

# CLASSICAL --- WORLD

Published for the Classical Association of the Atlantic States  
by the Johns Hopkins University Press

## CO-EDITORS

Robin Mitchell-Boyask, Lee T. Percy,  
*Temple University*      *Bryn Mawr College*

## ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Judith P. Hallett, *University of Maryland, College Park*

## ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Victoria Pedrick, *Georgetown University*

## ASSOCIATE EDITOR

James Romm, *Bard College*

## REVIEWS EDITOR

David Sider, *New York University*

## ASSISTANT EDITOR

Sarah Wahlberg, *The Episcopal Academy*

## EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Abbe Walker, *Bryn Mawr College*

---

## CAAS PRESIDENT

Janet M. Martin, *Princeton University*

## CAAS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Mary Brown, *Valley Forge Military Academy*

*Classical World*  
ISSN 0009-8418

© 2014 by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, Inc. All rights reserved.

*Classical World* (ISSN 0009-8418), formerly *The Classical Weekly* (est. 1907), is published four times a year (Fall: September–November, Winter: December–February, Spring: March–May, Summer: June–August) for The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, Inc., by The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2715 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21218-4363, USA. Periodicals Postage paid at Baltimore, Maryland, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Classical World*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Journals Division, 2715 N. Charles Street, Baltimore MD 21218-4363.

*Submissions.* All articles should be sent to Robin Mitchell-Boyask, 327 Anderson Hall, Department of Classics, Temple University, 1114 West Berks St., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122; email: [clswrld@temple.edu](mailto:clswrld@temple.edu). Books for review should be sent to Gareth Williams, Department of Classics, Columbia University, 1130 Amsterdam Ave., 617 Hamilton Hall, MC 2861, New York, NY 10027, email: [gdw5@columbia.edu](mailto:gdw5@columbia.edu). Authors of articles should send submissions electronically as PDFs. Since submissions are judged anonymously, authorship and affiliation should be revealed only in an accompanying e-mail. Authors of accepted articles will be expected to submit their final versions in a Word document formatted in accordance with a style sheet which will be sent to them. Acceptance of an article is contingent upon the author's signing a standard publication agreement, and *Classical World* reserves the right to make or require edits for style, clarity, and editorial consistency.

*Permissions.* No portion of this journal may be reproduced by any process or technique without the formal consent of the publisher. Copies for personal or internal use may be made on the condition that the copier pay a fee of \$8.00 per copy through the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Dr., Danvers, MA 01970, for copying beyond that permitted by Section 107 or 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law. This consent does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as copying for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. (0009-8418/13) \$8.00. Direct all other permissions requests to Permissions Manager at [www.press.jhu.edu/cgi-bin/permissions.cgi](http://www.press.jhu.edu/cgi-bin/permissions.cgi).

*Subscription Prices.* Individual membership rate is \$35 (print). Institutional rate per year is \$65.00 (print); \$72.00 (online); \$91.00 (print and online). Print subscribers in Canada or Mexico, please add \$10.00 postage; all other countries, add \$13.00 airfreight. *Prepayment is required for shipment or access.*

*Send subscription inquiries, orders, and business correspondence to:*

The Johns Hopkins University Press, Journals Division  
P.O. Box 19966

Baltimore, MD 21211-0966 (USA)

(410) 516-6987

Tollfree 1-800-548-1784 (US and Canada only)

Fax (410) 516-6968

E-mail [jrnlcirc@press.jhu.edu](mailto:jrnlcirc@press.jhu.edu)

Or visit our website: [https://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/classical\\_world/](https://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/classical_world/)

*Advertisers.* Please see our website above for details and deadlines.

This publication was designed by The Johns Hopkins University Press, Journals Division.

The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of ANSI-NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper). ∞

# CLASSICAL WORLD

## SPECIAL SECTION: RECENT WORK ON TIBULLUS

Introduction: Recent Work on Tibullus

*Erika Zimmermann Damer* | 443

Metrical Feet on the Road of Poetry:

Foot Puns and Literary Polemic in Tibullus

*John Henkel* | 451

Imperial Geographies in Tibullan Elegy

*Alison Keith* | 477

Gender Reversals and Intertextuality in Tibullus

*Erika Zimmermann Damer* | 493

## ARTICLE

Sexual Promiscuity of Non-Greeks in Herodotus' *Histories*

*Richard Wenghofer* | 515

## SCHOLIA

Croesus, Xerxes, and the Denial of Death (Hdt. 1.29-34; 7.44-53)

*William N. Turpin* | 535

IN MEMORIAM | 543

OVATIONES ET GRATULATIO | 545

REVIEWS | 553

BOOKS RECEIVED | 571

INDEX TO VOLUME 107 | 579

WHOLE NUMBER 1592

## **CLASSICAL WORLD**

### **AVAILABLE SPECIAL ISSUES**

- H. W. Benario ed., *Recent Work on Tacitus: 1974–1983* (80.2: Nov./Dec. 1986)
- H. W. Benario ed., *Recent Work on Tacitus: 1984–1993* (89.2: Nov./Dec. 1995)
- H. W. Benario ed., *Recent Work on Tacitus: 1994–2003* (98.3: Spring 2005)
- D. Boedeker ed., *The World of Troy* (91.5: May/June 1998)
- S. G. Cole ed., *The Organization of Space in Antiquity*, (93.5: May/June 2000)
- N. Crowther ed., *Studies in Greek Athletics, Part I* (78.5: May/June 1985)
- N. Crowther ed., *Studies in Greek Athletics, Part II* (79.2: Nov./Dec. 1985)
- M. C. English ed., *Aristophanes and the Boundaries of Comedy* (100.3: Spring 2007)
- T. Hofmeister ed., *From Homer to Omeros: Derek Walcott's Omeros and Odyssey* (93.1: Sept./Oct. 1999)
- J. Holoka ed., *Homer Studies 1978–1983, Part I* (83.5: May/June 1990)
- J. Holoka ed., *Homer Studies 1978–1983, Part II* (84.2: Nov./Dec. 1990)
- T. Johnson ed., *Homer* (93.2: Nov./Dec. 1999)
- P. Miller and C. Platter eds., *Power, Politics, & Discourse in Augustan Elegy* (92.5: May/June 1999)
- D. Poduska ed., *Classical Myth in Music* (92.3: Jan./Feb. 1999)
- B. Sammons ed., *Translations of Classical Works into English* (94.3: Spring 2001)
- M. S. Santirocco ed., *Engaging with Sulpicia* (100.1: Fall 2006)
- M. S. Santirocco ed., *Saving the City: Destruction, Loss, and Recovery in the Ancient World: A Commemoration of the Anniversary of 9/11* (97.1: Fall 2003)
- J. L. Sebesta and J. Siegel eds., *Texts and Technology 2012: Resources for Teachers* (105.3: Spring 2012)
- A. Smith and J. Thorburn eds., *Computing and the Classics* (91.6: July/Aug. 1998)
- M. R. V. Southern and J. Katz eds., *The Linguistic Edge: Using Linguistics to Enrich the Teaching of Classics* (100.2: Winter 2007)

