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Identity through Discourse: Narrative Technique in the Epistula Severi

Mark Pearsall
Glastonbury High School

The Epistula Severi provides an account of the conversion of the Jews on the island of Minorca in February 418. The letter was circulated and survived among documents associated with St. Stephen the Protomartyr. Although the author claims the saint’s relics were instrumental in initiating the events he describes, the letter is not hagiographical. In fact, the relics play a surprisingly small role in the story - interpretation of the letter had confounded scholars because of concerns of authenticity and historicity. The issue of authenticity has effectively been resolved through Bradbury’s research on the letter.¹ Scholars now are beginning rightly to move away from concerns about the historicity of the conversion of Jews on the island and instead explore what the letter can reveal about identity, religion, and gender in Late Antiquity. This, in turn, has allowed scholars to focus on the text as something besides a historical letter. Regarding historical fiction in antiquity, Perry notes:

Here we must repeat that throughout the formal prose literature of antiquity, exclusive of the romance and the traditionally comic or mimic genres, what we call fiction or story is conceived either as history or as the recording of presumably actual occurrences. In this fashionable environment, moreover, from the standpoint of dramatic development, a

¹ Bradbury (1996).
story is always depressed by being subordinated to something else, either to the larger framework of a history, within which it is only one incident, or to a philosophical idea which it serves to illustrate. 2

In this light, the letter should be considered a historical, fictional narrative. That is not to say that the letter is untrue but rather that it contains narrative elements that can be studied through rhetorical means. The story it tells is influenced in its telling by the motives of the author and thus reflects his philosophical beliefs and ideological goals. Thus, I will employ rhetorical narrative criticism to examine the discourse of the letter’s narrative. Through this analysis, I will show that the Epistula Severi is an early example of anti-Jewish propaganda that reflects the embrace of violence as a means of conversion. I will also examine how it promotes a totalizing discourse for an imperial, Christian identity that seeks to erase Jewish history from its past.

Severus’ narrative is told in the form of a letter. The epistolary form becomes a frame to contain the narrative. This means that the audience reading the narrative has basic expectations of form from the beginning. For instance, one expects a salutation, introduction, exposition, closure, and valediction. Indeed, all of these things are found in the letter. The choice of epistolary form sends a message to the reader about what to expect but does not dictate the contents of the narrative. At the same time, it does not reflect the veracity of the material contained within the letter. If this letter had been from the perspective of Theodorus, for example, the description of events and the way in which they were reported most likely would have been quite different. Likewise, had it been written to a Jewish audience, it would have had a different purpose and thus not related the events in the same way.

The focus on purpose is an important part of understanding the plot of the narrative. The events are not a collected list of random occurrences. Rather, the author has carefully arranged them in a progression from beginning to end to achieve his desired goal. “The rhetorical approach conceives of narrative as a purposive communicative act. In this view, narrative is not just a representation of events but is also itself an event – one in which someone is doing something with a representation of events.” 3 The implied author makes use of form, content, and order in telling his narrative. “Texts are designed by authors in order to affect readers in particular ways; those designs are conveyed through the words, techniques, structures, forms, and

---

2 Perry (1967, p. 70).

3 Phelan in Herman (2007, p. 203).
intertextual relations of texts.” Examining the way the plot is constructed, then, can reveal the discourse of the narration.

Severus, the implied author, had a message to deliver. He chose to deliver the message in the form of a letter which contains a story. However, this is an artifice. The author attempts to make his story feasible by the construction of the Severus character, using him as the narrator. The narrator, Severus, relates a personal account of events to an imaginary narratee, the recipient of the letter. This is the story aspect of the narration. Through this artifice, the implied author speaks indirectly to an implied audience. This is the discourse aspect of the narration. I will examine what the implied narrator tells us, what he does not, and the manner in which he brings together events to compel the implied audience to accept his story and thus his discourse. As Herman says, “Here is another important point about narrative. It at one and the same time fills and creates gaps. This is an insight that first received extended development by Wolfgang Iser and Meir Sternberg in the 1970s. As Iser wrote, ‘it is only through the inevitable omissions that a story gains its dynamism.’” Severus creates a number of dramatic gaps where he leaves out major events (like the burning of the synagogue). He also includes dreams, miracles, and information that have come to him only through external sources, and he recounts them not necessarily in the chronological order in which they occurred. Thus, his narrative plot (i.e. story as discoursed⁶) is intentionally arranged to influence the reader to believe him and accept his point of view.

The salutation at the start of the letter opens the narrative frame for the rest of the text. From the beginning, it delivers a message through its form and choice of words. It marks the creation of the implied author as a distinct character and imbues him with certain characteristics.

The beginning of a text is governed by the modelling of causality, whereas the end stresses goals,⁷ and this would seem to be a valuable way of linking plot structure to the “edge” of the text, the point at which the text passes into, and is closed off from, nonaesthetic space. The beginning of a text, finally, is the point at which the distancing between author and narrator usually occurs…⁸

---

⁴ Phelan in Herman (2007, p. 209).
⁵ Abbott in Herman (2007, p. 44).
⁶ Chatman as quoted in Powell (1990, p. 23).
As a frame, it creates a literary picture of both an artificial narrator, Severus, and an artificial narratee, the recipient of the letter, which, in turn, is meant to convey information from Severus to an audience. It also creates the expectation of an ending that will explain the contents of the letter in some way and, possibly, ask for something in return. That expectation is fulfilled by the end. In this sense, the beginning and the end of the letter are the most important parts. As the framing structure, they are the parts most likely to be remembered by the reader. The beginning must be dynamic and interesting enough to capture the attention of the audience and indicate what the implied author wants the audience to think. The ending must be satisfying and compelling enough to convince the audience to accept the author’s point of view. Everything in between is the author’s opportunity to influence the audience to arrive at the point of view he desires them to have. There is a natural flow between the textual elements of the story and the readerly dynamics in reaction to them. “A narrative’s movement from its beginning to its end is governed by both a textual and a readerly dynamics, and understanding their interaction provides a good means for recognizing a narrative’s purposes.”

Thus the narrative progression from beginning to middle to end is a crucial element in understanding the discourse of the letter.

In studying the character of Severus, the narrator, we see the way the implied author established at the start a mindset of binary opposition between Christians and Jews. This was the point in the narration which showed separation between the flesh-and-blood author, the implied author, and the character narrator. The salutation and the introduction of the Severus character form the exposition at the opening of the narrative.

Elements of exposition matter because they influence our understanding of the narrative world, which in turn influences our understanding of the meaning and consequences of the action, including our initial generic identifications of the narrative and the expectations that follow from that identification.

The implied author creates a world that is specific to his discourse. The authorial audience is invited to become part of that world as a means of accepting the discourse. If the audience rejects the world that is established by the implied author, there can be no forward movement in the narrative. The reader will stop reading or consciously choose to reject the discourse. Severus makes direct appeals to his audience to

---

accept the world he creates by referencing, for example, the selection from Tobit and claiming that it would be wrong to conceal the miracles of God (1.1-2). This creates a suspenseful intrigue that heightens the curiosity of the reader to find out what he means. At the same time, it tells us something about the ideal, narrative audience for whom Severus was writing. For one, he fully expects his audience to have familiarity with Tobit and other biblical references. He also assumes that his audience will be Christian and sympathetic to his story. His discourse, then, will involve the way he convinces his audience of something more than just being sympathetic. It is necessary to study the entire plot or narrative progression in order to see what that is and how he does it.

The story begins with the description of the island. It is a logical beginning for anyone who is not familiar with Minorca. It also serves the dual purpose of providing a geographical setting for the story and a philosophical one for the discourse. The establishment of the binary opposition at the beginning of the letter is essential for everything that follows. The storyline is dependent on the oppositional nature of the relationship between the Jews and Christians, and the discourse which continues to unfold is based on the concept of the two groups being at odds. The geography of the island actually is not described in much detail. The landscape of conflict is more important than the real life terrain. The same is true of the social relationships which are detailed in the beginning exposition. The narration creates a picture of conflict brewing just below the surface in any engagement of Christians and Jews. But gaps remain in the descriptions that cause us to wonder about the reality of the situation. For example, are there only Christians and Jews on the island? Where are the pagans? How did Jews get to be in such prominent political and social positions in the government in Magona if there is such dislike for them among the Christians? No explanation for these gaps is given in the story. Rather, the narrative quickly slides beyond them and moves toward the conflict which arises after the arrival of the saint’s relics. It is an effective technique as the reader gets caught up in the more pressing issue of the building trouble and the issues of realism (mimetic plausibility) are forgotten. This is a general pattern that marks the progression of the textual elements in the narrative.

On the textual side narratives proceed by the introduction, complication, and resolution (in whole or in part) of two kinds of unstable situations. The first kind exists on the level of story, that is, the events and existents, including character and setting, of narrative, and I call them simply

*instabilities*: they involve relations within, between, or among characters.
and their situations. ... The second kind exists at the level of discourse, that is, the narration and its techniques, and I call them tensions: they involve relations among authors, narrators, and audiences, and they include gaps between tellers and audiences of knowledge, beliefs, opinions, and values.\textsuperscript{11}

The instability presented at the beginning is the relationship between the Christians and the Jews. This is supported by the setting which creates binary opposition. In turn, this creates a tension between reality and the world of the \textit{Epistula Severi}. However, the tension is lessened if the audience is willing to accept the reality which Severus creates. The letter progresses through movements of instabilities among the characters and tensions as the reader is drawn into the authorial audience.

The initial depiction of life on the island is one of disquiet. This does not mean that life was actually like that in the real world. Certain contradictions in the text lead the reader to believe that there was less ill will between Christians and Jews than overtly stated (e.g. the reference to social interactions like greetings and even the mention of affection among the two peoples).\textsuperscript{12} But Severus describes a society in which the status quo is less peaceful or stable and resentment lurks below the surface. The first disrupting instability to come to the island then is the arrival of St. Stephen’s relics... or, rather, the appointment of Severus as bishop.\textsuperscript{13} The arrival of the relics is introduced with the seemingly offhand comment that they came “nearly on the same day on which I, although unworthy, acquired the title of such priesthood.”\textsuperscript{14} This is the first actual event in the story and the narrator signals right away that he will be substituting one thing for another in his recounting. Although he makes the case that St. Stephen was the inspiration for the events that unfolded, he also makes it clear indirectly that everything started with his own arrival. As if to remove any doubt about the swiftness of his actions, he repeatedly employs fire imagery\textsuperscript{15} to describe the reaction among the Christians.

\textsuperscript{11} Phelan (2005, p. 212).

\textsuperscript{12} Some modern scholars (e.g. Bradbury, 1996) have argued that these are clear indications of peaceful coexistence between Christians and Jews.

\textsuperscript{13} Most scholars accept Severus’ claim that the relics are the cause of the conflict against the Jews because they inspired such a strong reaction in the Christians. I am not saying they did not. Rather, rhetorically in the \textit{Letter}, Severus uses them as an excuse to stir up violence against the Jews. The mention of these two events as connected shows that he wants them connected in the reader’s mind.

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{diebus paene isdem, quibus ego tantii sacerdottii nomen, licet indignus, adeptus sum} (4.1).

\textsuperscript{15} Gaddis discusses the common use of fire imagery in religious zeal, especially as it relates to violence. “Fire imagery was often used to describe the Holy Spirit, Mary’s conception, and the presence
Quo facto, protinus ille, quem Dominus 'venit mittere in terram' et quem valde ardere\textsuperscript{16} cupit, caritatis eius ignis accensus est. Statim siquidem tepor noster incaluit et factum est cor nostrum, sicut scriptum est, 'ardens in via'. Nunc enim iam illud fidei amburebat zelus, nunc spes salvandae multitudinis erigebat.  

When this was done, immediately that fire of his love ignited, which the Lord ‘came to scatter onto the earth’ and which he wants to burn brightly. Indeed at once our warmth grew hot and our hearts became, as it is written, ‘burning on the path.’ For now that zeal of our faith was burning, now the hope of saving the crowd was exciting us.

This fiery beginning to the story catches the attention of the audience. It also sets the tone for the rest of the conflict between the two parties as it shows the Christians to be inspired by holy passion to serve the church and bring salvation to the disbelieving Jews. Their motivation is thus pure and even supported by scripture as shown by the two allusions to Luke.\textsuperscript{17}

Yet, as soon as the conflict begins it is interrupted, building suspense. Theodorus is presented as the typical villain of the story, powerful and corrupt. He is a noble, influential man on whom the Jews and even some Christians depended. Tapping into the binary opposition of Christians and Jews presented earlier in the introduction, Theodorus becomes the symbolic opposite of Severus. His power, and that of the Jews, is earthly.\textsuperscript{18} The Christians, on the other hand, are shown to be physically weaker but humble in their hearts and stronger in truth.\textsuperscript{19} Therefore the Jews put their trust in Theodorus but the Christians put theirs in the saint. This, of course, is another ruse on Severus’ part. The Jews look to their patron, Theodorus, of Christ within the Eucharist. Great zeal for the faith was commonly represented as ‘fire’ within the heart. It is in this context that we must understand the many stories of fire miracles by which holy men, Syrian as well as others, demonstrated their power or legitimated acts of righteous violence.” (2005, pp. 185-186). In this case, the fire of zeal foreshadows the fire which will destroy the synagogue later in the text.

\textsuperscript{16} It is significant that although he claims the Christians acted through peace and desire to help the Jews, the imagery he uses is often destructive. Here he talks about fire and burning which foreshadows the ultimate destruction of the synagogue later in the Letter.

\textsuperscript{17} Bradbury cites the two quotations as coming from \textit{Luke} 12:49 and 24:32 respectively (1996, p. 83).

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{et censu et honore saeculi praecipuus erat} (6.1).

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{corde ita etiam et viribus humiles sed veritatis robore superiores} (6.4).
for protection and he provides it by calming the disputes between the two groups. But the flame of faith\textsuperscript{20} reignites. It does not happen in Magona, however, where the relics are kept but rather in Jamona where Severus resides. This is the most obvious example of the author concealing the events behind the symbolism of religion. Of course, the narrator may well believe that St. Stephen was responsible for what happened. Certainly he wants his narratees to believe that it is true. But the underlying discourse reveals to us that in fact the bishop was the catalyst for the renewed zeal to move against the Jews.

The story continues with a description of the preparations for the confrontation. The Christians put their faith in Christ. While suspense builds the narrative in other situations, it is excluded when referring to the eventual outcome of the conflict. Simply stated, the Christians win despite the minimal odds. What is remarkable is that they do so with little effort because of the support of Christ.\textsuperscript{21} The author does not want the reader to wonder about the outcome and so he reveals it from the start. This frees the reader to focus instead on how the outcome was achieved which is really the discourse he promotes.

Meanwhile, the Jews look not to their future but to their past as they prepare. They remind themselves of the Maccabees and tell one another they prefer death to losing their heritage.\textsuperscript{22} Therefore they stockpile all manner of weapons to defend themselves. No weapons are mentioned in regard to the Christians. Instead, they merely had the protection of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{23} It is thus difficult to cast blame on them since they are weaponless. The Christians seem to win this war despite their own inaction. We know from the minimal details about the resulting destruction that this is not true, but Severus makes a concerted effort to portray the Christians as innocent of any aggression in the unfolding events.

The forward movement of the story is again interrupted at this point to relate the dreams of Theodora and Theodorus. In some ways, the dreams act as a break in the action to allow for reflection on what has happened while the author more actively promotes the discourse. In this instance, we are reintroduced to Theodorus who has not taken a leading role in the story so far. His only contribution has been

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{fidei flamma} (7.2).

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{absque ullo sudore certaminis exercitui suo hanc quam nemo aut optare audebat aut sperare poterat victoriam concessisse} (8.3).

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Iudaei igitur exemplis se Machabaei temporis cohortantes, mortem quoque pro defendendis legitimis suis desiderabant} (8.4).

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{virtute Sancti Spiritus praemunitam} (8.5).
the brief respite in the conflict which he provided to the inhabitants of Magona by his return from Majorca. The dream sequence serves both to round out his character and to foreshadow what will happen to him later. The Theodorus in the dream is not as self-confident and authoritative as in his first description. He is moved by fear of the Lion and flees in panic. This, as well as his encounter with Reuben and the solace he seeks from the female relative, foreshadow where the story will go. Importantly, though, it also develops the discourse by adding a new element. In the dreams, Theodorus and the Jews (in the guise of a widow) offer themselves to the Christians. This is significant because it shows willingness rather than coercion. While we can, and should, read between the lines that coercion was in fact the method to get the Jews to convert, the reader is shown how to promote a different portrayal of events. The goal is not only to convert the Jews but to make the conversion look like it was their idea.

An unspecified period of preparations for the “future war”\(^\text{24}\) allows both groups, significantly described as “armies”\(^\text{25}\) to be forewarned by countless dreams, of which the above mentioned are the only two reported. Recounting dreams takes the place of relating what actually went on in the Christian city. When the story resumes, the Christians are prepared and set out eagerly to confront the Jews in Magona. Crossing the island is dispatched in one sentence reflecting the eagerness of the Christians to enjoin their opponents. And then the conflicts begin.

From his arrival in Magona, Severus is hostile to the Jews. He demands that they meet with him and dismisses their refusals with more demands. He insists that his intention is to carry out peaceful discussion with them\(^\text{26}\) but his tone is condescending and he insults the Jews by insinuating that they might be using an excuse when they were really planning some kind of trick.\(^\text{27}\) The verbal sparring between the two parties ends when the Jews are forced to physically meet with Severus. Curiously, Theodorus is absent from all of these activities. In fact, it is unclear with which Jews Severus corresponded or who was forced to show up at his house. Those details are simply lacking. The Lion of God is named as the agent compelling the

\(^{24}\) *futurum instruitur bellum* (9.1).

\(^{25}\) *utrique exercitus* (9.1). Again, the word choice is important here. The notion of war and armies stands out in this supposedly peaceful plan especially since Severus claims that the Jews were stockpiling weapons, but the Christians had none.

\(^{26}\) *futurum autem esse modestissimum de lege conflictum, nec excitandas lites sed fabulas esse miscendas* (12.6).

\(^{27}\) *si non astute certamen fugerent sed simplicem afferent excusationem* (12.6).
Jews to come. This convenient symbol covers any indication of wrong doing or possible violent action. The Jews are described as terrified by the Lion\(^{28}\) but we don’t know what occurred to cause that reaction. The reader is left with a gap in the story that can be filled or not, and individual readers may insert different images as they imagine them. The not-telling creates a more powerful story because of the potential variation in how readers react. The discourse is also supported because the violence that was likely employed is never mentioned. It becomes clear that Severus wants an excuse to lead his band to the synagogue and he refuses to accept any argument from the Jews until they allow him to do so.

Going to the synagogue, the elated Christians begin singing songs to Christ.\(^{29}\) The Jews are likewise moved to sing and join the Christians in singing the same song.\(^{30}\) Bradbury\(^{31}\) suggests that this is evidence of close ties between the Christians and the Jews, contrary to Severus’ earlier claim that the appearance of friendship between the two peoples was out of obligation only. Whether that is true or not, Severus includes that detail for a reason. He even includes the words of the song they were singing: *Periit memoria eorum cum strepitu et Dominus in aeternum permanet.*\(^{32}\) These lines are pertinent for other reasons. First, they foreshadow what will happen to the Jews by the end of the letter: they will cease to be Jews and instead continue with the Christians. Second, they indicate again that the Jews willingly participate in this destruction of their past identity because they choose to join in the singing with the Christians. And third, it hints at the broader discourse of Christian reclamation of Jewish identity which was unfolding in this time and which Severus reasserts more forcefully later in the letter. It is their memory (i.e. their past) which perishes when they become Christians.

Jewish women throwing rocks from the rooftops and high windows interrupt the journey to the synagogue. This incites a miraculous riot in which no one is hurt. By this point in the letter it is clear that every event serves a purpose of discourse rather than reflecting any realistic picture of what happened. More time is spent describing the motives of the mob and God’s intentions than what actually must

\(^{28}\) *illis leonis terrore compulsi* (12.7).

\(^{29}\) *hymnum Christo per plateam ex multitudine laetitiae caneamus* (13.1).

\(^{30}\) *mira iucunditate etiam Iudaorum populus decantabat* (13.2).


\(^{32}\) “Their memory dies with an uproar and the Lord continues forever.” (13.2).
have transpired. The destruction of the synagogue is mentioned almost as an afterthought. The focus instead is on the actions brought about by divine will (e.g., it was God’s plan that the women throw the rocks; the Lion incited the Christians to attack; etc.). Recognition of divine accomplishments and praise of God are typical elements in Christian literature. Severus demonstrates how this can be used to support his other purpose, the appearance of Christian innocence in situations of anti-Jewish violence. He does not claim that the synagogue was not destroyed. He also does not fail to mention that it happened. It is important both to acknowledge the fact that violence happened and to dissimulate effectively the agency of the Christians in any wrongdoing. Divine support and pureness of intention are appropriate filters for such a discourse. With the synagogue destroyed, the Christians leave the scene singing again and turn their attention to the next phase of their campaign.

After a break of three days the narrative resumes. Just before, there is a short interlude inserted, however, describing the conversion of Reuben. He is the first to convert on the island. It is both sudden and dramatic. “For delighting the hearts of everyone with a very holy cry, he begged to be released from the chains of Jewish superstition.”33 This partially clarifies Theodorus’ unexplained dream that happened earlier. More significantly, it shows the first convert, seemingly of his own accord, asking to be made a Christian. There is no indication of coercion. The identification of Reuben with the first born son of Jacob lends an authoritative element to the act, however, because it confirms Severus’ earlier statement that God named this man appropriately and intentionally. Therefore, it was God’s will that this should transpire. And, in some sense, it rewrites an element of Jewish history in a new Christian setting that includes Jews becoming Christians rather than Christians distancing themselves from Jews.

