, Tibullus’ interactions with Marathus as a whole should not be used as an archetype for understanding pederastic relations in Rome. It must be kept in mind that this is poetry, and that all characters are a part of that poetic framework, as such it cannot be assumed that any character is necessarily based on a real person, or that any events or actions are reflective of the society’s “way of being.” By doing this one undervalues the true merit of the poetry itself and lessens its poetic importance for an easy route to thin historical extrapolations. A poem is not meant to be indicative of the world around you in every way, if it were then it would be history. This is not to say that it does not contain aspects of the outside world, or that there are not statements being made by the author, perhaps through his poetry, about aspects of his society (such as political dissatisfaction and the like). Nonetheless, these must still be taken within the poetic context and not as a historical document which can be dissected for its factual breakdown of habits and events. One must keep in mind the themes that the author is discussing, and that it is likely the author is attempting to wade through those concepts and ideas, as opposed to them trying to give a proper representation of whether male slaves were in fact treated as is described in the poem.\textsuperscript{23}

To further these points, it is important to note, that when discussing poetry in

\textsuperscript{22} Nikoloustos 2007, 70.

\textsuperscript{23} However, if it can be discovered, how this was seen by those who encountered it contemporaneously can be potentially used to understand the validity of these aspects, based on how shocked and outraged, or even uncaring, they were by its inclusion or descriptions.
the ancient world, that one must consider aspects of inter-textuality. It is believed that Callimachus may have been the source of Tibullus’ homoerotic Marathus cycle. The idea of inter-textuality, aside from being important for the understanding of intent, also takes away from the argument about learning historical fact from poems. If an author is adding some aspect of their poem as a reference to another who was in a completely different society and situation, then these things can only be viewed within this sort of shared world of poetry. Many scholars have also regarded elegists as being “thoroughly hellenistic in their use of technique and their deployment of themes and motifs; despite the fact that Tibullus is certainly unique in his approach to them.”

If this is truly the case then these ideas do not represent the times at all, and Tibullus is in fact keeping up a poetic theme by their inclusion.

On the subject of inter-textuality, there is something to be said for Marathus’ complexity. Namely that, at least in part, it comes from Catullus 99, which introduces a level of depth in the “motif of ‘boy rejects a man’s erotic advances.’” In this way Catullus opens up a way for Tibullus to give Marathus the leeway to be a varied character. There are other ancient poets that talk about boy-love, such as Vergil’s second eclogue; however the importance of these on the actual character of Marathus is questionable.

Two final interpretive thoughts are that Marathus in some ways could be said to work as a vehicle for Tibullus’ poetic persona to speak to itself, and to give himself advice (to function as his own magister amoris (master of love), and not simply one who instructs those around him). Marathus in 1.8 goes through things that Tibullus has gone through, and so he empathizes. The second is that Marathus as a changing character allows Tibullus to interact with different aspects of the Elegiac tradition directly, all conveniently embodied by a single figure.

In conclusion, through the Marathus cycle, a meagre three poems, Tibullus has managed to push the boundaries of the Elegiac tradition, and redefine the roles of Elegy, as well as to make profound statements about love itself. In some ways it seems that he attempted to re-imagine these concepts by attempting to keep everything within their confines, and so reordered them from within. In 1.4 he introduced the idea of a gender role defying character, in both Priapus, and in Marathus, allowing himself to step outside of his restrictions and become more than merely a lamenting poet-lover. In 1.8, with brilliant subtlety he showed that the genders could be subverted, through the use of ambiguity, then followed this by allowing a poetic character to step out and emerge as a poet in his own right. Completing this tale, in 1.9 he brought everything full circle, and showed that

24 Verstraete 2005, 302, 304.
25 Ibid, 303.
26 Ibid, 308.
the cycle continues ever on, and that this is just one moment in a perpetual sequence, a path that Elegy, and even love itself, goes through. Through all of this Marathus can be seen in many different ways, depending on the viewpoint, however he is surely a defining character for Tibullus and for Elegy as a whole because of the novelty of his existence, and the variability and depth that he brings to the genre.

Michael Ostroff
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In 121 BC, Gaius Sempronius Gracchus and his followers decided to occupy the Aventine during a final standoff against the Senate’s authority. The consul of that year, Lucius Opimius, led the attack that proved fatal to thousands of Gaius’ followers and to Gaius himself, who met his end at the hands of his slave.\(^1\) It is now generally accepted that Gaius’ retreat to the Aventine was an appeal to the tradition of the so-called “secession of the plebs.” Our modern interpretation follows closely the discourse of ancient sources, and although admittedly consistent, this theory nevertheless fails to address other potential connections between the Aventine and Gaius. I propose to study the topology of the Aventine and three temples in particular: the temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque, the Temple of Diana and the Temple of Libertas. By looking into the temples’ history and appearance, I will argue that each temple reflects a different facet of Gaius’ persona through connections to his office, to his political program and to his family’s political convictions. These new connections open new avenues to interpret Gaius’ decision to occupy the Aventine.

To visualize this area on the Aventine, let us first briefly summarize here the general topographical location of the temples. The Aventine is the southernmost hill of Rome’s seven hills. It lies southeast of the Tiber river and is composed of two summits, Aventinus Maior and Aventinus Minor, separated by a distinct cleft.\(^2\) It is generally accepted that the temple of Diana, the oldest temple on the Aventine, was located on the Aventine plateau, facing east.\(^3\) As for the Temple of Libertas, however, its precise location on the Aventine is unknown.\(^4\) Finally, the Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque,\(^5\) a temple dedicated to three...
grain deities, stood on the northern slope.

The Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque would have been the first temple seen by people coming from the Forum and may have reminded people of tribuniciam legitimacy and sacrosanctity. The cult of Ceres, in fact, played an integral role in the legitimation of the tribunate through its ties with the “first secession of the plebs.” Traditional literary elements, along with the unsuitability of the solution to the original causes of the crisis have led historians to argue that the “first secession” is actually a creation by annalists of the end of the 3rd century, beginning of 2nd century BC, who anachronistically transposed their contemporary political reality to the past to explain the origin of the tribunate and legitimize the office in the broader theme of the struggle of orders.

Regardless of the origins of the symbolism surrounding the “first succession”, strong connections now exist between the cult of Ceres and the tradition of the “first secession” of the plebs. Tradition has the temple vowed by dictator A. Postumius Albus after consultation of the Sibylline books during a famine in 499/496 BC. However, the temple was only dedicated by consul Spurius Cassius in 493 BC—the very same year the “first secession of the plebs” ended and the plebian tribune was created. Several annalists also claim the secession happened on the Aventine and not on the Mons Sacer. From this synchronism of date and place, there is a strong indication of a close association in the Romans’ minds between the foundation of the cult and the first act of the political

---

Ceres, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 82-83. The phrase “after the turning points” defines the location on the western end of east to west axis of the spina, the central divider of the track. The starting points are located in the western part of the Circus and the phrase “above the starting points” places the temple in the south end of a north to south axis. Both geographical indication combine, the temple is located on the northern slope of the Aventine (Spaeth 83).

6 The famous parabola attributed to Agrippa Meninus is in fact borrowed from Greek literature see Gary Forsythe, A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War, (University of California: Berkley, 2005), 173.

7 In the narration, an essentially economical problem, the debt level, is resolved by a political solution, the creation of the tribunate (Forsythe 173).

8 Forsythe 173.

9 Tac, Ann 2.49; Dion Hal 6.17.2-4.

10 Dion. Hal. 6.94.3.

11 The connection is very similar to the coincidence whereby the temple of Jupiter Maximus is vowed the year of the establishment of the republic by the first consul instead of the third year of the republic as some ancient sources report (Forsythe 173).

12 Forsythe 173; Livy, actually, in his narration of the event mentions that the early historian Piso, one of his sources, declared that “the plebian went to the Aventine” (Livy 2.32).
organization of the plebs, that is, the first secession.\textsuperscript{13} This close association is further supported by the transmission of the secession tradition into the cult \textit{ludi}. One tradition had the annual \textit{ludi}, part of the vow for the Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque.\textsuperscript{14} The Cerealia, the festival in honor of Ceres, was held between the 12th and 19\textsuperscript{th} of April and the celebrations were composed of \textit{ludi scaenici} [stage games], the first to be held in Rome, and \textit{ludi Circenses} [games presented in the circus] on the very last day.\textsuperscript{15} During those \textit{ludi scaenici}, early historical traditions like the “first secession” were performed in \textit{fabula praetexta}.\textsuperscript{16} Over time, successive Cerealia, stories were received into the Romans’ consciousness, then into Roman history.\textsuperscript{17} Similarly, secession tradition would have become part of the plebs’ social consciousness and later history. The cult of Ceres, in its annual celebration, then served as a vehicle to broadcast the legitimation of the tribune.

However, the role of the cult, and its symbolism, does not end there. Tradition dictates that soon after the return of the plebs and the creation of the tribunate, the law of sacrosanctity was passed to render the office of plebian tribune “sacred and inviolable.”\textsuperscript{18} Three punishments were thus outlined for the murderer of a tribune: he will be accursed, his property will be given to the goddess Ceres, and the person who kills the murderer will be ritually cleansed of the killing.\textsuperscript{19} From this passage it is clear that Ceres, the goddess of the underworld in early roman religion, acts as the depository for the property of the tribune’s murderer. The protective role of the goddess extends further. Barbara Spaeth argues that Ceres also acts as the recipient of a \textit{consecratio capitis} of the murderer.\textsuperscript{20} Following Spaeth’s interpretation, the role of the goddess Ceres in protecting the tribune is then twofold; not only is she the divine recipient of the property of the tribune’s murderer, but also of his head, and her temple acts as the physical recipient of all those consecrations, and thus is the physical representation of the tribune’s inviolability.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} Spaeth 91.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Dion. Hal. 7. 10.1, 17.2.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Ovid \textit{Fas.} 4.679-680.
\item \textsuperscript{16} T.P. Wiseman, \textit{Remus: A Roman Myth}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 132. He notes that by the time of the dramaturge Naevius in the third century, there was a flourishing of Roman historical drama, \textit{fabula praetexta}, (Wiseman, \textit{Remus}, 132), which Varro, is quoted by St Augustine, describes as “particularly suited to the theater” (Augustine, \textit{CD}, 6.5-7).
\item \textsuperscript{17} Wiseman 139.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Dion. Hal. 6.89.2-4.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Ibid. 6.89.3
\item \textsuperscript{20} She reads “accursed” from Dionysus passage as “consecrated” and thus the “accursed” murderer is to suffer “consecration of his head”, an offering Ceres is known to have received from another law dealing with damage to harvests according to Pliny (Spaeth 89).
\end{itemize}
To sum up, the Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque is a symbol of tribunician legitimacy and sacrosanctity through its connection with the “first secession” of the plebs and the role of the goddess Ceres as guardian of a tribune’s inviolability. The symbolism of the Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque then opens new ways of explaining Gracchus’ occupation of the Aventine in 121 BC. It first confirms the commonly accepted interpretation of Gaius’ actions as an appeal to the tradition of the first secession of the plebs because of the close association between the temple and the tradition. His gesture would have very likely been understood as emulation of the secession; his was a new battle that places him in the greater narrative of the struggle of orders. Gracchus’ demonstration was also to remind the Romans of his position as tribune of the plebs, an office he held twice. In the Romans’ minds, there would very likely have been a connection between the Aventine, the Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque, the office of the tribune, and Gaius’ role as tribune. By establishing such a connection, Gaius hoped to scare his attackers. His opponents would have certainly understood the warning as they passed by the temple:21 whoever kills Gaius – although admittedly was the tribune at the time, but remembered as such - would be punished accordingly. Ultimately, Gaius’ probable appeal to the inviolability of the tribune betray his desire to stay alive.

The Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque did not, however, only represent a symbol for the office of tribune. It was also a symbol for one of Gracchus’s major legislations, *Lex Sempronia Frumenta*. There was, in fact, a close association between Temple of Ceres and the distribution of grain to the urban poor. Varro in the first century BC, quoted in Nonius, noted: “Those who lacked wealth and had fled to the asylum of Ceres were given bread.”22 Assuming “the asylum of Ceres” refers to the Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque,23 the passage clearly testifies to the free distribution of bread, or perhaps grain (*frumentalia*) to make bread for the poor. It also suggests that the distribution of grain or bread for the poor would have taken place at the temple. This idea fits perfectly into the theory that the Temple of Ceres was the headquarters of the plebian aediles,24 whose jobs, as described by Cicero, was *Suntoque aediles curatores urbis annonae ludorumque sollemnium, ollisque*

---

21 One late tradition by Orosius has D. Brutus, one of the leaders opposed to C. Gracchus lead the attack against the Gracchus’ men following the *clivus Publica* (Orosius 12.7). The *clivus Publica* is known to begin in the *Forum Bovarium* (Livy 27.37), at the west end of the Circus Maximus and extended south across the Aventine (Livy 26.10). The Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque located on the northern slope of the Aventine, past the west end of the Circus Maximus, may very likely have been on the road Brutus followed. No other sources report such details from the attack and thus Orosius’s late account, though following the Appian and Plutarch tradition, may be doubted.


23 Spaeth 39. Also, there is a tradition in which the Temple of Ceres acts as a refuge for the urban poor.

24 Livy 3.55.13.
ad honoris amplioris gradum is primus ascensus esto.\textsuperscript{25} also served as headquarters of the administration of the grain supply, \textit{annona}. The Temple of Ceres, the goddess of grain, is in Roman tradition the place where grains were distributed to the urban poor.

The tradition of \textit{frumentalia} was actually instituted by the \textit{Lex Sempronia frumentaria} proposed by C. Gracchus in 123 BC during his first tribunate.\textsuperscript{26} It is a landmark law because, as noted by ancient sources,\textsuperscript{27} it was the first time there was regular corn distribution in Rome. The law provided a monthly distribution of grain to Roman citizens at the fixed price of six and one-third \textit{asses} for a \textit{modius}.\textsuperscript{28} It seems to have been an effort to counter the grain shortage in Rome due to a bad harvests in Africa, and to control the price of grain in Rome.\textsuperscript{29} Since the practice of the \textit{frumentalia} was associated with the Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque, and might even have been administrated from the temple, it was thus a symbol for Gracchus’ landmark legislation and for his legacy.