### **AVAILABLE ISSUES WITH SPECIAL PAEDAGOGUS SECTIONS**

- Special Paedagogus on *Teaching Catullus* (95.4: Summer 2002)
- Special Paedagogus on *Classics and Colonialism* (96.4: Summer 2003)
- Special Paedagogus on *Homer* (98.4: Summer 2005)
- Special Paedagogus on *Vergil* (99.2: Winter 2006)
- Special Paedagogus on *Alexander the Great* (100.4: Summer 2007)
- Special Paedagogus on *Ovid* (102.2: Winter 2009)
- Special Paedagogus on *Teacher Training Programs* (102.3: Spring 2009)
- Special Paedagogus on "Page and Stage" (103.2: Winter 2010)

Single issues cost \$9.00 for individuals, \$15.00 for institutions. Quantities of some titles are limited. Special issues can be purchased by personal check. Order by volume and issue number. Contact the editor:

Robin Mitchell Boyask  
Temple University  
1114 West Berks St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19122  
email: [clswrld@temple.edu](mailto:clswrld@temple.edu)

## INTRODUCTION

---

# Recent Work on Tibullus\*

ERIKA ZIMMERMANN DAMER

ABSTRACT: This introduction provides an overview of Tibullus' life, his poetry, and his style, and offers a bibliographical survey of emerging critical trends in interpreting this relatively neglected Roman elegist.

Roman poets and literary critics widely praised Tibullus' poetry: Horace teases the elegist (*Carm.* 1.33, *Ep.* 1.4); Ovid praises his poetry (*Am.* 1.15.28, *Ars* 3.334, *Rem.* 763, *Tr.* 4.10.51–53) and eulogizes him after his death (*Am.* 3.9); and both Velleius Paterculus (2.36.3) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.93) elevate him to the top of the elegiac canon. Yet despite the ancients' high esteem for him, Tibullus has done less well among moderns. Both in the classroom and in Anglo-American scholarship, he has garnered far less praise and attention than either Propertius or Ovid. This tide may now be turning: we have two new translations<sup>1</sup> and a new reader,<sup>2</sup> all of which promise to bring Tibullus' poems to a wider student audience. The two translations feature the work of two of Tibullus' great commentators: the posthumous translation of Rodney Dennis completed and expanded by Michael Putnam attempts to reproduce Tibullus' "immediate, unpretentious, but deceptively simple

---

\*Many thanks are due to our audience members and to my fellow panelists at the APA's 2009 panel on "New Approaches to Tibullus": Alison Keith, John Henkel and David Wray; to Sharon James and Jim O'Hara for their generous and acute feedback throughout different stages of this project; and to Megan Drinkwater and Konstantinos Nikoloutsos for sharing advance copies of their work. The Faculty Research Council at the University of Richmond provided generous support for this project. I wish also to thank *CW*'s anonymous referees for their helpful feedback and its editors (both previous and current) Matthew Santirocco, Judith Hallett, Robin Mitchell-Boyask, and Lee Percy for being efficient, thorough, and fair. Any errors that remain in this collection are mine alone.

<sup>1</sup> A. M. Juster, tr., *Tibullus Elegies*. With an introduction and notes by R. Maltby (Oxford 2012); R. Dennis and M. Putnam, trs., *The Complete Poems of Tibullus. An En Face Bilingual Edition*. With an introduction by J. H. Gaisser (Berkeley 2012).

<sup>2</sup> P. A. Miller. *A Tibullus Reader. Seven Selected Elegies* (Mundelein, Ill. 2013).

*Classical World*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2014) Pp.443–450

style,”<sup>3</sup> while A. M. Juster, in a new Oxford World’s Classics edition introduced and annotated by Robert Maltby, seeks to capture internal and end-rhyme as well as to imitate Tibullus’ alliteration and assonance.<sup>4</sup> Since these new publications promise to improve Tibullus’ fortunes in the classroom, the time is ripe to refocus scholarly attention on this under-appreciated Augustan elegist. We have therefore brought together in one place several innovative critical approaches to Tibullus’ poetry in hopes of fostering many more fruitful conversations.

The essays that follow formed the core of an APA panel on “New Approaches to Tibullus” and represent several of the new avenues that have emerged in the study of Tibullus’ poetry in the decade since the publication of Maltby’s scholarly commentary in 2002. John Henkel’s essay on foot puns offers a philological study of Tibullus’ references to feet, which builds upon the groundwork of Keith and Fineberg to attempt a metapoetic reading of poem 1.1.<sup>5</sup> Alison Keith’s essay examines Tibullus’ aestheticization of imperialism, engaging in dialogue along the way with Keith’s own work on Propertius and with Lowell Bowditch’s recent series of articles on post-colonialism and imperialism in Roman love elegy.<sup>6</sup> Finally, Erika Zimmermann Damer’s essay on Tibullan allusion and gender reversals brings continued attention to the Marathus poems (1.4, 1.8, 1.9), where elegy offers its most intense experiment in representing male-male love.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Dennis (above, n.1) x.

<sup>4</sup> Juster (above, n.1) xxviii.

<sup>5</sup> A. Keith, “Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory,” *Mnemosyne* 52 (1999) 41–62; B. Fineberg, “From a Sure Foot to Faltering Meters: the Dark Ladies of Tibullan Elegy,” in M. DeForest, ed., *Woman’s Power, Man’s Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King* (Wauconda, Ill. 1993) 249–56; B. Fineberg, “Repetition and the Poetics of Desire in Tibullus 1.4,” *CW* 92 (2000) 419–28.