Theodorus makes his entrance as an active character in the next segment of the story. This is the epic fight scene: like two warriors surrounded by their supporters, Theodorus and Severus face off against one another. They clash with words, however, and in the battle, Theodorus is superior. But the Christians are not vanquished. Severus had predicted this outcome long before when he compared the Jews and the Christians preparing to fight.

Christum vero cuius ‘regnum non in sermone sed in virtute est’ nobis ne verbum quidem proferentibus, suis omnia viribus consummasse, et absque

33 Nam clamore sanctissimo laetificans corda cunctorum, absolvi se a vinculis Iudaicae superstitionis depre-cabatur. (15.2).
ullo sudore certaminis exercitui suo hanc quam nemo aut optare audebat aut sperare poterat victoriam concessisse. (8.3)

But Christ, whose ‘kingdom is not in word but in virtue’ accomplished everything by his own force without us even saying a word, and he granted his army without any sweat of struggle a victory which no one dared to hope for or was able to expect.

In fulfilment of that prophecy, the miracle occurs which leads to Christian victory and Jewish demise. The misunderstanding of the shout for Theodorus to believe leads to a general panic among the Jews and leaves Theodorus alone and vulnerable. Or, at least, that is what Severus wants his audience to believe. As with the other riot, most of the details are missing or symbolically portrayed. “That terrible Lion” appears once again and instills fear in the Jews. Theodorus’ dream continues to be realized next when it is revealed that he is standing on the exact spot about which he had dreamed. The singing monks are depicted again and Reuben shows up. We have no understanding of what else happened during the show-down. We know that many Jews fled in fear for their safety, some even leaving the city for the protection of the wilderness. The cause of their fear, which must have been grand, is not discussed. However, it is once again implied and certainly evident from the reaction of the Jews.

The interaction with Reuben provides another opportunity for Severus to shape the discourse by adding something new to it. From the beginning, he has slowly unrolled his agenda. First, he created the sense of binary opposition. This was followed by the suggestion that the Jews volunteer to convert rather than be coerced. He then added the notion that this was all part of God’s plan. Reuben is responsible for a new element in the formula. He makes an offer of continued prestige and safety for Theodorus if he converts. This is an obvious example of coercion: the implication is that failure to convert will result in a loss of prestige and possible harm. However, it is also a form of negotiation that was not present before. Theodorus obviously perceives it to be such because he accepts but makes a counter offer – give him a little time to make his announcement public so he can gain more prestige by convincing others to convert with him.34 This is a completely unexpected answer from Theodorus. He is the leader of the Jewish people and responsible for their well-be-

34 permittite mihi ut prius alloquar plebem meam, ut maiorem conversionis meae etiam ex reliquis possim habere mercedem. (16.16).
ing. His motivation is unclear for making this offer. Is he concerned about his own position and power? Is he willing to sell out his own people for personal gain? Or is he so terrified for his people that he thinks he only can save them by making them convert? Generally speaking, Severus provides the reader with ambiguities when he is trying to communicate something else. When we examine the context of this startling exchange, it starts to make more sense. The previous scene had just shown what happened when the Jews thought their leader had converted. The description of the panic was detailed with women screaming and tearing out their hair and men running for their lives. Theodorus would want that not to happen if he converted. But Severus also would want that not to happen. His dilemma is how to convert the Jews without making it seem like a forced or violent affair. Here, he has suggested a new strategy: bribe the leadership and get them to assist. With Theodorus working from the inside, the chance of the Jews offering themselves for conversion is more likely. And indeed, immediately after this, large crowds of Jews assembled at the church and asked to be converted.

The episode which follows, involving Meletius and Innocentius hiding in the cave, is one of the longest in the letter. There is little forward progression in the narrative (no indication of what is happening in the city while they are gone is provided) in this segment as it almost completely takes place in a cave and ends with the two characters returning to the city from which they just had left. It is a curious episode because it shows Innocentius trying to convince Meletius that they should convert. Placed after the short passage in which Theodorus made a strikingly rapid decision to convert and just before the public meeting in which he tries to convince the other Jews to convert with him, this scene takes on a new meaning. It shows the psychological and philosophical argument that Severus wants us to imagine the Jews had in deciding to convert. The notion that the whole population would suddenly convert is unrealistic without at least some internal struggle. This passage provides that. It is unlike any other passage because it represents two sides of the argument for converting. Meletius holds out and tries to resist while Innocentius provides reasons why they should become Christian. However, his arguments sound suspiciously like Severus’ discourse. When Meletius complains he cannot drive out the phrase “Christ, in your name” from his mind, Innocentius replies:

35 Iudaeorum multitudinem convenisse inspeximus, qui omnes unanimiter deprecabantur ut Christi characteren a me, licet indigno pastore, susciperent. (17.1-2).
36 Christe, in nomine tuo (18.6).
‘Non’, inquit, ‘frustra hic sermo, quem neque cor tuum, ut apud cunctos probatissimum est, antea cogitavit neque os umquam protulit, hoc praesertim tempore menti tuae, ut asseris, tam violenter insertus est . Ex Deo hoc esse arbitrator. (18.7)

It is not in vain that this phrase, which neither your heart (which is very well proven among everyone) has ever thought nor your mouth ever produced, has been so violently inserted, as your claim, into your mind especially at this time. I believe it is from God.

The conversion is God’s will, according to Innocentius. Those do not seem like the words of a Jew who just fled from the city in fear. However, Innocentius encourages Meletius to struggle harder against the thoughts. When this does not prove to be enough, he tells him that he heard the Christians exclaim that Theodorus had converted and wondered if it were not likely that Meletius too would soon convert just as his relative did. Based on that supposition he concludes that it is useless for them to remain in the cave and risk the dangers of starvation; they should return to the city. His suggestion that the conversion of Theodorus indicates that it is inevitable that the others will convert is spurious at best and the idea that they should return to Magona for safety is out of place with their flight from there in the first place. His further description of the Christians as “such a merciful people,” “blameless,” and “not at all enemies” are thoughts that Severus wants his implied audience to have, not what someone who just fled for his life from the city would have said. As unbelievable as these words are to us, they are equally inconceivable to Meletius who rejects them outright and urges voluntary exile before apostasy. And so the two set out to escape again. At this point God intervenes and nature itself rises against them, driving them back toward the city until they eventually, as Innocentius had foreseen, abandon their plan for escape and accept that conversion is their only option. It is worth noting that they did so “against their will and plan.” When reasoning failed, forced coercion was a valid alternative.

37 Poteritne fieri ut non etiam tu germani constrictus exemplo religionem Iudaicam desereris? (18.13).
38 plebs tam misericors (18.14).
39 innoxios (18.14).
40 in nullo sensimus inimicos (18.14).
41 contra voluntatem ac propositum suum (18.23).
Three days after these events, Theodorus completes whatever requirements are needed to address his people and bring them together “to call them to faith in Christ.”\(^4\) By the end of this episode many Jews in fact rushed to become Christians.\(^4\) However it is not because Theodorus convinced them. Instead, before he could address the crowd, two others, a young relative of Theodorus named Galilaeus and another civic leader, Caecilianus, interrupt him. They relate powerful anecdotes about how they feared for their lives and could not continue to be Jews for fear of being injured or even murdered.\(^4\) This is the most overt reference to violence and forced conversion in the letter. Notably it is expressed by the Jews and not the Christians. If the audience has been won over to Severus’ argument by now, they will see that Jewish perception as shown here is not in keeping with the Christian behavior that Severus has been describing all along. Still, it is a strange episode to include as it has the potential to dilute or contradict the message that has been so actively promoted thus far. One possible reason for including it is to draw the attention away from Theodorus. There is a strong possibility that Theodorus could end up looking like the hero in this tale if he is the agent responsible for winning over all of the Jews. Such an ending would clearly undermine the whole message of this letter because it would show Theodorus as the charismatic leader who repents from his evil ways and leads his people out of darkness into the light. Severus, while not particularly trying to promote himself overtly as the savior here, really aims toward a discourse on how to convert the Jews. To reduce this conversion to one Jewish leader would make the letter a worthless message in the long run. Instead, by introducing these two characters who have never shown up before and allowing them to steal the glory from Theodorus, he removes the attention for a single individual. After this episode the audience sees that it takes multiple leaders to convert the whole group. There is also a strong reminder that force or threats of violence have an appropriate and useful role in the process. Theodorus had been frightened into becoming Christian earlier and now Caecilianus, who was also a “father of the Jews,”\(^4\) expressed his own fear of being harmed as a reason to convert. Theodorus has been rendered irrelevant despite his role in converting the other Jews while Severus has re-emphasized the basic principles of his discourse.

---

42 *ad fidem Christi provocare* (19.1).
43 *multosque Iudaeorum eadem die ad fidem Christi…suscepimus* (19.10).
44 *si in Iudaismo perseverare voluero, forsitan perimendus sum* (19.4).
45 *Caecilianus autem cum esset Iudaeorum pater* (19.2).
Having accomplished a major goal in the narrative, the forward progression is again interrupted with the recounting of prodigies. As usual, the interruption develops the discourse in a new way. The letter is getting close to its completion and so the discourse needs to be solidified for the audience. The joint miracles, told in reverse order chronologically, provide the final expansion of the discourse along two planes. First, they show that conversion of the Jews is not, in and of itself, the last stage. Rather, Judaism itself must be converted. The letter thus provides a model for re-claiming Jewish history and therefore Jewish identity as Christian. The Exodus from Egypt does not end with the arrival in the Promised Land. It ends with the arrival via conversion in Christianity. Therefore, Judaism is not itself complete until it makes the rest of the journey as well. The second idea is that conversion is God’s will and must be diligently pursued throughout the whole world. The remote island of Minorca is chosen as an example for other places to follow. If such miraculous conversions could happen there, then it must be God’s design they should be accomplished everywhere. This is both a broad and obvious message as the conclusion to the prodigies. But it should not be understated that the miracles show this letter is not simply an account of what happened on Minorca but rather a call to action for others to go out and employ the same techniques to convert the Jews.

Theodorus finally converts on the next day. He first needs to be reminded by everyone that he had promised. He is hesitant to make a formal declaration because he has not spoken with his wife since she is still on Majorca. His two concerns are that she would not also convert and that she would choose to leave the marriage. The Christians are understanding of his concerns and willing to accommodate them but the Jews who have already converted became upset and protest his delay. We don’t know what ultimately drives him to convert but Theodorus cuts short his delay and converts, thus fulfilling the last part of his dream by “hurrying to his female relative’s bosom.” That is the moment when the floodgates open and the mass conversion occurs.

post quem omnis, tamquam remoto obice, ad ecclesiam synagoga confluxit. Mirum dictu, inveterati illi legis doctores sine ulla altercatione verborum, sine ullo scripturarum certamine crediderunt. Tantum

46 summa omnium expectatio Theodorum ut sponsioni suae satisfacere admonebat (21.1).
47 Cum haec Theodorus Christianis iam acquiescentibus perorasset, Iudaeis qui conversi fuerant acerrima commotione consistentibus (21.3).
48 ad matris propinquae sinum festinus (21.3).
percunctati an vellent fidem Christi suscipere, credere se in Christum et Christianos statim fieri cupere profitebantur. (21.4-6)

After him the whole synagogue, just like when an obstacle has been removed, poured toward the church. Wondrous to say, those elderly teachers of the law, without any argument over words, without and fight about scripture, believed. Having doubted so much about whether they were willing to accept Christ’s faith, they professed that they believed in Christ and that they were desiring to become Christians immediately.

In a curious turn of events, Theodorus turns out to have been the obstacle blocking the Jews from converting all along. While obviously not the case, the imagery makes it look that way. Once Theodorus has finally confirmed his promised conversion, everyone else willingly joins, in accordance with Severus’ wishes and the letter’s discourse.

The letter moves toward a conclusion after the conversion of Theodorus and the majority of the Jews. The next sections all involve final converts. Some are quick and nameless, but a few still attempt to resist for a short while before they too convert. In the former category is an old man who decides to convert before he dies (22) and some nameless Jews who, while sailing past the island, are forced ashore by storms and decide to convert while there (23). In fact, Severus almost jokingly mentions a brief miracle in which there are repeated rainstorms (25). Every time it rains, another group of Jews converts. In the latter category, those who resist conversion, include only women. Specifically, the women are Artemisia (Meletius’ wife) with her female friends and servants, the unnamed wife of Innocentius, and her sister. Kraemer gives an excellent feminist reading of the role and treatment of these (and other) female figures in the text⁴⁹ which I will not try to reproduce. From a rhetorical perspective, these figures also have significance collectively and individually. The fact that only the wives and women resist was predicted several times in the concerns expressed by Theodorus. One of the reasons he delays the public announcement of his own conversion is that he was afraid his wife would fail to convert or leave him if he did not discuss it with her first. The actions of Meletius’ and Innocentius’ wives show that his concern is valid. Also, in terms of closure to the letter, it is appropriate that these women be the last to convert since Meletius and Innocentius are, after Reuben, the first named characters to convert. Their conversion at the end completes the picture,

---

⁴⁹ Kraemer (2009).
symbolically marking the success of Severus’ mission.

Each of the (groups of) women also has a rhetorical purpose in the letter, reinforcing the discourse one last time before the valediction. When Severus states that there are three who have not yet become Christian, he comments that such is the will of God for the purpose of spreading His glory further. Their individual purposes are revealed in the recounting of the subsequent passages. The miracle story involving Artemisia shows the re-writing of Jewish history in a Christian context and voluntary conversion. Innocentius’ wife reasserts the power of prayer as a means of dissimilating forced conversion. The story about her sister uses biblical support to express the pre-destined outcome that the Jews will convert (i.e. that it is God’s will).

Innocentius’ wife resists conversion for four days. She is unable to be persuaded by her husband through threats or prayers or tears. And so a whole crowd of Christians lay siege to her home. It should not go unnoticed that Severus claims they came because Innocentius asked them to do so. When they arrive, they try to force her to convert with words but she is still not willing.

 Cum igitur diu cassa verba surdis auribus ingerentes nihil profecissemus, ad cognitum orationis praesidium convolavimus precesque, quas humana repellebat impietas, ad caelestem misericordiam vertimus. (27.4)

Therefore when we had produced nothing forcing pointless words on deaf ears for a long time, we rushed to the known protection of prayer, and we turned prayers which human impiety rejected to heavenly mercy.

It is noteworthy that they “are forcing” (ingerentes) the words on her for a long time. The sense of coercion is strong. Her continued resistance and the subsequent assistance sought in prayer is a familiar formula in the letter at this point. The graphic image of the Christian army sweating in its effort to convert this one woman is almost comical in its hyperbole. The same must be said about the comparison be-

---

50 *ad virtutis suae gloriam dilatandam in duritia perfidiae suae Christus permanere aliquantulum passus est* (24.1).

51 *vel minis vel precibus vel lacrimis moveri posset* (27.2).

52 *universa Innocentio rogante ad domum in qua habitabat fraternitatis multitudo convenit* (27.3).

53 *nostri sudavit exercitus* (27.5).
tween her and Amalek. However, for all its absurdity, this pattern again draws an allusion to Exodus and reiterates the familiar pattern of reclaiming Jewish history in a new Christian context. And, in fact, after a lot of praying and crying, she at last agrees to convert: “And when the people shout ‘Amen’ at the end of the prayer, she adds that she believes and wants to become a Christian”. In the end, the decision is hers and she willingly converts. But the emphasis in the passage is on the immense effort the Christians make to convince her. They occupy her house and remain there for hours persuading her, praying and singing. We have seen before, however, that violent things sometimes occur while the Christians are praying (e.g. the burning of the synagogue; the terror inspired in the Jews after the debate; etc.) in the letter. Even if she agrees merely in order to get them out of her house, this is still a form of coercion that is masked behind religious devotion and prayer.

The next day, Severus and the other Christians who accompany him prepare to return to Jamona. They are convinced at this point that all of the Jews have convert-ed. They are surprised, therefore, when Innocentius’ sister-in-law approaches them because they know she has boarded a ship to leave the island when she realizes that Innocentius has converted. In fact, when she boards the ship, there has been no attempt to stop her from leaving. Rather, they encourage her to go because there is no way to convince her to convert. However, she is driven back to shore when she tries to leave. Now she approaches Severus and wraps her arms around his legs like a suppliant begging to convert. Bewildered, he asks her why she wished to abandon her brethren in the first place. She replies that even Jonah wished to flee from the

54 Itaque usque in horam ferme tertiam, hymnorum atque orationum proeliis adversus Amalech hostem Iesu ducis nostri sudavit exercitus. (27.5). “And so up until the third hour our army sweated in battles of hymns and prayers against Amalek, the enemy of our leader, Jesus.” This one woman is compared to the leader in Exodus who first attacked the Jews fleeing to Israel from Egypt. That she is the final convert may be seen as a parallel to the destruction of the Amalekites whose name was to be forever expunged from history.


56 This is reminiscent of the psychological torment experienced by Judith in the tale of Judith and Aseneth before she converts to Judaism.

57 Et cum in consummatione orationis ‘Amen’ populus inclamasset, illa credere et se Christianam fieri velle subiensit. (27.7).

58 Indeed, such divinely inspired violence after prayer is not unique to the Letter. See, for example 3 Maccabees. An important part of the discourse here is that the violence is inspired by God and not simply the earthly agents.

59 navem ascendit, non solum permittentibus verum etiam suadentibus nobis, quia ad fidel Christi nec verbis nec miraculis flecteretur (26.2).
face of God. She adds that he did however fulfil God’s will albeit unwillingly. Thus, she is very much like Jonah herself because she flees from conversion in the beginning but, after unwillingly returning to the island, she then converts and offers her two daughters for conversion as well. This, of course, has been God’s intention all along as Severus indicates before he begins recounting the tales of the three women.

After the conversion of these last women, the letter concludes. Severus reports that five hundred and forty Jews join the church during the eight days he describes. He adds that he finds it important to report that so many Christians accompanied him on the thirty mile journey from Jamona to assist in the confrontation with the Jews. Since he does not name anyone in particular for helping him, his goal in reporting this fact cannot be to win favor for anyone. It seems possible then to consider that he wants it noted that he has a force of supporters with him when he makes his attack. The accomplishment of such a great task would not have been possible without a large band of enforcers. This is all the more important when considered with the next segment of the letter in which he describes how the Jews themselves are responsible for tearing down the remains of the synagogue and building a new cathedral on its site. As Bradbury notes,

In cases of synagogue burning in the late 4th and early 5th cents., the issue of compensation was hotly disputed...The details of Ch. 31 reveal how tough Severus has been in negotiations with Theodorus and the other Jewish notables. Conversion was only part of the bargain.

This reveals that a negotiation in fact must have occurred between them. There were hints of this in the conversation between Theodorus and Reuben but the results here confirm it. Including this information at the end of the letter is a not so subtle reminder to the reader that negotiation should be used to persuade conversion.

In a poetic closure, Severus returns for a moment to some of the imagery he employed at the beginning.

Illud magis mirum magisque gaudendum est, quod ipsam Iudaicae plebis terram diu inertem, nunc autem recissis incredulitatis vepribus et recepto verbi semine, multiplicem fructum iustitiae germinare conspicimus, ita ut nobis in spe tantorum novalium gaudeamus. (30.1)

---

60 ‘Et Ionas’, inquit, ‘propheta a facie Domini fugere voluit, et tamen voluntatem Domini licet invitus implevit.’ (28.5).

61 Inane autem et supervacuum non reor ut... commemorem (29.3).

We must rejoice more for that rather marvelous thing that we see the land itself of the Jewish people, which was inert for a long time but now after the thorns of unbelief have been cut back and the seed of the word has been taken in, it produces a multitude of the fruit of justice. And so let us rejoice in the hope of such cultivated land.

No longer is the countryside inhospitable and bearing poisonous snakes and scorpions. The wolves and foxes are gone. The geography has changed. And in fulfilment, at last, of Theodora’s and Severus’ dreams, the barren fields which were offered to him have been planted and are producing.

Having brought closure to all of the elements he introduced, he also closes the frame of the narrative with a valediction. He includes a formal ending and the date of the events. He follows this with a polite exhortation for others to imitate his actions.

Quamobrem si indigni et peccatoris verbum dignanter admittitis, zelum Christi adversum Iudaeos sed pro eorumdem perpetua salute suscipite. Forsitan enim iam illud praedictum ab Apostolo venit tempus, ut plenitudine gentium ingressa omnis Israel salvus fiat. Et fortasse hanc ab extremo terrae scintillam voluit Dominus excitari, ut universus orbis terrarum caritatis flagraret incendio ad exuendum infidelitatis silvam (31.2-4)

For which reason if you respectfully accept the word of an unworthy sinner, take up the zeal of Christ against the Jews but on account of their eternal salvation. For perhaps the time predicted by the Apostle has come already so that all of Israel with the plentitude of the people having entered will be saved. And perhaps the Lord wants this spark to be ignited from the end of the earth so that the entire world will flare with the fire of love to burn down the forest of disbelief.

There can be no doubt after reading his final lines that this letter is in truth a call for action. Severus, as elsewhere, uses biblical reference to support his argument and suggests that conversion is in accordance with God’s will. Although his claim at the beginning of the letter was that he wants to relate the events to avoid concealing Christ’s miracles, the ending of the letter does not stop with that. The journey from
beginning to end has carefully laid out a strategy for forcing conversion on the Jews. The feeling that Severus wants his audience to have at the end of the letter is enthusiasm to go forth and save the Jews, not wonder at the things God has done. The riot which erupted at Uzalis when the letter was read before a Christian congregation\textsuperscript{64} is evidence that he was able to achieve his goal.