The Temple of Diana also acts as a symbol of C. Gracchus’ legislative program. Indeed, two bronze tablets of law in the temple directly appeal to legislation projects carried out by Gracchus. Ancient sources in fact agree that the temple was funded by the Latin league\textsuperscript{30} and was built in Rome during the rule of King Servius Tullius.\textsuperscript{31} Dionysus of Halicarnassus reports that the sacred law regarding the mutual rights of the cities and describing the cult’s sacrificial procedure was written and erected on a bronze pillar.\textsuperscript{32} This law is known as the \textit{Lex Arae Dianae}. Dionysius later states that the pillar and the bronze tablet, carved with archaic letters, still existed by his time.\textsuperscript{33} Whether such a document really survived for such a length of time is arguable, though not impossible.\textsuperscript{34} If the documents had survived, problems would eventually have arisen from historians’ inability to read the
ancient language. In order to explain the context of the text, late annalists consequently invented a tradition in which the Latin tribes were important allies of Rome and set apart through special mutual rights of worship. This tradition of the Latin people's special connection to the Romans ultimately expressed itself politically through the attempted Lex sociis et nomine Latino, which seems to have been introduced in the middle of 122 BC, during Gaius's second tribunate. Contrary to Velleius’ statement that Gaius “was for giving the citizenship to all the people of Italy and expanding it as far as the Alps,” the law, in fact, just opened citizenship for the Latins. Appian explicitly reports: “Gaius invited the Latins to share fully in all the rights of the Romans.” The other allies were just promising to receive such rights later on. Through their connecting tradition, the Lex Arae Dianae and the Lex sociis et nomine Latino echo through time; the older law is an appeal to the new project of law and vice versa. Consequently, the Temple of Diana, therefore, with its bronze tablet of the Lex Arae Dianae, then became a symbol for Gracchus’ citizenship project, which was never to become law.

The symbolism does not stop there. Dionysius also mentions the presence of another bronze tablet on which was written the Lex Icilia de Aventino Publicando, which stipulates that public land of the Aventine hill held by patricians be seized and be distributed to the plebians. Considering the previous explanation about textual interpretation of ancient text by Roman historians, it is hard not to interpret the tradition of this law’s passage as out of order from the setting of contemporary agrarian land reforms to explain those land reforms. In any case, whether or not the historicity of the passage is doubted, Lex Icilia de Aventino Publicando still constitutes the first example of land distribution to the plebs in Roman history by proposing a new solution to the problem of landless citizen. It is also a precursor to C. Gracchus’ own agrarian law. Ancient literary sources about Gaius’ law are scarce. Epigraphic evidence from the agrarian law of 111 BC, however, implies
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35 Forsythe 73.
36 Ibid. 74.
37 The name of this law is known from Cicero describing a speech given by Fannius, consul of 122 BC, against Gracchus’ law; see Stockton 239.
38 Stockton 157.
39 Vell. Patr., 2.6.2.
40 App., BC, 1.23.2. This statement is further supported by a phrase in a fragment from the speech that the consul Fannius gave against the law: “si Latinis civitatem dederitis…” see ORF 144.
41 Dion. Hal. 10.32. 3-5.
42 Appian does not mention the law at all but seems to imply it in his context, Plutarch has a very short and
that C. Gracchus’ law was more potent than the one proposed by his brother Tiberius.\footnote{C.G. Bruns, \textit{Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui}, (7th edition, Tubingen, 1909) 11, line 22.} It has been speculated that this law gave more power to commissioners to deal with \textit{ager publicus populi Romani} outside Italy and to create colonies throughout the empire,\footnote{Stockton 132.} all for the benefit of the landless Roman citizens. The idea of creating colonies outside of Italy was new for the time, just like the \textit{Lex Icilia de Aventino Publicando} was new at its time. Both were landmark laws that echo through time because of their new solutions to a timeless problem. The Temple of Diana, therefore, because it housed within its walls the first revolutionary agrarian law, acted as a reminder of Gracchus’ own revolutionary agrarian law.

To conclude, the Temple of Diana may have reminded people of Gaius’ legislation program. Two bronze tablets in the temple recorded laws that appeal to the Gracchan legislation program. The \textit{Lex Arae Dianae} evokes the \textit{lex sociis et nomine Latino} through the perpetuation of the Latin tradition. The \textit{Lex Icilia de Aventino Publicando} strongly appeals to Gracchus’ \textit{Lex agrarian} because of shared novelty. In light of these connections, the symbolism of Gracchus’ occupation of the Aventine, and especially of the Temple of Diana, further deepens. This temple, superbly located, acted as a direct reminder to everyone of Gracchus’ legislative program that favored of the people.

Gaius’s political convictions are embodied in the Temple of Libertas. This temple indeed acts as a reminder of the Sempronii Gracchi’s history and ideology. As tribune of the plebs in 246 BC, Gaius’s great grandfather, T. Sempronius Gracchus, built the Temple to Libertas on the Mons Aventinus.\footnote{Gell. \textit{NA} 10,6; Liv. 24,16,19 : He financed the construction from a fine imposed to Claudia, daughter of Appius Caecus (cons. 307 BC/296 BC) for indecent speech, together with other funds.} As with the Basilica Amelia, associated with the Amelius family and heavily used in their political propaganda,\footnote{In 78 B.C., the consul M. Aemilius Lepidus decorated the basilica Aemilia with engraved shields or portraits of his ancestors see Plin. \textit{NH} XXV.13. His son, Lepidus, for a coin, \textit{triumvir monetalis} about 65 represents it as a two-storied porticus on which shields are hung with the legend M. Lepidus \textit{reflecta} \textit{s(enatus) c(onsulto)} as the mean of family propaganda.} the temple would very likely have been associated with the Sempronius Gracchus family. T. Gracchus’ son of the same name (cons. 215-212 BC), further accentuates this connection through his gift of a painting. After his victory over Hannibal in 214 BC during the Second Punic War, he ordered a painting.\footnote{Livy 24,16, 7-9.} According to Livy, the painting is said to have depicted the victorious...
volones, slave soldiers, dining in the streets of Beneventum after the battle. The painting commemorates the victory. Livy’s account, the sole attestation of the painting, has been doubted. However, Koortbojan, in his study of the painting, reviews the evidence and successfully ascertains the worth of the account. He notes that Livy himself quite possibly saw the painting since the Temple of Libertas was part of Augustus reparation program. He argues for the longevity of the painting based on Varro’s account of seeing in the first century BC the Picta Italiae, set up in 210 BC in the Temple Tellus. By accepting Livy’s account and thus the existence of the painting, the temple itself, with such decoration, consequently becomes a monument to the glory of the Gracchi. It is a lasting reminder of their glorious past.

The painting, however, also plays another important role. Livy, in his description of the celebratory scene says: pilleati aut lana alba velatis capitibus volones epulati sunt, alii accubantes, alii stantes qui simul ministrabant uescebanturque. The emphasis on slave soldiers wearing the pilleus and the lana alba velatis capitibus, two symbols of libertas, highlights Gracchus’ decision to grant promised liberty to all slaves; fighters and deserters alike. However, for Koortbojan, the desire to represent such a scene would have stemmed from a desire to give an exemplum, a moral of conduct, a visual representation of deeds to emulate. The painting in the Temple of Libertas, then, not only serves as a commemoration of Gracchus’ grant of libertas, but also places it as a deed ready for imitation by other generations and as a mos maiorum (ancestral custom) to follow. It consequently sets an ethos for the family and the Temple of Libertas as a symbol of the Gracchan ideology.

In 121 BC, when Gaius occupied the Aventine, the connection to the temple and its painting would have very likely been evident. If so, Gaius’ actions then had a deeper significance. By occupying the Aventine, Gaius was first able to appeal to the glorious
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48 Ibid. 24,16,9.
50 Ibid. 36.
51 Ibid. 36; He also defends Livy detailed narration and the significance of the depicted event by exploring the possibility of the painting containing details of the story, despite its one scene composition and by alluding to a similar triumph in 179BC see Koortbojian 37.
52 Livy 24.16.
53 RE, s.v. ‘Pileus’ (R. Kreis-von Schaewen).
54 RE, s.v. ‘Lana’, col. 598 for the woolen pileus (Kroll).
55 Koortbojian 40.
past of his family, who served Rome with the highest distinctions. He could also appeal to the *exemplum*, reminding his opponents of this *mos maiorum*. *Libertas* has various interpretations for Romans, but the liberties of citizens are assured by certain basic rights, among them the *ius provocationis*, a protection against magisterial coercion.\(^{56}\) To grant liberty is in a certain sense to ensure the respect of those rights. In that sense, C. Gracchus was then very likely making a claim to a fair judgment of the situation. Finally, Gaius could claim to be himself a true defender of *libertas populi Romani*. He protected people’s right to freedom by, on one hand, enacting the civic right to tribunician help, *auxilium*,\(^{57}\) and on the other hand, by ensuring a greater repartition of wealth and power among the Roman society through his legislations.\(^{58}\) Through this claim, Gaius then would have almost certainly positioned himself in the narrative of the struggle of orders.

In conclusion, through a topographical study of the Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque, the Temple of Diana, and the Temple of Libertas on the Aventine hill, I have attempted to argue that each temple reflects different facets of Gaius’ persona through connections to his office, to his political program and to his family’s political convictions. Located on the northern slope of the Aventine hill, the Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque is first a symbol of tribunician legitimacy and sacrosanctity. Through its historical and geographical ties with the so-called “first secession” of the plebs, the cult of Ceres played an important role in the legitimation of the office of the plebian tribune- an office that Gaius held twice in 123 BC and 122 BC respectively. By law, the goddess Ceres also acts as a guardian of the sacrosanctity of the tribunate. As the cult center for the goddess of grain, the Temple of Ceres, Liber, Liberaque, is furthermore a potent reminder of Gaius’ legislation on regular corn distribution, the *Lex Sempronia frumentaria*. The Temple of Diana, on the Aventine plateau, further embodies Gaius’ legal legacy. Two bronze tablets in the temple recorded laws that appeal to the Gracchan legislative program; the *Lex Arae Dianae* evoking the *Lex sociis et nomine Latino* through the common connection with Latin tradition. The *Lex Icilia de Aventino Publicando* strongly appeals to Gracchus’ *Lex agrarian* because of the common agrarian theme and novel approach to the land problem. Finally, the Temple of Libertas embodies the Gracchan family *ethos*, through its dedication by Gaius’ great-grandfather and through the *exemplum* of *libertas* set up by the Gaius’ grandfather. Those new highlighted connections now open new avenues to interpret and to explain Gaius’ decision of occupying the Aventine. Gaius is not longer just trying to appeal to and to emulate the so-called “first secession of the plebs,” he is also promoting himself

\(^{56}\) Henrik Mouritsen, *Plebs and Politic in the Late Roman Republic*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001),10

\(^{57}\) Ibid. 10

\(^{58}\) Ibid. 10; the use of *libertas* against oligarchy is common in the *populares* discourse.
and his legacy while at the same time appealing to save his own life.

Samuel Sigere
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In Plato’s *Theaetetus*, Socrates considers the way in which perceptions are experienced by each. When one perceives a table, there is an awareness of its brown color, its woody smell, its smooth texture, and so on. But what, asks Socrates, is the relationship between these various perceptions? He tells us that it would be strange if the way in which perceptions are present within us turned out to be similar to the way in which the individual Greek heroes were present inside the Trojan horse – some over here, others over there, but none of them sharing anything in common save for the fact that they were inside the vehicle. Socrates thinks that if this were the case, we would serve as a vessel for the various perceptions of our senses, but there would be no unifying factor that could turn this plurality of sense perceptions into the experiences of single objects with which we are familiar. To return to the initial example, if perceptions were present within me as the heroes were present within the Trojan horse, I would not perceive a single, unified table, but would instead have in my experience some patch of brown color, in addition to an unrelated woody smell, in addition to some smooth texture, etc. What allows me to experience all these perceptions as being attributes of one table? Plato invokes the soul as the higher order agent responsible for organizing the plurality of sensations we encounter. More significantly, it is the rational part of the soul that supervenes on the senses and allows for the determination of things like ‘being,’ ‘similarity,’ and ‘difference.’

After Plato, philosophers are still concerned with explaining how it is that we are able to distinguish the various classes of sensible object and how we are aware of the activity of our own senses when in fact they are active. Chief among those who deal with this issue are Aristotle (384-322BC) and the Aristotelian commentator Alexander of Aphrodisias (circa 200AD). Unlike Plato, both Aristotle and Alexander think that sensation by itself is able to do things like determine differences between sensible objects before thinking (i.e. reflection or inferential acts) enter into the picture. Additionally, if the activity of distinguishing and unifying is an act accomplished by sensation itself, then the body plays a much more fundamental role in the sensation of unified objects than Plato envisaged for it. Aristotle and Alexander both hold what they call the ‘common sense’ (κοινή αἴσθησις or the sensus communis in the Scholastics) as responsible for the unified sensory experience we have of objects. The common sense is also on their account responsible for our cognizance of the differences between the five modes of sensation.

The foregoing is but one of the philosophical problems associated with sensation.
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1 Plat. *Theaet.* 184d.

2 As is common practice, I treat Socrates’ opinions as being also endorsed by Plato, while of course acknowledging that these were two distinct individuals, historically speaking.

3 Although later philosophers will make a distinction between perception and sensation, this is not the case in Aristotle or Alexander, and so I use the terms as if they had the same meaning.

4 From Arist. *De An.* III.2, 426b10 “With what do we perceive that they [sensible qualities] are different? It must be by sense...”

5 They also argue that the five modes of sensation are all the modes of sensation that there are. See below.
that Aristotle and Alexander discuss following treatments by earlier Greek philosophers such as Plato and Socrates. This paper will compare and contrast Aristotle’s account of the common sense and other problems regarding sensation as they are found in *De Anima* III.1-26 and elsewhere with Alexander’s account of this subject as it is found in his own *De Anima*. I have distilled three additional philosophical problems addressed in both Aristotle’s and Alexander’s accounts; this paper will be a careful examination of the similarities and differences between Aristotle’s and Alexander’s treatments of each of these problems. Alexander is unique among the extant Aristotelian commentators in that he (apparently) has no ulterior philosophical agenda informing or guiding his reading of Aristotle. Still, Alexander’s handling of these problems does in some cases differ from Aristotle’s. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to detail precisely how Alexander’s own philosophical position differs from that of Aristotle, the interpretive bases informing Alexander’s reading of Aristotle can at least be gestured at by careful examination of the ways in which he departs from Aristotle’s text. Finally, I will explore some possible explanations for these departures.

**The Special Senses**

What is the nature of our different powers of sensation? Are they just instruments, “looking glasses” for the soul by which we relate to the outside world? Or do they have some of their own internal structures, so that they would act on sensibles (αἰσθηταί) in their own right, delivering to the soul not some “bare givens,” but always an already structured item? Alexander begins his discussion of the special senses (ἰδιᾳ αἰσθήσεις) by giving a definition of sense itself. “A sense is a power of the soul which, through the instrumentality of certain sense organs, receives and discriminates sensible species separated from their substrate matter.” This definition will be important for the problem concerning the perception of perception examined below. What is important at this point is the language of instrumentality. This language harks back to Plato’s *Theaetetus*, where Plato stated that the senses are akin to instruments used by the soul for the end of perception. I don’t point this out to argue that Alexander is harboring Platonist sympathies. Instead I mention this affinity because it will be relevant later when I try to distinguish Alexander’s stance on the status of the common sense from Aristotle’s. To foreshadow that distinction briefly, we can say that Aristotle’s common sense is simply the special senses acting as one unified whole at an undivided instant, as is Alexander’s. But Alexander, by using this language of “instrumentality” and by later speaking of the common sense as an “ultimate power”
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6 Where a primary discussion of sensation takes place.
9 Plat. *Theaetetus* 185d.
that “employs” the special senses, gives a more robust and independent weight to the common sense. Aristotle’s views on the common sense in his *De Anima*, however, are quite minimalist and one will not find the language of instrumentality or ultimate power/faculty in the relevant passages. I will address this issue more fully below.