<sup>6</sup> A. Keith, *Propertius, Poet of Love and Leisure* (London 2008); L. Bowditch, “Propertius and the Gendered Rhetoric of Luxury and Empire: A Reading of 2.16,” *CLS* 43 (2006) 306–25; L. Bowditch, “Palatine Apollo and the Imperial Gaze: Propertius 2.31 and 2.32,” *AJP* 130 (2009) 401–38; L. Bowditch, “Tibullus and Egypt: A Postcolonial Reading of Elegy 1.7,” *Arethusa* 44 (2011) 88–121; L. Bowditch, “Roman Love Elegy and the Eros of Empire,” in B. Gold, ed., *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy* (Oxford 2012) 119–35.

<sup>7</sup> See also B. Verstraete, “The Originality of Tibullus’ Marathus Elegies,” *J Homosex*, 49 (2005) 299–315; K. Nikoloutsos, “Beyond Sex: The Poetics and Politics of Pederasty in Tibullus 1.4,” *Phoenix* 61 (2007) 55–82; K. Nikoloutsos, “The Boy as Metaphor: The Hermeneutics of Homoerotic Desire in Tibullus 1.9,” *Helios* 38 (2011) 27–57; M. Drinkwater, “His Turn to Cry: Tibullus’ Marathus Cycle (1.4, 1.8 and 1.9) and Roman Elegy,” *CJ* 107 (2012) 423–50.

The poet Albius Tibullus was born between 60 and 55 B.C.E. in the region of Pedum, east of Rome (Hor. *Ep.* 1.4.2), and he died in 19 B.C.E., the same year as Vergil. In both background and biography, Tibullus shares much with other Augustan poets: like the elegists Gallus, Propertius, and Ovid, he was born into the equestrian class, and like Propertius and Vergil, he saw his family suffer under the land confiscations during the proscriptions of the second triumvirate (Tib. 1.1.41–42). Unlike Propertius, Horace, and Vergil, Tibullus belonged to the poetic circle not of Maecenas but of M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, whose patronage later extended to Ovid and Sulpicia as well. Tibullus also served under Messalla as a soldier and traveled with him on campaign in Aquitania (1.7.9–12). Messalla supported Augustus against Antony in the civil war but retired from politics after his Aquitanian triumph, celebrated in 27 B.C.E. and recorded in Tibullus 1.7.

Tibullus published sixteen poems in two books of poetry. The date of the first book has recently been challenged by Peter Knox,<sup>8</sup> but general consensus places its publication after Propertius' *Monobiblos* in c. 26 B.C.E. In this book, Tibullus speaks of his relationships with his mistress Delia (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6) and the boy Marathus (1.4, 1.8, 1.9); he celebrates Messalla's birthday (1.7); and he closes the collection with his rejection of a military career and praise of an idealized country life and erotic love (1.10). The second book, published posthumously in or around 19 B.C.E., contains three poems celebrating rites or ceremonies (2.1, 2.2, 2.5), but its main focus is on a new beloved, the appropriately named Nemesis (2.3, 2.4, 2.6), whom Tibullus presents as a consistently harsh and greedy mistress. Where in book 1 Tibullus had imagined an idealized country life with Delia as his faithful lover, in book 2 the speaker's elegiac servitude, *servitium amoris*, begins to look more and more like actual enslavement and the countryside becomes a space of laborious toil and exertion instead of an agricultural idyll. As he becomes a truly downcast lover, the poet-speaker recants his earlier desires,<sup>9</sup> until in the final poem of book 2, he rejects both the countryside and military service in favor of the city and a permanent connection to his unavailable mistress—who nevertheless rejects him, despite his willingness to give her luxurious gifts (2.4, 2.6).

Tibullus' subject matter shares much with the elegies of his contemporary Propertius and with Ovid's *Amores*. Yet, while the elegies

<sup>8</sup> P. Knox, "Milestones in the Career of Tibullus," *CQ* 55 (2005) 204–16.

<sup>9</sup> D. Bright, *Haec mihi fingebam: Tibullus in His World* (Leiden 1978) 184–227.

of Propertius and Ovid enjoyed a warm reception in the latter half of the twentieth century, Tibullus' elegies have often been overlooked on account of their style. Where Ovid's poetry follows a linear narrative or a clear rhetorical structure and Propertius' elegies create a vivid sense of the speaker's emotions, Tibullus' poems move through metonymic associations from couplet to couplet.<sup>10</sup> Thanks to the clarity of Tibullus' Latin, which offers "easy syntax, straightforward word order, and reasonable images,"<sup>11</sup> Tibullus' verses appear deceptively simple and have not attracted the degree of attention that the troubled Propertian textual transmission has brought to Propertius.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, although the syntax and word order are straightforward, the dreamy quality of the transitions between Tibullus' verses obscures the movement from one scene to the next and from one theme to another.<sup>13</sup> For David Wray, Tibullus' smoothly polished poems belie the difficulty of reading his disjunctive, "hyper-subjunctive" dreaminess.<sup>14</sup> Paul Allen Miller's influential post-modern and psychoanalytic readings build from this very dreamlike quality of Tibullus' poetry, presenting his elegies as dream texts, susceptible to being read through a Freudian or Lacanian lens.<sup>15</sup> These dream texts, in turn, through their unresolved tensions between opposing subject positions within and between the poems, are able to express the profound disruptions to Roman elite male identity characteristic of elegiac poetry written during the transition from the Republic to the Principate.

## I. Contemporary Critical Trends

Miller has recently argued that the lack of critical attention to Tibullus "fundamentally distorts" the nature of Roman love elegy as we scholars

<sup>10</sup> P. Veyne, *Roman Erotic Elegy: Love, Poetry, and the West*. D. Pellauer, tr. (Chicago 1988) 36; P. A. Miller, "Tibullus," in B. Gold, ed., *The Blackwell Companion to Latin Love Elegy* (Oxford 2012) 54.

<sup>11</sup> J. P. Elder, "Tibullus: *Tersus Atque Elegans*," in J. P. Sullivan, ed., *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962) 79.

<sup>12</sup> Gaisser (above, n.1) 1; Miller (above, n.10) 53–54.

<sup>13</sup> M. Putnam, ed., *Tibullus: A Commentary* (Norman, Okla., 1973) 11–13.

<sup>14</sup> D. Wray ("What Poets Do: Tibullus on 'Easy' Hands," *CP* 98 [2003] 217) reminds us how W. Wimmel (*Tibull und Delia: Erster Teil, Tibulls Elegie 1.1. Hermes Einzelschriften, Heft 37* [Wiesbaden 1976] 32) coined the term *überkonjunktiv* to describe Tibullus' indicative verbs.