\textsuperscript{64} The riot is mentioned in the \textit{Liber de miraculis sancti Stephani protomartyris} by Evodius. (Ginsburg, 1996, p. 210).
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Lycophron’s *Alexandra*: “Restaging” the East-West Conflict

Akira V. Yatsuhashi
State University of New York, College at Oneonta

Stephanie West has likened Lycophron’s *Alexandra* to the modern novel stating that they share the same kind of “unstoppable imperialism… with its tendency to absorb imaginative literature of every sort.”¹ In fact, Lycophron’s work appears to fold the world into 1500 iambic trimeter lines, condensing both the heroic and historical world of the Greeks and their respective conflicts with their “Asian” rivals into a grand narrative of epic scale. Because of its difficult language, its meter, and its theme of East versus West, the work is often likened to Aeschylus’ tragic works.² Lycophron’s poem, however, also evokes another key fifth-century figure in the shaping of the continental rivalry, Herodotus. The poem, in fact, culminates in its “Herodotean” narrative, two hundred lines that play upon and expand Herodotus’ Asian account of the conflict between Asia and Europe. By taking up Herodotus in an Aeschylean guise, Lycophron gives a nod to his literary predecessors but also reimagines and re-situates the conflict between East and West from a fifth-century perspective to one that better suits the realities of the world in the wake of the conquests of Alexander.³

¹ West (2000, p. 166).
² Hornblower (2015).
³ Priestley has briefly surveyed the differences and similarities between Herodotus’ work and Lycophron’s, focusing on how the work “presents a synoptic history of the Mediterranean that, in a Herodotean manner, includes in its scope a survey of East-West relations through time, and yet its compression and abstruseness stand in stark contrast to Herodotus’ own expansive narrative and engaging style” (2014, p. 186).
In this manner, Lycophron’s poem attempts to reimagine the world, both reinforcing and undermining the Herodotean geographic and cultural divide between the “Asia” and “Europe.” The poem does this by subtly revealing how the two sides share a past, forged precisely through the cycle of violence that defines their relationship. Unlike Herodotus’ narrative, the *Alexandra* supplies its audience with the possibility for reconciliation between the two sides in the form of a “future” reconciler, Alexander the Great, albeit one who will achieve that reconciliation through violence. Ultimately, Lycophron’s literary work mimics the imperialism of the age, attempting to reconcile competing narratives assembled from a hodgepodge of sources into a singular single poetic creation, much as the world of Alexander and his successors attempted to reconcile and shape a wide range of competing cultural and political groups into a coherent and cohesive political whole under the umbrella of performing “Greekness.”

I. “GREEKNESS”

“Greekness” or Hellenicity is not a static concept, but one that was continually contested and redefined in antiquity. Greeks throughout antiquity consistently relied on the binary of Greek versus barbarian as the means of defining themselves. From the time when they encountered *barbaroi* in the seventh century BCE down through the Second Sophistic, the concept of who fit within which category was continually negotiated and renegotiated and became a palimpsest of cultural difference. The provisional nature of these categories is to be expected, but the manner in which cultural identity historically played out cannot be examined apart from the broader political and historical events that informed exchanges among the various participants involved.

From its earliest narratives, we can see how Greek-speaking peoples imagined their relationship with the other or barbarian as one that catalyzed into a sense of panhellenic identity. Initially, this is evident in their interactions with non-Greek speakers in the age of colonization in the Archaic period, where there had been an ambivalence toward peoples some of whom would have become members of “Greek” colonies. With Persian invasions of the early fifth century, however, we begin to see a more negative, orientalist depiction of barbarians in the works of

---

4 Pouzadoux and Prioux (2009) also explore the idea of Alexander as a reconciler but in the context of the late third century BCE in Southern Italy and Western Greece.

5 For the term, Hellenicity, see J. Hall (2002).

Aeschylus and Herodotus, whose narratives could be easily seen as narratives of resistance to the larger and imperialistic “barbarian” invader, the Persians. Cultural identity came to the fore in the late fourth century exacerbated by the colonial and imperial ambitions of the Greco-Macedonians. The fourth century saw the growth of a broader and more developed sense of panhellenic identity constructed vis-à-vis the othering of barbarian peoples within the Greek discourses of tragedy, history, and oratory. The fourth century orator, Isocrates, for example, expanded the definition of “Greekness” so as to include aspects of culture as well as nature in his *Panegyricus*. Still Isocrates was not calling for a world culture, but rather for all Greeks to unite behind the shield of Athens in a campaign against the Persians. His statement nevertheless reflects a willingness of the Greeks to debate the terms of what constitutes their identity.

After the conquests in the early Hellenistic period, the notion of Hellenicity appears to have shifted from being primarily determined biologically to one determined through performing Greekness. Naturally, the language of defining identity in the Hellenistic period was still very much couched in the traditional genealogical forms inherited from earlier generations, but from the start we see those traditional discourses molded for a new audience in newer political situations. Throughout the history of this notion, we witness the politics of cultural identity formation, where power relations among an ever-changing slate of political players (the Athenians, Spartans, Ionians, Greeks, Persians, Egyptians, Greco-Macedonians, Celts, Indians, Jews, Scythians, Italic peoples, etc.) are played out in the discourse surrounding the manner in which people no longer can easily define themselves merely vis-à-vis

---

7 For more on this notion of the “other” informing the construction of Greek identity in the fifth century BCE, see Hartog (1988), E. Hall (1989 and 2006), Vasunia (2001), and J. Hall (2002). For views running contrary to this approach, see Miller (1997) and Gruen (2010).

8 Section 52 of Isocrates’ speech is as follows:

τοσούτον δ’ ἀπολέλοιπεν ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν περὶ τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ λέγειν τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων, ὡσποδ’ οἱ ταύτῃ μαθηταὶ τῶν ἄλλων διδάσκαλοι γεγόνασι, καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὄνομα πεποίηκε μηκέτι τοῦ γένους ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας δοκεῖν εἶναι, καὶ μᾶλλον Ἔλληνας καλεῖσθαι τοὺς τῆς παιδεύσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας ἢ τοὺς τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως μετέχοντας.

So far has our city left other men behind with regard to wisdom and expression that its students have become the teachers of others. The result is that the name of the Hellenes no longer seems to indicate an ethnic affiliation (*genos*) but a disposition (*dianoia*). Indeed, those who are called ‘Hellenes’ are those who share our culture (*paideusia*) rather than have a common biological inheritance (*physis*).

some distant other. Instead, we begin to see a transformation of the idea of what exactly constituted these categories of Greek and barbarian. Even in terms of performance, the idea of being Greek was no longer merely wrapped up in participating in local or regional rituals and traditions or even in partaking in earlier panhellenic institutions, such as the Games, the Homeric tradition, or the more recent Athenian inspired cultural institution of tragedy. For many thousands of Greek colonists living outside of the traditional Greek homeland and for the numerous native elites in the newly conquered lands, new ways for defining and participating in “Greekness” were needed.

Literary works from this period both reflect the anxiety of the period and also provided their readers with narratives that gave a place for a new audience living in areas formerly considered “barbarian” and helped those living in the traditional lands of the Greeks a way to view those “Greeks” now living in them. This trend is most clearly seen in early Hellenistic historical treatises that negotiated the situation as old and new players set their hand at defining the past. For example, Hecataeus of Abdera, in his third century BCE history of Egypt, tried to define Egypt for Greeks in a traditionally Greek mode, while native elites, such as Manetho and Berossus, wrote the histories of Egypt and Babylon respectively in order to write their own ethnic groups into the dominant cultural discourse. By the late second century BCE, intellectual elites throughout the Successor kingdoms were competing with one another by claiming the central figure of the Greek cultural past, Homer, for themselves, as elites still struggled with ways to present themselves as part of the dominant cultural paradigm. This anxiety over who controls the past is clearly visible in an epigram of the late second century BCE poet and grammarian, Herodicus of Babylon:

φεύγετ’, Ἀριστάρχειοι, ἐπ’ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάττης
Ἑλλάδα, τῆς ξουθῆς δειλότεροι κεμάδος,
γωνιοβόμβυκες, μονοσύλλαβοι, οἴσι μέμηλε
τό σφίν καὶ σφῶιν καὶ τὸ μὶν ἧδε τὸ νίν.

9 This is not to suggest that these “older” institutions were no longer highly influential entities through which culture was defined, since they were. It is just not within the scope of this article to discuss the implications of these ideas to their fullest extent.

10 It seems fairly clear, however, that both Manetho and Berossus did not merely “borrow” Greek methods of historiography to tell their own versions of their respective countries. They also introduced native or foreign modes of history into their accounts and therefore transformed the very mode historical discourse. For a fuller discussion on the authors, please see Kuhrt (1987); Verbrugghe and Wickersham (2001); Moyer (2015); Haubold (2013).
τοῦθ’ ὑμῖν εἴη δυσπέμφελον· Ἡροδίκω δὲ Ἑλλὰς ἀεὶ μίμνοι καὶ θεόπαις Βαβυλών.

Flee, students of Aristarchus, over the wide back of the sea from Greece, you who are more cowardly than the nimble deer, buzzers-in-corners, masters of the monosyllable, concerned with sphin versus sphoin and min versus nin. This is what I wish for you, storm-tossed ones. But may Greece and Babylon, child of the gods, always be there for Herodicus.¹¹

This epigram not only seems to lay claim to the Greek literary tradition but places that tradition in both Greece and Babylon.¹² Lycophron’s work, produced in the period between the earliest writers mentioned here and the last, presents a similar kind of anxiety and offers a similar solution of bringing together disparate pasts and traditions through learned discourse in the present.

The Alexandra and other texts like it not only reinforced a sense of alienation from the world but also provided a way for integrating oneself within it. In form, it appears to be a tragedy due its meter, iambic trimeter, and yet it takes a topic more suitable to epic meter, a grand one in both temporal and geographic scope. Moreover, the text dresses up history, mixing it with mythology and mythography - subjects more suitable to prose - and putting it into tragic form. In all these ways, the work in all its facets seems to harmonize much that was hitherto considered incompatible, matching form with substance. Written texts, like Lycophron’s, as at no time before, provided a way of bridging the distances between people, compensating everyone for their collective sense of displacement. Moreover, the contents of those works also supplied its consumers with new modes of forming communities.

As we can see from the issues discussed above, the ability to comprehend, partake, and reproduce this type of learnedness in the Greek cultural past, or being pepaideumenos, came to be seen as a way of becoming a civilized, imperial Hellenistic subject.¹³ Birth was no longer the prerequisite to having a voice in the larger political community—now both a member from the priestly caste in Memphis and a Greek colonist in the chôra could perform and take part in larger and broader political states of the period.

¹¹ This is a modified translation from Olson (2006, pp. 560–561).
¹² For more on this epigram, see Yatsuhashi (2010, pp. 173–175) and Haubold (2013, pp. 178–181).
¹³ For a more thorough treatment of these ideas, see Yatsuhashi (2010).
II. READING THE TEXT

The first line of the *Alexandra* begins with a guard responsible for looking after the Trojan princess, Cassandra, reporting her most recent “rantings” to her father, King Priam. He states: Λέξω τὰ πάντα νητρεκῶς, ἃ μ’ ἱστορεῖς. On the most basic level, the line’s meter, iambic trimeter, would signal to its reader that this is a tragedy and that this character is merely here to provide background of the play, much like the watchman at the beginning of Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*. In this case, however, it is a guard or slave announcing to King Priam that he will report (λέξω) exactly (νητρεκῶς) everything (τὰ πάντα), of which the king has asked (ἱστορεῖς) from him. Naturally, the “joke” or “punch line” of this supposed tragedy will be realized after its reader gets through the next fifty lines, when it becomes clear that this opening speech will never end, and that this play will, in fact, be one continuous messenger speech. Since it will be the Trojan guard recounting the entire narrative, it makes sense to examine just exactly how one should interpret this decision to focalize the text through this specific character.

When closely examining just exactly who is doing the “talking” or “telling” of the *Alexandra*, it is curious that the person who actually retells the course of the history of the Greek-speaking world is a barbarian, most likely a Trojan. The use of iambic trimeter, the meter of tragedy, and narrators who are barbarian immediately suggests a connection to Aeschylean tragedy dealing with themes of the conflict between Asia and Europe with non-Greek characters playing primary roles, such as *The Persians* and *The Suppliant Women*. It should come as no surprise that a work that takes up themes, narrative perspectives, and the style of Aeschylus is actually restaging works of the master tragedian. And, much like Aeschylus, Lycophron makes his characters speak in obscure words and references with constant use of *hapax legomena, prima dicta*, and with frequent references to characters as animals.\(^14\) Although there are many examples of pre-Hellenistic literary works that have barbarians playing a central role,\(^15\) we should consider that Hellenistic *literati*, especially the Alexandrians, were writing from a radically different political position than their

\(^{14}\) Exactly 518 of the 3000 distinct words in the *Alexandra* are *hapax legomena* while another 117 appear here for the first time, Hopkinson (1988, p. 230).

\(^{15}\) One immediately thinks of the *Iliad* and the important role the Trojans play within it, Aeschylus’ *Persians* and *Suppliant Women*, Euripides’ *Medea* and *Trojan Women*, and even Herodotus’ *Histories*, in which Xerxes among others plays a central role to the larger work. The key in these works is that the “barbarian” speaks for himself or is at least presented in that manner.
predecessors. Given that a barbaros is giving word to events of a conflict between Greek and non-Greek, the last word of the Alexandra’s first line, ἱστορεῖς, should be looked on in a different light since the word appears to invoke another key figure who shaped the Greek-barbarian binary, Herodotus.

It is and was well known that its root word, ἱστορίη, is featured prominently in the first line of Herodotus’ Histories. At first glance, the term visually and aurally evokes connections to history, and further examination of the word also points to it as a reference to Herodotus. From a superficial reading of the poem, ἱστορέω appears to merely mean “to ask,” but if one looks at several factors, the word position at the end of the first line also suggests other valences of the term, like “to seek to know” and “to research.” Clearly, Lycophron’s poem was built upon an enormous amount of research from other literary and non-literary texts, which this messenger is reporting, and it seems more than plausible that the term can be seen as an early reference to Herodotus in the poem. Furthermore, seeing the root of this word as a reference to Herodotus also makes sense considering the undeniable role that Herodotus and his accounts play within the work as a whole. Furthermore, recent scholars of Lycophron, such as Pouzadoux and Prioux, identify lines 1283-1450 as a clear reworking of Herodotus, and Hornblower, in his recent commentary on the work, sees references to Herodotus in the second line. For instance, Hornblower points to “ἣν δὲ μηκυνθῇ λόγος” (line 2) and states that Herodotus’ “Histories are unmistakably and programmatically recalled from the very start of this poem.” Furthermore, Hornblower further argues that this work specifically alludes to Herodotus’ Egyptian and Samian logoi. It, therefore, seems more than plausible that the use of ἱστορέω on the first line also suggests a similar reference to Herodotus, especially after encountering the second line.

Herodotus was not the first to use or coin the term, ἱστορίη, but it is clear that by the third century BCE, the word had become associated with his work. According to Gould, words related to ἱστορίη appear twenty three times in his text. Of those twenty-three incidences, nine appear in Herodotus’ famous Second Book, which provides of an account of ancient Egyptian society as seen through Greek

16 Herodotus’ text begins: Ηροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε (1.1).
17 Hornblower (2015, p. 121). For connections to the Egyptian and Samian logoi, Hornblower cites Hdt. 2.35, I, ἔρχομαι δὲ περὶ Αἰγύπτου μηκυνέων τὸν λόγον and 3.60, I, ἐμήκυνα δὲ περὶ Σαμίων μᾶλλον.
18 Gould (1989, pp. 9–11). Naturally, later historians used the term as well, but many of those historians, like Polybius and Plutarch clearly post-date any likely date for Lycophron’s work.
eyes.\textsuperscript{20} By invoking this word in the first line of the \textit{Alexandra}, Lycophron’s work seems to lay claim to the genre of history and to put the spotlight on his Second Book, Egypt. Lycophron’s account of the conflict between Asian and Europe (1283-1450) rewrites Herodotus’ account (1.1-1.5). Just as Herodotus constantly calls upon words related to \textit{ἱστορίη} to attain a sense of epistemological authority over both his logographic predecessors and his audience, so here too Lycophron attempts to achieve that same type of authority over his readers through an intertextual reference to that earlier work in order to rewrite that work for his new audience.

Lycophron’s \textit{Alexandra} is filled with tales about the conflict between the “East” and the “West” or the “two continents,” to quote the author himself,\textsuperscript{21} but it is not until line 1281 that the narrative directly engages with the Herodotean account of the origins of the conflict between the Greeks and barbarians (1.1-1.5).\textsuperscript{22} In Herodotus’ \textit{Histories}, the historian gives us his version of what the Persians and Phoenicians claim to be the causes of the conflict. Herodotus states that the Persians’ claim that the Phoenicians started it by abducting Io from the Greeks, and that the conflict lingered due to “common violence” (\textit{Μέχρι μὲν ὦν τούτων ἁρπαγάς μοῦνας εἶναι παρ’ ἀλλήλων}), but that ultimately the Greeks would be “greatly to blame” (\textit{Ἕλληνας δὴ μεγάλως αἰτίους γενέσθαι}).\textsuperscript{23} The Phoenician account naturally clears their own sailors of blame, offering an alternative story in which Io goes willingly with the sailors to Egypt. This account attributed to foreigners was ultimately a Herodotean construction that created the illusion of a perceived, long-standing tension between Asia and Europe. After the account, Herodotus himself intervenes and claims that he will no longer dither on about all these stories and will instead move onto something about which he actually knows.\textsuperscript{24} Herodotus, in this manner,

\textsuperscript{20} 2.19.14 and 2.19.17 near the beginning of his inquiry on the nature of the Nile; 2.29.4 used describing his journey up the Nile to Meroe; 2.34.6 where he compares the Nile to the Ister; 2.44.17 where he visits Phoenicia; 2.99.1 ending his account of Egypt; 2.113.1 begins a discussion he had with Egyptian priests over Helen while 2.118.3 and 2.119.13 where he concludes his inquiries with the priests where he reconciles Egyptian and Homeric accounts of stories about Helen. The last usages are telling in linking the method of Herodotus with Lycophron both in approach as well as subject matter.

\textsuperscript{21} See line 1295 for “ἡπείροις διπλαῖς.”

\textsuperscript{22} See West for the most recent treatment of this issue (2000, pp. 154-56).

\textsuperscript{23} Both passages are from Herodotus 1.4.

\textsuperscript{24} The Greek runs as follows (1.5):

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτων οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἐρέων ὡς οὕτως ἢ ἄλλως καὶ ταῦτα ἐκ νεῖντο, τὸν δὲ οἶδα αὐτός πρῶτον ὑπάρξαντα ἀδίκων ἔργων ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, τούτων ὁμοίως προβῆσαμεῖ τὸ πρόσω τοῦ λόγου, ὁμοίως μικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἀστεα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξείων.}
\end{quote}
claims authority and legitimacy over the competing accounts of the conflict privileging his own rational perspective and relegating the mythic stories of prehistory to the other side.

The *Alexandra* expands upon Herodotus’ 1.1-1.5, both in terms of its length and temporal scope. His “Herodotean” narrative runs from line 1291 to 1460, tracing the conflict’s origins back to the age of the gods and pushing it forward down to the “prophetic future” in the age of Alexander the Great. The tale of the conflict is once again posed as one narrated by the Asians. Its narrators, the guard and Cassandra, reclaim the authoritative high ground from the Herodotean narrative by claiming comprehensive knowledge of the strife.

Lycophron begins his retelling of the history of the conflict between the Greeks and barbarians within the personal tragic narrative, having Cassandra foretelling her enemies’ destruction:

\[
\text{Tosau\text{\textcopyright}ta m\text{\textepsilon}n dy\text{\textepsilon}stl\text{\textgamma}ta pe\text{\textgamma}so\text{\textepsilon}ntai kaka} \\
oi t\text{\textepsilon}n \text{\textepsilon}m\text{\textepsilon}n m\text{\textepsilon}ll\text{\textomicron}ntes ai\text{\textomicron}st\text{\textomicron}seiv p\text{\textalpha}tr\text{\textalpha}n. \\
(1280-81)
\]

So many are the woes, hard to bear, which they shall suffer who are to lay waste to my fatherland.

Much as Herodotus in his preface (1.4.1-1.4.4) claims to present the Persian version of the conflict between Europe and Asia as a series of abductions leading to the Greek sacking of Troy, Lycophron, here, begins to present a similar retelling of the back and forth between the two sides:

\[
\text{"Oloin\text{\textomicron}to na\text{\textepsilon}tai pro\text{\textomicron}ta Karvi\text{\textepsilon}tai k\text{\textomicron}nes,} \\
oi t\text{\textepsilon}n bo\text{\textomicron}pin taur\text{\textomicron}topar\text{\textomicron}theun kor\text{\textomicron}n} \\
\text{Ler\text{\textepsilon}n\text{\textomicron}n an\text{\textepsilon}nep\text{\textomicron}nanto, for\text{\textomicron}n\text{\textomicron}g\text{\textomicron}oi l\text{\textomicron}koi,} \\
\text{pl\text{\textomicron}t\text{\textomicron}n por\text{\textomicron}\text{\textomicron}\text{\textomicron}\text{\textomicron}si k\text{\textomicron}ra Me\text{\textomicron}f\text{\textomicron}t\text{\textomicron} pr\text{\textomicron}m\text{\textomicron}w,} \\
\text{ek\text{\textomicron}hr\text{\textomicron}as de pup\text{\textomicron}\text{\textomicron}n \text{\textepsilon}ran \text{\textepsilon}p\text{\textepsilon}\text{\textomicron}\text{\textomicron}r\text{\textomicron}i\text{\textomicron}s di\text{\textomicron}plai\text{\textomicron}i.} \\
(1291-1295)
\]

---

25 In terms of length, I merely mean that Lycophron’s treatment spans a little over ten percent of his work whereas Herodotus 1.1-1.5 is a very small fraction of its entirety.