For both Aristotle and Alexander, a special sense can by itself discern differences within the class of sensible objects for which it is specialized. This is an important point, whether they are differences between sensibles in the same class or differences between the special senses themselves, difference in both these cases is apprehended by sense, not by reason or thinking or something else that someone like Plato might suggest. This point having been made, Alexander is then concerned with the case of a particular specific sense perceiving contraries. He states that the special senses are like media such as air and water. Media can convey contraries like white and black without issue since the media itself is not a passive recipient nor is it a material subject that can be both white and black simultaneously. Alexander presumably thinks that the case of the media just described is analogous to the case of the special senses. They too are media and thus can perfectly well ‘convey’ contraries to the ultimate sense organ or ultimate sense power. Alexander has addressed the concern as to how the individual senses can perceive contraries. Contraries are in a way present in the individual senses but not in the way that one can predicate contraries of the individual specific senses, just as one cannot predicate black and white of air which serves as a medium for black and white. Though he solves the issue as it is found in the special senses, Alexander has pushed the real question back, for the contraries that the special senses (conceived as media) convey must end up somewhere. Indeed, they end up at the ultimate sense organ and thereafter the common sense and Alexander will wind up saying something along the following lines; the matterless form of the contraries is received by the common sense and although the common sense ‘is’ both of the contraries at one and the same moment, in another way the common sense that possesses these forms of the sensible object is not a subject of which we can really predicate black and white.

The most important point regarding the special senses is that sense itself is able apprehend difference. To answer the question which began this section, the senses themselves do not act as a transparent window into the world. Instead, like a prism, they structure and discriminate the items of perception before reflection begins to attend to them. Keep in mind, however, that the special senses can apprehend only differences within their respective class of objects. What enables perception of the difference between the special senses themselves is not as clear. We must perceive that we are one, individual being that nevertheless perceives with multiple, different special senses. Aristotle and Alexander both
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11 Ibid. 16.2.48, 14-16.
12 Arist. *De An.* III.2, 426b8-10; Alex.Aphr. *De Anima*, 16.2.41, 10-15.
13 Alex. Aphr. *De Anima*, 16.2.47.
14 Whether the contraries are received by the ultimate sense organ, the heart, and then in a subsequent moment transmitted to the common sense or if said contraries are received by the common sense and the ultimate sense organ concomitantly is not clear, at least in the case of Alexander. Cf. Alex. Aphr. *De Anima*, 16.2.51, and 16.2.52.
15 Alex. Aphr. *De Anima*, 16.2.41.
believe that the faculty which allows for this unity in multiplicity is not in the soul. But before we can address the way in which they deal with that problem, we need to turn to the problem of the number of senses.

**On the Number of Senses**

It is common knowledge that we have five modes of sensing the world – sight, smell, taste, touch, and sound – but what if there were some additional sense that could give us access to otherwise unknowable phenomena? If that were the case, there would be objects human beings were unable to know because they lacked the necessary sense. In order to avoid such a disheartening epistemological limit, Aristotle and Alexander will argue that there are no more senses than the ones human beings possess. The philosophers discuss this issue after having already examined the five special senses.\(^{16}\) Striking here is the fact that they have completely different arguments for why this is the case. Aristotle maintains that each sense-organ wherein a particular sense inheres can be composed out of either of two of the four elements, water or air.\(^{17}\) Aristotle thinks that if we have examined all the sense organs composed out of water and air and the sense powers which inhere in them then there will be no sense powers left unaddressed. This is because all unique powers of sense must have a corresponding organ, and there are no sense organs left unconsidered if our examination of water and/or air sense organs was exhaustive.\(^{18}\) Barring discovery of some fifth element, a possibility Aristotle does consider,\(^{19}\) there are no senses except the ones Aristotle had discussed in book II of his *De Anima*.

Alexander’s line of argument is quite different, although he does rely on some of Aristotle’s claims. He says nothing about the elements or about what the sense organs of the body are composed of in this context. It is worth remarking that his discussion of the number of senses is the very last section of his chapter on the senses and the sections preceding this discussion are largely unrelated. It seems as if Alexander did not have occasion to mention this issue and so he addressed it at the end merely for completeness’ sake. He gives three quick arguments for why his enumeration of the senses is complete.\(^{20}\) For the first, he states that even a highly developed creature could not possess more sense organs than the most highly developed creatures (i.e. man) now actually possess. Relying on Aristotle’s claim\(^ {21}\) that absence of a sense necessarily entails absence of a sense organ, Alexander concludes that if no more sense organs are possible than what there are now then there can be no more senses than those which now exist. There are a few issues with this argument. Most pertinent is the fact that Aristotle does not say at the referenced line that
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\(^{16}\) Aristotle’s discussion of this runs from *De An.* III.1 424b20 until 425a12. Alexander’s discussion is in chapter 16, section 2.56 of his *De Anima*.

\(^{17}\) Cf. *Arist.* *De An.* III.

\(^{18}\) *Arist.* *De An.*, III.1, 425a6-7.

\(^{19}\) Ibid. III.1, 425a11-14.

\(^{20}\) Alex. Aphr. *De Anima*, 16.2.56, 5-25.

\(^{21}\) *Arist.* *De An.* III.1 424b25-26.
absence of a sense organ necessarily entails absence of a sense, instead he says that absence of a sense necessarily entails absence of a sense organ.\(^2\) The former may very well be true, but it is not something Aristotle explicitly states there.

The second issue is less pressing but worth touching on. A modern reader would be struck by this argument’s anthropocentrism. Alexander assumes without question that man is the most highly developed creature because he is the only creature with reason (λόγος). While anthropocentric, this assumption is nonetheless still true today. Though other animals display signs of rationality and obviously possess communication capacities, no other known species possesses what the Greeks named with λόγος — the ability to make rational arguments and present grounds for assertions. While ascribing a unique function to human beings has been uncouth since the rise of Darwinism, which thinks of all differences between human beings and animals as being a matter of degree rather than kind, fear of being-uncouth is no good reason to deny plain truth.

The next argument Alexander offers seems to be an empirical one. It is just a fact that no animal has been found to have a sense other than any Alexander has discussed. Just as Aristotle’s argument described above is vulnerable to the discovery of a new element, so too is Alexander’s argument undermined if one day we should discover an animal with a never before seen mode of sensation (a bat or a dolphin, for example). The last argument Alexander employs to prove that his list of the senses is exhaustive is the most interesting. Alexander claims that the most perfect (τελειοτάτην) powers of the soul are only had if a being already possess all the complete forms (τελειότεραι) of lower order powers. In this argument, sensory abilities are lower order powers because they are more vulnerable to error than the higher order power of reason. Since sensation is a lower order power and we in fact possess reason, Alexander concludes that we must have the complete array of sensory abilities.

Providing multiple quick arguments in the place of one longer argument seems to be a consistent approach Alexander has with regard to this portion of Aristotle’s *De Anima*.\(^2\) Perhaps Alexander felt Aristotle’s argument from the number of elements to be unsatisfactory and felt he needed to justify the completeness of the list of senses by other routes. One hesitation Aristotle might have regarding Alexander’s empirical argument is the certainty with which he claims that there is no animal with a yet-to-be-discovered sense. Aristotle himself considers the possibility that a fifth element might be found and undermine his argument and I think he would suggest that Alexander similarly consider the possibility that an animal might be discovered which possesses a new sense.

### Simultaneity and Perceiving Perception

How are we able to perceive the differences *between* our different senses? This

\(^2\) Aristotle makes a similar move in *De An*. III.1. He states at 425a15 that we do not have a special sense organ for the common sensibles but then at 425a20 he writes as if he has argued for us having no special sense. Absence of a sense necessarily involves absence of a sense organ is what he states at 424b25 but does absence of a sense organ necessarily involve absence of a sense? If not, then proving that there is no sense organ will not necessarily entail the absence of a sense.

\(^{23}\) That is, Arist. *De An*. III.1-2.
problem was introduced in the discussion of the special senses, where it was stated that the special senses are not able to apprehend the differences between classes of sensible objects. Aristotle and Alexander think that the faculty which unites our various special senses is the common sense. Unlike Plato’s rational faculty of the soul which unites the special senses at a level higher than sensation itself, the common sense unites the special senses at the level of sensation. What is at stake here is how much intellectual as opposed to bodily activity occurs before we perceive the unified objects around us.

Both Aristotle and Alexander stress the important role simultaneity plays in the common sense’s ability to assess difference between special senses. The two philosophers go to great lengths to show why we must pronounce the difference between two sensible objects which are not in the same class, at one undivided time. Aristotle does this by stating that the time in which this difference is stated is not accidental to our asserting it. This means that if someone is to truly assert the difference between sensible objects which are not of the same class, it is essential that this person make this assertion at a time when both these sensible objects are present to her. If she does not, if she asserts this difference successively, the difference might then be viewed as a result of the sensible objects’ distinct temporal positions. That is to say, it will not be clear how white is different from sweet. This sensible object “white” might very well be different from sweet insofar as white appears in the morning (clouds in the sky) whereas sweet appears in the evening (dessert). But if the time wherein the difference between white and sweet is asserted is a time at which both white and sweet are present then the difference between white and sweet cannot be viewed as a matter of discrepancy in temporal position. This is because the times at which white and sweet appear are identical. Alexander makes a similar point.24

In addition to these arguments, both Aristotle and Alexander put forward an example that is intended to demonstrate the validity of the following claim: that which says that two things are different must be one.25 They both offer the same example concerning two interlocutors. The first member of the two perceives sweet but not white and the second perceives white but not sweet. The interlocutors then presumably communicate their different perceptions to each other. Both Aristotle and Alexander assume without argument that the difference between the two perceived qualities will be readily apparent.26 And both authors believe this scenario demonstrates that whatever perceives a difference between two must be one. Alexander even refers to this ‘perceiver of a difference between two’ as ‘some single agency.’

This argument is obscure and is only a few sentences in length in either author. I make sense of it in the following manner, although the reader should be forewarned that there is a dearth of scholarly consensus on this passage. The case of the two interlocutors perceiving different qualities is analogous to the case of two special senses perceiving their respective qualities in the body of a single person. In the former the different perceptions are ‘made one’ by the fact of the interlocutors’ communication. Informally, I am thinking of communication here as an exchange and combination of perceptions; the
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24 Alex. Aphr. De Anima, 16.2.44.
26 Ibid.
two individual interlocutors’ separate perceptions become one and the same in the medium of discourse (and I take this discourse to in some sense be Alexander’s ‘single agency’). This is similar to the special senses’ separate perceptions becoming a unified experience in a single individual. From the perspective of the single discourse between the interlocutors the difference between each interlocutor’s respective perceived quality is apprehended. In both cases, that which says that two things are different is itself one.\textsuperscript{27} I take it that for Aristotle and Alexander, only an individual or multiple individuals participating in a single discourse can assert difference. If this is true, showing how in both those cases what asserts difference in one is in fact an exhaustive demonstration that what asserts difference between two must always be one. With this accomplished, both Alexander and Aristotle further examine the nature of the entity that asserts a difference between the special senses.

One necessary condition for the assertion of such a difference is self-perception. How can I tell the difference between my sense of sight and my sense of smell if I don’t perceive my sense of sight or sense of smell? Aristotle deals only with the self-perception of seeing but it is likely that he thought that such an account of sight’s self-perception could be extended to the rest of the senses. Aristotle takes it as given that we do see that we see,\textsuperscript{28} and he sets out to explain how this is possible. Either something else sees that sight is seeing or sight sees itself seeing. We can choose either the former or the latter but in either case we will need to eventually suppose some sense which is aware of itself, otherwise we will have to keep positing entities \textit{ad infinitum}. Aristotle says that given this disjunction we must assume this ‘in the first case’\textsuperscript{29} i.e. the first to be aware of itself, i.e. the sight that originally visually perceives objects is able to see itself seeing. But this leads Aristotle to ask the following question: is that which originally sees itself coloured? If it is ‘seen’ by itself and all that can be seen is what is colored, then it itself must be colored if it is to see itself. Aristotle presents two possible solutions to this issue. The first solution has to do with there being a different meaning of “perceive by sight” applicable to the case of sight perceiving itself, and this different meaning does not necessarily entail that the object perceived by this kind of “seeing” is in fact coloured. The second proposed solution does not suggest a different meaning of ‘perceive by sight’ but instead proposes a different meaning of ‘coloured.’ In receiving the form of the sensible object without its matter, sight in some sense “has” the sensible object and would thereby have its colors as well, and the sight which sees seeing would presumably see these colors as possessed by the form of the sensible object as it is “in” seeing. Aristotle here offers a short justification for his claim that sense organs receive the form of sensible objects without the matter by arguing that this would explain how the sensing of an object can continue even when the sense object is absent.

\textsuperscript{27} In some sense it is the case that the example of the interlocutors will ‘decompose’ into two instances of a single individual apprehending the difference between the perceptions or experiences of his own special senses. The qualification here being that one of the perceptions was in some sense acquired or given through discourse, rather than direct sensation. Spelling my thoughts on this out in great detail is not relevant to the purposes of this paper.

\textsuperscript{28} Arist. \textit{De An.} III.2, 425b11.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid. III.2, 425b16-18.
Alexander discusses similar issues in his *De Anima*. We are faced with the same aporia arrived at in the previous section on the special senses. There the issue was concerned with a special sense receiving contraries. The problem was that the same subject (the special sense) would have to be white and black at one and the same time. Alexander sees a solution in asserting that the sense powers do not take on the properties of sensible objects when active, and therefore neither do the sense organs. The pupil itself does not become black or white because sight is not matter that can assume qualities contrary or otherwise. Right away we should notice that this leads Alexander into conflict with Aristotle’s aforementioned claim that sight is in some sense colored. Aristotle of course does not think that sight has matter either, but sight does seem to undergo some kind of change when it receives the form of sensible objects without the matter. Alexander seems to conclude more strongly that sight cannot be colored, perhaps not even in the sense in which Aristotle says it is. But if this is so, then Alexander will have to deal with the same problem Aristotle faced if he is to account for the fact of self-perception; either sight sees itself or some other sense faculty sees sight seeing. Alexander too would then be forced to explain where self-perception comes in to stop the infinite regress Aristotle warns us about at the beginning of *De Anima* III.2. The simple fact of the matter is that Alexander does not come to an obvious solution of this dilemma. Not only does he not seem to see the problem of the infinite regress Aristotle mentions, but Alexander also equivocates on the way in which we receive sensations. Alexander says the qualities of sensible objects come to exist in sense organs just as a reflection of a color comes to exist on the surface of a lake or in a mirror. But he also says that the presence (as a reflection) of a color in a mirror departs as soon as the sensible object bearing this color is removed. If this is true, Alexander here seems to be contradicting Aristotle’s claim that sensations continue to occur even when the object has been removed. Alexander will address this by saying that mirrors and lakes are inanimate bodies as opposed to living bodies. He states that living bodies are affected by objects in a different manner, so perhaps he is taking back the claim we started with, namely that sensibles’ way of being present in sense organs is analogous to a reflection’s way of being present in a mirror or water. Indeed, at the end of section 2.49, it is through the use of the imagination (φαντασία), he says, that sensibles can occur in the body even when the original object that they originated from has been removed. Whatever the case, it is evident that Alexander may have missed the infinite regress problem Aristotle mentions in connection with self-perception and later tries to get out of the problem by altering the definitions he starts with. He does not want sight to be coloured in any sense and yet he needs there to be something like the form of color in the eye in order to explain how sensibles can continue despite the absence of an object. Aristotle’s solution was to simply say that sight *is* in some sense coloured, but he does not spell out exactly what this entails.
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30 Alex. Aphr. *De Anima*, 16.2.46.
31 It is arguable that Aristotle does not do so either. For how satisfactory is the answer “The sight is in some sense colored and in some sense not?”
32 Alex. Aphr. *De Anima*, 16.2.47.
34 Alex. Aphr. *De Anima*, 16.2.49.
This discussion has allowed us to catch sight of Alexander’s attempt to work out Aristotle’s claim that we see our seeing without resorting to Aristotle’s solution.