<sup>15</sup> P. A. Miller, "The Tibullan Dream Text," *TAPA* 129 (1999) 181–224; P. A. Miller, *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real* (Princeton 2004).



understand it and as we teach it to our students.<sup>16</sup> Yet scholarly interest has been turning to Tibullus since Murgatroyd's and Maltby's magnificent scholarly commentaries have joined Putnam's.<sup>17</sup> What follows is a necessarily selective and brief introduction to several of the major critical trends that have appeared in studies of Tibullus in the past decade.

The turn towards interrogations of Roman masculinity has brought attention to Tibullus' Marathus poems (1.4, 1.8, 1.9), and to his programmatic 1.1. In a series of two articles, Nikoloutsos has argued that Marathus should be read, like the *puellae* of elegy, as a *scriptus puer*, whose appearance and behavior more closely model the aesthetics, generic features, and economic and social structures that characterize Roman love elegy, than as an accurate representation of male-male love relationships in Rome.<sup>18</sup> Drinkwater's examination of Marathus' speech in 1.8 demonstrates how the homoerotic relationship of the Marathus cycle encapsulates in microcosm the gamut of elegiac roles and situations: the *levis puella*, the *exclusus amator*, and the greedy rival among them.<sup>19</sup> These readers have scrutinized the elegiac *amator* and his male beloved and their particular expressions of masculinity and have begun to reincorporate Tibullus into the flourishing scholarly conversation about sexuality and gender in Roman love elegy.<sup>20</sup>

Psychoanalytic and postmodernist readings of Roman love elegy have further destabilized the constructions of gender and subjectivity

<sup>16</sup> Miller (above, n.10) 54.

<sup>17</sup> P. Murgatroyd, ed., *Tibullus 1: A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (Pietermaritzburg 1980); P. Murgatroyd, *Tibullus. Elegies II* (Oxford 1994); R. Maltby, *Tibullus: Elegies. Text, Introduction, and Commentary. ARCA 41* (Cambridge 2002).

<sup>18</sup> K. Nikoloutsos 2007 (above, n.7), esp. 79, and K. Nikoloutsos 2011 (above n.7), esp. 49.

<sup>19</sup> M. Drinkwater (above, n.7).

<sup>20</sup> A few exemplars must suffice: J. Hallett, "The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism," *Arethusa* 6 (1973) 103–24; M. Wyke, "Written Women: Propertius' *scripta puella*," *JRS* 77 (1987) 47–61; A. Sharrock, "Womanaufacture," *JRS* 81 (1991) 36–49; B. Gold, "But Ariadne Was Never There in the First Place: Finding the Female in Roman Poetry," in N. S. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin, eds. *Feminist Theory and the Classics* (New York 1993) 75–101; E. Greene, *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry* (Baltimore 1998); M. Janan, *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV* (Berkeley 2001); M. Wyke, *The Roman Mistress* (Oxford 2002); S. James, *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Latin Love Elegy* (Berkeley 2005); Miller 2004 (above, n.15); Keith (above, n.6); E. Greene, "Gender and Elegy," in B. Gold, ed., *The Blackwell Companion to Latin Love Elegy* (Oxford 2012) 357–372.

in Tibullus' poetry by embracing the instability of the Tibullan poet-lover's subjectivity. Critics such as Fineberg, Miller, and Lee-Stecum have shown that, as readers, we should perhaps not expect to find a coherent identity running through the Tibullan texts, either for the poet-speaker or for his various beloveds.<sup>21</sup> Like the *scriptae puellae* of Propertius and Ovid, Tibullan characters—including especially the poet-speaker himself—emerge as radically unstable and subject to disruptions and discontinuities of poetic, political, sexual, and gender norms.

In contrast to these approaches, Wray's cogent analysis of Tibullus 1.1 argues for the ultimate interpretability of Tibullus' elegiac persona.<sup>22</sup> Wray works outward from several apparently paradoxical uses of *facilis*, "easy," to an etymologically and semantically grounded approach to Tibullus 1.1 as "poetological allegory."<sup>23</sup> His poetological reading sees an *ars poetica* in the *ars vivendi* of this poem, and we see the semantic slippage between the poet-speaker's elegiac lifestyle (*vita iners*) and the stylistic vocabulary that scholars continue to observe in Propertius and Ovid, who more overtly conflate the qualities of the speaker and/or his love object with the aesthetic conventions of Alexandrian Roman love elegy. Wray's work thus offers a welcome challenge to an emerging view of Tibullan elegy that articulates the fundamental instability of the Tibullan poet-lover's subjectivity and, in so doing, risks reifying earlier nineteenth- and twentieth-century readings of Tibullus that saw him as a dreamy poet not worthy of serious critical scrutiny.<sup>24</sup> While this dreamlike and unstable quality holds greater appeal for postmodern readers, Wray's Tibullus instead emerges as a potent and deliberate wordsmith.<sup>25</sup>

Several other recent approaches deserve mention as well. Bowditch has offered a postcolonial reading of Tibullus 1.7's appropriative

---

<sup>21</sup> B. Fineberg, "Configurations of Desire in the Elegies of Tibullus" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago 1991); Fineberg 1993 (above, n.5); Fineberg 2000 (above, n.5); Miller 2004 (above n.15); P. Lee-Stecum, *Powerplay in Tibullus: Reading Elegies Book One* (Cambridge 1998); P. Lee-Stecum, "Poet/Reader, Authority Deferred: Re-reading Tibullan Elegy," *Arethusa* 33 (2000) 177–215. F. Cairns' seminal work (*Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* [Cambridge 1979]) helped readers see Tibullus' strategies to destabilize readerly expectations.

<sup>22</sup> Wray (above, n.14).

<sup>23</sup> Wray (above, n.14) 232.

<sup>24</sup> Miller (above, n.10) 53–55 offers a concise historiography of earlier readings.