26 For most of the translations, I have relied on Mair’s translations (1921) which I have modified on occasion, mostly by inserting parenthetical explanations.
My curse, first, upon the Carnite (Phoenician) sailor hounds! The merchant wolves who carried off from Lerne (Argos) the ox-eyed girl (Io or Isis), the bull-maiden, to bring to the lord of Memphis (Telegonus, King of Egypt, or possibly Osiris) a fatal bride, and raised the beacon of hatred for the two continents.

This act of curse and blame is the first noticeable departure from the Herodotean version. No longer will the barbarians place more blame on the Greeks, but blame will be spread evenly between the two parties as in the following passage:

\[
\text{αὖθις γὰρ ἕμπρος τὴν βαρείαν ἁρπαγῆς}
\]
\[
\text{Κουρῆτες ἄντιποινον Ἰδαῖοι κάπροι}
\]
\[
\text{ζητοῦντες αἰχμάλωτον ἠμπρευσαν πόριν}
\]
\[
\text{ἐν ταυρομόρφῳ τράμπιδος τυπώματι}
\]
\[
\text{Σαραπτίαν Δικταῖον εἰς ἀνάκτορον}
\]
\[
\text{δάμαρτα Κρῆτης Αστέρῳ στρατηλάτη.} \quad (1296-1301)
\]

For afterwards the Curetes (Cretans), Idaean boars, seeking to avenge the rape by their heavy deed of violence, carried off captive in a bull-formed vessel the Saraptian (a Phoenician town) heifer (Europa) to the Dictaean palace to be the bride of Asteros, the lord of Crete (Zeus).

Then Lycophron continues to rewrite the narrative of Herodotus, deepening his narrative by adding motivation to his actors, having Cassandra state that the Greeks are not satisfied with a tit-for-tat:

\[
\text{οὐδ' οἵ γ' ἀπηρκέσθησαν ἀντ' ἴσων ἴσα}
\]
\[
\text{λαβόντες, ἀλλὰ κλώτα σὺν Τεύκρῳ στρατόν}
\]
\[
\text{καὶ σὺν Σκαμάνδρῳ Δραυκίῳ φυτοσπόρῳ}
\]
\[
\text{εἰς Βεβρύκων ἔστειλαν οἰκητήριον,}
\]
\[
\text{σμίνθοισι δηρίσοντας, ὧν ἀπὸ σπορᾶς}
\]
\[
\text{ἐμοὺς γενάρχας ἐξέφυσε Δάρδανος,}
\]
\[
\text{γῆμας Ἀρίσβαν Κρῆσσαν εὐγενῆ κόρην.} \quad (1302-1308)
\]

Nor were they contented when they had taken like for like; but sent with Teucer and his Draukian father Skamandros a host of plunderers to the dwelling-place of the Bebryces (Trojans) to war with mice; of the seed of
those men Dardanos begat the authors of my people, when he married the
noble Cretan maid Arisba.

Although Cassandra directly names the Greek army a “raping army” or “host of
plunderers” (κλῶπα στρατὸν, 1303), she begins to attempt to reconcile the two par-
ties in the last two lines, when she points out that this conquest also began a system
of mixing between the two sides and concludes with the detail that the Trojans have
Greek ancestry through Dardanos.27 Here, a Trojan princess lays bare the common
ancestry between the two sides through which there might be reconciliation.

In the examples cited above, Lycophron uses the language of song or literature
to convey Cassandra’s judgments. Much as Herodotus “invented” historical prose
by borrowing from genres such as epic, tragedy, and the early logographers, and
recombining them into a new form, in a similar fashion, Lycophron mixed together
form, primarily borrowed from tragedy, with content drawn from both the myth-
ological past and more recent historical past. Although there had been tragedies,
such as Phrynicus’ Sack of Miletus, most tragedies were set in the mythical past and
a tragedy was never the vehicle that had mixed together subject matter better suited
to a wide range of genres into one form. In this manner, both authors attempt to
displace their predecessors and create a space for their new way of presenting the
world through generic innovation. Here, Lycophron absorbs both poetic and prose
traditions within his narrative, producing a hybrid product to impose an authority
upon his readers, an authority based on new means of viewing the world presented
through the lens of erudition.

Over the next 150 or so lines, Cassandra recounts the wars waged back and
forth between the two sides, including all of their major figures: the Argonauts,
Theseus, Herakles, the Amazons, Paris and the Trojans, Helen, Agamemnon, Or-
estes, the Dorians, Midas, and Xerxes. Even within this stretch of narrative, there
are still episodes where Lycophron complicates the narrative by mixing in examples
that foreshadow the way a hero-figure could resolve this conflict but have clearly
not been successful in doing so. For example, Cassandra points out that Orestes will
found a colony in Aeolis in Asia Minor of many races and diverse tongues.

27 Dionysios of Halicarnassos (1.61–62) states that Dardanos was originally from Arcadia. Further-
more, although the mixing between the two sides was present from the beginning in the Iliad, that
narrative had been sublimated under the broader Herodotean narrative that emphasized the geographic
and cultural divide between the two sides.
And, second (Orestes), the son of him that was slain in a net, like a dumb fish, shall lay waste with fire the alien land, coming, at the bidding of the oracles of the Physician (Apollo), with a host of many tongues.

Ultimately, Cassandra ends her narrative in the historical present of the early third century BCE. She ends her tale foretelling the arrival of a lion and a wrestler, who will resolve the conflict. The idea of a man resolving the conflict with a polyglot army or host is a precursor to the end of this narrative and this conflict, with some figure bringing the world’s together whether it be Alexander the Great, Pyrrhus, or any other Hellenistic candidate, the narrative clearly foretells a ruler who will finally end the conflict as it had in the early Hellenistic period:

Until a tawny lion—sprung from Aiakos and from Dardanus, Thesprotian at once and Chalalstarian—shall lull to rest the grievous tumult, and, overturning on its face all the house of his kindred, shall compel the chiefs of the Argives to cower and fawn upon the wolf-leader of Galadra, and to hand over the scepter of the ancient monarchy. With him, after six generations, my kinsman, unique wrestler, shall join battle by sea and land
and come to terms, and shall be celebrated among his friends as most excellent, when he has received the first fruits of the spear-won spoils.

This passage has rightly generated much scholarly controversy, which probably would have pleased Lycophron. The issue of who the “lion” is and who the “wrestler” is has produced many candidates ranging from Alexander the Great to Pyrrhus of Epirus to Titus Quinctius Flaminius.\(^\text{28}\) Ultimately, the issue is irresolvable, and it seems to make the most sense to seek out plausible ways of interpreting the prophecy rather than seeking out the definitive way to view them. What is clear is that everyone who has offered answers to this puzzle has believed that one of the players is Alexander the Great. Simon Hornblower has made a compelling case that Alexander is the lion spoken in these lines. He argues that line 1440 highlights Alexander’s maternal descent from both Aiakid Pyrrhus and his son Neoptolemus, and Helenus, son of Priam and a descendent of Dardanus, and therefore line 1441 addresses his paternal side and his connections to Macedonian kings with its reference to Chalastra, a town in Macedonia. Thus, Alexander is painted here as a figure who has three ethnic identities: as a Macedonian, a Trojan, and Greek.\(^\text{29}\) This more than plausible reading of these lines presents a figure who can achieve reconciliation by bringing together separate groups and their respective histories, an idea presented many times throughout this part of the poem.

Through an analysis of the Herodotean passage, we can see how Lycophron’s poem is an attempt to reconcile all narratives, conflicting or not, within one grand comprehensive narrative, simultaneously reinforcing and undermining the constructed geographic divide between the “Asia” and “Europe.”\(^\text{30}\) Lycophron, however, constantly complicates and muddies the water with his use of obscure language and references to characters and prophecies that spark argument and controversy, such as his prophetic finish. In the Herodotean section, Lycophron complicates the

\(^\text{28}\) To provide a brief sample of some of the various theories from the modern era: Wilamowitz (1883) argues that the “wolf” is Alexander and does so using convoluted reasoning that identifies the Argive chiefs of line 1443 as Persians. Holzinger says that the “lion” is Pyrrhus (1893). Niebuhr believes the wrestler is Flaminius and therefore hypothesizes that the work was by a younger poet named Lycophron working in the early second-century BCE (1827). Mair argues that the “lion” is Alexander but that the “wolf” and “wrestler” symbolize entire peoples (2006). West even calls it a panegyric to Alexander (2000). For fuller discussion, see Mooney (1921); West (1983, 1984, and 2000); Mair (2006); Hurst (2008); Pouzadoux and Prioux (2009); McNelis and Sens (2011); Hornblower (2015).

\(^\text{29}\) Much of this argument is based on Hornblower (2015, p. 494).

\(^\text{30}\) See West (2000, pp. 158-59).
relationship between these two “foes” by spreading equal blame to both parties and highlighting shared ancestry; he seems to present that the cycle of violence between the two sides demands resolution through his presentation of a great reconciler in this part of the story. In this manner, Lycophron’s literary work attempts to reconcile the conflicting sides by showing how they have been resolved in a single poetic creation in a work that simultaneously reimagines and partially neutralizes the Manichean divide between the two continents which Herodotus constructed in his *Histories*.

III. CONCLUSION

Lycophron relied on the cultural capital he has accrued through the composition of his poem to redefine the traditional Herodotean binary between the Greeks and barbarians for the Hellenistic Age. He pushed aside the Herodotean model of Greekness and demonstrated how it had broken down. The complexity and shifting nature of the world he inhabited suggests that such a world demanded a work that reflected that complexity, one that takes on this complexity in a different manner from his predecessor, Herodotus. The world of the third-century BCE was a place where the Greeks found themselves masters of the known world. They were no longer threatened by a foreign other as formulated in earlier discourses, and the *Alexandra* provided a way to deal with the politics of this new age. His work seems to have provided a means of recuperating, reformulating, and reconciling cultural-historical narratives, such as the Greek ancestry of the Trojans, by overwriting the traditional Herodotean narrative which emphasized the natural enmity and difference between the two sides. The poem, thereby, provides a means for dealing with the historic situation of the early Hellenistic period when Greek identity had expanded beyond its biological parameters, which in turn raised anxieties about what constituted Greekness, and how the Greeks could form a cohesive ruling class from such a diverse group of peoples. Any reader of the Successor kingdoms who possessed the erudition to comprehend the *Alexandra* could begin to see themselves as part of a broader community of readers in a different way from the older narratives of Herodotus (and even Aeschylus). For a role model for performing this new type of “Greekness,” they only needed to look at the narrator of the poem.
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There may be no subject matter better at inspiring people of all ages to visit the museum than ancient Egypt. *Beyond the Nile* is the publication of the Getty’s first exhibition in its “Classical World in Context” series, intended to counter-balance the predominantly Roman and Greek material in the museum’s collections by presenting the Mediterranean as a wide, connected region, focusing on cultural interaction, trade, and artistic influence. Eventually, the series will produce exhibitions featuring Mesopotamia, Anatolia, the Levant, the Central and Eurasian Steppes, and South Asia. Egypt is the ideal starting point—not just because of its intrinsic appeal, but because the last few decades have seen a wealth of scholarship exploring the impact of the very interconnections that the exhibition explores, not only as evidenced by material culture but as reflected in the most canonical texts of antiquity (e.g., the path-breaking work of Ian Moyer and Susan Stephens on Herodotus and Hellenistic poetry, respectively). One result is that this volume may be less well situated to shape the field than will future exhibitions in the series, for much more has been done on Egypt’s relationship with Greece and Rome than has been done for other areas. Yet this volume is uniquely positioned to set the stage: it aims to convey difficult ideas to the public at large, thus establishing the value of looking beyond the capital cites of Athens and Rome to contact zones and peripheries.

The book is beautifully produced. It is broken into four sections: “The Bronze Age”, “The Greeks Return to Egypt”, “Ptolemaic Egypt”, and “The Roman Empire.” Each section includes critical essays that offer historical and political background, followed by catalogue entries for the objects in the collection. The essays are brief, but even so manage to incorporate many images of material not on display in the exhibition but of crucial importance to the topic. The essays are written by experts, and most would serve well as an introduction for undergraduate students, though it should be noted that some suffer from rather sparse footnoting of relevant sources. A few stand out because they offer fresh vantage points, or give accessible, concise overviews of material that can be difficult for students to find in English.
Although the essays are too many to acknowledge individually, Henry P. Colburn's discussion of the cities of Naukratis and Memphis, Thomas Landvatter's piece on Alexandria, Luigi Prada's treatment of multicultural language use in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, and Laurent Bricault's useful presentation of the cult of Isis will all find their way onto undergraduate syllabi.

The catalogue entries are the heart and soul of the volume. Here, readers familiar with the topic will enjoy large-scale, color images and clear discussion of many famous objects, but will also be surprised to see material that is less well-known. The catalogue rewards repeated scrutiny. The objects are chosen so that they speak both to issues of artistic influence and trade, and also to the lives of those living in Egypt and beyond in the periods covered. So, for example, there is a funerary stele carved (and originally painted) in Egyptian style, but engraved with the name of a Carian, who was living in Egypt at roughly the same time Greeks were hired there as mercenaries in the 6th c. BCE (cat. 59). There is a monument to a humble Roman soldier perhaps stationed in Luxor (cat. 146), and a gold signet ring inscribed with the name of Antoninus Pius in the hieroglyphic script, intended to be used by officials during his regime (cat. 144). Most of the material is organized by period and genre (e.g., “Greek Pottery in Egypt,” cats. 62-65), accompanied by short essays that interpret the material and present relevant issues. Particularly worthy of praise is the decision to present some material as whole assemblages or by findspot (e.g., Abdydos Tomb 416, cat. 24-37).

There is little to fault in the volume other than missed opportunities, particularly given the goals of the “Classical World in Context” series. The second section, “The Greeks Return to Egypt” (72-89), is significantly shorter than the others, with only 30 supporting catalogue entries. This is unfortunate, in part, because the period from 700-332 BCE will be of crucial importance to some of the future exhibitions planned for the series, if the goal is to view trade and interaction as a broad phenomenon that brought many regions into an expansive network. Further, the way that this section is structured means that this period is seen only through the lens of interaction in the eastern Mediterranean. The flow of Egyptian goods to places as far as Etruria and Sardinia is mentioned only in passing. Only one Etruscan object is included in the catalogue, and that example was selected for its mythic subject matter rather than its cultural context (cat. 75, a Caeretan hydria featuring the myth of Busiris). There are just two essays in this section, and an additional essay detailing the place of Egyptian goods in extended networks would have been welcome—all the more so because the place of Etruria in pan-Mediterranean networks is an area in need of more scholarly attention, and it would have been an opportunity for
the volume to break new ground. Particularly germane would have been objects that show how ‘international’ the production of luxury objects was becoming in this period, such as ostrich eggs that likely made their way to the Mediterranean along Egyptian trading routes, were painted in Cyprus, and finally interred as prized possessions in Etruscan tombs (e.g., British Museum 1850, 0227.9, from the “Isis Tomb”, Vulci).

In sum, the catalogue is a rich trove of material, presented in a way that will engage all manner of readers, from the specialist to students to those with merely a passing interest in the place and people of Egypt in the Classical period. I heartily recommend it to any university or community library.

Jonathan L. Ready,
*The Homeric Simile in Comparative Perspectives: Oral Traditions from Saudi Arabia to Indonesia.*


In this book, Ready examines an impressively wide range of modern oral traditions as a prelude to explore two speculative questions about Homeric performance, one concerning possible criteria for performative competence, the other concerning the artistry of Homeric similes. The modern material includes quotations from and scholarly discussion of Turkish minstrels, Chinese (prosimetric) storytellers, and Egyptian singers of epic to identify what constitutes “competence in performance” (56) and studies of epics from India, Indonesia, modern Kyrgyzstan, and Serbo-Croatia, as well as lyrics from Saudi Arabia, to consider the artistry of the Homeric simile.

For this reviewer, the first chapter is the weakest and not essential for the subsequent chapters. In it, Ready makes the claim that similes in Homer and modern oral traditions share a number of formal qualities, most notably that two or more similes may appear in a series and that the similes’ tenor may come before or after
the vehicle. Neither feature is at all peculiar to oral poetry; even more concerning, the narrative quality of the modern examples only bear slight resemblance to the similes in Homer.

In the second chapter, comparative study brings out the book’s two central points, namely what constitutes competence in oral performance and how oral performers and audiences judged what in Homer studies is usually classified as traditional and innovative elements. Jettisoning these terms, Ready prefers to describe narrative elements that are either shared by other performers or individual. For the latter, he uses the rather ugly word “idiolectal.” He also makes the important point that for passages to be considered shared or the “same,” they need not be verbatim likenesses; anything that “make[s] use of the same compositional building blocks (lines, scenes, speeches) in the correct order” (74) should be considered “shared.” Among the many interesting points gained from these modern examples is the claim that “performers consciously present shared and idiolectal elements” (85) and “a diverse repertoire of shared and idiolectal” phrasings constitutes “proof of [a poet’s] skill” (87). Audiences, similarly, judge performers by this diversity: “the knowledgeable tradition-oriented audience member…grasps the poet’s modulation between the idiolectal and the shared” (79), and “seeks” both (93). Herein lies the core of Ready’s thesis: rather than looking primarily to the virtuosity of singular expressions and viewing traditional passages as the backdrop against which the particular stands out, audience members of oral performances judge excellence and skill by a performer’s mastery of both individual and shared elements: “a performer shows competence through the delivery of both” (98). Asking why audiences should value shared, familiar passages, Ready suggests that it is because such passages re-enforce a spirit of community, both by presenting an image of that community and by creating that image in the telling. Audiences judge a shared passage to be in error or a mistake when it does not convey all significant elements and fails to place them in their proper order.

Applying these observations to the construction of similes, Ready illustrates (in chapter three) how performers in five modern oral poetries “use similes to present shared and idiolectal elements” (130), and in two chapters on Homeric similes in Part II he argues by analogy that Homeric audiences also measured a poet’s competency by his skilled treatment of both shared and innovative motifs.

Also in Part II, Ready asks the question what makes for “a good poet” (183) in Archaic Greek hexameter poetry. He identifies eight qualities: a poet who bewitches, delights, sounds good, and uses the phorminx expertly, and poems which possess beauty, have the capacity to divert the audience from its cares, as well as to move
it, while instructing about human woes and significant events. In addition, the performer “must know his story and be able to tell it well and at length” (183), a skill that necessarily combines a mixture of shared and singular moments. This list, however, seems incomplete, especially as it fails to mention the power to bring a community together. Odysseus points to this quality of oral performance when he says that nothing is more pleasing than the well-mindedness (euphrosunê) that passes through the community (the dêmos) when those at a banquet listen to a bard (cf. Od. 9.5-11). For Odysseus, the shared listening to song has the effect of instilling a sense of collective social harmony and joyfulness. The Theogony offers a different version of a similar sensibility when it describes how kings, when they speak straight verdicts with the honeyed sweetness and soothing words of the Muses on their tongues, can restore harmony to a community in distress. Such, Hesiod says, is “the sacred gift of the Muses to humankind” (Th. 93). Perhaps this is what Hesiod meant when he described the Muses as being “of like mind” (Th. 60). They make a community at one with itself. Included in this sense of oneness is a song’s modeling of good and bad behaviors, as for example in modeling examples of leadership and social mores, both good and bad. Certainly, another inherent component of a poet’s excellence is the ability, through song, to bring out empathy, as in the example of Odysseus who melted, shedding tears, like a woman weeping over the body of her husband killed while defending the city, when he heard Demodokos sing of the Greeks sacking Troy (Od. 8.521-31).

As a last point, even as we recognize the splendid insights into Homer that may be gleaned from studying modern oral comparanda, it is also important to consider the possible limitations of such comparisons. Ready concludes his thoughtful study of ancient and modern performance as follows: “This model allows one to imagine that the things our [Homeric] poets were doing with their long vehicle portions were things done by other poets too” (244). “I do not consider the Homeric case as something apart” (191); “our Homeric poets sought to do what their peers were doing” (194). In some sense this must be true, but not in another. In important ways the Iliad and Odyssey were apart. No other ancient epea came close to equaling them in magnitude, and Aristotle adds the important point that only Homer’s epics were artistically arranged, subordinating episodes around a single story with a beginning, middle, and end (Poetics 1450b-51). Similarly, we need to ask why is it that the Greeks, already in the Archaic period, singled out Homer and Hesiod, only rarely mentioning their many competitors? Yes, these performers were doing what their peers were doing but also, it would appear, they did something different. It is worth considering what that difference may have been.
Such caveats notwithstanding, Ready has done us a great service by evaluating Homeric skill and technique within the context of a vast array of modern oral parallels. His many quotations from other epics and from scholars on those epics will enrich and expand our own vocabulary when discussing Homer artistry. Particularly important is Ready’s emphasis on the value of shared elements in oral performance and in the construction of similes.