**Common Sensibles and the Unity of the Common Sense**

The final theme that I will examine deals with the nature of the common sensibles (κοιναί αισθητά) and the common sense that is responsible for perceiving them. The common sensibles are qualities which we perceive, but not on the basis of any special sense. So, while we perceive the special sensible ‘visual quality’ on the basis of sight, we do not perceive the common sensible ‘unified quality’ on the basis of any of the five special senses. Other common sensibles include being, similarity, and difference. Aristotle will claim that I am able to perceive a thing’s being and its similarity to others only on the basis of the common sense.

There are many textual issues regarding Aristotle’s discussion of the common sensibles. Although he does say that the common sensibles are perceived incidentally (κατὰ συμβεβηκός), he also says that they are perceived directly (καθ’ αὐτὰ). Since he seems at *De Anima* III.1 425a20-26 to be attacking the idea that the common sensibles are ever perceived incidentally I read the text as supporting the idea that the common sensibles are always perceived directly. The special senses perceive directly their own


36 Arist. *De an.* III.1 425a15.

37 Arist. *De an.* II.6 418a8.

38 He also seems to distinguish two kinds of sensation κατὰ συμβεβηκός, the first kind is like that of the case where we perceive what is sweet by vision and the second kind is like the case where we perceive the son of cleon via what is white.

39 Moreover I take it that incidental perception in the sense of perceiving what is sweet by vision is only possible because the unified nature of the five senses. Aristotle says something in support of this at 425a30. This unified nature demands that the there is an incidence of the special perceptions upon each other. But why is that? Is it because in being unified the senses are in some sense contiguous? It seems that in completing a perception of multiple qualities in one and the same moment the five senses are directed as a whole. This employment of the whole can result in the concomitant arrival of multiple sense qualities and this can sometimes lead us to not realize which special sense is responsible for which sensible quality. The special senses are all activated at once and in the simultaneity of activations we may find it difficult (at first) to determine what is related to what. When the whole strikes us in a single moment it is difficult to determine the causal and the incidental (or perhaps coincidental) relations. If we were to observe a man raising his arm, a truck backing up, and a tree falling all at the exact same moment we might at first think that the man’s arm being raised caused the falling of the tree or that the falling of the tree caused the backing up of the truck etc. But with adequate reflection we’ll discover that the man was simply gesturing and that the truck was pulling the tree down with a previously unobserved rope. We determine that the relation between the man’s arm and the other two events is one of mere coincidence and that the relation between the truck and the tree is one of cause. Likewise, when we reflect on our perception of bile we see that the relation between bitterness and seeing is one of coincidence whereas the relation between yellow and seeing is cause.
proper objects and also the common sensibles. The common sensibles are less easily apprehended however, because it is difficult for us to not conflate the proper sensible of a specific sense with the common sensibles it also apprehends. That is why there would be a serious problem if we had only one sense. In fact, Aristotle supposes such a scenario for the sake of argument. If we had only sight and only white as an object everything would merge into “an indistinguishable identity.” This does not happen for us because the variation of our senses allows us, if we are careful, to see that the common sensibles are the object of no specific sense alone. In fact, Aristotle even speculates that the reason for the plurality of senses might be to prevent a failure to cognize common sensibles. For it is only by varying that we are able to distinguish what is a common and what is a special sensible. What I have tried to convey here is the very minimalist concept of a common sense that Aristotle has in the context of the De Anima. The phrase common sense refers to two psychological phenomena: (1) the common sense or ability that all five special senses have to perceive common sensibles, and (2) the unified activity of the five senses. What allows for perception of the common sensibles is not a general sensibility, as Smith translates it, for that sounds like something over and above the special senses. Rather it is the use of the special senses at once and as one in the manner of an interdependent network.

I emphasize this point because I think it will serve as a contrast to Alexander’s notion of the common sense. As stated above, Alexander uses language that would make one think that the common sense is something much more independent than the unity of the special senses Aristotle has described. Furthermore, Alexander states that the common sense is power higher than the special senses which has as its correlate the common sensibles. The impression of a power standing over and above seems closer to the role played by Plato’s soul than that of the common sense in Aristotle’s De Anima. I will venture some hypotheses as to why Alexander may differ from Aristotle’s De Anima in this respect in the conclusion of this paper.

It is also important to note the similarities in Aristotle’s and Alexander’s account of the common sense. Alexander selects several apt examples to explain the phenomena with which both he and Aristotle are concerned. For example, both philosophers use a geometrical analogy to demonstrate how something like the common sense can be both one and many. Alexander’s discussion seems to improve upon Aristotle’s point in that his example explains by analogy better how it is that the common sense can at once unify and distinguish multiple special senses, whereas Aristotle’s example, going purely by the text, can help us to understand this process only if two special senses are involved. While they both do compare the common sense to a point, Aristotle states that the point is used
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40 Arist. De an. II. 425B5-10.
41 See J.A. Smith’s translation.
42 Alex. Aphr. De Anima, 16.2.55.
43 With the obvious qualification that the common sense is not at all a thinking or rational entity like what Plato is discussing in the Theaetetus.
44 Arist. De an. III.2, 427a10-15; Alex. De Anima, 16.2.50.
“twice”\textsuperscript{45} and also compares it to a boundary (πέρας). He likely does this because he is thinking of a difference between two special senses, i.e. sight and taste. If we permit a visual simile, sight and taste are like two contiguous windows separated by a boundary. By Aristotle’s language the boundary is the common sense. As a limit, it is in some sense two by being part of both the special senses, and it is in another sense one in that it divides the two special senses. Alexander’s example, on the other hand, is that of a point as is found in the center of a circle. It is one in that it is the common terminus of not only two but an infinite number of radii extending from the circumference to the center. But this center point is also many in that it can be taken as part of any radii in particular. Alexander’s example is an improvement of Aristotle’s in that it clarifies how multiple senses can be related and integrated in something that is one and undivided.

**Conclusion**

We have examined four problems that arise in the context of Aristotle’s and Alexander of Aphrodisias’ respective discussions of sensation. It has been shown that Alexander for the most part follows Aristotle, though on a few notable occasions he departs from his line of thought. Alexander uses different examples, different arguments, and even brings up different arguments in the course of his discussion. Why is this?

To begin with, Alexander lives centuries after Aristotle. He inhabits a world where the great Hellenistic philosophies reign far and wide and Aristotle has been largely neglected. It is in Alexander’s best interest to temper Aristotle’s text to the demands of his times, and this often means ignoring some points Aristotle makes in order that Alexander may emphasize others. For example, instead of discussing methodology as Aristotle does in the opening of his De Anima, Alexander takes this opportunity to remark on the excellence of the body in an effort to argue against (likely Platonist) detractors of Aristotle’s philosophy. We also have evidence that Alexander engaged in polemics with other philosophers such as Galen during the course of his philosophical career.\textsuperscript{46} By these points we might venture to explain some of the differences observed between Alexander’s writings on the soul and Aristotle’s.

Additionally, Aristotle sometimes uses language in other texts that would give the impression that the common sense is an independent faculty acting over and above the special senses. The De Somno certainly uses language along these lines. It is quite possible that Alexander would have known the order of the Parva Naturalia and thereby that the De Somno came after the De Anima. This may have led him to think that Aristotle’s account as presented in the former was the more mature theory. Even though Alexander’s text is explicitly relying and modeling itself on the De Anima, it would not be implausible to suppose that he took materials from other Aristotelian works with greater authority. If this is the case, then what is required is a more comprehensive account of Aristotle’s

\textsuperscript{45} This is obscure but I read it meaning something along the lines of a point counting for two lines on a grid.

discussions of the problems of sensation as they appear elsewhere in his corpus. With such an account on hand, one could readily see where Alexander on the common sense departs from Aristotle proper and not just from Aristotle’s *De Anima*. Such an undertaking is obviously beyond the limits of this paper but is nevertheless an endeavor to which the author hopes to contribute.

**Lewis Innes-Miller**
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47 Grigorie’s is the most recent attempt.
Puissantes images et paideia :
fondements et portée de la collection des Bains de Zeuxippe

Les Bains de Zeuxippe, construits par Septimius Severus vers la fin du deuxième siècle, furent pris en charge par Constantin I au quatrième siècle et transformés non seulement en l’aire de baignade la plus importante de Constantinople, mais aussi en un centre majeur de discours et de débats publics. Dans la lignée de la tradition romaine, les Zeuxippe abritaient une importante collection de statues, représentant des figures telles qu’Apollon, Aphrodite, Homère et Platon. Le présent essai propose, d’une part, une vision globale de l’emplacement et de la structure des Bains de Zeuxippe pendant leurs deux siècles d’existence. Il cherche, d’autre part plus globalement à réconcilier des études récentes à propos (i) de la réception et des perceptions idéologiques des statues antiques, (ii) du raisonnement impérial à la base des Zeuxippe, et (iii) des théories de vision et de visualité dans l’Empire byzantin, des thèmes généralement examiné individuellement. En définitive, je soutiendrai donc que les notions de pouvoir des images, d’extramission et de paideia sont essentielles afin de comprendre les intentions derrière les Bains de Zeuxippe et les réceptions tant populaires qu’impériales.

La structure et l’emplacement des Bains

Avant d’aborder la collection de statues et sa portée, il est important d’examiner plus en détails la structure et la typographie des Bains de Zeuxippe. La décoration des Bains par Constantin I devait concorder avec la consécration de sa « Nouvelle Rome », Constantinople. Dans le Chronicon Paschale, on décrit les nombreux changements apportés aux structures urbaines à cette époque. On y affirme que Constantin « compléta le bain public appelé Zeuxippe et le décora de colonnes, de différentes sortes de marbres et de statues en bronze […] ».1 Situés sur l’acropole, le centre de l’autorité impériale et ecclésiastique à Constantinople, et au coin nord-est de l’hippodrome, la localisation déjà significative des Bains fut renforcée par la construction adjacente du Grand Palais à l’est et de l’Augustaion au nord (ill. 1). L’historien du sixième siècle Hésychios de Milet, en désignant le Zeuxippe comme un μέγιστον λουτρόν (que l’on pourrait traduire comme « bains maximaux »), témoigne non seulement de la majesté du complexe, mais aussi de l’aire importante qu’il devait occuper.2 L’espace accordé aux Bains dans les reconstructions


graphiques de la région doit donc tenir compte de ces considérations.³

Les Bains de Zeuxippe étaient probablement un bain-gymnase, un type de bain commun en Asie mineure à partir du deuxième siècle. Un tel complexe était caractérisé par la combinaison du gymnase grec avec sa palaestra, une aire d’exercice généralement encadrée d’une colonnade, et des halls voûtés des bains romains.⁴ Les fragments découverts lors des fouilles entreprises par la British Academy entre 1927 et 1928 permettent d’appuyer cette description des Bains.⁵ Les fondations et les murs inférieurs excavés forment deux structures d’arrangement irrégulier, séparées par un passage (ill. 3). L’édifice I, construit en briques et en béton, constituait probablement le bain lui-même. D’une part, il semble avoir été composé de voûtes et recouvert d’un dôme, ce qui le relie à la structure architecturale typique du bain romain. D’autre part, la présence de dispositifs hydrauliques dans ses fondations confirme l’utilisation d’eau.⁶ L’édifice II, caractérisé par une abside de douze mètres de diamètre, était probablement un gymnase. En effet, il fait face à l’est vers ce qui devait être un péristyle, une cour entourée de colonnes, ce qui rappelle la structure de la palaestra grecque.⁷ Outre les traces archéologiques, le titre de l’ekphrasis de Christodoros de Coptos décrit la collection de statue contenue dans le δημόσιον γυμνάσιον (gymnase public) nommé Zeuxippe.⁸

Les considérations soulevées ci-dessus permettent maintenant d’aborder plus spécifiquement des questions de disposition et de séquence de la collection de statues. Évidemment, sur la base de ces ruines dispersées, il est impossible de tenter une reconstruction complète de l’apparence des Bains. Toutefois, certains indices permettent quelques précisions. Le titre de l’ekphrasis de Christodoros, tel que mentionné précédemment, suggère que la collection était située dans le gymnase. Avec l’espace important qu’occupait probablement la palaestra, il aurait été physiquement possible pour la totalité de la collection d’y être située. Cependant, il est plus probable que Christodoros ait eu l’intention de décrire le complexe en entier. En effet, puisque les Bains de Zeuxippe

³ À titre d’exemple, on peut comparer les illustrations 1 et 2 en annexe. Cette dernière sous-estime certainement le territoire que devaient occuper les Bains.
⁴ Fikret Yegül, Bathing in the Roman World (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 155.
⁷ Mango 1959, 38.
s’inscrivaient dans la tradition des bains romains, une partie de la collection devait sans doute être située dans les Bains eux-mêmes. Par ailleurs, et surtout, la terminologie elle-même était devenue confuse depuis la transformation des gymnases traditionnels en bains-gymnases : les mots « gymnase » (γυμνάσιον) et « bain » (βαλανείον) peuvent donc être compris, dans une certaine mesure, comme interchangeable.9

Bassett en conclut que la collection devait être concentrée dans « le clou de tout établissement impérial », le frigidarium : le hall principal de baignade en eaux froides, contenant souvent une ou plusieurs piscines non-chauffées.10 Toutefois, certaines raisons remettent en cause cette conclusion hâtive. En effet, il n’est pas certain que le frigidarium ait occupé la place centrale aux Bains de Zeuxippe. Premièrement, le frigidarium lui-même fut l’objet de changements pendant l’Antiquité tardive et la période byzantine. En effet, sa taille et son importance furent réduites : il passa d’un espace majeur contenant de larges piscines convenables pour la baignade, à une combinaison de « salon » et d’apodyterium (le vestiaire d’un bain) dans un endroit plus restreint.11 Deuxièmement, ce que Bassett qualifie de « zones d’exposition secondaires » devait en réalité être comparable au frigidarium. Par exemple, le caldarium, la principale salle chaude, était généralement tout aussi luxueux et architecturalement imposant que le frigidarium.12 Le gymnase, principale institution éducationnelle à l’époque, lieu de rencontres, de conférences et d’enseignement de l’idéal grec de la paideia, devait certainement aussi être décoré de statues. Pour ces raisons, je suggérerai donc que la collection de statues était plus ou moins uniformément étendue à travers les différentes structures des Bains.