<sup>25</sup> E. Oliensis (*Freud's Rome. Psychoanalysis and Latin Poetry* [Cambridge 2009] 8–10) continues the conversation between Miller and Wray on how to read Tibullus' *facili manu* of 1.1.8.

discourses of the Egyptian world wherein Roman political and representational control of Egypt and the representation of Osiris and Messalla within the poem intersect with elegiac power relations between patron and lover-poet and between lover and beloved.<sup>26</sup> Ramsby's illuminating chapter demonstrates that Tibullus introduces full inscriptions into his first book of poetry to distinguish the poet from his persona. While the persona inhabits the world of the elegiac lover in which he rejects Roman social values, Tibullus' inclusion of his own epitaph memorializing his work as a soldier on Messalla's campaign in 1.3 points to his desire to be remembered as a full participant in Roman society. Tibullus' poetry thus balances Alexandrian poetic style with the elegiac tradition's roots in Roman commemoration.<sup>27</sup> Outside of Anglo-American criticism, there have also been numerous valuable European studies of Tibullus interested in the structure and design of Tibullus' poetry book.<sup>28</sup>

## II. Our Contributions

In his essay, "Metrical Feet on the Road of Poetry: Foot Puns and Literary Polemic in Tibullus," John Henkel demonstrates that Tibullus, well before Ovid's more overt joking about the unequal line lengths of the elegiac couplet in *Amores* 1.1 and 3.1, innovates in how he deploys the trope of the unevenness of the elegiac couplet. Through images of limping, binding, and chains (especially in 1.1), Tibullus expresses metaphorically the literary and poetic issues that he encounters as an elegiac poet and engages in intergeneric polemic with choliambic and epic poetry through this metaliterary play.

Alison Keith's essay, "Imperial Geographies in Tibullan Elegy," argues that Tibullan elegy domesticates newly conquered Greco-Egyptian culture and geographies through the translation of Greek and Egyptian language into his poems on the Roman imperial project (1.3, 1.7, 2.2, 2.3). Despite his overt statements to the contrary, Tibullus' poetry

<sup>26</sup> Bowditch 2011 (above, n.6).

<sup>27</sup> T. Ramsby, *Textual Permanence: Roman Elegists and the Epigraphic Tradition* (Ann Arbor 2007) 73–87.

<sup>28</sup> See W. Wimmel, *Der frühe Tibull* (Munich 1968) and Wimmel (above, n.14); H. Mutschler, *Die poetische Kunst Tibulls: Struktur und Bedeutung der Bücher 1 und 2 des Corpus Tibullianum* (Frankfurt 1985); C. Neumeister, *Tibull: Einführung in sein Werk* (Heidelberg 1986); C. Rambaux, *Tibulle, ou La répétition* (Brussels 1997); L. D'Azay, *Tibulle à Corfou* (Paris 2003).

participates in the project of securing Roman hegemony in the Mediterranean by reimagining Roman expansion as a literary excursion through Greek mythology and by incorporating the non-Latin vocabulary of imported foreign luxury goods affiliated with elegiac love.

Erika Zimmermann Damer's essay, "Gender Reversals and Intertextuality in Tibullus," focuses on Tibullus' manipulations of readerly expectations through intertextualities with Philotas, Callimachus, Catullus, and Propertius in 1.8 and 2.6. Tibullus uses intertexts of prior elegiac works to create unexpected gender reversals and to demonstrate his skill in manipulating the flexibility of grammatical gender in Latin in order to establish his own, subtly marked version of elegiac Callimacheanism. This intertextual reading thus underscores Tibullus' contributions to the gender play and instability of gendered identities characteristic of Roman elegy.

Together, these three essays more richly locate Tibullus in his Augustan context as a poet actively engaged in generic self-definition through metrical play, one involved with the politics of imperial expansion and the importation of luxury goods and luxury language into the Roman center, and one concerned with establishing his own, subtly marked Alexandrian aesthetic through unexpected gender reversals and intertextuality that obfuscate the male-female gendered binary. It is our hope that this collection, alongside the appearance of these new translations of, and commentaries on, Tibullus' poetry, will promote a new image of Tibullus, whose seductively smooth generic rhetoric has so long defined him as a rustic, dreamy poet uninterested in (or unaware of) the broader thematic concerns of his fellow elegiac and Augustan poets.

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND  
edamer@richmond.edu

---

# Metrical Feet on the Road of Poetry: Foot Puns and Literary Polemic in Tibullus\*

JOHN HENKEL

ABSTRACT: Throughout his two books, Tibullus cultivates feet, chains, and related images as metapoetic symbols to express both his literary program and his involvement in contemporary literary polemic between elegy and epic. Unlike Propertius and Ovid, Tibullus engages only minimally in explicit programmatics and polemics, but metapoetic symbolism reveals literary concerns analogous to those of the other elegists. In Tibullus 1.1, these symbols allow the speaker's rejection of riches and soldiering to function also as a *recusatio* from writing panegyric epic for Messalla.

## I. Introduction

Metaliterary punning between “anatomical foot” and “metrical foot” is a well-known feature of both Greek and Latin poetry (πούς, *pes*).<sup>1</sup> Particular instances have been discussed by many scholars, particularly in Latin poetry, where, as Stephen Hinds has remarked, “Latin poets are always ready for *any* wordplay involving human and metrical feet.”<sup>2</sup>

---

\*I am grateful to Sharon James, Jim O'Hara, Erika Zimmermann Damer, Patrick Lake, and the anonymous *CW* referees for their advice and feedback at different stages of this project. I owe special thanks to Erika for organizing this volume and the panel that led to it, “Rethinking Tibullus” at the 140th annual meeting of the American Philological Association in Philadelphia, and to my co-panelist Alison Keith, the respondent David Wray, and the rest of the audience that day for their questions and suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> See *OLD* s.v. *pes* 11, *TLL* 10.1.1910.45–1912.11; *LSJ* s.v. πούς IV.

<sup>2</sup> S. Hinds, “Booking the Return Trip: Ovid and *Tristia* 1,” *PCPS* 31 (1985) 19; S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone* (Cambridge 1987) 16–17. Scholars have also found puns on words like *ictus* (Hinds 1987, 17) and on the choliambic “limp”: see L. Morgan, “Metre Matters: Some Higher-level Metrical Play in Latin Poetry,” *PCPS* 46 (1999), 99–120. A. Barchiesi (“Alcune difficoltà nella carriera di un poeta giambico. Giambo ed elegia nell' Epodo XI,” in R. Cortés Tovar and J. C. Fernández Corte, eds., *Bimilenario de Horace* [Salamanca 1994] 135–37) lists foot puns in an appendix; for additions, see S. J. Heyworth, “Catullan Iambics, Catullan *Iambi*,” in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni,

*Classical World*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2014) Pp.451–475

These metapoetic metrical puns (some call them metametrical) appear frequently in programmatic passages about genre, from which meter is inseparable, and in the Augustan period they cluster especially around Roman love elegy, an emergent genre about which the Augustan poets seem to have engaged in a partisan literary debate (especially in comparison to hexameter epic). Both Propertius and Ovid defend elegiac love poetry through explicitly polemical poems or passages, several of which they address explicitly to hexameter poets.<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere, though, all five major Augustan poets use metapoetic foot puns as a less explicit means to engage in the same debate. In Tibullus, especially, these puns are both more numerous and more important than has been recognized. These Tibullan metapoetic foot puns are comparable in form and function to those known from Propertius and Ovid, but they are less overt, and so have been less often discussed by scholars. And because Tibullus is also less overt than Propertius and Ovid about declaring his literary program, such metapoetic wordplay offers unique and valuable insight into his poetry.