_Homer, Emily Wilson, trans.,_  
_The Odyssey_,  

The _Odyssey_, despite its straightforward syntax and pellucid clarity, is not an easy poem to translate. The further one dares to venture from the literal meaning of the Greek, the greater the risk of incurring the criticism which Bentley famously leveled at Pope’s _Iliad_: “It is a pretty poem, Mr. Pope; but you must not call it Homer.” A schoolroom crib such as one might find in Bohn’s Library may offer a scrupulously accurate translation of Homer—it will also turn off a contemporary reader faster than you can say “helmet-shaking Hector.” Robert Fagles recognized this fundamental dilemma when he explained his own method for translating the _Odyssey_: “the more literal approach would seem to be too little English, and the more literary seems too little Greek.” And so it is that each translator of Homer confronts the same task: to abandon tedious literality, while capturing in English the rhythm, music, and charming verbal texture of the original Greek. In her _Odyssey_, Wilson succeeds admirably with a version that is lean, clear, direct, and marked by a distinctively forward-moving narrative energy.

Wilson’s lengthy and fully comprehensive Introduction is superbly written. It is a useful primer for new readers as well as a welcome feast for professional scholars. She guides the reader through a careful summary of the poem’s formal qualities, composition, authorship and reception. She delves into the _Odyssey’s_ geographical,
social, and historical setting, exploring at length important topics under subheadings such as “Friends, Strangers, Guests,” “Gods,” “Goddesses, Wives, Princesses and Slave Girls,” “Becoming a Man,” “Slaves,” “The Choice of Odysseus,” “Hated Odysseus,” “Endings,” and “Reception.” Throughout her Introduction, Wilson offers a wealth of interpretive insights that are as sound as they are provocative. There are four full-sized maps, zooming from a cosmic view of the Homeric universe to a close up of the Peloponnese, each usefully tailored to the poem’s content. The text also contains twenty-six pages of notes (including a brief summary of each book of the poem) and a pronouncing glossary listing major and minor characters.

An eleven-page Translator’s Note is essential reading for those wishing to understand Wilson’s modus operandi. With a thoughtful grasp of the many problems that confront the translator of Homer, she carefully explains her choice of iambic pentameter, her employment of a variety of speech registers, and why she consistently sought “simplicity of diction” (85) over “grand, ornate, rhetorically elevated English” (83). She is sympathetic to the expectations of contemporary readers and firmly grasps the overriding principle that a translation of a long epic poem can only be successful by maintaining a fundamental readability.

Rendering Homeric hexameters (ranging from twelve to seventeen syllables) line for line into English pentameters is an unusual choice, one that demands a fairly aggressive reformulation of the Greek text. To achieve such rigorous economy, Wilson employs a variety of devices. She trims epithets (e.g., “golden” for “golden-sandal’d”) or drops them altogether. She eliminates pleonastic phrases, a hallmark of Homer’s style. She replaces a four-syllable name such as “Pontonoos” with a two syllable “steward.” Beyond these strategies, Wilson skillfully transforms Homer’s expansively polysyllabic phraseology into chiseled lines that are marked by simple, plain, and often monosyllabic diction of astonishing clarity.

Wilson’s resourcefulness as a translator appears in her deft handling of Homer’s formulaic epithets. She skillfully exploits, in her own words, “the opportunity offered by the repetitions to explore the multiple different connotations of each epithet” (84). Thus, εὐπλόκαμος is “cornrows” (Demeter, 5.125), “pigtailed” (Athena, 7.41), or “bright-haired” (Dawn, 9.75). A common epithet of Odysseus, πολυμήχανος, is variously “clever,” “master of any challenge,” “adept survivor,” “master of every circumstance,” or, in the words of Achilles as he greets him in Hades, “you fox!”

The same approach is at work in her treatment of full line formulas. For example, ἤμος δ᾽ ἠριγένεια φάνη ροδόδακτυλος Ἠώς (“when early-born, rosy-fingered dawn appeared”) — a line that occurs twenty times in the Odyssey — is rendered differently each time it occurs. This is a remarkable testament to Wilson’s attention
to context and ability to see Homer’s formulaic conventions as a translator’s gifts rather than obstacles. A small sampling reveals much creative variety: “When Dawn appeared, her fingers bright with flowers” (4.431), “Early the Dawn appeared, pink fingers blooming” (9.307), and “When early Dawn, / the newborn child with rosy hands, appeared” (19.428).

A striking feature of this translation is Wilson’s decision to highlight the prevalence of slavery in the poem—very much a part of Homeric social organization, though consistently underemphasized or ignored by other translators. (Indeed, so common is slavery in the poem that the swineherd Eumaeus, a slave, purchases his own slave, Mesaulius, when Odysseus is away at Troy.) Wilson frequently (though not always consistently) translates ἀμφίπολος (“handmaiden”), ταμίη (“housekeeper”), ὑφορβός (“swineherd”), and κῆρυξ (“herald”) as “slave.” One doesn’t ordinarily think of Circe as a slave owner, yet the four women attending her, whom Homer calls both ἀμφίπολοι (10.348) and δρήστειραι, “laborers, workers” (10.349) are “four slaves, her housegirls” (10.349). They are also “nymphs” (10.350), a common translation well supported by the context, though the word does not appear in the Greek.

No translation will satisfy all readers; some may perhaps revive Bentley’s censure of Pope and assert that Wilson has taken one too many liberties with Homer. To be sure, this translation is radically unlike Caroline Alexander’s recent Iliad, which hews far more closely to Homer’s actual words. Yet to make such a claim would be to misunderstand entirely what Wilson set out to do in the first place. To be a successful translator, one must first be a successful reader, and Wilson establishes beyond a doubt that she is indeed an acutely sensitive reader of Homer. Her Odyssey differs in significant ways from all other versions that are currently in publication. It may also become the standard against which future translations of the poem will be measured.
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Sarah Hitch and Ian Rutherford, eds.,
Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient Greek World.

The twentieth century witnessed successive generations of thinkers whose “grand theories” of animal sacrifice advanced research begun in the Victorian era. Hitch and Rutherford’s collection of twelve recent essays captures the current state of research on this aspect of Greek religion, as scholars from varied specialties re-evaluate their structuralist ancestors. While nineteenth- and early twentieth-century research, starting with Robertson-Smith and Frazer, worked within a largely comparative tradition, this collection showcases the wide variety of disciplines and methods applied to a topic that continues to excite debate. Classical scholars now approach the study of sacrifice in the Greek world using tools from literary and historical studies, art history, religious studies, archaeology, epigraphy, and even philosophy. In lieu of sustained comparative analyses, these essays center on the rich details of localized practice in the Greek world itself or on the edges of it.

The introduction to the volume, jointly authored by volume editors Sarah Hitch and Ian Rutherford along with contributor Fred Naiden, orients the reader to the topic and scope of the essays. Their overview of the dominant scholarly framework benefits from a succinct discussion of typical sacrificial “scripts”; equally welcome is the editors’ prescription that the horizontal and vertical axes of sacrificial ritual—sociological and theological—consistently be analyzed together. In the decades since the most visible proponents of the “grand theories” (e.g., Detienne and Vernant; Burkert) were most active, scholarship has moved away from approaches that focus mainly on polis religion. With this in mind, the editors organize the essays around four themes: Victims, Procedure, Representation, Margins. A substantial bibliography is followed by a full index locorum.

Prior critiques of late twentieth-century studies of sacrificial practice identified a bias favoring Athens based largely on the availability of evidence. Once new types of evidence were gathered, scholars began analyzing local variation in areas beyond Attica; the current volume continues that commendable work. The opening four essays explore sacrificial victims and ritual procedures through the analysis of bones—whether zooarchaeology (Ekroth, Ch. 1), archaeozoology (Larson, Ch. 2), or
osteology (Villing, Ch. 3, and Georgoudi, Ch. 4). Analysis of altar debris and bone deposits in sanctuaries throughout the Greek world give insight into actual practices, economic realities, and environmental forces—a much-needed corrective to the idealized depictions of sacrificial ritual well-known from literature and the visual arts. The possibilities to study the consumption of dogs and horses (Ekroth), deer (Larson) and birds (Villing) in sanctuaries, alongside the more expected sacrifice of cows, sheep, goats, and pigs, move scholars away from stereotypes and binaries, and closer to the adaptive flexibility of lived religion. While communal responses to ritual impurity and miasma may overlap with sacrificial practices, sacrifice and purification are not coextensive; their relationship to each other is more complex that we may realize (Georgoudi). The power of religious practice lies in its polysemy.

Several essays (Chs. 5-9) remain embedded in material evidence from Attica, or focused on a more traditional mode of literary analysis. An examination of a scene from the Homeric Hymn to Hermes (Thomas, Ch. 7) offers a template for how to use literary sources to uncover aetia and local knowledge in the co-evolution of literary performance and ritual practices outside of Athens. Chapters 5, 6, and 8 turn to material evidence for ritual practices from Attica (Naiden, Ch. 5; Klöckner, Ch. 8), or Attica and Ionia (Carbon, Ch. 6). Informed analyses of inscriptions and votive reliefs uncover complex representations of symmetry and reciprocity within Greek society. Regulated privileges and political hierarchies operated within the sphere of the polis, and yet exhibit a homogeneity that reached across polis boundaries (Naiden and Carbon). The representation of Athenian sacrificial ritual in votive reliefs (Klöckner) communicated not so much a mirror image of actual practice, but an expressive and deliberative choice made by individuals that attests to the cultural importance of the ritual. Another literary analysis of a scene from Aeschylus’ Seven (Seaford, Ch. 9) likewise focuses on the emotional impact of ritual, and the powerful subjective experience of those depicted making public sacrifices and oaths in Attic drama. The power of ritual on the stage is carried over to the audience in performance.

Any familiar Athenian frame for the study of sacrifice, or any preference for classical literary sources, is thoroughly swept away in the final three essays’ examination of evidence both early (16th century BCE) and late (4th century CE). Working at the “margins” of the Greek world, scholars discuss sacrifice in Hittite, Egyptian, Roman, and “pagan” contexts. After taking Burkert to task for his universalizing theory of ritual violence in Homo Necans (Mouton, Ch. 10), a thick description of Hittite practices does indeed point to some common ground between Hittite and later Greek customs, especially in the notion of gift-giving, and the significance of the victim’s vital organs. Similar common ground appears to have existed between
Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians in Greco-Roman Egypt (Rutherford, Ch. 11); although the knowledge of Egyptian customs among Classical/Hellenistic Greeks and Romans may not have been entirely reliable, abundant literary evidence for a “transcultural conversation” holds out the possibility for knowledge of the other not entirely based on ethnic stereotyping. The final essay (Knipe, Ch. 12) vaults the reader forward into the age of Shapur and Julian, complete with a detailed discussion of Julian’s brand of Neoplatonic theurgy. In this late antique world of Persia and the Byzantine Empire, sacrificial cult in the eastern Mediterranean used symbols and symbolic actions to elevate the human soul. In this the Greeks—and Romans—were no different than other traditional Mediterranean ritual systems at the threshold of Christianity.

While each essay offers evidence that often forces the reader to shift her perspective on Greek sacrificial practices, the volume’s two most compelling arguments come in early chapters. The work of Jennifer Larson (Ch. 2) and Stella Georgoudi (Ch. 4) strongly engages the insights of Detienne, Vernant, Burkert, Parker, as well as the recently deceased scholar of religion J. Z. Smith, exemplifying fruitful new directions for scholarship. Larson’s critical rereading of French structuralism invites scholars to look at the wider systems that Greek sacrifice existed within—systems that were not simply based in the polis but were framed by resource availability, market forces, and environmental limitations. Villing’s conclusion (Ch. 3) for bird sacrifice and changing ritual practices reinforces Larson’s point about food production and the alimentary system. Scholarship in Religious Studies (cf. Smith) challenged scholars to question their categorization of phenomena labeled religious; bringing environmental and economic concerns alongside traditional worship of the gods illustrates one advantage of Smith’s approach. The future of the study of sacrifice perhaps lies in this area, encouraging scholars to develop a sensitivity to how ritual practices changed in view of environmental and economic concerns. Finally, scholars who work with material from Greek antiquity face one recurring challenge. Rutherford (Ch. 11) discusses the bias of ancient Greek writers trying to understand Egypt; this quietly begs the question of how far we have advanced in our own methods and awareness of biases. Separating ritual practices into the binaries Greek and non-Greek—whether that means Roman, Egyptian, Hittite, Jewish, “Near Eastern”, or “pagan”—does not simply label and categorize these other traditions, it can also marginalize them by assuming—perhaps implicitly supporting—a notion of some purely Greek substrate of practice. Georgoudi deftly moves beyond this conundrum by evoking the poikilia of Greek practices. Her analysis of the poikilia entailed in sacrificial and purificatory rituals reminds the reader that attention to the details
of practice combined with theoretical grounding can lead to deeper overall understanding. The Greek world indeed was a crossroads of culture and practice, and these twelve essays capture the possibility for new insights when scholars include evidence and perspectives unexplored in the past.

Paulin Ismard, Jane Marie Todd, trans.,
_Democracy’s Slaves: A Political History of Ancient Greece._

This work, originally published in French as _La démocratie contre les experts: Les esclaves publics en Grèce ancienne_ (2015), is the first book-length treatment of ancient Greek public slavery since Oscar Jacob’s _Les esclaves publics à Athènes_ appeared in 1928—an astounding interval, given the importance of the subject. In classical Athens, there were probably well over a thousand public slaves (dēmosioi) who did much of the day-to-day work of _polis_ administration, handling everything from filing documents in the public archives to serving as the city’s police force. And while the ancient evidence on public slavery is depressingly scanty, Ismard’s book shows just how much can be said about it. Admittedly, many of the conclusions Ismard draws are speculative, and his use of sources is in some instances open to challenge, but this is, nonetheless, a tremendously valuable book.

Although Ismard’s focus is democratic Athens, he attempts a comparative perspective and draws on material not only from other Greek city-states but from throughout history and across the globe. Despite fairly numerous typos, a few obvious mistranslations from the French, and other errors, the book is engagingly and even thrillingly written, carrying the reader to such far-flung destinations as seventeenth-century Malacca, the nineteenth-century Sokoto Caliphate in West Africa, and Athens, Georgia, during the American Civil War. _Democracy’s Slaves_ unites breadth with brevity, a combination that will no doubt frustrate some classicists while attracting the well-deserved interest of less specialized readers. This book is
not a complete or rigorous survey of public slavery in ancient Greece. Rather, it is a powerful demonstration of the significance of an understudied phenomenon.

In his first chapter, Ismard addresses the origins of public slavery in the Hellenic world. He identifies an institutional precursor in the pre-classical *démiourgoi*, itinerant professionals like craftsmen, scribes, and heralds whose services were contracted by entire communities. The transformation of the *démiourgoi* into *demosioi*, Ismard suggests, was occasioned not just by the development of chattel slavery but also by the rise of democratic government. Since the existence of professional expertise posed a threat to the people’s collective authority, those who possessed such expertise, according to Ismard, had to be radically separated from, and subordinated to, the political community. Jobs in the public administration that required professional skills—the ancient equivalent of the civil service or bureaucracy—were therefore entrusted to the *demosioi*, “democracy’s slaves.” This, in brief, is the main argument of the book.

In his second chapter, Ismard surveys the many sorts of public services performed by *demosioi* in Athens and elsewhere. The range is impressive: they were clerks and accountants; policemen, prison guards, and executioners; mint workers, marble haulers, and maintenance men. They were even, apparently, in two late inscriptions from Delos and Rhodes, priests (48–49). In many of these jobs, Ismard emphasizes, the slaves had considerable power and autonomy, yet they were not, strictly speaking, public officials (*archai*) and did not possess the rights accorded to ordinary citizens. At the same time, however, they were not like other slaves. In his third chapter, Ismard seeks to show that they often possessed privileges that distinguished them from slaves owned by private citizens. These could include, according to Ismard, the right to live on their own, to possess and bequeath personal property, and even, in some instances, to own slaves themselves. In Athens, they sometimes received public honors, and in a few cases they or their sons may have been granted full citizenship rather than the more common post-manumission status of resident alien (*metoikos*). Such peculiarities of status are not nearly as well-documented as we might wish, and in this chapter especially Ismard is perhaps too credulous: without much hesitation, for example, he accepts claims concerning the servile origins of prominent Athenians like Hyperbolus and Nicomachus (66–67). Still, he may be right to contend that the *demosioi’s* position gives the lie to any idea of the Greek city as a simple hierarchy of clearly distinct statuses: rather, it was “a multidimensional social space,” a “kaleidoscope” (78) in which rights and privileges could be renegotiated and recombined.
The book’s final chapters are its most theoretical. Chapter Four develops Ismard’s thesis that the individual expertise required by some government jobs conflicted with the democratic ideal—best articulated, according to Ismard, by Plato’s *Protagoras*—according to which all necessary political knowledge could be derived from the collective deliberations of the citizen body. The relegation of technically demanding jobs to slaves served to conceal expertise and thus preserve democracy’s epistemological convictions. Chapter Five pursues this idea still deeper into theoretical territory through a consideration of three public slaves in Greek literature: the king’s shepherd in *Oedipus Tyrannos*, the *dêmosios* in Plato’s *Crito*, and the Ethiopian royal eunuch converted by Philip in the *Acts of the Apostles*. In these texts, Ismard argues, the slave who is also the agent of the state offers the key to revealing what has been hidden and thus to understanding the political and social order as a whole.

Ismard is surely right to argue that the *dêmosioi’s* existence tells us something important about Greek democracy, and he is also no doubt correct to insist upon his subject’s relevance to the crisis of democracy in the present day (ix–x). On the other hand, there are reasons to doubt his thesis that the assignment of government jobs to slaves was chiefly a way to hide the threat posed to democracy by expertise. There were more pragmatic reasons why many public services should be performed by slaves, and some of these reasons occasionally surface on the pages of Ismard’s book. As with the royal slaves whom Ismard frequently cites as comparanda, the servile status of the *dêmosioi* tended above all to guarantee their loyalty (107) and encouraged them to serve as a useful check on the power of citizen officials (40). Perhaps the extensive use of *dêmosioi* was intended less to conceal the fact of expertise than to maintain the tightest possible hold on public servants—a well-attested preoccupation of the Athenian *dêmos*. More fundamentally, it seems unlikely that most *dêmosioi* were the highly-trained experts imagined by Ismard. A few public slaves, like the verifiers of coinage (*dokimastai*) mentioned in an Athenian law of 375/4 (83–86), may perhaps have required an unusual degree of skill, and some public slaves certainly had to be literate, but for most *dêmosioi* the relevant competence was probably acquired, relatively quickly, in the course of the job itself. With luck, these issues will be among those debated in the wake of Ismard’s stimulating book.
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David Stuttard,
_Nemesis: Alcibiades and the Fall of Athens._

In _Nemesis_, Stuttard’s attractively produced and well-edited biography about Alcibiades, son of Cleinias, we have a book written “not for the specialist but for the general reader with an interest in the many areas of human experience with which Alcibiades’ biography intersects: politics and society, religion and philosophy, ambition and betrayal, and the drama of a life lived to the fullest by a subject who often seems to have been making up the rules as he went along” (7). Alcibiades’ career, as the author notes, is “unique” and quite apt for such a diverse, contextual approach, because among his contemporaries Alcibiades’ career was “not confined to his native city” (9). For both better and worse, Stuttard provides a kaleidoscopic presentation of the age of Alcibiades, who, in tragic fashion, suffered a retributive _nemesis_ by trying “to break the mould — only to be broken himself” (7).

Stuttard’s book plays a useful role: there is no real non-specialist biography of Alcibiades. P.J. Rhodes’ _Alcibiades: Athenian Playboy, General, and Traitor_ (South Yorkshire 2011) and Walter M. Ellis’s _Alcibiades_ (New York 1998) are both very academic in approach. The only other true biography in English is Edward F. Benson’s _The Life of Alcibiades_ (New York 1929), a romantic account of Alcibiades’ career, full of breathless interjections and fanciful speculation presented in mental Alcibiadean soliloquies. Stuttard’s book, like many modern biographies designed for a mass audience, is a straightforward narrative that gives concise but sufficient background and context for the non-specialist. Stuttard has “made hard choices” (7) over what to include with the goal of maintaining a coherent narrative, though when he makes an exceedingly “hard choice” he reveals his anxieties in the endnotes.

The combined pastiche of politics, socio-cultural history, and biography is, for the most part, successful. The prologue, entitled “A Family Divided,” illustrates the strengths of Stuttard’s approach. The stage is set with myriad stories about Alcibiades’ family and ancestry (accompanied by a family tree on p. xv that traces the subject’s heritage back to Nestor on the Alcmæonid side and Ajax on the Eurysacesid side). Stuttard emphasizes the aristocratic _bona fides_ of Alcibiades’ maternal and paternal heritage in detail, mixes in colorfully fitting primary sources from Pindar
to Libanius, and includes almost every story of note he can find about Alcibiades’ ancestors. His family, foreshadowing the dynamic career and personality of Alcibiades, establishes multi-faceted connections with Athens, Persia, and Sparta, and Stuttard’s web of anecdote, familial characterization, and the occasional cultural/literary addendum informs and entertains.