Dans tous les cas, il est peu probable qu’une séquence d’observation de la collection ait été prévue. Bien que l’aspect séquentiel de l’ekphrasis de Christodoros indique qu’il a probablement décrit la collection dans l’ordre où il l’a vue, rien n’implique qu’une telle séquence ait été obligatoire. En fait, les concepteurs des collections thermales préféraient une disposition libre afin d’offrir plusieurs possibilités de visualisation.13 Par ailleurs, même si un programme de baignade était généralement encouragé, il n’était pas obligatoire et les baigneurs pouvaient se déplacer à leur guise entre les différentes salles.14

9 Yegül 2010, 156-157.
10 Bassett 1996, 500.
11 Yegül 2010, 182.
12 Yegül 2010, 17.
14 Yegül 2010, 17; Marcus Louis Rautman, Daily Life in the Byzantine Empire (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2006), 77. Les baigneurs procédaient généralement en se changeant dans l’apodyterium, en se lavant dans le tepidarium (le bain tiède), et enfin en se baignant dans le caldarium puis dans le frigidarium.
Enfin, l’accès au complexe variait en fonction du sexe des baigneurs : les hommes et les femmes se baignaient non seulement à des moments différents, mais l’accès à la palaestra était probablement facilité pour les hommes.\textsuperscript{15}

**La collection : iconographie, intentions impériales et réceptions**

L’ekphrasis de Christodoros mentionne quatre-vingts statues, mais il est probable que la collection ait été plus grande.\textsuperscript{16} En effet, non seulement l’ekphrasis lui-même est vraisemblablement incomplet, mais il a aussi été suggéré que le regroupement de statues était conçu de manière à rendre possible l’ajout de figures au fil du temps.\textsuperscript{17} L’ekphrasis offre néanmoins un portrait global de ce qui devait composer la collection jusqu’à sa destruction.

Les statues qui constituaient la collection peuvent être divisées en trois catégories générales. La première regroupait des dieux et des demi-dieux païens. Au nombre de onze, ces statues étaient toutes associées au bain et à ses activités à travers leurs connections à la santé, l’activité social, ou l’eau elle-même.\textsuperscript{18} D’importance notable aux Zeuxippe est la présence de trois statues d’Aphrodite, trois d’Apollon et une de Héraclès. Aphrodite, née de la mer, était ainsi liée à la baignade. Héraclès était lié aux bains à travers son association avec la forme physique. Apollon, lorsque représenté avec les Muses, signifiait la stimulation intellectuelle et sociale espérée d’une visite aux bains. Apollon est cependant à chaque fois mentionné seul, ce qui réfère probablement à ses propres pouvoirs guérisseurs.\textsuperscript{19}

La deuxième catégorie rassemblait des personnages mythologiques, appartenant principalement aux cycles mythiques thébain et troyen. Seulement deux statues du premier cycle sont notées dans l’ekphrasis (le devin Amphiarao et son fils Alcméon), mais vingt-neuf sont associées au deuxième. Ce dernier nombre suggère que l’on tentait de représenter le célèbre Sac de Troie, ou *Iliupersis*.\textsuperscript{20} Ces cycles, dont la popularité était évidente pendant l’Antiquité tardive, en faisaient des thèmes récurrents dans les bains à travers l’Empire.

La troisième catégorie regroupait des portraits de figures historiques majeures. Bien que cette inclusion était standard dans les bains romains, l’ensemble des figures

\textsuperscript{15} Yegül 2010, 33.
\textsuperscript{17} Sarah Bassett, *The Urban Image of Late Antique Constantinople* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004) 55.
\textsuperscript{18} Bassett 2004, 52.
\textsuperscript{19} Bassett 2004, 52.
\textsuperscript{20} Bassett 2004, 53.

Un accent, en somme, était résolument mis sur le passé gréco-romain, en incluant tantôt des divinités païennes, tantôt des figures paradigmiques de l’histoire antique. La signification et la portée de la collection ne se limitent toutefois pas à ces considérations. En fait, afin de mieux comprendre sa constitution idiosyncratique, il est important de considérer les idéologies byzantines au sujet des statues, particulièrement les statues antiques et païennes. L’historienne de l’art Liz James a récemment soutenu que ce qui est fondamental dans les écrits byzantins à propos de l’art est une préoccupation pour le pouvoir des images.\(^{21}\) En effet, il semble que la plupart des statues étaient perçues comme utiles et puissantes, et qu’elles pouvaient ainsi être manipulées et utilisées par ceux qui connaissaient les procédures correctes.\(^{22}\) Par ailleurs, James souligne que cette attitude était généralisée à la plupart des statues antiques, qu’elles soient païennes ou chrétiennes.\(^{23}\) Cette attitude prévalait non seulement au sein de la population, mais aussi chez les empereurs, pour qui les statues étaient souvent utilisées pour leur fonction apotropaïque, par exemple.\(^{24}\)

Le fait que cette notion du pouvoir des images se soit répandue jusqu’à la sphère impériale explique en partie, à mon avis, les motivations sous-jacentes à la collection des Bains de Zeuxippe. En effet, l’élaboration de la collection, tel que mentionné ci-dessus, devait concorder avec la consécration de Constantinople. Dans cette perspective, elle s’inscrit dans la campagne importante menée par Constantin I afin de légitimer son règne et de consolider sa vision de la nouvelle capitale de l’empire. Les sculptures et les statues jouaient ici un rôle fondamental. Elles permettaient non seulement de symboliser l’étendue
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et la force de l’empire, mais aussi de légitimer la nouvelle puissance byzantine. C’est particulièrement ce dernier rôle que devait jouer la collection aux Zeuxippe, à travers son inclusion de divinités païennes et l’accent sur des figures historiques gréco-romaines. D’une part, la reconnaissance de qualités esthétiques dans les statues devait sans doute contribuer à s’approprier la glorieux passé gréco-romain. D’autre part, et surtout, la constitution particulière de la collection, certainement investie de la puissance décrite ci-dessus, devait servir les motivations de l’empereur : s’approprier le passé gréco-romain pour mieux le transcender (avec l’ajout éventuel de figures byzantines contemporaines) et légitimer son propre règne.

Bref, il est clair que l’élaboration de la collection aux Zeuxippe avait ses fondements dans les intentions de Constantin I, et que celles-ci étaient notamment liées à la notion du pouvoir des images, ce qui est rarement explicitement reconnu. Bien qu’il est tout à fait légitime de chercher à comprendre les intentions impériales derrière un tel projet, une approche strictement intentionnaliste s’avère, comme James le souligne, limitée et réductrice, principalement en ce qu’elle ne considère pas la réception de la collection.

Du fait qu’elle soit publique, la collection des Bains de Zeuxippe devait faire face à une multiplicité d’actes réceptifs (certains d’entre eux notés dans les ekphraseis). Sa portée doit donc être considérée sous ce nouvel angle.

Pour le peuple byzantin, tel que mentionné ci-dessus, le pouvoir des images faisait sans aucun doute partie de l’imaginaire (ou du savoir) collectif. Cependant, pour véritablement saisir les implications d’une telle collection pour sa réception, il est important de prendre également en considération les théories de vision et de visualité de l’époque, qui ont fait l’objet d’un récent article par Robert S. Nelson. Dans le but de mieux comprendre les conceptions byzantines de la vision, Nelson examine un ekphasis livré en 867 par le Patriarche Photios. Il soutient que la conception de la vision la plus répandue était une version de l’extramission, selon laquelle des rayons optiques passaient de l’œil à l’objet vu, puis retourneraient à l’œil en contenant l’essence de la chose vue. De ce fait, un individu pouvait gagner du savoir en regardant, un savoir « supérieur » à celui obtenu par les autres.

25 À cet égard, la colonne de serpent de Delphes et l’obélisque de Toutmôsis III de Karnak (ill. 4), monuments majeurs dans leur lieu d’origine, sont des exemples appropriés. Leur seule importation à Constantinople témoigne de la force importante de l’empire.

26 Pour la reconnaissance de qualités esthétiques ou artistiques dans les statues antiques, voir, par exemple, Saradi-Mendelovici 1990, 58.


sens parce que plus « sûr ».29

À la lumière de ces considérations, la portée de la collection des Zeuxippe se modifie. Que devait-il y avoir à *apprendre* pour les baigneurs lors d’une visite aux Bains de Zeuxippe? D’une part, il est clair que la collection devait agir comme un rappel de l’autorité impériale et de sa légitimité, tel que le voulait Constantin I à travers son élaboration : ainsi, le seul fait de *constater* la grandeur de la collection permettait aux baigneurs d’*apprendre* le lien entre celle-ci et la grandeur de l’empereur.

D’autre part, il est important de reconsidérer les Bains de Zeuxippe dans leur contexte éducationnel. Selon Bassett, l’accent sur le passé gréco-romain ne visait pas seulement l’appropriation et la continuité de cette noble tradition, mais aussi l’association de Constantinople à l’autorité morale reliée à la *paideia*.30 Elle souligne avec à-propos que, dans l’Empire Romain tardif, l’accès au pouvoir était fonction d’éducation et, plus précisément, de la maîtrise des traditions littéraires et rhétoriques de la *paideia* grecque.31 Être éduqué dans la tradition de la *paideia* garantissait l’autorité ou le savoir moral.32 Pour Bassett, la collection des Bains de Zeuxippe agissait ainsi comme incarnation de la *paideia* et, de ce fait, liait la « Nouvelle Rome » à la véritable source de pouvoir dans l’Antiquité tardive.33 La conclusion de Bassett est bien fondée et met en lumière les fondements éducationnels des Bains de Zeuxippe. Aussi, elle a comme avantage supplémentaire d’être cohérente avec la notion de pouvoir des images qui prévalait à l’époque. En tenant compte de la théorie de vision par extramission, ses arguments toutefois se complexifient. Comprise dans ce cadre, l’incarnation de la *paideia* devait non seulement lier Constantinople à la source même du pouvoir, mais aussi permettre aux baigneurs d’*apprendre* de cette tradition ou, du moins, de *reconnaître* son autorité.

Je souhaite aussi complexifier l’aspect réceptif de la collection de manière plus générale, et considérer un aspect largement ignoré dans les études des Bains de Zeuxippe : l’existence et la portée de la réception impériale. Dans la première section de cet essai, la structure des Bains a été détaillé et leur emplacement au cœur du complexe urbain, impérial et ecclésiastique de l’acropole de Constantinople a été souligné. En fait, plusieurs indications suggèrent un lien étroit entre l’empereur et les Bains. Tout d’abord, un passage privé reliait probablement le Grand Palais aux Zeuxippe, bien que son emplacement
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29 Ibid., 154.
30 Bassett 1996, 506.
33 Bassett 1996, 506.
Il est de ce fait certainement arrivé à l’empereur de se baigner aux Zeuxippe, comme il lui arrivait de le faire ailleurs. Les Bains de Zeuxippe étaient ensuite aussi intrinsèquement liés aux cérémonies et aux rituels impériaux. Faisant face au Regia (la prolongation du Mese entre le Milion et le Chalke), les Zeuxippe constituaient un relais important pour l’empereur lors de sa route cérémoniale de retour vers le Grand Palais. Lors d’occasions spéciales telles que le lundi de Pâques ou les mercredis de la mi-Pentecôte, les empereurs y réalisaient des ablutions, rendant ainsi explicite le lien entre les Bains et les rituels impériaux.36

Bref, le lien existant entre l’empereur et les Bains de Zeuxippe requiert que l’on reconnaîsse une réception impériale. Je suggérerai que le contexte de paideia devait affecter l’empereur, mais dans ce cas en lui rappelant les fonctions mêmes de l’office impérial. Autrement dit, la force et l’autorité morales incarnées dans la collection aux Zeuxippe, lors de la réception impériale, fonctionnaient probablement comme rappels des tâches de l’empereur et des responsabilités qui lui incombait. Cette suggestion est renforcée si l’on se souvient que des figures byzantines contemporaines devaient être ajoutées à la collection. Dans ce cas, la collection constituait certainement une illustration de la généalogie ou de l’héritage impériaux, soulignant davantage les fonctions de l’empereur.37

Entre leur prise en charge par Constantin I et leur destruction en 532 lors des Révoltes populaires de Nika, les Bains de Zeuxippe constituèrent un des points focaux de la nouvelle capitale orientale de l’Empire romain. Cet essai a visé à démontrer que la collection de statues qu’ils contenaient, dont les sujets variaient entre dieux, personnages mythologiques et figures historiques gréco-romaines, avait probablement comme fondements intentionnels la légitimation et la consolidation de l’autorité impériale à Constantinople. Il a aussi été question ici des implications de la collection pour les réceptions populaire et impériale. Plus précisément, j’ai soutenu que ces réceptions étaient fondamentalement reliées à l’enseignement de la paideia grecque et au rappel du rôle de l’office impérial. L’objectif global, toutefois, a été la synthèse et la réconciliation de divers champs théoriques – principalement les théories de vision et de visualité dans l’Empire 34
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Vincent Marquis

Puissantes images et paideia

byzantin, et les perceptions idéologiques des statues antiques – dans le but de sous-tendre les documents textuels et archéologiques associés aux Bains de Zeuxippe. La tradition des Bains demeure évidemment complexe, mais la présente étude permettra certainement de mieux saisir les liens entre agendas idéologiques et productions culturelles pendant l’ère byzantine, et d’expliquer comment les idées politiques de l’époque ont été articulées à travers la culture visuelle populaire.

Vincent Marquis
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The Use of Classicism in Fascist Italy’s “Roman Empire”

The use of the Classical motif and identification with ancient Rome abroad during the reign of Italy’s fascist government was not only important to the fascist ideological message of creating a Second Roman Empire, but also imperative to justify military actions leading into World War II via “the use of Ancient Roman examples to create a new sense of discipline, militarism and order.”\(^1\) By using Ancient Rome as an exalted example of perceived discipline, militarism, and order, Mussolini was able to subjugate lands that were not inherently part of his dominion, yet that he could justify claiming due to previous Roman occupation.

But what did the promotion of “romanità” or “romaness” have to do with the development of the classical motif abroad? Mussolini created the term “romanità” as a general “catch-all” for his right to the lands previously occupied by the original Roman Empire, under such leaders as Augustus and Julius Caesar. While many agree with Visser’s assessment of “romanità” as an “opportunistic choice of Roman catchwords and symbols, lacking any substantial ideological coherence and with no intellectual coherence and with no intellectual background of any standing,”\(^2\) others describe it as, “akin to Roman culture.”\(^3\) Perhaps in the case of Mussolini, the most apt description is that it “signified the greatness of ancient Roman civilization and its uninterrupted manifestation throughout the centuries.”\(^4\)

This spread of “romanità” was probably demonstrated most prominently both at home and abroad by “la parola al piccino,” or “the discourse of the pick-ax,” whose effects were widespread. This was the fascist government’s use of classical archaeology for the promotion of ideologies by presenting themselves as the second coming of the Roman Empire through the ultimate reconstruction of it. The use of classical archaeology was felt both at home and abroad, through a combination of continuing to promote the idea of “romanità” in contrast to the archaeological style of “modernità” or modernity. This Romanization of the colonies stood “on top of the Fascist political agenda.”\(^5\) Mussolini and the Fascists meant to align themselves with Classical Rome and consequently

---


\(^4\) Ibid.