Whether or not it has to do with feet, metapoetic wordplay in the Augustan poets operates in the same way: by literalizing the terms of literary-critical metaphor and using this literalized metaphor as part of the purportedly mimetic world of a poem. Thus, for example, a poet can literalize *pes/πούς*—which is a metaphor when applied to a unit of poetic meter—through the feet of a lover or his beloved (or anyone/anything else), and these feet can be read simultaneously both as part of the poem's narrative and as a metapoetic symbol for poetry.<sup>4</sup> In elegy, this process of literalization is partly responsible for the metaphorical slippage between love and love poetry, since Latin uses the single term *amor* to refer to love as an emotion (*amor*), love personified as a god (*Amor*), and poetry about love (*amores*).<sup>5</sup> Latinists are familiar with el-

---

and A. Barchiesi, eds., *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire* (Lanham, Md., 2001) 133 n.45; J. L. Ferriss, "Catullus Poem 71: Another Foot Pun," *CP* 104 (2009) 377 nn.7–8.

<sup>3</sup> See below.

<sup>4</sup> Although for simplicity's sake I take a traditional approach to metaphor, speaking of literal and figurative applications of a word, see D. Kennedy, *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy* (Cambridge 1993) 46–63 on the inherently metaphorical nature of all language and the dependency of these judgments on an external hierarchy of values.

<sup>5</sup> For *amores* as "love poetry" see P. Fedeli, *Sesto Propertio, il primo libro delle Elegie* (Florence 1980) on Prop. 1.7.5; P. Fedeli, *Propertio, Elegie Libro II* (Cambridge: 2005)

egy's tendency toward metapoetic self-expression, particularly in clearly programmatic passages such as *Amores* 3.1, where Elegy's mismatched feet allude to the mismatch of hexameter and pentameter in the elegiac couplet (8–10), or in poems where literary terms like *mollis* are applied to the elegiac mistress or parts of her body, especially her feet (e.g., Prop. 2.12.24).<sup>6</sup> Metapoetic symbolism, however, can operate in practically any passage in Augustan poetry, including those that have no apparent connection to a poet's literary program, and even those that have no connection to recognized metapoetic symbols like feet.<sup>7</sup> Generally such symbolism reinforces the explicitly programmatic or polemical remarks a poet makes elsewhere in his work, but in Tibullus it takes on primary importance, because he alone of the elegists does not engage elsewhere in explicit programmatic and polemics.

Throughout his poetry, Tibullus uses metapoetic symbolism to structure the elegiac life of his speaker as a broad metaphor for his own elegiac poetry and poetics. This paper cannot discuss Tibullan metapoetics in its entirety, but will focus on metapoetic feet and related images as an important and representative example and on foot-related imagery in poem 1.1 especially. Brenda Fineberg and Alison Keith have shown that foot imagery in Tibullus appears in a fascinating variety of ways, a number of which allude to qualities of Tibullan or elegiac verse (see below). These passages, in other words, are metapoetic in the way I have outlined above. Indeed, on my reading of Tibullus, the metaphorical slippage between love and love poetry is nearly constant.<sup>8</sup> Tibullus

---

on Prop. 2.1.1–2; cf. D.Serv. Verg. *Ecl.* 8.22–23; *Ecl.* 10.6, 52–54, with B. M. Gaulty, *Liebesfahrten: Zur Rolle des elegischen Ich in Ovids Amores* (Frankfurt 1990) 33–40. For *Amor* as a symbol for elegiac poetry, see S. J. Harrison, *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace* (Oxford 2007) 31–32, 65; M. Wyke, *The Roman Mistress* (Oxford 2002) 129. On ambiguity between the several versions of *amor*, see J. C. McKeown's commentary on Ov. *Am.* 3.1.69–70 (forthcoming).

<sup>6</sup> See S. Hinds, "Generalizing about Ovid," *Ramus* 16 (1987) 4–31; Wyke (above, n.5) 46–77, 115–54; A. M. Keith, "*Corpus Eroticum*: Elegiac Poetics and Elegiac *Puella* in Ovid's *Amores*," *CW* 88 (1994) 27–40; A. M. Keith, "Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory," *Mnemosyne* 42 (1999) 41–62.

<sup>7</sup> The vocabulary of Latin literary criticism is largely metaphorical, so the possibilities for literalizing it are manifold; see Hinds (above, n.6) 22, Keith 1994 (above, n.6) 29 on the substratum of Callimachean vocabulary that underlies Augustan poetry.

<sup>8</sup> Tibullus further encourages the identification of these two semantic fields by pairing them together in some passages, as at 1.9.48, where Tibullus is ashamed of his love for Marathus and the love poetry he wrote for him. On aspects of Tibullan metapoetics, see D. Wray, "What Poets Do: Tibullus on 'Easy' Hands," *CP* 98 (2003) 217–50; J. Booth and R.

has filled his poetic world with literalized literary-critical metaphors, so that the very same words that seem literally to describe his speaker's life function metaphorically at the same time to reflect his program as an elegiac love poet. This hidden register offers Tibullus a versatile, subtle, and often humorous way to participate in contemporary literary-critical discourse.