Stuttard’s efforts in the prologue are emblematic of the breadth of his research and learning throughout. Each chapter not only presents information about Alcibiades and his life along with necessary historical background and a summary of the political situation, but also provides concise, often vibrant details about pertinent bits of Athenian culture as well as whatever people—Spartan, Persian, Thracian—Alcibiades comes into contact with. When Alcibiades arrives at Sparta, the reader is treated to a précis of the Spartan government from the view of an Athenian, and finds a jarring mention of the “Crypteia, a ruthless liquidation squad, tasked with policing Sparta’s Helot slaves” (168). When Alcibiades arrives at the court of Chithrafarna (Greek Tissaphernes; Stuttard chooses to use Persian names instead of Greek ones: hence, e.g., Farnavaz, Korush, and Dārayavahuš for Pharnabazus, Cyrus, and Darius), we learn of Persian birthday customs and the symbolic, hierarchy-supporting “hunting” parties (196–7).

For the most part, Stuttard’s technique of including everything but the proverbial kitchen sink proves evocative, but sometimes these erudite additions cross the line from interesting to distracting. When the primary sources are more reliably thorough and Stuttard has a stronger biographical foundation from which he can add supplemental information, they prove charming, in spite of their lack of importance to the overarching narrative. Yet, in the chapters where sources about Alcibiades are wanting, especially the first three chapters, I found myself experiencing “detail fatigue.” For example, from pages 24 to 30, Stuttard covers the following topics: Alcibiades’ adoption by Pericles, Pericles’ status/career, Pericles’ affair with Aspasia, Greek nannies, Spartan nannies and women’s roles in a household, paidagogoi, Zopyrus the Thracian paidagogus, Athenians’ view of Thracians, Alcibiades as a headstrong child, rumors about Alcibiades, typical Athenian male education, elite education, Alcibiades and Homer, and gymnasia. The result is a dizzying panorama of facts and anecdotes, tying myriad threads not altogether clearly, and the ostensible subject, Alcibiades, is lost for paragraphs (if not pages) at a time.

As a consequence of Stuttard’s method, I find the composite of Alcibiades lacking cohesion. This inclusion of so much background and summary of the political situation, as well as the insertion of myriad bits of socio-cultural elements of the ancient Mediterranean peoples, frequently overshadows Alcibiades as a character.
Sometimes the cost of getting the reader to see as much of Classical Greece as possible costs Stuttard the reader’s connection to Alcibiades himself, i.e., imparting so much history waters down the book’s biographical essence.

My other lament probably stems from the fact that I am an adorer of Plutarch, whose biographical purpose is that of moral instruction through the analysis of character. Plutarch, in fact, occasionally attempts to provide such instruction through the motif of tragic *nemesis*. Plutarch’s moral approach fits well with such a theme, and Stuttard’s broader historical approach struggles with it. After the introduction he rarely revisits the matter, nor does he clarify what has tragically undone Alcibiades, even in Chapter 12 (“Nemesis”). The most dissatisfying of his implied *nemeses* concerns Alcibiades’ death at the hands of Persian assassins. Stuttard’s explanation of all the parties’ motives (Lysander’s, Agis’, the Thirty’s, Farnavaz’) is far too muddled to come across as being due to a tragic failure of Alcibiadean character. In fact, Stuttard ultimately says it “did not matter” who wanted him dead, even proposing, among other possibilities, that Farnavaz had determined that he was an “agent of the Evil One, the Great Lie, Angra Mainyu” (296)! Ultimately, the narrative structure of the biography fails to highlight the “tragedy” of Alcibiades in a specific, satisfying way, and is secondary to other concerns with which Stuttard approaches his subject.

In conclusion, what this book does well is to give a concise and atmospheric history of what occurred in Greece and Asia Minor during Alcibiades’ lifetime. For a non-specialist interested in Hellenic antiquity, the book will prove a fine and entertaining example of popular biography. Scholars probably won’t find much new here, but the writing is evocative, the campaign narratives easy to follow, and many of the episodes charming and occasionally insightful. The relationship between Alcibiades and Socrates, in fact, is judiciously depicted and explains the unfortunate separation of the two in a way I find exceptionally plausible. And if this reviewer does not see a cohesive strand in the character and ultimate *nemesis* of Stuttard’s Alcibiades, perhaps it is not so much that Stuttard has not done his job well, but the opposite: Alcibiades remains as convoluted and tricky a figure to come to grips with as ever.

NECJ 45.2

Michael Nerdahl
Bowdoin College
Daniel S. Richter and William A. Johnson, eds.,
_The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic._

_The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic_ includes 43 chapters by 42 authors, organized into seven sections. The majority of the contributors approach the Second Sophistic as an imperial-era cultural movement interested in self-conscious _paideutic_ display. But as editors William Johnson and Daniel Richter state in their introduction, they have preferred “leaving to one side the well-worn discussion of the ways that Greeks could retain and promote their cultural identity within the context of Roman rule” (6), thus creating some space between this volume’s aims and those of earlier works of Ewen Bowie, Simon Goldhill, Simon Swain, and others. In the second chapter of the introductory section, Tim Whitmarsh illustrates the opportunity of casting a wider net of study by analogy to “wave function” observations as opposed to the “particulate” approaches that have been emphasized in previous scholarship. The introductory section’s inclusion of Thomas Habinek’s chapter “Was There a Latin Second Sophistic?” proves that the aims of the editors and the observations of Whitmarsh are substantive. Ultimately, Habinek is cautious about viewing the Latin and Hellenic worlds on precisely the same terms, but there are some provocative discussions—for example, on Pliny’s _Epistles_ as sophistic display pieces—that reveal a commitment to innovative approaches to the Second Sophistic.

The second section, “Language and Identity,” likewise includes a mixture of innovative and proven approaches. Lawrence Kim’s chapter, “Atticism and Asianism,” is a boon to the volume and to studies on the Second Sophistic more broadly, offering an unparalleled treatment of various aspects of linguistic/lexico-grammatical and rhetorical/stylistic Atticism and Asianism—terms sometimes misunderstood in previous scholarship. Martin Bloomer’s chapter on “Latinitas” continues the discussion of language while highlighting several ways in which _latinitas_ and _hellenismos_ ranged on similar social fields. This treatment of language as a function of identity helps maintain unity in a section that proceeds to discussions of ethnicity, culture, and sexuality, wrapping up with Amy Richlin’s novel use of “retrosexuality” as a “kind of antiquarian sex, scripted and acted out by well-known contemporary
figures” (117). Her deployment of Martial, Juvenal, and Suetonius proves that the question raised in Habiniek’s chapter is one worth asking, and her emphasis on retro-sexuality as performance looks ahead to the third section of the *Handbook*, “Paideia and Performance.”

In this section, Thomas Schmitz’s chapter boils down previous scholarship by Kendra Eshleman, Maud Gleason, and Schmitz himself, and further illustrates that there was not a prescribed arena for sophists, spatially removed from the real world. That is, the sophists’ culture was at once elite and popular. Edmund Thomas follows with a chapter on “Performance Space” that adds a welcome treatment of architecture and space that has been neglected in many studies of the Second Sophistic. These first three sections are perhaps the strongest of the volume.

The fourth section, “Rhetoric and Rhetoricians” begins with Laurent Pernot’s chapter on “Greek and Latin Rhetorical Culture.” He offers a succinct diachronic survey of the various ways in which rhetoric operated within sophistic culture, from educational exercises to social and political action. The remainder of this section and much of the fifth section on “Literature and Culture” turn to studies of individual rhetoricians and authors that, while generally well written and prepared, sometimes replicate past work by Bryan Reardon, Simon Swain, Tim Whitmarsh, and the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Among chapters dedicated to specific authors, Frederick Brenk’s on “Plutarch: Philosophy, Religion, and Ethics” merits particular mention for its emphasis on the value of the *Moralia* as a treasury of paideutic acquisitions and displays. Daniel Richter’s chapter on “Lucian of Samosata” is a fine model of general background information with nuanced analysis, in this case of Lucian’s Syrian culture and Greek mimesis.

The second half of Section Five departs from individual authors and moves to genre, with Daniel Selden’s chapter on “The Anti-Sophistic Novel” bridging the gap. Selden resists the widely-held view of the ancient novel as univocal promoter of sophistic and Hellenic culture, arguing that the novelistic corpus is larger than often recognized and infrequently features “sophistic” rhetorical display. Taking the *Alexander Romance* as a point of focus, Selden illustrates that the cultural or ethnic antitheses deployed in Dio Chrysostom, for example, are not so easily delineated in the “anti-sophistic” novel. Among other chapters on genre, Sulochana Asirvatham’s contribution on “Historiography” returns to Whitmarsh’s “wave function” approach, pointing out that sharp exclusion of *romanitas* in sophistic historiography is hard to justify.

A sixth section on “Philosophy and Philosophers” offers the opportunity to view both the integration of and tension between sophistic rhetoric and philos-
ophy. In “The Aristotelian Tradition,” Han Baltussen observes that Peripatetics looked to the classical past in a manner that was in keeping with Second Sophistic ideology, but they engaged frequently with intellectualism and philosophy rather than style and allusion. Conversely, in his “Platonism” chapter, Ryan Fowler notes that Platonists pursued academic and scholastic issues less frequently than they did metaphysical, syntactical, and allusive references to Plato’s writing. While the other chapters in this section offer useful background on the state of philosophy during this period, this section is perhaps the least integrated into the larger oeuvre and readers may desire more direct treatment of how particular branches of philosophy related to or rejected ideologies prevalent in the Second Sophistic—a disconnect that is foreshadowed by the noticeable infrequency of reference to these chapters in the editors’ introduction.

A final section on “Religion and Religious Literature” at times shares this lack of integration, but to a lesser extent. Again, the inclusion of this topic provides value in its own right, as it encourages literary scholars to explore a wider variety of works and cultures that existed within the milieu of the Second Sophistic. Andrew Johnson’s chapter on “Early Christianity and Classical Tradition” offers one such useful chapter, as he highlights the power of *logos* for Socrates, members of the Second Sophistic and Christians. Yet, as Johnson notes, similarities are not to be taken wholesale—Christian writers such as Tatian are more willing to criticize Hellenism than most traditionally accepted members of the Second Sophistic. Erich Gruen’s discussion of *Maccabees 4* and Philo of Alexandria in his chapter on “Jewish Literature” points the scholar of the Second Sophistic to less-trodden, though quite promising, areas for study. So too does Scott Fitzgerald Johnson in his chapter on “Christian Apocrypha,” though some readers who will undoubtedly benefit from his survey of diverse apocryphal works may desire further discussion of precisely how “the Christians were certainly reinforcing, rather than challenging, established habits in Second Sophistic literary ideology” (680).

As I hope this selective summary illustrates, the volume has many merits and will undoubtedly be a useful resource to students and scholars approaching the Second Sophistic from different levels of experience and interest. There are, however, a few shortcomings that I must address. The *Oxford Handbooks* series aims to offer a “state-of-the-art survey of current thinking and research.” Yet — perhaps because of the production time required for a large volume with many contributors — readers will miss much significant scholarship produced since 2014. In addition, readers will unfortunately encounter errors and infelicities ranging among typography, spelling, grammar, and bibliographical information. Finally, chapter-by-chapter bibliogra-
phy (to the exclusion of a comprehensive one) with end-of-volume endnotes might strike some as insufficiently user-friendly. Nevertheless, the volume offers a centralized resource for scholars of imperial literature and culture with chapters by many of the most respected scholars in the field. Moreover, it succeeds in illustrating that many aspects of the Second Sophistic are apparent and relevant across boundaries of time, space, ethnicity, and culture.

Brandon Jones
Boston University

Kathryn Lomas,

_The Rise of Rome: From the Iron Age to the Punic Wars._


Was there something exceptional about Rome from its very origins that positioned the city to dominate Italy and, eventually, the Mediterranean? In this volume written for a general audience, Kathryn Lomas sets out to answer this question by tracing Rome’s rise to power from the Iron Age to the eve of the First Punic War. The result is a comprehensive, readable, and up-to-date synthesis of the archaeological and historical evidence for this integral period in Roman history.

Lomas’ goals in this volume are twofold: first, to explore how Rome, one of many settlements in central Italy in the Iron Age, became the dominant power on the Italian peninsula by the First Punic War; and second, to situate Rome’s growth within its broader Italian context. Lomas suggests Rome’s rise cannot be understood without an awareness of the Italian world in which the city developed and which it would eventually come to dominate (3-4). She argues that Rome’s success was, at no point, a given, but that specific aspects of Roman society and its interactions with its neighbors, allies and enemies alike, ultimately set the stage for Roman domination of the Italian peninsula.

The book is divided into fifteen chapters arranged chronologically. Part I (chapters 1-5) examines the development of Rome and Italy, particularly Etruria and Latium, from the Iron Age through the Orientalizing period. Lomas surveys the
archaeological and historical evidence for the origins of the city and traces Rome's
development and that of its neighbors. Part II (chapters 6–10) covers Rome and Italy
between 600 and 400 BCE, exploring the end of the monarchy, the nature of the
fifth-century “crisis,” and the beginning of Roman expansion in Latium. Part III
(chapters 11–13) discusses the Latin War and its consequences, Roman interaction
with allies and enemies, especially the Samnites, and Roman colonization. Finally, in
Part IV (chapters 14–15), Lomas assesses the impact of Roman expansion on Rome
itself in the mid-Republic and sets the stage for Rome’s later imperial and Medi-
terranean dominance (and for the subsequent volume in this series).

In order to situate Rome within its broader Italian context, Lomas alternates
chapters on Rome with chapters on Italy, beginning close to Rome, with Latium
and Etruria, and eventually, as Rome’s domination grows, incorporating Campania,
northern Italy, and the Apennines. As Roman influence expands, the lines between
these alternating chapters (naturally) blur. This arrangement of alternating chapters
does introduce some redundancy, particularly across early chapters, but it also means
that each chapter can be fruitfully read (or assigned) on its own or with its compan-
ion chapter.

Lomas synthesizes an extensive corpus of archaeological and historical materi-
al, much of which has only been published in Italian. Chapters dealing with the Iron
Age and Archaic periods are particularly welcome, as they offer a straightforward
account of the development of city-states in central Italy through the lens of materi-
al culture, which is accessible even to a general audience. Lomas deftly incorporates
a wide range of archaeological material in her narrative and demonstrates that this
evidence (even given its limitations, which she acknowledges) paints a picture of in-
creasing socio-political complexity in central Italy through the Iron Age and Archa-
ic periods. Lomas is more skeptical of the literary sources than the material culture
related to Rome’s foundation and early growth, which may cause some to object to
her account. She is, however, clear that this is her view, and makes her reader aware
of other perspectives on the foundation myths and early history of Rome, such as
Carandini or Wiseman (35–37). Indeed, throughout the book, Lomas is careful to
present differing views on the material and historical evidence, and to explain many
of the complex debates in Roman history and archaeology in a straightforward,
accessible way.

Lomas is less skeptical of the historical sources for the 5th century and beyond,
and these sources (used carefully) increasingly dominate her narrative, forming the
backbone of her exploration of how Roman socio-political organization changed
in the Early and Mid-Republic. The archaeological evidence for Mid-Republican Rome is woven into this narrative, but material culture becomes less dominant in these chapters, which is not surprising, given the problematic, fragmentary nature of the evidence from Rome during the Mid-Republican period.

It is in these chapters that Lomas articulates most clearly her belief that an important aspect of Roman exceptionalism was the complex system of bilateral alliances between Rome and other Italian states in the post-Latin War period. She argues that this system placed Rome squarely at the center of the Italian political and military landscape, and effectively shut off the ability of any group to form a coherent resistance to Roman power. Such alliances also regularly pulled Rome, willing or unwilling, into conflicts across the Italian peninsula (287), creating more opportunities for the acquisition of booty and land, and promoting a system of aristocratic competition which dominated Rome in the Mid-Republic. Lomas convincingly suggests that these aspects of Roman culture—an emphasis on aristocratic competition, military accomplishment, and the acquisition of booty—fueled Rome’s continued participation in this cycle of conquest. Aristocratic competition, in turn, altered the landscape of Rome itself through the variety of construction projects sponsored by successful aristocrats (324–325).

Lomas also suggests that Rome’s openness to outsiders—built into its very foundation myths—and its ability to expand access to citizenship contributed to Rome’s ability to establish a flexible, stable system of control in Italy (324). Her discussion of the Mid-Republican character of Roman expansionism is especially timely as Mid-Republican colonization is a topic of some scholarly interest at the moment, and she neatly incorporates recent research on the character of the colonies of the Mid-Republic into her narrative (274–280).

Not everyone will agree with Lomas’ presentation of Rome’s rise to power and Roman exceptionalism. She herself admits that it is difficult, given the source material, to tell whether Rome’s development was typical of other Italian city states, or if the settlement was somehow more adept at coping with instability and change than other cities (323). While this is not the book everyone would write about the rise of Rome, especially given Lomas’ particular skepticism towards the literary sources, it is also a book few could write. This volume is the direct result of Lomas’ impressive command of the archaeological material and her ability to translate and synthesize the complexity of the archaeological and historical record into a coherent and engaging narrative. She is able to incorporate recent theoretical approaches to material culture through lenses such as mobility, funerary investment, and social complexity, for example, in a way which is clear even to a non-specialist audience. Her account
of Roman exceptionalism is thus a compelling and a welcome addition to current discussions about the character of Rome and its rise to power.

Given her audience and the scope of the book, Lomas sacrifices some depth for the sake of her overall narrative, but offers plenty of additional bibliography and source material to explore. The accessibility of the narrative is complemented by the volume’s supplementary material, including images, footnotes, additional sections on ancient sources and Roman chronology, and a guide to relevant museums and sites. While this is an excellent resource for a general audience, this book (or selections from it) would also be a welcome supplement to a survey course in Roman history or archaeology.

NECJ 45.2
Catherine Baker
Bowdoin College

Catalina Balmaceda,
_Virtus Romana: Politics and Morality in the Roman Historians._

In this thoughtful and engaging study, Catalina Balmaceda traces the relationship between _virtus_, Roman historical developments, and historical writing from Sallust to Tacitus. Although _virtus_ is not understudied, Balmaceda’s contribution stands out from others, for example Sarsila (Being a Man [Frankfurt 2006]) and McDonnell (Roman Manliness [Cambridge 2006]), in that it is distinctly a concept study rather than a word study. Reflecting on _virtus_ as a category of good qualities, Balmaceda illustrates how it developed as a moral and political principle in historical texts. Her strategy is on the whole successful, and the work provides valuable insights into changing conceptions of a man’s central virtues in Roman social and political life.

After a brief introduction, Balmaceda devotes Chapter 1 to the definitions and historical development of _virtus_. Her tight analysis demonstrates effectively that _virtus_ is a native Roman concept whose development owed relatively little to Greek
and philosophical influences. This chapter also introduces the important principle, persistent throughout Balmaceda’s analysis, that proper Roman *virtus* can only be present when an individual is motivated by the good of the community rather than selfish desires.

Slightly troubling is Balmaceda’s distinction between two kinds of *virtus*: *viri-lis-virtus*, narrowly defined as physical and battlefield courage, and *humana-virtus*, a broader form encompassing nearly all good qualities. This distinction seems unnecessarily sharp; Balmaceda herself acknowledges that the word often resists attempts to distinguish its meanings, and even some cases she treats as clear-cut admit shades of interpretation. The more essential point is that from the beginning, physical courage was only one manifestation of the rather broad moral quality of *virtus*.

In Sallust’s monographs, the subject of Chapter 2, Balmaceda argues for the beginning of a redefinition of *virtus* not as an ancestral quality of the *nobiles* but as a personal quality that any citizen could claim through his actions. This *virtus*, however, turns out to be partial and defective in Sallust’s view. In the *Catiline*, *virtus* is nowhere found complete: it appears only in fragments and “turns against itself” (61) in its inability to preserve Rome. The quality’s “dangerous closeness to vice” (60) is apparent again in the *Jugurtha*, where a succession of figures demonstrate how easily *virtus* is corrupted by *ambitio*, *superbia*, or *avaritia* when an individual begins to serve himself rather than the *res publica*. Balmaceda’s exposition is intricate and persuasive, though it oddly lacks consideration of Sallust’s *Histories*, where we also see public figures claiming *virtus* in contradictory ways.

Chapter 3, on Livy, focuses on the exemplarity of *virtus* and its role in defining identity and protecting the Roman people. Balmaceda argues that for Livy, *virtus* was linked to *libertas*, and that the *Ab Urbe Condita* chronicles “the gradual acquisition of *libertas* for the Roman people through acts of *virtus*” (84). The idea of true *virtus* arising only from selfless acts on behalf of Rome is especially important here. As wars became matters of conquest rather than survival, Livy’s attribution of *virtus* to Roman armies declines dramatically. *Virtus* is also absent in civil conflict except in clear cases of courage in freeing the broader *res publica* from oppression, as in the expulsion of the decemvirs. Although we cannot know how Livy dealt with the more recent events that made Sallust despair of *virtus* as a cure for moral decay, Balmaceda builds a strong case that Livy saw a renewed commitment to *virtus* throughout Roman society as the key to reclaiming Roman identity.

Balmaceda’s treatment of Velleius Paterculus in Chapter 4 is striking and showcases the benefits of analyzing different manifestations of *virtus* on their own terms rather than trying to standardize the concept across time and text. Balmaceda takes
Velleius seriously as a “valid testimony of his time” (131) and sees in Velleius’ work a genuine attempt to negotiate a new age in which the entire polity was bound up in the character and *virtus* of a single individual. In this context, even Velleius’ extreme enthusiasm for the new system is understandable. Not hampered by a pedigree an emperor might find threatening, Velleius saw the moderate rule of Tiberius not as a curtailment of *libertas* but as an expansion of the freedom of all Romans to serve though acts of *virtus*. This is not so different from Sallust’s idea that *virtus* available to all regardless of background is, at least in principle, a good thing.