\(^5\) Dyson, 177.
have ready justification for their imperial movements and growth of their Second Roman Empire. By proving that a Roman past existed in the countries they invaded, Mussolini was able to plead an ancestral right to any lands previously contained in the original Roman Empire, and in the process re-incarnating himself as a modern-day Julius Caesar. Mussolini had learned the importance of using archaeology “as propaganda in North Africa from the French”, employing “classical archaeology as a tool for justifying modern colonialism.”

In following imperialistic and nationalistic policies, Mussolini was able to integrate and consequently justify these policies by removing any doubt as to whether Italy was meant to possess these lands by pointing to Ancient Rome’s military achievements. However, many questioned this logic from the start; if Italy was to truly mirror the Ancient Roman Empire, Germany and parts of Britain would also by default be incorporated into Mussolini’s “divine right” scheme of imperialism. Nevertheless, the government “financed exhibitions [in North Africa]” and created museums “that highlighted the new discoveries… strengthen[ing] the connection between “romanita” and fascist policy.” Any archaeological discoveries were used as immediate justification of Italian presence.

The Classical motif image Mussolini used not only aided him in promoting his expansionist ideals abroad, but also improved the image of the dictator himself, connecting him to the classically heroic image of strength and ability associated with a great historical past. Mussolini saw himself as the next Caesar, whom he admired greatly, creating his entire foreign policy around this cult of personality:

The murder of Caesar was a disgrace for humanity… I love Caesar. He was the only one who united in himself the will of the warrior and the genius of the wise man. In the end he was a philosopher, who contemplated everything sub specie aeternitatis. Yes, he loved glory, but his pride didn’t divide him from humanity.

Despite using this questionable ideology as justification for his private and public beliefs, Mussolini’s excavation of the ancient world was for the most part met with foreign approval from other first-world countries’ intellectual circles. In fact, “as classical archaeologists they could not help but be excited.”

---
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The Use of Classicism in Fascist Italy’s “Roman Empire”

This “reconstruction” of the Roman Empire first began in Libya. Despite having been seized in 1911 from the Ottoman Empire, the Greek, Punic, and Roman sites had yet to be excavated at the rate Mussolini desired after his ascent to power in 1923. A second foreign annexation occurred a year after Libya with the seizure of the Dodecanese Islands in 1912. Both locations were rife with classical archaeological influences for the new Roman Empire, though Libya in particular was considered significant:

In the course of the Italian North African excavations, entire cities, with their theatres, baths, fora and elegant houses were unearthed. Museums were created and guidebooks published…. The civilizing accomplishments of the Romans were made visible, both to the new Italian colonists transplanted to Cyrene and to the nationalists at home… The Italians sent into Libya [were meant to] find inspiration in the Roman ruins as they worked to create a new imperium romanum on African shores.

Although Italian colonialism had begun far earlier than the actual reign of Mussolini, it was he who first proclaimed the existence of the Italian Empire on the ninth of May 1936, whose territories included Libya, Eritrea, Somalia, and parts of Ethiopia (annexed by force through the Second Italo-Abyssinian war in 1935). All new colonial additions were under strict policies to introduce rapid Italianization and Romanization into each region:

An antiquities administration modeled on that of Italy was imposed. Foreign archaeologists were allowed no place in either country. The Americans were forced out of Libya, and the Danes had to abandon their excavations at Lindos on Rhodes.

The only excavations to unearth any antiquities were done solely under Italian and Italian-approved supervision. Museums and academic journals were founded to support Italy’s basis to be a present force in each and every country they invaded. They sought to overturn the local culture and eventually stamp out any local beliefs and replace them with Italian “romanita,” which is evident even today in areas such as Rhodes, the historic region of Tripolitania in Libya, Harah, Jimma, and Gondar in Ethiopia, as well as the capital of Libya itself, Tripoli.

Colonialism was Mussolini’s vehicle to show the rest of the world the single-handed

---
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might that the Italians could exhibit as an upcoming world power. The planning and construction on the outskirts of their “Roman Empire” proved no exception, especially in Libya. As Stephen Dyson writes, “the [Libyan and Italian] authorities sought to learn from the Roman use of land and water as they established new settlements.”

Examples of this would be the transportation of water based on an entirely Roman system, and the use of silt in the desert sand as a basis for strong and supposedly indestructible building materials to use in the development of impressive architecture. By unifying both architecture and design as new points of power in Mussolini’s ever-expanding empire, the spreading of Italian values based upon the ancient Romans themselves could not only be a philosophical ideal, but also an actual reality. The Fascists then managed to put into place the same policies they had used to Romanize Africa into Rome and Italy itself. Old monuments, having fallen into disrepair, were rebuilt, revitalized, and restructured. Italy was meant to return to the same grandeur of the Roman era, complete with autarky and a “romanticized rurality.”

However, the architectural and infrastructural goal of creating the perfect Second Empire in Libya did not only focus on structural design but also on urban planning as well. Towns and cities were constructed in the style of traditional Roman cities; courtyards dominated the middle of towns, leading to several smaller buildings, in stark contrast to the Arabic style of having a private space for each individual family, or a courtyard on the interior of the home. However, to say that all architecture built in Libya at the time was solely based on Roman influences would be untrue; the Fascists also wanted to create a dichotomy between moving forward (the movement of “modernita”) and Italian classical architecture. The use of architecture was vitally important to the Italians because it was a constant reminder to the rest of the world of the cultural ambitions passed to them from their ancestors. This had always been an Italian mentality, ever since the unification of Italy in 1871. As the renowned Minister of Foreign Affairs Francesco Crispi stated in 1889, “our fathers cleared the path to new civilization… we would be failing our country if we did not enlarge our field of activity.”

Libya had also been famed for its fertility in the ancient world, and the fascist colonialists “supported their belief in Libya’s great promise of wealth with frequent reference to Greek and Roman classics.” In order to return to this classical belief, the
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Fascists in turn believed they needed to populate Libya with “brava gente,” or good Fascist families ready to work and rebuild the Italian Empire. Consequently, the Governor General of Libya, Italo Balbo, organized the relocation of the “ventimilia,” (twenty thousand) settlers relocated from impoverished Southern Italy (also a solution to population overgrowth). This population was meant to prove the success of the Second Roman Empire abroad, by “converting desert lands to their former Roman glory, but along modern lines.”

To move this new colonial acquisition away from its “normadic and slothful population,” symbols of Italy’s former glory were placed throughout Libya. Examples of such architecture would include the “Pavilion of the Governatrorato di Roma” at the Fiera di Tripoli, the triumphal arch by the architect Rava (built in Tripoli in 1931), as well as many other locations in Italian East Africa. Somalia also provided many of its own architectural developments, with architectural designs by Rava present in its triumphal arches and the parliamentary buildings in Mogadishu, built in the style of a classical Roman forum. Another suitable example would be the Temple of Zeus in Cyrene, Libya; it was excavated before the reign of Mussolini (1917-1922), yet it was still used to “promote the idea of Italian East Africa as Italy’s ‘fourth shore’ of its Empire.”

However, Italy’s foreign policy was also concerned with the maintenance of Roman “blood,” and discouraged any Italian settlers in East Africa from consummating sexual relationships with the local population; or as Mussolini put it, “creat[ing] a nation of half-castes.” To uphold this racial segregation, the cities of the new Roman Empire were built to enforce this, and to allow only for the minimum interaction between the local population and Italian immigrants, the city was divided according to race, religion, and class, despite the fact that all people under the Italian jurisdiction were technically “Roman.” Other demonstrations of this movement towards the Roman “elite” were more prominent:

Italian planners frequently laid out boulevards that joined a significant new building representing the Fascist empire to an iconic historical structure representing the Abyssinian empire. Parades on these roads always began at the older site, symbolically reinforcing the transfer of Imperial power. A similar appropriation of historic structures appears in the places set aside for
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19 Mia Fuller, Moderns Abroad: Architecture, Cities and Italian Imperialism (London: Routledge, 2007), 60.
20 Fuller 1988, 457.
21 Ibid. 463.
22 Fuller 2007, 6.
“adunate” (political rallies)… where the assembled masses symbolically reenacted the seizure of Italy’s African possessions… Italian urban designers carefully used zoning and landscape to further construct social identities by segregating colonial cities.24

Italian Fascist architects, who claimed that Libyan architecture was really born of Roman origin and inspiration, also essentially stripped Libya of any national identity. “The true tradition of Rome, the unerasable…imprint of its dominion” was said to be prominent, even in “primitive Berber architecture.”25 The importance of this distinction cannot be underemphasized. By classifying Libyan architecture as “Roman,” the Mussolini regime was able to borrow both materials and ideas from local indigenous architecture without suggesting that they were compromising on ideals. Additionally, by labeling Libya as “Roman”, the Italians would then be met in their vision of a “Roman Empire” by gaining a newly constructed history and the right to these lands by ignoring the other multitudes of racial groups who had been present there beforehand, such as the Ottomans.

In essence, “Libya was denied history, identity, culture; it was the repository of modern Italy’s roots”.26 By classifying modern architecture in Libya under a new term, “Mediterranean,” it effectively bridged the gap between African and Italian, “modernita” and “romanita.”27 Instead, the primary focus for the Roman Empire abroad continued to be segregation and race. The “new” Ethiopian cities continued to highlight this class distinction and the separation between white and black. For all the constructed cities such as Addis Ababa, Gondar, Jimma, and Dessyse, traffic and pedestrian flow was constructed to allow for as little interaction between the two races as possible. The local population would have “restricted access to the Italian market,” although it would have frequent commerce with it.28 “Indigenous quarters” were planned to allow whites easier access to central civic buildings without having to interact with the native population.29 All this was intended to highlight the ruling power of the more “Roman” class over the “primitive” peoples of Libya:

It will be possible to plan concentric cities with urban zoning plans

---
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centered around a knoll or spur, where, as though it were an acropolis, the building of Government, the element of conquest and domination will constitute the urban hierarchy of the city which should formally make evident the predominance of white over black, and usually admonish that every piazza seeks our supremacy over the infantile, primitive, indigenous population.30

This focus on designing a “white core” of the city with “black” outskirts was the key in designing new Roman cities abroad. While “the true Negro city” was described as “the unhappy result of the incapacity that blacks on the whole and Ethiopians especially have [for organization],” categories prominent in planning for non-indigenous zones were listed as “service, industrial, military, residential, schools, sports complexes, markets, hospitals and hotels.”31 Planning was judged in its relation to the center/acropolis and its “quality of triumph”.32 This Roman planning of cities and countries continued until well into the Second World War.

However, Italian East Africa and a greater Africa itself was not the only opportunity for the Italian fascists to display their connection to their glorious past. Another example of architectural use of propaganda and Italianization of local populations was evident in the Dodecanese Islands, in particular Rhodes, where over eighty percent of Italians who immigrated to the isles lived. However, Rhodes did not openly offer the sort of “pro-Roman propaganda that North Africa did, in particular Libya.”33 While Libya’s great classical heritage could be seen to be Roman, Rhodes’ heritage was in fact Greek. Nevertheless, Italian archaeologists were able to uncover sites to suit their purposes.34

One of the main points that the Fascists leapt on was the connection to the West as a Christian bastion against the March of Islam in the Middle Ages. Buildings such as the former headquarters of the knights of Rhodes were restored and used as museums, with Italian archaeologists using “all their skills at historical restoration learned on the buildings of Rome.”35 And while Rhodes as a whole offered few possibilities for new colonial foundations, the archaeological scene on the island was organized and streamlined for maximum efficiency:
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The archaeologist most closely associated with Rhodes was Amadeo Maiuri (1886-1963), who was even better than others at surviving in prefascist, fascist, and post-fascist Italy... In 1914 he was sent to Rhodes, where he found a chaotic archaeological scene with poor administration and a lively trade in antiquities. He remained for ten years, excavating, working with the architect Giuseppe Gerola to restore buildings, and found[ed] the archaeological museum at Rhodes.\textsuperscript{36}

Maiuri continued to plan throughout Mussolini’s reign, while other nationalities such as the Danes were forced to leave Rhodes in favor of Italian archaeologists who would rebuild and redefine their finds if needed. While the outbreak of war effectively ended the archaeological operations in Rhodes, much was accomplished before the retreat occurred.\textsuperscript{37}

Mussolini in particular saw Rhodes and the Dodecanese islands as a prime location to enforce Italianization and to make Rhodes a “transportation hub” that could aid in the spread of Italian culture through Greece and the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{38} Italian schools were opened on the islands, and modernization was made a priority. Malaria was eradicated from the local population, and aqueducts, hospitals, and power plants were constructed. Architecture was rebuilt in an effort to connect the Roman Empire with Rhodes’ Christian and Western past. A prime example of this would be the citadel of Rhodes itself.

Nevertheless, the reconstruction of architecture on the city of Rhodes under the fascists was not in any way entirely positive. Following the example of “\textit{la parola al piccino}” at home, many non-classical architectural structures belonging to the Ottoman Period of Rhodes were destroyed as a result of fervent Italianization. Jewish and Ottoman cemeteries were also turned into “green zones,” while other architecture of what they deemed to be “minor importance” was destroyed.\textsuperscript{39} The appointment of Cesare Maria De Vecchi as governor of the Aegean Islands in 1936 only resulted in a further program of forced “\textit{rominita},” stopped only by the country’s entry into World War Two.

The “restoration” of Rhodes under the Fascists and their policy of “\textit{la parola al piccino}” are heavily criticized today, despite the reinvention of many prominent architectural pieces on the island, as well as their social policies of “\textit{romanita}” and Italianization. Italian was made the compulsory language on the island, and incentives were given to those who rejected Greek language and culture and who instead adopted Italian mannerisms. One

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
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of the primary examples of this would be the construction of the town of Portolago, later renamed Lakki. The Greek Orthodox religion was strongly discouraged, and resulted in a large amount of number of Greek Orthodox practitioners leaving the island, in comparison to the influx of Italians arriving on it.

Yet still, much of the great architecture that exists today is the direct consequence of the Italians’ attempt to preserve it. Portolago itself was built in typical “modernità” Italian deco style. Using almost exclusively “free” local labor, the Italians restored examples that marked the unity of the island with Rome, such as the Filerimos Monastery and the Saint Francisco church.

Mussolini’s goal in highlighting these architectural achievements was to create a common historical identity based not in blood, but in heritage. Still, a hierarchy existed based on race. Fascist Italians still saw themselves as “Romans” who brought civilization to “savage” populations on the outskirts of their Roman Empire. Despite Mussolini’s dream of re-instating Italy’s glorious history of Roman domination, in practice, his policies were bound to fail. Despite the staunch imperialism he attempted to enforce, and his attempts to create an internal unity within his empire, his inherently aggressive policies were not conducive to long term-success. His process of Italianization and “romanità” perhaps should not have been based so much on Julius Caesar, but rather on his adopted son Augustus. For while Augustus did conquer other regions, he never overstepped his boundaries into something that he could not control or that would upset the general population. When Mussolini attacked Ethiopia, an acknowledged member of the League of Nations, it was the beginning of the end, as it attracted widespread international hostility. The “Scramble for Africa” had long since been over, and the attempted creation of superpowers such as Germany or Italy only resulted in World War II, the East Africa Campaign, and the end of Fascist Italy and Mussolini himself, as well as the returning off all lands to their respective parties.

Still, the testament to Mussolini’s vision of a Second Roman Empire still remains, most prominently through architecture and city urban planning. Although much of the architecture and the culture of each of these respective countries was lost due to Fascist Italy’s Romanization policies, much was restored as well. Therefore, it seems that Mussolini’s policy of “romanità” is destined to go down in history as disputed and criticized as the man who established and promoted it.
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Back Matter
So he spoke, and Dream heard his word and descended afterward.
Swiftly he came down by the Achaean’s nimble ships, and went to Agamemnon, son of Atreus. He lighted upon him sleeping in his shelter, immortal sleep poured ’round him. Dream stood by his head, in the guise of Nestor, Neleus’ son,…
Book Three

So she spoke, and Helen, Zeus’s daughter
was scared
and went, covering herself in her radiant,
shining robe,
quiet, she escaped the notice of all the
Trojan women,
but the goddess was in the lead.
When they came to the beautiful house of
Paris,
the handmaids went quickly to their work,
but she, heavenly among women, went to
the high-roofed bed chamber.
And laughter-loving Aphrodite seized a
chair for her,
carrying it, the goddess set it before Paris,
and there Helen sat, daughter of Zeus of
the Aegis,
having turned back her eyes, she reproved
her husband with words:
“You come back from the fight. How you
wish to be destroyed on the spot,
overpowered by the stronger man, who
was my husband once before…”

(Il., 3.418-29)
οὐδὲ σέθεν Μενέλαε θεοὶ μάκαρες λελάθοντο ἀθάνατοι, πρῶτη δὲ Διός ὑψάτηρ ἀγελείη, ἢ τοι πρόσθε στάσα βέλος ἐχεπευκὲς ἀμυνεν. ἢ δὲ τόσον μὲν ἔεργεν ἀπὸ χροὸς ὡς ὅτε μήτηρ παιδὸς ἐέργῃ μυῖαν ὅθ᾽ ἡδέϊ λέξεται ὕπνῳ, αὐτὴ δ᾽ αὖτ᾽ ἴθυνεν ὅθι ζωστῆρος ὀχῆες χρύσειοι σύνεχον καὶ διπλὸος ἤνετο θώρηξ.

Menelaos, the blessed immortal gods did not forget you, but first and foremost is Zeus’ daughter, the driver of spoil, who, standing before you, deflected the sharp arrow. Indeed, she kept it away from his skin, like when a mother, brushes a fly from her child, lying in pleasant sleep, herself straightening it to where the gold belt clasps and the two parts of the corslet met.

(Il. 4.127-133)
There, reaching forward to strike, the high-hearted son of Tydeus, leaping, wounded the feeble hand with the sharp spear. At once, the spear bore right through the skin through the immortal cloth which the Graces had fabricated for her, over the base of her palm, and immortal blood gushed from the goddess, the serum of such a kind that runs through the blessed divinities.

(II. 5.334-40)
καὶ ποτὲ τις εἴπησιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ
χέουσαν:
Ἔκτορος ἥδε γυνὴ ὃς ἀριστεύεσσε
μάχεσθαι
Τρώων ἵπποδάμων ὅτε Ἰλιον
ἀμφεμάχοντο.
ὡς ποτὲ τις ἐρέει: σοὶ δ᾽ αὖ νέον
ἔσσεται ἄλγος
χήτεϊ τοιοῦδ᾽ ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον
ήμαρ.
ἀλλὰ με τεθνηῶτα χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖ
καλύπτοι
πρὶν γέ τι σῆς τε βοῆς σοῦ θ᾽ ἑλκηθμοῖο
πυθέσθαι.

(Il. 6.459-465)

…and one day, some man, seeing you pouring down tears, might say:
“Here is the wife of Hector, who was the best of the Trojans in battle, breaker of horses, when they fought in Ilion.”
Thus one will ask about you, and it will be a new sorrow for you to lack such a man to ward off the day of your slavery.
But I have died and let earth, poured down, cover me before I learn of your shouts from being carried off.
Thus he spoke, and gave over a silver studded sword, together bringing it forward with a sheath, and also a well-cut strap, and Ajax gave a radiant purple warrior’s belt.

(II. 7.303-5)
καὶ τότε δὴ χρύσεια πατὴρ ἐτίταινε
tάλαντα:
ἐν δ᾽ ἐτίθει δύο κῆρε τανηλεγέος
θανάτοιο
Τρώων θ᾽ ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν
χαλκοχιτώνων,
ἔλκε δὲ μέσα λαβών: ὥπε δ᾽ αἰσιμον
ἡμαρ Ἀχαιῶν.
αἱ μὲν Ἀχαιῶν κήρες ἐπὶ χθονὶ
πουλυβοτείρη
ἐξέσθην. Τρώων δὲ πρὸς οὐρανὸν
ἐφίστην ἄερθεν.

And then the father stretched out golden scales,
and he set in them two fates of woeful deaths
for the Trojans, breakers of horses, and for the bronze-clad Achaeans,
and balanced it by the middle handle.
But the destined day of the Achaeans sank. There, the fates of the Achaeans sank to the bountiful earth,
and the fates of the Trojans were raised to the wide sky.

(II. 8.69-74)
Book Nine

Man’s appointed doom is the same for the man who stays at home, the same if he wages war. But we share the same honor, the brave men and the base men. But we die away the same, the idle man and the one who has done much. There is nothing laid out for me, since I have felt pain in my heart, forever fighting, my life, fodder.

(II.9.318-22)
I WANT YOU FOR THE ACHAEAN ARMY
...δ ὁ ἄφρ᾽ ἔστη τάρβησέν τε
βαμβαίνων: ἄφριβος δὲ διὰ στόμα
γίγνετ᾽ ὀδόντων:
χλωρὸς ὑπαὶ δείους: τὼ δ᾽ ἀσθμαίνοντε
χιχήτην,
χειρῶν δ᾽ ἀφάσθην...

...He stood in terror,
shivering, through his mouth there was a
gnashing of teeth,
beneath pale-green fear. And these two,
breathing hard, approached him,
and fastened his hands...

(Il. 10.374-377)
Book Eleven

ὡς δὲ λέων ἑλάφοιο ταχείς νήπια
tέχνα
ημίδιως συνέαξε λαβὼν κρατεροίσιν
ὀδούσιν
ἐλθὼν εἰς εὐνήν, ἁπαλόν τέ σφ᾽ ἦτορ
ἀπηύρα:
η δ᾽ εἰ πέρ τε τύχησι μάλα σχεδόν, οὐ
dύναται σφί χραισμεῖν…

So as a lion seizes the infant young of the swift deer,
and easily crushes them with mighty teeth,
when he has come into their lair, and takes out their supple hearts.
And even if the deer happens to be near,
she is not able to ward him off…

(Ill. 11.113-121)
Ἀχιλλεὺς μετὰ Σατύρων

ὁ ψευδοσάτυροι τοῦ Άρων Γόλις

Σιληνός

Ὡ Διονυσέ, τλάμονον ἐποίησας μὲ καὶ
μοῖχοις ὅσοι δὴ φάσκειν δύναμαι ὅτι
μάρτυρος ὄν, ἐξετ' ὁ Λύκουργος ἄναξ,
ὁ δυσσεβής τύραννος, ὁ βλασφημόσας ὄν,
εἰς οἰνόπα τε τῷ περιέχοντας πήχες
Θέτιδος Ἀλοσύνης σ᾽ ἐξεδίωξε. Τλάμον ἐγώ.

ἐπεὶ τε σ' αμι' ἐνθα προλέλοιπας ἄνελπιδον,
ἠμεῖς δεδουλώμεθ᾽ ὑπὸ τοῦ δεινότατου,
πρὶν δὴ τὸ θεῖον δυσμενέας κεκτῆται
καὶ γάρ φασίν πάσχων ὑπὸ θεοβλάβειας.

ἐπεὶ μὲν ἐκφεύγειν παγίδας ἐς τὴν ἄλλην
δεδυνήμεθα. καλὸς τὰ τῆς τύχης ἐξει:
παῖδες τ' ἐγὼ γάρ ζωσι κάκπευγαμεν.

ἐπεὶ δὲ Τυρρήνοι πειραται ἐξέκλεψαν
σὲ, μὲ καταλείπων ἐκπεπόρθμευται τε μοί
καὶ χθονός, ὡς ἐγενέσθαι ἐν
δυσάμμορως ἐγενευόμενοι σοι πανταχοῦ.

νῦν ἀλλὰ σοὶ ἡμεῖς άτε ἀπόντης, ἀτερ
τῆς Βρομιου μίας ψακάδος τ' ἀμήχανοι.
καὶ, ἤ κάκιστη μοῖρα, ἀμέθυστοι εσμεν.

νῦν δ' ἀποροῦντες, τοῖς Ἀτρείδῃς συμμαχεῖν
τὰς κέρατα ὁμόσαμεν. τίς οἴδ' ὅτι τοιού
πολεμοποιεῖν μηδομένοι ὑμᾶς ἐνεκα.

νῦν πᾶσαι αἱ τῆς Ἑλλαδος δὴ στρατίαι
τροίας τὸ πέρθειν στέλλουσιν, τὸ πᾶν μίαν
Silenus
Oh, Dionysus, miserable you’ve made me and
to toils so many, I can promise that
I was witness, ever since King Lycourgus,
that godless king who blasphemed,
into the wine-dark sea and the embracing arms
of Sea-born Thetis, he chased you. Tlamon ego.
And when you abandoned us there hopeless,
we were enslaved by that terrible man,
until he brought upon himself the god’s hostility
for they say he suffered under the god-sent mad blindness.
Thus we were able to escape one trap into another
Fortune held us well:
since my sons and I live and we escaped.

But then the Tyrrhenian pirates stole you away,
leaving me behind, they have taken you from both
the land and me, so we’ve become eternal searchers,
looking for you everywhere most miserably.
But now, because we’re without you
we’re without a single drop of wine and helpless.
And, what is the worst fate, we’re sober!
So, with no way ahead, to the Atreides
by our horns we swore fealty. Who knew that they
were planning on going to war on account of the Argive woman.
And now all the armies of Greece

Are preparing for the sacking of Troy, all because of
one girl! I would say plainly that this is laughable,
δία. ἀντικρὺ ᾧν δ’ ἀποφαίην ἔχειν γελοίως
eἰ ύμεῖς ἐρωτάτε μέ. γἀρ αἱ πολλαὶ κόραι
ἐνταῦθ᾽ ἐν τῇ Σκῦρῳ. ἐγὼ δ’ οὖν τ᾽ εὐπαιδία
tὸν ἡμετέρων αὐτῶν τὸ πέρθειν στέλλομεν.

όδε φράσω διότ’ ἐλθόντες ἐνθάδε.
ὁ γὰρ νομοῦ ἀναξ Λυχομιδῆς μὲν οὐχ
υιόσιν ἔστι ταῖς δὲ τοι πολλαὶς κόραῖς
καὶ δὴ αἱ ἄβραι παρθένοι εὐσπίδες.
καὶ οὖν οἱ ἐκεῖνοι βιασταί, οἱ ᾧν δὴ
ἀναγκάζοιει ἡμᾶς ἔνθ᾽ ἄνθροποι ἔσται.
eἰ οἱ δύναιντο, ἀλλ᾽ οἱ οὔδεπώποτε
ταύτη γε ζητήσομεν ἂνθροποι κύριον.
ἀλλ᾽ εἴπερ οἱ ποτ᾽ ἥκουσιν, ἐσκευάσασα.
tοῦτος γαρ οὖν καὶ ἐνδέδυκα στρόφιον
καὶ τοι οἱ κροκόστιόν τοῦ τήμετρον.
δεῖ γ᾽ ἐμ᾽ ἔννοσθαι ἡμὰς ἱσχύνην ἄβραν
ὀλίγης τὰς ἡμέρας, ἐως οὓς τὰς τὰς ἄν
τῶν στεῖρων πιγνύσιν εἰ περιστείλας
ἐν τῇ Τροίας ψαμάθῳ. ἀλλὰ τότ᾽ ἠδη
αὐθίς γε σώσομαι τε οἱ παῖδες ἐμοὶ.

πειράμευοι δὴ οὖν ἐκάς που ἔννοσθαί
καὶ πᾶς δοράς: πέπλους ποδήρεσιν. μισθάριον
τίνειν ἐνεκά τοῦ ἀλύσκειν τοῦ στρατεύόμενον
τὸν εὐτελεστέρον ἢ τίνειν τῇ κράστῃ.

ὁ ἀλλ᾽ ἥκουσι παῖδες ἐνθάδε τὰς ἐν τῇ
θυγατήρ᾽ ὁμοιότητα τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἥκουσι

πάροδος

Χορός
ἐμολον γ᾽ ἀμφίς ταῦτας ψάμαθον
Σκῦρου ἐναλίας πάρ᾽ αἰγιαλὸν
οἴκου δὲ δία στενοπόρθους
οἶκον ἐν ὀρέοις τὸν ἀμετρὸν λίπον
βῆσῃ τε νάπαις μετ᾽ ὀρεστίαδον,
ἡ ἐκελλὸν πρὸς λιμένι ναιαδὸς.
if you had asked me. Since there are plenty
of girls here on Scyros! Consequently my good sons and I
will prepare a ravishing of our own.

Thus I will tell you the reason why we came here.
You see the island’s King, Lycomedes, has no
sons, but instead only many daughters,
and pretty fair-eyed ones at that!
And therefore those violent men, who would
here compel us by force into military service,
if they could, but they’ll never
look here for anyone to enlist as soldiers.
And if they ever do come, I’m prepared.
For that is the reason why I’m wearing this belt
and this little saffron-coloured dress today.
All I have to do is where this pretty shame
for a few more days, at least until every single one
of the bows are buried—well wrapped—
in the sans of Troy. When that times comes then
I will hereafter be safe—my sons too.

They’re somewhere not far off trying on
their new skins: foot-length gowns. A small price
to pay to dodge the draft.
Cheaper than to pay by the head.

_The Satyr Chorus begin to enter/prepare for the parados_

Oh! But here come my sons, all
Bearing themselves in the likeness of daughters.