Balmaceda’s final chapter, on Tacitus, is her longest and most complex, and it shows the limits of her conceptual approach to *virtus* while remaining both useful and insightful. Throughout her analysis, Balmaceda has shown *virtus* changing to accommodate changed realities, expanding its social range and fluctuating in its meaning until in the principate it encompassed all good qualities, contained (or not) in the emperor and reflected (or not) in his people. Balmaceda argues that in Tacitus’ view, this reality made it impossible for Romans at the highest level to compete in old-fashioned *virtus* to benefit the commonwealth, since the winner must be predetermined and egregious *virtus* in others was dangerous, both to the individual displaying it and to the stability of the empire. Thus, the principate needed a new *virtus* that represented “the proper characteristic of a man” (16). This replacement consisted of political flexibility and moral resolution, and the men Tacitus singles out for praise are described in terms of *moderatio* and *constantia*, preserving their own freedom of moral action in service of Rome.

Here, however, is the problem. *Moderatio* and *constantia* have been part of *virtus* all along, and it is in some sense natural that Balmaceda treats them as facets of *virtus* that have increased in prominence and honor. These virtues in Tacitus, however, seem to be almost completely untethered from the word *virtus* itself. Roman characters use it to describe themselves, but Tacitus withholds authorial consent to this characterization and rarely uses *virtus* to describe even good Romans; further, the two Romans to whom Tacitus mainly ascribes *virtus* in the *Annals* share a curious quality of “being to some degree out of their times” (214). At the same time, the old quality of competing to preserve freedom from oppression still exists in Rome’s barbarian enemies, and Tacitus uses the word *virtus* to describe it. This leads me to question whether, when the word is no longer applicable or applied to Romans, we can still talk about *virtus* as the essential Roman quality in Tacitus. It seems that perhaps the core of Roman *virtus* has rotted out and that *moderatio* and *constantia*, once subsumed within *virtus*, have now replaced it as the chief Roman political virtues.
Of course no book is perfect, and I would like more direct comparison between conceptions of virtus in the different texts, a task made more difficult by the book’s strict organization by author. In the end, though, despite any flaws, Balmaceda’s work succeeds in its main goal. It shows compellingly how the forms of virtue, courage, and public service required by a Roman man changed as Rome moved from republic to principate and that Roman historians took an active role in negotiating that change.

Catalina Balmaceda,

_Virtus Romana: Politics and Morality in the Roman Historians._


Catalina Balmaceda’s book serves as an introductory _vade mecum_ to the major extant Roman historians (Sallust, Livy, Velleius Paterculus and Tacitus), arriving after a number of companion volumes of the past few years including the _Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians_ (A. Feldherr, ed., Cambridge 2009), the _Blackwell Companion to the Greek and Roman Historiography_ (J. Marincola, ed., Malden, MA 2010) and _Roman Historiography: An Introduction to its Basic Aspects and Development_ (A. Mehl, Malden, MA 2009). Balmaceda uses virtus as a way to focus her studies of each of the historians around a core Roman cultural concept — what it means to be a Roman _vir_ — and this focus on intellectual history makes it a welcome volume for graduate school reading lists and for advanced undergraduates.

In the introduction, Balmaceda sets out her main ambit, to “show how a group of Roman historians not only wrote history but also helped to shape it” specifically with an “investigation into a culture’s conceptual categories of self-definition and goodness in action” (2). In short, she aims to investigate how the Roman historians shaped Roman culture and history by constructing ideals and rules for how to be a man (for virtus is, as all the studies note, derived from _vir_, “man”). In a sense, this makes her book a complement to Myles McDonnell’s _Roman Manliness_ (Cambridge
2006), in that Balmaceda’s focus is primarily on the Augustan and Imperial historians, while McDonnell’s focus on *virtus* in the Republic makes a temporal boundary for his book with Sallust. The rest of the introduction summarizes both the book’s contents and the main questions that have driven studies in Roman historiography for the past thirty years—issues of the truth value of the Roman historians and the role of rhetoric in Roman historiography studied by Wiseman and Woodman, amongst others. Balmaceda stakes out a middle ground in these debates: that these texts are rhetorical, with all that implies, but that our modern narratives of Roman history inevitably and inextricably depend upon them.

In her first chapter, Balmaceda sets out to define *virtus* and attempt to unravel its Latin roots and Greek influences and how we can differentiate between *virtus* as courage and *virtus* as moral excellence (“virtue” in our modern sense). She is right in showing how *virtus*, like many Roman moral qualities, is primarily social and relational—for many Roman writers true *virtus* earns *gloria* for serving the *res publica*. Cicero’s influence on our ideas on Roman *virtus* and the place of *virtus* in Stoic thought at Rome also receive attention. Despite her best attempts, Balmaceda is not entirely able to break free of the influence of McDonnell here. While echoing the criticisms of Robert Kaster in his review (*BMCR* 2007.02.08), she still essentially accepts the basic premises of McDonnell’s book, while arguing for more and earlier Hellenic influence through the concept of *aretê*. Much of the chapter is a digested form of McDonnell’s basic conclusions, showing how *virtus* was always a contested term for the Romans.

The following chapter on Sallust tackles his account of the decline of *virtus* after the removal of any *metus hostilis* by the destruction of Carthage in 146 B.C.E. in his two monographs. Much of this chapter builds on the work of Batstone, Levene, Kraus, and Woodman, but a particular highlight is Balmaceda’s exploration of the permeable linguistic boundaries between *vitium* and *virtus* in Sallust’s narratives, “the disturbing way words that usually refer to *virtus* are now used to refer to *vitium*, and the proximity of meanings that, for Sallust, is even more dangerous” (77). This is a profitable direction in exploring Sallust’s language, building on the problems of *virtus* in Sallust that Batstone showed years ago in his important article on the *synkrisis* between Caesar and Cato. In Balmaceda’s telling, Sallust sees nothing but decline everywhere and no way out—a diagnosis of the Republic’s fall with no cure or remedy.

Turning to Livy in her third chapter, Balmaceda correctly sees Livy as writing consciously in response to Sallust’s works and his pessimism. For her, Livy’s answer
is to restore *virtus* by putting forth *exempla* of great *virtus* by early Romans. In this reading, Livy “was constructing—and to some extent also fixing—Rome’s memory so as to protect and safeguard her true identity in an age of changes” (83). *Libertas* becomes an important secondary theme in Balmaceda’s work in this chapter, as she notes Livy’s use of *virtus* cluster around martial engagement with foreign enemies abroad, and the preservation and expansion of *libertas* domestically. I found this chapter to be the most diffuse of the book—something that is, admittedly, hard to avoid when trying to deal with the entire extant corpus of Livy in the confines of one book chapter. A finer and more focused study on similar questions is Ann Vasaly’s recent book, *Livy’s Political Philosophy* (Cambridge 2015).

As Balmaceda turns to writers of the imperial period in her final two chapters, the book really comes into its own. I suspect there are still many readers that are not as cognizant of the work of Velleius Paterculus as the other historians, and Balmaceda’s chapter here is a great introduction to the Tiberian writer. She highlights Velleius’ adaptation of the arguments of *virtus* and *novitas* found in Cicero and Sallust, and how Velleius’ work argues that, contra Livy, one does not have to go to the ancient past to find *exempla* of Roman *virtus* when Tiberius provides a multi-faceted *exemplum* in Velleius’ own day. In fact, Balmaceda observes that it is only through discussion of individual virtues that certain events of Tiberius’ reign are recorded in *Historiae Romanae*.

The final chapter on Tacitus is the longest and richest in the book. Starting from the *prima facie* surprising fact that Tacitus is far more apt in his corpus to attribute *virtus* to foreign enemies than to Romans, Balmaceda sets out explore what makes a good man under the imperial system for Tacitus. She argues that Tacitus has a strict usage of *virtus* as courage in war, but that under the emperors such *virtus* is impractical and must be tempered by *moderatio*. By restricting *virtus*, Tacitus shows, in Balmaceda’s telling, there are different ways to be a good man under the Julio-Claudians and Flavians, one obvious example being his father-in-law, Julius Agrippa.

A brief conclusion wraps up the book, where Balmaceda charmingly and effectively imagines a dialogue between her four authors (a scene one imagines Tacitus and Cicero would appreciate), where they sum up their ideas about *virtus* in their respective times. Ultimately, as a companion volume to the Roman historians this is a worthy book. It is less successful when tackling *virtus* as a concept in the first century BCE, alternately arguing against and for a dualistic view of *virtus* between courage and moral excellence, but Balmaceda’s analysis of the changes in *virtus*
Lee Fratantuono, ed.,
*Tacitus: Annals XVI.*


Lee Fratantuono’s recent Bloomsbury edition of Book XVI of Tacitus’ *Annals* is a very good choice for undergraduate or graduate students studying this text in the original Latin for the first time. This edition demonstrates considerable scholarly erudition without getting bogged down. Fratantuono’s commentary elucidates Tacitus’ difficult grammatical constructions without providing excessive translation assistance for Latin students, and he discusses many textual quandaries, most of them involving emendations to the second *Mediceus* manuscript largely responsible for the survival of the extant Neronian section of the *Annals* (Books XIII-XVI). A fuller discussion of the textual transmission would have been welcome in the introduction but perhaps lies outside of the purview of this edition. The editor does not purport to furnish an exhaustive and authoritative scholarly commentary like the English one by Furneaux (1907), upon which Fratantuono relies heavily, or the German commentary by Koestermann (1967), upon which the editor draws less often and does not list in his general bibliography. Fratantuono does, however, make frequent use of Jackson’s 1937 Loeb edition of *Annals XI-XVI*.

Fratantuono’s edition and commentary are quite accessible for students new to Tacitus’ laconic, ironic, and compressed Latin prose. The editor’s discussions of the themes and characteristics of Book XVI, including the interplay between illusion and reality, servility and nobility; Nero’s obsessions with Dido’s gold and the Trojan origins of the Julian *gens*; and the pervasive theatricality of the Neronian regime, are all instructive without being overly pedantic. One of Fratantuono’s most interesting observations is the degree to which the emperor’s own forays onto the stage at the
Quinquennial Games (or Neronia), detailed in *Annals* Book XVI.4-5, are effectively upstaged by the theatricality of the *ambitiosae mortes* of such victims of his wrath (forced to commit suicide) as the notorious Petronius and inimitable Thrasea Paetus, and even by the deaths of less famous victims such as Lucius Antistius Vetus and his long-suffering daughter Politta (*Annals* Book XVI.10-11).

Some of the better parts of Fratantuono's edition are his detailed literary discussions of individual passages. He astutely points out Politta's status as an extreme example of an *univira* (“one-man woman”), who had witnessed her husband's bloody execution, then starved herself, consuming only sufficient victuals to prolong her widowhood (68), and finally ended her own life piously with the same blade other family members used (71-72). Petronian scholars might compare Politta with the matron or widow of Ephesus, a fictional character in the novel very likely written by Nero's most famous victim of *Annals* XVI. In *Satyrica* 111-112, the widow of Ephesus, like Politta, also emphasizes her status as *univira* to theatrical effect but with less genuinely pious intent.

The most important sections of any edition of Book XVI of Tacitus' *Annals* must be those that cover the spectacularly theatrical and subversive forced suicides of Petronius and Thrasea Paetus, which culminate in *Annals* XVI.19 and XVI.35, respectively. The former section of Fratantuono's commentary is very well done, though marred by several typographical errors and repetition of phrases, which should be corrected before a reprinting. (These begin in earnest on page 92 of the text, right before the Petronian section, and end by page 108, early in the commentary on Thrasea Paetus.) The commentator does well to discuss the Epicurean aspects of Petronius' demise but neglects the less obvious Cynic aspects of Petronius' flouting of Neronian authority, as when on his deathbed he refused to leave his estate to Nero but instead listed the emperor’s sexual scandals in a codicil to his own will. Fratantuono does perceptively state: “The Tacitean narrative of the suicide of Petronius stands in prefatory contrast to that of the Stoic Thrasea Paetus that follows soon after, and with which the surviving portion of this book breaks off” (100). Indeed, the best part of Fratantuono's commentary is his treatment of the suicide of Thrasea Paetus and of the latter's status as a “Socrates Redivivus” (135-154). This excellent section does lead the scholarly reader to reflect on the inherent difficulty in writing a commentary on Book XVI without composing a companion commentary on Book XV, which contains Tacitus' account of the Pisonian conspiracy and the forced suicides of the Neronian literary luminaries Seneca the Younger (*Annals* XV.62-65) and his nephew Lucan (XV.70); Book XVI of the *Annals* contains the similarly forced suicides of Petronius and Thrasea Paetus. Fratantuono's commentary on the Petronian sections
of Book XVI does contrast Petronius’ suicide briefly with that of Socrates but fails to characterize Petronius’ death as a parody of Seneca’s *ambitiosa mors*. Fratantuono does cite Star’s informative work *The Empire of the Self* (Baltimore 2012) in this regard. The commentator does a better job describing at length how Thrasea Paetus self-consciously emulated in his own manner of death the suicides of Socrates and Seneca.

The commentary cites many works that do not appear in the general bibliography. This is understandable given the specific nature of many of the former citations. There are some surprising omissions from the bibliography altogether. One would have thought that since Fratantuono acknowledges the Blackwell *Companion to Tacitus* (Oxford 2012), edited by Victoria Pagán, as such an important work, he might have also acknowledged her monograph, entitled *Tacitus* (London-New York 2017), but perhaps the latter work had appeared too recently for consultation or inclusion in the bibliography. Reference to the excellent discussion of the transmission and reception of the works of Tacitus in her final chapter could have supplemented the relative paucity of this kind of discussion in Fratantuono’s edition, though he refers to Mendell’s *Tacitus* (New Haven 1957) as a useful *précis*.

Certainly, Petronian scholars would note the omission in the bibliography of any edition of Tacitus’ *Annals* XVI of K.F.C. Rose’s posthumous monograph, *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (Leiden 1971). Importantly, the editor does cite Courtney’s *A Companion to Petronius* (Oxford 2001) and Schmeling’s *Commentary on the Satyricon of Petronius* (Oxford 2011), which both discuss Rose’s *libellus* at length. Fratantuono on page 95 follows Courtney’s example of citing progressive Petronian scholarship as well as traditional works. Although Fratantuono does not take much space to discuss the identification of Tacitus’ Petronius with the author of the *Satyricon*, the editor wisely eschews the tendency, criticized by Holzberg in his review of Schmeling’s commentary, of relying excessively on J.P. Sullivan’s 1968 monograph on Petronius, which, of course was “untouched by Foucault and all that came after him” (Holzberg, *Classical World* 2013, p. 542). Fratantuono does include Prag and Repath’s recent *Petronius: A Handbook* (2009), an edited volume on various aspects of Petronius, with each essay providing progressive suggestions for further reading.

Finally, page 146 of the commentary wisely cites Ker’s *The Deaths of Seneca* (Oxford 2009) for a comparison of the deaths of Socrates, Seneca, and Thrasea. Fratantuono also refers in the commentary (147) to Branham and Goulet-Cazé’s excellent edited volume entitled *The Cynics* (Berkeley 1996), and to Rist’s *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge 1977). However, in an edition of a book that trails off with Thrasea Paetus’ deathbed address to the Cynic philosopher Demetrius, at least one work on
the influence of Cynicism or Stoicism on the Roman empire should appear in the general bibliography.

Overall, Fratantuono’s edition makes a strong and accessible contribution to the Tacitean scholarship on Book XVI of the *Annals*. The edition contains a helpful 21-page Latin–English glossary after the commentary. This glossary is fuller than the subsequent three-page “Bibliography and Further Reading” section or the index at the end, which confines itself to ancient topics and names, eschewing reference to scholars cited.

*Necj* 45.2

Daniel B. McGlathery

Newton, MA

Maren R. Niehoff,

*Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography.*


Maren Niehoff’s latest book furthers her previous efforts to provide context for the voluminous surviving writings of Philo of Alexandria, illuminating his development as a pioneering thinker both in the realm of Jewish philosophy and among the philosophers of antiquity more generally. Philo’s writings are notoriously lean on personal or biographical details, limiting previous attempts to fashion from them the sort of intellectual biography that Niehoff sets out here to achieve. She succeeds in avoiding excessive speculation, grounding her arguments in her intimate familiarity with Philo’s works and her extensive knowledge of contemporary philosophical traditions. The result is a persuasive and illuminating sketch of one of antiquity’s most fascinating figures.

Rather than narrating Philo’s biography in chronological order, Niehoff makes the unexpected but effective choice to begin her study near the end of Philo’s life, taking as her point of departure the one event in Philo’s *Vita* that can be dated with certainty: his participation in an embassy of leading Alexandrian Jews to the Emperor Gaius Caligula in Rome in 38CE. Niehoff argues forcefully that the im-
pact of Philo’s time in Rome has been under-appreciated in previous scholarship, identifying his encounter with Roman literary culture as the key to interpreting Philo’s oeuvre and understanding his development as a thinker. Building from previous research that has sorted the roughly three dozen works surviving from Philo’s pen into five distinct sets of treatises, Niehoff posits a distinct Sitz im Leben and intended audience for each set. She argues that three of these groups—the *Exposition of the Law*, the Philosophical Writings, and the Historical Writings—reflect Philo’s exposure to ideas and discourses circulating in Rome. Working backwards, she then identifies the two remaining sets of treatises, the *Allegorical Commentary* and the *Questions and Answers*, as reflective of the concerns and controversies present in the young Philo’s Alexandrian milieu.

The book is structured in three parts. Part I, “Philo as Ambassador and Author in Rome,” demonstrates how Philo’s historical and philosophical treatises engage in discourses and debates that occupied the Roman literati of the first century. Moving beyond traditional readings of *Against Flaccus* and *On the Embassy to Gaius* that focus on their reliability as historical sources, Niehoff illuminates points of intersection between these texts and the works of Seneca, Josephus, and Lucian of Samosata. She argues that Philo’s treatises share with them a common interest in the limits and abuses of political power, as well as a similar authorial self-awareness and sense of irony.

The influence of Philo’s time in Rome is also detected in the topics treated by Philo’s philosophical treatises. The dialogues *On the Rationality of Animals*, *On Providence*, and *Every Good Man is Free* are read in light of the lively debate on these topics between contemporary Stoics and Platonists. Philo champions Stoic defenses of humanity’s exclusive claim to reason, the benevolent involvement of God in human affairs, and the conviction that true freedom is only found in the willing acceptance of one’s circumstances while, in *On the Eternity of the World*, Philo falls into the Platonist camp, taking particular offense at the Stoic theory of conflagration. In each of these debates, Philo adopts the position that best aligns with his interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures, whose authority he seeks always to defend.

Part II, “Philo’s *Exposition* in a Roman Context,” offers a plausible occasion for Philo’s composition of the treatises collectively known as the *Exposition of the Law*. This series consists of biographies of Israel’s patriarchs followed by writings devoted to the interpretation of the Law of Moses. The *Exposition’s* first volume is the treatise *On the Creation*, a fact that has been obscured by its separation from the rest of the *Exposition* in the most frequently read English translation. By restoring *On the Creation* to its rightful place at the outset of the *Exposition*, Niehoff contends, the
purpose and the intended audience of these texts comes more sharply into focus. She attributes the attention paid to the material cosmos in the *Exposition* (in contrast to its near absence in the *Allegorical Commentary*) to Philo’s encounter with Stoic philosophy in Rome. According to her reading, Philo “has not simply remained loyal to the biblical creation account, rejecting alternative pagan views, but has instead gone through an intellectual development, exchanging a more transcendent Platonic position for the Stoic approach prevalent in Rome” (101). The influence of Rome is also apparent, Niehoff contends, in the biographies, which “make full use of biographical conventions and themes of Roman Stoicism” (127). Similarly, Philo’s portrayals of Biblical women in the *Exposition* conform to Roman models, while Biblical law is shown to be congenial to Stoic ethics. Read as a cohesive whole, the *Exposition* is convincingly shown to be an apologetic introduction to Jewish life composed for a Roman audience unfamiliar with the texts, laws, and practices of Philo’s people.

In Part III, “Young Philo among Alexandrian Jews,” Niehoff assigns the remaining texts in Philo’s corpus to his early years as a scriptural exegete and commentator in Alexandria. The *Allegorical Commentary*, she contends, demonstrates his familiarity with the critical methods of scholarship developed by scholars of Homer at the Museum and reveals Philo to be conversant with other Jewish scriptural commentators. The *Commentary*’s philosophical commitments, particularly to the notions of God’s transcendence and ultimate unknowability, are decidedly Platonic and reflective of Alexandria’s intellectual climate. Niehoff’s careful reading culminates in a concluding study of Philo’s evolving usage of Stoic concepts and vocabulary, demonstrating Philo’s movement from “deep ambivalence to adoption of central Stoic tenets popular in Rome” over the course of his career (241). In so doing, Niehoff makes a strong case for the necessity of a contextual interpretation that resists the temptation to harmonize Philo’s works and obscure his development as a thinker (226).

The same commitment to nuance and differentiation is unfortunately not as evident in Niehoff’s discussion of Philo’s “religion,” a term she uses primarily to discuss matters of worship and beliefs about the divine, but that is left under-theorized. As a consequence, her discussion skims over the complicated interplay between ethnicity, citizenship, ethics, cult, and philosophical speculation that characterize this time period and is so evident in Philo’s writings. This results in some confusing statements, such as her characterization of Philo as an “advocate of Judaism in Rome,” suggesting that his role was to be a religious apologist rather than rather than a diplomat interceding in defense of the rights of his community. Likewise, her contention that Philo presents Judaism as “an apolitical, religious entity” in *On
the Life of Moses (120) confuses me, as Philo attributes many political functions to Moses in this text.