**Parodos**

**Chorus**
I have come to this sandy
shore of Scyros in-the-sea
from my home across the narrows,
having abandoned my lovely home in the mountains,
and in the woodland vales amongst the nymphs,
where I used to put ashore in the Nymph’s harbour.
ἐμολον πρώτον πρὸς Ἀτρείδες [or: Μυκήνη]
γυμνὰς καὶ ἐλευθεριάζων.

καὶ τόθεν εὐρών τὸν ἐμαυτὸν ἐκυρσ’
ἐγὼ ἐσσόμενος τὸν νεόν ὄρκιον
ἀέκων τῷ καῖνῳ ἀνακτί.

καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐκλήθην γε πρὸς Αὐλίδα
ἀλίμον, τῷ καῖνῳ ἀνακτί.

καὶ τόθεν εὐρών τὸν ἐμαυτὸν ἐκυρσ’
ἐγὼ ἐσσόμενος τὸν νεόν ἔντεα
Ἄρεως γυμνασμενος ὅπλα.

καὶ τὰ μὲν οὖν αὖθ’ ἐμολον νῦν
Σκῦρου ἐναλίας πάρ’ αἰγιαλὸν
φεύγων υπὸ νυκτὶ κρυπτομενος.
ὁ μὲν οὖτως ἡμὰς δεῖν ἐφάσεν
κρυπτεῖν εἴνεκά καλεσάνδρου,
πολεμοῦ κλήσιν φευγεῖν ἐφάσεν,
πολεμοῦ δεσμοὺς λύεσθαι ἐφάσεν
δεῖν δὲ τὰ παντὰ ἐφάσεν ἡμὰς
ἐν’ ἐλευθεριάν νῦν ἐκοίμεν
καὶ τόθεν εὐρών τὸν ἐμαυτὸν ἐκυρσ’
ἐγὼ ἐσσόμενος τὸν νεόν κρήδεμνον
τε πέπλον, τῷ γ’ ἀλλῷ ἀνακτί.
ἀντὶ τινος ἄναξ ἄλλασσόμενος
τι τ’ ἄνθ’ ἀλυσεως [ἄλλασσόμενος.]
First, I came before the Atreides [Mycenae],
naked and free.

And there I found myself
clothed in a new oath
under compulsion, to a new lord.

and then I was called to Aulis
by-the-sea, by my new lord.

And there I found myself
clothed in new armour
and trained in the marches of Ares

And now I have come here
to the shore of Scyros in-the-sea
having fled under the cover of night.
Just as he said that it is necessary for us
To hide because of the draft agent (summoner of men)
To avoid the summons of war, he said,
And to be free from the bonds of war, he said.
All of this is necessary for us, he said,
So that now we might have our freedom
And so there I found myself,
Clothed in a new head-dress
And fine robe, for yet another lord
Exchanging one lord for another,
And one chain for another.
Philoktetes

With three productions to its name, the McGill Classics Play is fast becoming an established tradition, both for the university and for the broader Montreal community—a highlight of each year which brings students together and gives us an opportunity to be true ambassadors for antiquity. Then, too, the play is far more than its performance: it is a chance to see and experience a text from many different angles. We first read the play in Greek, thinking of it grammatically, historically, culturally, much as we would in a classroom. Then we engage in the subtle alchemy of translation. Suddenly the text we have puzzled over is back to being a work of art. How best can we convey the timbre of the Greek in such a distant tongue as English? What to capture, what to leave behind? With rehearsals the play gains three dimensions, and we encounter still more facets as actors dig deep into their characters, we explore space and movement, and add visual and sonic dimensions of costume and music.

This year, with the unflagging efforts of a dedicated group of translators, actors, and crew members, I have had the joy of watching a dream I had in the depths of last winter grow into reality. I was drawn to the Philoktetes by its intensity: set on a deserted island, it centres closely on the choices Philoktetes, Neoptolemos, and Odysseus must make as they navigate the treacherous waters of duty and justice, community and individuality. Original music by local musician David Oppenhein beautifully evoked nineteenth century nautical culture, making our isle of Lemnos sea-circled indeed, and enclosing the intensity of the text in an intensity of sound.

None of this could have come about without the vision, mentorship, and leadership that Professor Lynn Kozak has untiringly poured into this program. Thank you, Lynn, for bringing this program to life. I hope and trust that it will continue to put down roots, and to touch the lives of McGill students and ordinary Montrealers, for many years to come.

As it will most certainly do next year, with our first comedy: Aristophanes’ Lysistrata, directed by Negar Banakar. Like all the annual McGill Classics Play productions, the Lysistrata will centre around the principle of inclusivity: anyone who wants to participate is welcome. If you would like to become involved, or support the play in any way, please email lynn.kozak@mcgill.ca.

Elizabeth Ten-Hove
The Cast of Philoktetes

(Top row, left to right) Samuel Sigere, Lauren Thurber, Samantha Bickell, Pamela Caccese, Tavis Schroeder, Giulietta Fiore, Lewis Innes-Miller; (center row, left to right) Kate Sprung, Catherine Cournoyer, Elizabeth Ten-Hove; (bottom row) Kendra Pomerantz, Sara Tatelman, Katerina Patouri, Anya Baker, Alex Myhr.

Photo by Stephanie Adjemian
Odysseus (Tavis Schroeder) makes plans with Neoptolemos (Giulietta Fiore).

Photo by Elizabeth Ten-Hove
Philoktetes (Lewis Innes-Miller) is restrained by the Choros.

Photo by Elizabeth Ten-Hove
Herakles (Samuel Sigere) appears to end the action.

Photo by Elizabeth Ten-Hove
Interview with Martin Sirois

Conducted by Disha Jani

Where are you from and where did you go to school?

I’m from Quebec; about six hours outside of Montreal. I did my Master’s degree on the Iliad and the Shield of Achilles, and then I moved to the States for my Ph.D. at Princeton, and then I came back here. I continued teaching all over the place: U de M, Concordia, and McGill.

What are your academic and research interests?

Since working on the Iliad, I’ve moved forward in time, to the fourth century and I’m going to move to Alexandria slowly. I’m really excited about my Alexandria class next year. I really want to move my research to Alexandria. Right now, I’m looking at Diogenes the Cynic, from a social perspective rather than a philosophical, social and literary one. My main focus would be literary consciousness or something like that, rather than literature per se. I’m certainly more interested in ideas and the history of ideas rather than working on one author or one specific text. [Studying the] history of ideas allows you to follow an idea through different authors and texts…I don’t have to limit myself to one single thing. I do like to exploit [these ideas] in a specific period; the fourth and fifth century is good for that.

Well, looking at Alexandria, that seems to be outside of the scope of what most people think of when they think of the Classics. People think of Greece and Rome and they kind of stick to that side of the Mediterranean. What do you think about that?

I think that Alexandria is one of the most amazing places in time; it does deserve some more digging. I think all of the literary experimentations have happened there, and I think a lot of scholars have been focusing on it lately – German scholars –I think it’s really a good place, and especially for me, [someone] who is interested in literary consciousness. This is all where it fixed itself; somehow, you know they all started conceiving literary as a tradition, and assessing what has been done previously. I think tis realy a fertile ground to see what has led up to this. And eventually, I am going to go into harsher waters because I am going to see how the Greek tradition travelled from Alexandria into Italy, and see the arrival of Greek tradition in Rome (through southern Italy, most likely).
When you’re looking at the interaction of different cultures, and the fact that Alexandria lies outside the scope of what we would consider the Western world today, is that an important distinction for you?

Well, it was so much Hellenized, that it is pretty much as Hellenistic as well. I don’t see it as so foreign, maybe it’s something I will have to look into more deeply.

What do you love about the Classics, what got you interested in it? What would be your advice for undergrads who are thinking of dabbling, or thinking of majoring?

Well, [laughs] that’s a good question. I certainly started on a whim, and I had no idea it was still offered at a university; that was a surprise. Looking back almost twenty years later, I’m still enjoying it, so something always resounds in an individual to keep them in Classics, certainly. Due to the current reality about Classics, and seeing all over the world that Classics is being pushed aside or even closed down, I’m trying to be optimistic because there’s so much to be learned, obviously, from the ancient world. It resonates so much as our cultural heritage—I know its cliché—but that’s why, I assume, people stay in Classics, there is something true there with social or civilization history. To encourage people… [pauses]. Something that I see missing from a younger generation is a [desire to learn about] general culture. The Classics isn’t just about general culture, or being able to name certain people and events, but it’s so much about the human psyche and to know where we’re from.

It should be on a personal level. One has to do Classics for personal reasons. But if you stick to it, it will always pay off to have a classical background. Even if you do not stay in Classics, it is well known that a Classics student will do well in the outside world, no matter what he or she decides to do. It’s certainly a basic training; it teaches you so many things.

It’s nothing wasted in itself even if you don’t continue doing classics all your life. It’s certainly one of the hardest fields in the humanities, but it teaches you great abilities.

Moving back to the topic of your work, I know that you’re mostly focusing on ideas, but throughout your career so far, do you have a favourite author or favourite texts, either for personal or professional reasons?

I really enjoy works of satire, from Greek Iambs to Archilochus, all the way to the Cynics. That’s one of the reasons I got into the Cynics; [their] sharp wit made it interesting for me. And one of my favourite Roman authors is Horace, the satire is so amazing: the idea of criticizing society, always with a humorous twist to it. That is the main thing that has been following me for the longest [time]. That sharp bite that literature has, that you see
developing in Greek and Roman [literature], adapting and changing also. [These traditions] are all seen as boxes themselves, but certainly they all fit into one strain, one tradition.

**Do you have any favourite modern writers or films?**

[Pauses]…hold on. Anything Stanley Kubrik has done. [Pauses] Yeah, [that question] just surprised me. I suppose I’ve been reading Margaret Atwood’s *The Penelopiad*…I think that’s the best thing I’ve discovered in recent months. That was my latest discovery. What else? Well…science fiction. Hmm. Makes me feel like my life is boring…[laughs]. Kidding. What else have I read recently? Not much. Well, not much modern stuff, even if I have time to spare, I’d rather read a Greek tragedy in translation. I’m watching *The Big Bang Theory* right now, which is amazing. Favourite sitcom: *Seinfeld*…

**That’s a classic!**

[Laughs] In terms of sword and sandal stuff…it’s not my favourite. Even HBO’s *Rome*, I haven’t seen all of it, but that’s …shameful.

**What do you think of that sort of popularization of the Classics?**

We have to open up access to ancient stuff. Any publicity is good publicity, that’s for sure. I always say that you shouldn’t allow classicists to be movie reviewers because obviously they’re always going to complain about the inaccuracies. I don’t really care about the inaccuracies, as long as it gets material out there to the public, so it’s always a good thing. And of course, people should take courses in order to rectify [for themselves] what is wrong. That’s interesting, that recently – I don’t know if it’s a North American trend – but mythology courses [and] history courses are more popular. Every once in a while, there’s a massive coming of new students, and it’s probably because of popular culture. No, I don’t care that movies are inaccurate.

**What do you think makes the Classics so popular, especially for undergrads?**

There must be things they want to explore… I’m not sure to be honest. I should ask students [why] they take it. I have no answer for that. Is it because HBO’s *Rome* is so awesome, and they want to learn more about Rome? I don’t know. I think they just want to hear the stories because they feature historical figures, rather than seeking the truth, which is problematic in itself in the Classics. Do we ever get the actual truth? But really, Classicists should never be movie reviewers, since you know it’s going to be a bad review…and many movies do suck. *Troy*, for instance, which missed the point completely. But I’m not going to complain
about that, its bringing Troy to a whole new audience. I hope people read Homer after it…I’m doubtful, but I hope so.

**I guess more people read Homer afterward than otherwise.**

Exactly! Right. Even if only one percent read the Odyssey or the Iliad, it’s something.

**Back to the subject of teaching…I know you teach introductory Latin, and also the texts. Do you feel there’s a difference? Is there a difference between teaching prose and poetry?**

Well, classroom sizes. My favourite are medium-sized; I like the interaction. Whether its language-based or a civilization course, I prefer to have students’ input…it’s one of the reasons I love teaching so much and one of the reasons I specialize in it. In terms of the material, I don’t mind. My favourite things are languages and literature. I enjoy doing my Virgil class, just slowly reading the actual language rather than simply doing the civilization, when you can bounce ideas off the students. In the big classes such as mythology or modern media, there is always this screen, because everyone is sort of anonymous. It’s cold, I feel, for a lecture style.

**Is there anything else you’d like to add?**

I would actually have questions for students…

**That’s good too!**

What brings – still, in 2013 – what brings students to Classics? I know when I did it, it was sort of opening a door and trying it, and doing it after so many years, I’m glad and I’ve never regretted my decision, but I’m curious. I would be interested in what brings students here. I hope it keeps going, I hope it will never die, it cannot. If we reject the past and everyone keeps being so individualistic about their Facebook, their iPad, popular culture, then obviously it’s going to die out. It cannot die out. So I wonder why students are still interested.

What I see is that people are so focused on the present and they discard the past – “it’s old stuff, it’s passed, we don’t need it anymore” – that scares the [expletive] out of me. It’s good to enjoy the present and Carpe Diem-
That’s Latin, though!

Yeah, [laughs] right, right…but how can people stay so focused on the present? It’s mindboggling. It’s not only cool…indeed, all classicists will share that idea, [but] there something to be learned necessarily.

I think it’s good to be optimistic about that.

We have to be optimistic; otherwise we will be out of a job!

Have you seen this? (whatshouldwecallmeclassics.tumblr.com)

Yes, I’ve seen this! You’re right; I have to keep this in mind. There is a –not even subculture-whole culture about bringing Classics to the present day, indeed. I’m still unsure about what the end result is or will be. How will it play out? Will it only become fun factoids, or will people take a bigger interest into that, or will it just be marginal or fringe references? I have friends doing blogs…I don’t know if you know CRG…Classicist Ryan Gosling? A friend of mine posts these, and every day, I get posts from her on my Facebook: “here’s the new CRG!” So certainly, that keeps it alive. There was actually a panel at the American Philological Association about that. It’s good that the field is looking outside; I’m curious to see [where it goes]. I’m optimistic. [However], looking at it from an academic point of view, we see in the States, so many Classics programmes being squeezed…

Is that just a question of funding?

It’s prioritizing. Certainly the financial crisis did not help, and hopefully it will pick up again. There is nothing worse than when I am asked what I do, and I say Classics, and they say, “Oh…music? No. Latin and Greek. “What? They still teach that?”” I’m sure you get that as well. “What is Classics? What are you going to do with that?”

Do people still say that to you? Despite the fact that you teach at a university?

No, [they have a problem with] the field.

That’s alarming, because I’d thought that that stops when one gets a job in the Classics.

No…grownups.
Really?

Smart people…

That’s upsetting…

That’s when I get pessimistic… my field is unknown! “Oh, you read those old texts?” Well, there’s something in there, that’s why I keep reading them. That’s why we’ve all been reading them for the past 2,500 years and more! It certainly rings on a personal level. I mean, we all read those texts because they mean something; it has to, because otherwise people would not stay in Classics, for sure. Hopefully it will go well, it will all go well. People will pick it up again.