Nevertheless, Niehoff has produced an engaging and highly readable biography that provides a plausible new interpretive framework for approaching Philo’s body of work in a holistic manner. This volume would serve well as an introduction to Philo for advanced students of second-temple Judaism, ancient philosophy, and early Christianity, while also providing fresh insights for seasoned readers of his works.

NECJ 45.2

J. Alison Rosenblitt,
E. E. Cummings’ Modernism and the Classics: Each Imperishable Stanza.


In this book, Alison Rosenblitt argues that Cummings’ time at Harvard as a Classics student had a profound influence on his poetry. Building upon the earlier work of critics such as Malcolm Cowley and Guy Davenport, she both summarizes former research and adds in new information concerning his views on sexuality from previously unpublished poems of Cummings, which appear in the Appendix. As she states: “[T]his book argues that, by restoring and examining a forgotten classical context, we can fundamentally refocus our current sense of Cummings’ work” (4).

The book is divided into five sections: E. E. Cummings as a Classical Poet (Chapters 1-3); Childhood, Harvard and Paganism (Chapters 4-5); The Great War and Beyond (Chapters 6-8); Cummings, Classics and Modernism (Chapters 9-10); and Translations, Further Verse and Prose by E. E. Cummings. Each section is further divided into chapters. All the poems are referred to by their first lines, as Cummings didn’t use titles.

In the Foreword, Rosenblitt attributes Cummings’ poor spelling, “especially letter reversals and trouble with doubled consonants” (xxii) to dyslexia; this is certainly a new theory to explain the structure of his poems.
Rosenblitt remarks in the Preface that Cummings himself “emphasized the influence of classical authors on his poetic development” (3-4). He especially admired Sappho, as did other Modernists of his time such as the Lowells. Modernists such as Ezra Pound, Debussy, Freud, and Cezanne also influenced him. However, Rosenblitt believes that “[H]e has been relegated out of the mainstream study of modernism simply because he is not considered to be a serious poet in many scholarly circles” (4). She considers Cummings to be a Modernist and also a poet of World War I (especially in his use of the epic journey to the underworld [the katabasis]); this book, therefore, is her attempt to bring Cummings back to the ‘canon’ of important poets.

In Chapter 2 Rosenblitt discusses Cummings’ schooling, concentrating on his studies at Harvard. To show his classical influences, as his contemporaries saw but critics now do not, Rosenblitt concentrates on his early and late poems, where Cummings’ knowledge of the Classics is most obvious. She quotes Guy Davenport, who saw the similarities between ancient Greek texts, with their “frail scatter of lacunae, conjectures, brackets, and parentheses” and the placement of words in an E. E. Cummings poem (25). Rosenblitt shows how Cummings used the Greek middle voice and the influences of other Greek authors such as Sappho and Plato. While arguing that he is a Hellenist, not a Latinist, she does discuss how he also was greatly influenced by Horace and Catullus.

Chapter 3 begins with a discussion of Cummings as a translator. Rosenblitt believes that his translations were not literal but figurative; he would emphasize those parts of a poem that seemed important to him. He used Sapphic and Alcaic meters, emphasizing stress on a word. In addition, he often used rhyming Shakespearean couplets to end his poems.

Chapter 4 deals with the “Pan/satyr/faun motif… ubiquitous in nineteenth century art and literature” (64). This motif was part of the “paganism” of his circle at Harvard, as was the joining of Bacchus and Pan as springtime. Rosenblitt discusses the sexual nature of “innocence, voyeurism, eroticism and transgression” in these poems in light of the evidence she has presented that Cummings was sexually repressed in his youth. With “In Just” (written in 1916 and published in 1920 and 1923) as her exemplar, she views the faun as innocence and the satyr as aggression. The idea of a satyr among children has led to differing interpretations of innocence versus experience; however, since Cummings was a follower of Freud and underwent analysis later in life, one can see the influence of Freud’s vision of sexuality in children in these earlier poems.

A significant point in this chapter is the poems shouldn’t be read in isolation, but in the context of which poems are around it and when it was written and pub-
lished. This is the opposite of the New Criticism so popular in the mid-twentieth century.

Chapter 5 deals with the poems at the end of Cummings’ life (1952–63), which show a return to paganism and the influence of the poetry of Milton, Blake and early Pound (91). Cummings followed the Freudian view “that everything is intrinsically bound up with its opposite… His own work freely reworks, distorts, and plays with classical texts and classical ideas” (93). Rosenblitt states that his interest in incest/sex abuse is related to the Freudian idea of dualism. She argues that this use of Freud is more “postmodern” (109).

The next section deals with World War I. In Chapter 6 we learn that Cummings and a friend were jailed in France during the war on suspicions of espionage (the charges were later dropped). Rosenblitt shows how his experiences in the war, especially his visits to prostitutes in France, had a great influence on his poems in this period. In his poems, he “puts sex, gender, and sexual violence at the centre of the links he forges between the Classics and the Great War” (114).

Chapter 7 deals with the poems of Songs I and II. Rosenblitt argues that “[A]gainst the backdrop of the Great War Cummings forged a poetry of death and decadence, of erotic love and fantasies annihilation… [his] fantasies of annihilation have earlier roots in his classical engagements at Harvard and also in his Harvard exposure to the poetry of the Decadents.” (133). While various poems remind us of Sappho or Horace (especially *carpe diem*) and the pastoral setting, not to mention that the “attainment of love is death” (135; could this be a reference to Catullus 52?), Rosenblitt believes that, in addition to Horace’s *Odes*, especially 1.24, “[t]he classical text which lies most directly behind Songs I is Virgil’s retelling, in the *Georgics*, of the story of Orpheus and Eurydice” (141).

Chapter 8 discusses Cummings’ use of the idea of “war as love”; Rosenblitt calls this “seduction as a response to war” (166). She notes that the structure of classical poetry with its free placement of words, especially in Horace, gives a framework to the instabilities of modernist poetry. For example, Cummings placed adjectives so that they could be used with two different nouns, as if he were writing in Greek.

Chapter 9 discusses Cummings’ antithetical ideas of κίνεσις as movement and life versus στάσις as position and death; Cummings strove for movement. He preferred the Greek friezes to statues, as they seemed more able to move and express motion, while the statues were static.

Finally, Chapter 10 uses as its theme the idea that “[t]he modernist world shaped Cummings’ work as well as his life. His earliest poetry was influenced by Imagism” (224). In addition, he had strong Romantic sympathies at the end of his life.
This led to his “persona as the quintessential romantic poet-lover” (225). Rosenblitt’s view is that Cummings used the “classical canon” in topic and meter to “outflank high modernism (239).”

The last section has translations of Greek and Latin that Cummings did in college.

This is a book that is best for finding information about a specific topic (the war, translations) or a specific poem, not for reading all at once. It lends itself to this very well because of the fine indices of poems and topics. The extent of the bibliography is really impressive. Rosenblitt offers a rich discussion of Cummings and his poetry, and the influence of Classics on both. Overall, it is a fine and interesting book.

NECJ 45.2

Ruth Breindel
Retired, Moses Brown School
Dear Members of CANE:

A new year is upon us and I don’t know about you, but I am very much looking forward to it.

Don’t get me wrong, I am not one to wish any moment of my life away. In fact, if I could afford it, like Trimalchio, I would employ a trumpeter to play every hour as a reminder of another sixty minutes gone, just gone. Instead I have my mother, who raised me on a now favorite saying of mine oft-told to nearly all I have met and taught: “we all die a little bit every day.” It may sound a bit bleak upon first hearing, but Mom always says it with a smile. And so do I.

In talking with students, colleagues, friends, and family, however, it has become clear that, for many of us, the past year has contained more than the usual aggregate of difficulties and challenges. For myself as well. And so I am looking forward to a new beginning this year as I never have before.

It may come as a surprise to those of you who only know me through the above, but I am not a person who finds it easy to see the glass “half full.” Nonetheless, I would like to suggest that we at CANE issue in the new year on the theme: *The Year You Toot Your Own Horn.* Or perhaps someone else’s horn. In other words, in the absence of a 21st century Pindar to sing our praises, let’s make like Walt Whitman and sing songs of ourselves.

Among CANE’s membership are many talented, generous, and award-winning scholars, teachers, and community members, and, yet, we – and the people who evaluate their work for promotion and other purposes – do not always hear of the many contributions these individuals make to CANE itself and to the
larger Classics community.

Two of CANE’s outstanding members, Charlie Bradshaw and Jere Mead, have proposed – quite rightly – that we at CANE need to do more to celebrate the service and achievements of our members. So many do so much that goes unremarked upon, much less celebrated, and who knows when a letter to a principal or an announcement of an award in a local newspaper might make a difference to the survival of a Latin teaching position or a whole program. It can’t hurt to try.

So, let’s celebrate this as *The Year You Toot Your Own (or Someone Else’s) Horn*. Or, if you prefer the cliche in British English (to me, it sounds a bit more modest that way): *The Year You Blow Your Own (or Someone Else’s) Trumpet*. Whatever else may be implied by these clichés, I simply wish to ask you to let us and others know of your or someone else’s professional and intellectual triumphs. You might begin with a resounding, “io triumpe!” and follow up with an email to me (Susan.Curry@unh.edu) detailing your or someone else’s special achievement.

If, like me, such tooting and trumpeting is totally anathema, likely only to draw the attention of jealous and angry deities – or perhaps that is just me – or, again, like me, you are a person who has a chorus of internal slaves reminding you that you are a mortal human being, not just at moments of triumph, but pretty much every day of every moment of your life, then you might start by celebrating another.

Let us begin:

“Io triumpe!” (I proclaim in an intellectual/pedagogical achievement and not a militaristic sort of way...there is, I believe, a slight difference in pitch and accent.)

I am absolutely thrilled to congratulate here, Thomas J. (TJ) Howell of Northampton High School in Massachusetts. He is the recipient of one of two national Society for Classical Studies Precollegiate Teaching Awards – a great honor indeed! The SCS website details some of TJ’s innovative approaches to the teaching of Latin including his talents for engaging students through *Commentarii de inepto puero (Diary of a Wimpy Kid)*, the Bayeux
Tapestry, and Catullus and through a number of different communication methods designed to demonstrate to students that Latin is a language, a means of communicating, and not simply a taxing translation exercise. Many of you, too, are aware that TJ has given much of his time in service, for example, as President of the Classical Association of Massachusetts and as a board member of CANE.

A huge CONGRATULATIONS to TJ!!!

And speaking of communication … while we are singing songs of ourselves and celebrating the triumphs of others, please be sure to share this information with those closest to you on a daily basis: your students and colleagues. I would especially ask you to sing CANE’s praises to a new generation of teachers and scholars, who may not know of all CANE does to offer its members chances to learn from one another at the Annual Meeting and throughout the year, to meet others as passionate about things ancient as you are, and to keep the study of the ancient world alive in a world that all too often insists upon its demise. We all know that reports of its death are greatly exaggerated. Nonetheless, if we do not speak up and celebrate what we do and do well, exaggeration may quickly become reality.

So – if you forgive this last analogy – let’s make of CANE itself a kind of English village pub. Like in Midsomer Murders, perhaps, but without the murders. What I love about a local pub in England is the way they are so often patronized by several generations at once, often several generations of the same family at once. I know we need several generations with their different kinds of energy, knowledge, and know-how to even have a shot at winning on trivia night at our local, and we at CANE also need several generations with their different kinds of energy, knowledge, and know-how if we are to survive, support one another, and keep bringing the rigors and pleasures of the study of the ancient world to New England.
We have much to offer.

Let the young people know.

Looking forward to seeing you all at the CANE Annual Meeting at the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Massachusetts, March 8th and 9th, 2019, and I wish you a year full of celebrations.

Sue Curry,
CANE President
Senior Lecturer in Classics, University of New Hampshire
Susan.Curry@unh.edu
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Paul B. Langford, 59 Sheafe Street, Portsmouth, NH 03801; (H) 603-431-3635, (W) 603-777-3303; PLANGFORD@exeter.edu
Other committees as established by the By-Laws

Nominating Committee

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

Bethanie Sawyer, 169 Waite Avenue, Chicopee, MA 01020; 413-559-1661; BSAWYER@longmeadow.k12.ma.us

Geoffrey Sumi, Department of Classics, Mt. Holyoke College, 50 College Street, S. Hadley, MA 01075; 413-532-1295; GSUMI@mtholyoke.edu

Barlow-Beach Distinguished Service Award

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

Jeremiah Mead, 20 Dalton Road, Chelmsford, MA 01824; 978-256-2110; JEREMEAD@msn.com

Roger Travis, 16 Juniper Lane, Medfield, MA 02502; ROGERTRAVISJR@gmail.com
Committee on Discretionary Funds
Aaron Seider, College of the Holy Cross, 1 College Street, Worcester, MA 01610; 401-316-2269; ASEIDER@holycross.edu

Lindsay Sears, 11 Armonk Street, Apt. 10, Greenwich, CT 06830; LSEARSTAM@gmail.com

Meredith Safran; Meredith.Safran@trincoll.edu

Local Arrangements Coordinator
College of the Holy Cross: Timothy Joseph, Box 144A, 1 College Street, Worcester MA 01610

Program Committee 2018 Annual Meeting
Susan Curry, 319 Murkland Hall, 15 Library Way, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824; 603-862-3589; susan.curry@unh.edu

Auditors
Shirley S. Lowe, 2 Laurie Lane, Natick, MA 01760; 508-6655-8701; sfglowe@rcn.com

Paula Chabot, 7 Woodsedge Lane, Westbrook, CT 06498; 860-399-5414; CHABOTP@madison.k12.ct.us

Resolutions Committee
Jacques Bailly, University of Vermont, 481 Main Street, Burlington, VT 05401; 802-859-9253; JBAILLY@uvm.edu

Richard E. Clairmont, 302 Murkland Hall, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824; (H) 603-868-2286, (W) 603-862-3130; RICHARDC@cisunix.unh.edu
CANE Summer Institute 2019-2020

**Director, Steering Committee:** Amanda Drew Loud, PO Box 724, Holderness, NH 03245; 603-536-1343, and Timothy Joseph, Box 144A, 1 College Street, Worcester, MA 01610

**CSI Steering Committee**

Stefan Cressotti, St. Sebastian’s School, 1191 Greendale Avenue, Needham, MA 02492; 781-449-5200; STEFAN-CRESSOTTI@stsebs.org

Erin Cummins, 77 Arlington Street, #2, Brighton, MA 02135; ERIN.CUMMINS@gmail.com

Fred Drogula, drogula@ohio.edu

Ann Higgins, PO Box 351, Monterey, MA 01245; 413-528-6691; ANN.HIGGINS1@verizon.net

Mark Mucha, PO Box 992, Groton, MA 01450; 508-826-0074; MMUCHA@lacademy.edu

Roger Stone, 79 Market Street, Amesbury, MA 01913; RF_STONE@comcast.net

**Brown University Representative:** Jeri DeBrohun, 182 Adams Street, Warwick, RI 02888; JERI_DEBROHUN@brown.edu

**CANE Exec. Comm. Representative:** Ruth Breindel, CANE Treasurer
Other officers

Writing Contest
President-Elect (Chair), Executive Committee State Representatives

Katz Prize
Immediate Past President (Chair)

Wiencke Prize

Chair: Aaron Seider, College of the Holy Cross, Classics Dept., 1 College Street, Worcester, MA 01610; 401-316-2269; ASEIDER@holycross.edu

Lindsay Sears, 11 Armonk Street, Apt. 10, Greenwich, CT 06830; LSEARSTAM@gmail.com

Meredith Safran; Meredith.Safran@trincoll.edu

CANE Certification Scholarship
See CANE Scholarship Committee above
Representatives to Sister Organizations

**Council of the American Classical League:** Kevin Ballestrini, 21 Oakwood Drive, Storrs, CT 06268; KEVIN.BALLESTRINI@gmail.com

**National Committee for Latin and Greek:** Sally Morris, Phillips Exeter Academy, #2333, 20 Main Street, Exeter, NH 03833; 603-777-3814; SWMorris@exeter.edu

**American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages:** Mark R. Pearsall, 59 Taylor Bridge Road, Lebanon, CT 06249; (H) 860-887-4709, (W) 860-652-7259; MPEARSALL281@earthlink.net or mpearsall281@gmail.com; Glastonbury High School, 330 Hubbard Street, Glastonbury, CT 06033; pearsallm@glastonburyus.org

**National Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages:** Madelyn Gonnerman-Torchin, 10 Fox Lane, Newton Centre, MA 02459; (H) 617-964-6141, (W) 617-713-5085; madelyngonnerman@gmail.com
CANE Annual Writing Contest 2018

“...sed iam felicior aetas
terga dedit, tremuloque gradu venit aegra senectus,
quae patienda diu est (nam iam mihi saecula septem
acta vides): superest, numeros ut pulveris aequem,
ter centum messes, ter centum musta videre.
Tempus erit, cum de tanto me corpore parvam
longa dies faciet consumptaque membra senecta
ad minimum redigentur onus: nec amata videbor
nec placuisse deo;...”

Ovid, Metamorphoses XIV.142-150


“Would you like to live forever? Some billionaires, already invincible in every other way, have decided that they also deserve not to die. Today several biotech companies, fueled by Silicon Valley fortunes, are devoted to ‘life extension’ – or as some put it, to solving ‘the problem of death.’”...As the longevity entrepreneur Arram Sabeti told The New Yorker: ‘The proposition that we can live forever is obvious. It doesn’t violate the laws of physics, so we can achieve it.’”

In the passage cited above, the great poet, Ovid (43 BCE – 17/18 CE), gives voice to the Cumaean Sibyl who knows a little something about living a long, long, long, long, long life. Using this passage as a starting point, imagine that these contemporary immortality-seeking billionaires pay a visit to Cumae. What advice do you imagine the Sibyl would give to these men trying to find a way to live forever?

Due Date: 17 December 2018
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENTS:

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

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

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

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

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

Signed________________________________Date_____________________

Signed________________________________Date_____________________
GUIDELINES FOR TEACHERS

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

1. Present the topic to your students and answer any questions they may have about it.

2. **Give your students a copy of the document “CANE Annual Writing Contest 2018,”** including a due date and supplementing it with any additional suggestions you may have about revising the rough draft and proofreading the final copy.

3. Give your students a deadline early enough to allow you to judge your students’ projects and submit the three best projects to your State Representative by **December 17, 2018.**

4. **You may discuss the general topic with your students to be sure they understand it,** but explain that the projects must be original works on the given topic and that students may not seek help from others, whether students, teachers, or parent, although they may arrange to have the final draft typed or word-processed by someone else.

5. **For the three winning entries you submit to your state representative,** make sure your students have included the required cover page and statement that the work is their own
   
   » Name of Student  
   » Grade of Student  
   » Name of School  
   » Name of Teacher  
   » Email Address of Teacher

We will use teacher e-mail to communicate with the top three winners in each state at the middle school and high school level. If one of your students’ projects is among the winning entries, you can expect to hear from your State Representative by **January 15, 2019.**
6. Remind your students that this is a contest, with certificates and prizes given to the three finalists in each of the New England states at both the high school and middle school level, and that the New England-wide high school winner will receive a certificate and a gift card, to be presented at the 112th Annual Meeting of CANE, 8 and 9 March 2019 at the University of Rhode Island. **The high school winner will have the opportunity to be our guest for dinner and to read the winning entry at this event. The winning entry will be published in CANE's Annual Bulletin and on its website with the student’s name.**

7. You may find it helpful to provide your students with copies of past winning projects, published in the Annual Bulletin. Please visit www.caneweb.org for recent high school winning entries.

8. Submit the best three projects from your school to your CANE State Representative by December 17, 2018, making sure that you enclose each student’s signed statement that the project is his or her own work. For names and addresses of the State Representatives see the listing under the CANE Executive Committee on the CANE website, www.caneweb.org. Students may not submit their projects directly to the Chair of the Writing Contest. To do so will invalidate the project.

9. Please do not rank the three projects that you submit from your school to your state representative. If you wish, you may recognize the authors of all three projects in some appropriate way, but at this preliminary level students’ projects are not to be ranked first, second, or third place. The State Representatives will submit the entries to the president-elect.
The National Association of Secondary School Principals has placed the CANE Writing Contest on the 2018–2019 NASSP National Advisory List of Contests and Activities as a regional program for participation by students in middle and secondary schools in Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Students from other states who are enrolled in independent or parochial schools in New England are eligible to enter the CANE Writing Contest. We have had many inquiries about the CANE Writing Contest from students in schools outside the area served by the Classical Association of New England. We are happy to answer these inquiries with information about the contest, but we regret that students enrolled in schools located outside New England are not eligible to participate.

Attention State Representatives: After you have read your assigned entries, please advise John Higgins, President-Elect, of your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place choices by January 15, 2019. Please also include a ranked list of the three top winners in the state, including the students’ teachers and the name of their school.


ANNOUNCEMENTS

Funding Opportunities

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

Two sources of funding are open to CANE members.

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

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

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

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

2019 NATIONAL LATIN EXAM

- More than 143,000 registered students in 2018
  - 40 question multiple choice exam
  - Seven levels; Introduction to Latin through Latin VI
  - Grammar, reading comprehension, mythology, derivatives, literature, Roman life, history and oral Latin
    - Gold and silver medals
    - Opportunities for Scholarships
      - $5 per US student, $7 per foreign student, $10 minimum order, to be sent with the application
      - N.B. $10 shipping and handling fee per school
- Postmark Deadline for application and payment: January 22, 2019

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

NATIONAL LATIN EXAM • SINCE 1977
Sponsored by The American Classical League/National Junior Classical League
NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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