## II. Elegiac Literary Polemic in Tibullus and Tibullan Foot Puns

One of the most striking features of elegy's generic rhetoric is the genre's self-styled diametric opposition to epic. We see this posture both in the various *recusationes* in which Propertius and Ovid refuse to write epic (or other elevated genres) in favor of elegy (Prop. 2.1, 2.10, 3.1, 3.3, 3.9; Ov. *Am.* 1.1, 2.1, 3.1) and, even more, in the polemical verse epistles that these poets address to friends writing hexameter epic (Prop. 1.7, 1.9; Ov. *Am.* 2.18).<sup>9</sup> Such polemic seems even to be a convention of elegy from its beginning, since some scholars believe that Gallus too used the *recusatio* in his elegies.<sup>10</sup> Tibullus, unlike Propertius, Ovid, and perhaps Gallus, does not himself write explicit polemic against hexameter epic, but rather creates implicit polemic through his extensive use of metapoetic symbolism.

In Tibullus this anti-epic polemic attaches itself especially to foot imagery, which both Fineberg and Keith have seen as reflecting on Tibullus' elegiac poetic agenda. Fineberg's work shows that both foot imagery and the related imagery of roads are important parts of Tibullus' style and that Tibullus uses the words *pes* and *via* much more often than

---

Maltby, "Light and Dark: Play on *candidus* and Related Concepts in the Elegies of Tibullus," *Mnemosyne* 58 (2005) 124–51; M. Putnam, "Virgil and Tibullus 1.1," *CP* 100 (2005) 123–41. On the claim that this register operates nearly constantly, see Hinds (above, n.6) on Callimachean metapoetics in Augustan poetry generally.

<sup>9</sup> See P. Fedeli, "Elegy and Literary Polemic in Propertius' *Monobiblos*," *PLLS* (1981) 228–52 on Prop. 1.7 and 1.9; Fedeli 1980 (above, n.5) 185–88. S. L. James (*Learned Girls and Male Persuasion* [Berkeley 2003] 77–78) sees Prop. 1.7 and 1.9 as performing the steps of the *recusatio*.

<sup>10</sup> See J. K. Newman, "De novo Galli fragmento in Nubia eruto," *Latinitas* 28 (1980) 83–94; J. F. Miller, "Propertius 2.1 and the New Gallus Papyrus," *ZPE* 44 (1981) 173–76; F. Cairns, *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist* (Cambridge 2006) 143–44; see also R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry* (New Haven 1995) 34–36.



other contemporary authors, often in ways that seem metapoetic.<sup>11</sup> Keith discerns two distinct strains of Tibullan metapoetic foot puns, each of which attributes to the feet of Tibullus or his beloved qualities that Propertius or Ovid elsewhere attribute to elegiac poetry.<sup>12</sup> In one strain (1.3.20), the poet-lover's stumbling reflects the distinctive, uneven alternation of hexameter and pentameter lines in the elegiac couplet, which Ovid famously represents in *Amores* 3.1 through the unequal feet of personified Elegy;<sup>13</sup> in the other, the smooth motion of elegiac feet represents the smoothness of elegiac verse, a quality that Propertius claims for his own poetry in the polemical *et frustra cupies mollem componere versum* ("and you will desire in vain to compose soft verse," Prop. 1.7.19) and transfers to Cynthia's feet: *et canat ut soleant molliter ire pedes* ("and would sing how her feet are accustomed to go softly, Prop. 2.12.24").<sup>14</sup> As Keith points out, these motifs occur in Propertius and Ovid as well as Tibullus, and they allude to the stylistic claims that Roman love elegy makes for itself as a genre.<sup>15</sup> Because each motif, however, also constitutes a tendentious characterization of elegiac poetics, we ought to consider further whether and how such foot-based metapoetic images participate in elegy's project of generic polemic against epic.

One clear instance where both Tibullus and the other elegists use metapoetic foot puns for generic polemic involves the word *tener*, "tender," a close synonym of *mollis*, "soft," and like *mollis* a word that the

---

<sup>11</sup> B. Fineberg, *Configurations of Desire in the Elegies of Tibullus* (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1991); B. Fineberg, "From a Sure Foot to Faltering Meters: The Dark Ladies of Tibullan Elegy," in M. DeForest, ed., *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King* (Wauconda, Ill. 1993) 249–56. Fineberg's excellent tables (1991, 166–76) give usage statistics for *pes* and *via* in Tibullus, Catullus, Propertius, Ovid's *Amores*, and Vergil's *Eclogues*. Although my own methods and results differ from Fineberg's (see 1991, 1–18 on her methodology), I am indebted to her work and hope that my results both confirm her general findings and contextualize Tibullan practice vis-à-vis other Augustan poets.

<sup>12</sup> See Keith 1999 (above, n.6); on the body as a metaphor for elegiac style.

<sup>13</sup> See Keith 1999 (above, n.6) 48–49 on Tib. 1.3.20; on Ov. *Am.* 3.1, Wyke (above, n.5) 122–24 notes that Ovid's description of Elegy's limp coincides with the metrical limp of the pentameter.

<sup>14</sup> See Keith 1999 (above, n.6) 48–49 on Tib. 1.2.20, 1.2.35, 1.3.92, 1.5.24, 1.7.61–62; Keith also notes that Horace *Epist.* 1.4.1–5 seems metapoetically to figure Tibullan verse as smooth. On other metapoetic play with Tibullus' style see Booth and Maltby (above, n.8). See Wyke (above, n.5) 67 on Prop. 1.7.9 and 2.12.24; Keith 1994 (above, n.6) 35–34 on similar metapoetic walking at Ov. *Am.* 2.4.23–24.

<sup>15</sup> See Keith 1999 (above, n.6) 55–56 on Propertius and Ovid.

elegists polemically oppose to epic “hardness” (*duritia*).<sup>16</sup> Ovid uses the term frequently to characterize elegiac poetry and poets as well as such quintessentially elegiac topics as tender girls, tender cheeks, and tender love/Love(s);<sup>17</sup> in *Amores* 2.1 and 3.1, he uses it to play metapoetically between “tender” elegiac poetry (2.1.4, 3.1.69) and “tender” elegiac girls (2.1.33, 3.1.27).<sup>18</sup> Unlike Ovid, Tibullus never uses *tener* explicitly of poetry, but he uses the term more frequently than either Ovid or Propertius, to characterize—among other things—love/Love (1.3.57, 2.6.1), current or potential love interests (1.4.9, 1.4.58, 1.6.33, 1.8.51, 1.10.64), and body parts including feet (1.1.68, 1.2.75, 1.4.14, 1.5.43, 1.7.46, 1.9.30, 1.10.55).<sup>19</sup> Tibullus uses *tener* twice to describe feet directly (1.7.46, 1.9.30), and once more in close connection with them, recalling a time when he himself was tender before the feet of his Lares (1.10.16). As Lyne remarks, the elegists are so fond of referring to “tender feet,” that the phrase *teneri pedes* becomes actively elegiac in tone:

Elegy made it its own. Ovid does *not* consider this phrase appropriate for the “half-way” diction of the *Met.* and has only one example in the *Fast.* (1.410). In Vergil cf. only *Ecl.* 10.49 *teneras . . . plantas* which we can assume to be an echo of Gallan elegy (especially given the example of *teneri pedes* in Prop. 1.8 . . . ).<sup>20</sup>

<sup>16</sup> On *mollis* and *durus*, see Wyke (above, n.5) 168–69, 174–76; J. C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores* (Liverpool and Wolfboro, N. H. 1987–<1998>), *Am.* 2.1.3–4; Fedeli 1980 (above, n.5), Prop. 1.7.19. F. Cairns (“The Etymology of *Militia* in Roman Elegy,” in L. Gil and R. M. Aguilar, eds., *Apophoreta Philologica Emmanuelli Fernández-Galiano a Sodalibus Oblata* [Madrid 1984] 220–21) attributes the polemical opposition of hard and soft to Gallus.

<sup>17</sup> Ovid uses *tener* of elegiac poetry at *Am.* 2.1.4, 3.1.69, 3.8.2, *Ars* 2.273; of elegiac poets at *Ars* 3.337, *Rem.* 757 (here of love poets generally); cf. McKeown (above, n.16), *Ov. Am.* 2.1.3–4, for bibliography. In the *Amores* alone, Ovid mentions tender girls at 2.1.33, 2.14.37, 3.1.27, 3.3.25, 3.4.1, 3.7.53; tender cheeks at 1.4.62, 2.5.46, 2.6.4; and tender Love/love at 2.18.4, 2.18.19, 3.1.69, 3.15.1.

<sup>18</sup> See McKeown 1987–<1998> (above, n. 16) on *Am.* 2.1.33–34 and *Am.* 3.1.69–70 (the latter in a forthcoming volume); cf. Keith 1994 (above, n. 6) 35.

<sup>19</sup> Tibullus uses *tener* 28 times in total (2.26/100 lines); Ovid uses it 22 times in the *Amores* (.89/100 lines), Propertius only 11 times total (.27/100 lines); I base my statistics on line counts at Fineberg 1991 (above, n.11) 166.

<sup>20</sup> O. Lyne, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge 1978), *Ciris* 169. For non-Tibullan examples of *teneri pedes* in elegy, see Prop. 1.8.7; *Ov. Am.* 1.4.44; *Her.* 16.66; *Ars* 1.162, 2.212, 2.534. On *teneras plantas* in *Ecl.* 10 see further below.

This fondness for “tender feet” is probably the clearest instance of the elegists’ use of references to feet to allude metapoetically to the polemical stylistic claims of their genre (cf. Propertius’ transferral of *mollis* from verse in 1.7 to feet in 2.12), opposing the “tender” metrical feet of elegy to the “hard” ones of epic. It is striking that this motif appears so often in Tibullus, a poet not otherwise known for overt polemics. But in its metapoetics, at least, Tibullan poetry is rife with such polemic.

While the tender feet motif alludes on one hand to the opposition of “soft” elegy and “hard” epic, it is also a pointed inversion of the “limping” motif that iambic poets had long used to characterize the metrical unevenness of the choliamb. Greek poets first developed this motif to characterize the combination of regular and irregular metrical feet in choliambic poetry, where the last foot of each line is a spondee instead of the expected iamb. The very names of the choliamb (choliamb < χολός, “lame”; scazon = σκάζων, “limping”) advertise its metrical deformity, and iambic poets in both Greek and Latin play self-deprecatingly on this deformity with images of limping, disability, or exhaustion, especially in the “limping” last foot of the line. Callimachus in his programmatic first *Iamb* puts references to walking and to debilitating gout in the limp of two of his lines (Ἀκούσαθ’ Ἰππώνακτος· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ’ ἤκω, “Listen to Hipponax, for indeed I have come,” *Ia.* Fr. 191.1; ἔστησε τοῦ κλιντήρος· εἶχε γὰρ δεσμ[ό]ς, “He placed [his sons on either side] of his bed, for he was held by gout [literally, ‘the chain’],” fr. 191.41), and Catullus, who uses limping iambs in poem 31 to express exhaustion after a long trip, seems to collapse into his bed in the limp of one line (*desideratoque acquiescimus lecto*, 31.10).<sup>21</sup>

In Rome, the elegiac poets both extended this motif from choliamb to elegy and, it seems, sought ways to invert this negative characterization in ways that advanced their project of anti-epic polemic. The impression of uneven progress is even more distinct in elegy than in choliamb, both because hexameter and pentameter alternate in every other line—whereas the choliamb substitutes spondee for iamb in only one foot out of six—and because the pentameter itself is composed of irregular two-and-a-half-foot segments. Ovid famously plays on this limp in *Amores* 3.1, where he personifies his genre as a woman with feet of unequal length: *pes illi longior alter erat. . . . et pedibus vitium causa decoris erat*

<sup>21</sup> See Morgan (above, n.2) 100–107; on representations of choliamb generally, see L. Morgan, *Musa Pedestris* (Oxford 2010) 115–30.

(“one of her feet was longer than the other. . . and this flaw in her feet was the cause of her seemliness,” *Am.* 3.1.8, 10), and he makes the limp explicit in *Tristia* 3.1, where he says that his “limping poems stumble in every other verse” (*clauda quod alterno subsidunt carmina versu*, *Trist.* 3.1.11).<sup>22</sup> Ovid also follows Callimachus and Catullus in pointing up his self-reflexivity by alluding to elegy’s limp in the pentameter, where this *vitium pedis* is most evident (the other elegists, however, do not observe this mannerism uniformly).<sup>23</sup> But images of limping are not the only metapoetic motif that elegy derives from the metapoetic self-denigration we see in choliambic poets: Lyne has suggested in a discussion of Prop. 2.12 that Cynthia’s smooth-moving feet (*molliter ire pedes*, “her feet go softly,” 24) there constitute a pointed reversal of the limp imagery associated with metrical irregularity in choliamb.<sup>24</sup> Lyne is right, I believe, in his assessment of Prop. 2.12, but the pointed reversal of elegiac/iambic limp imagery is neither unique to this passage, nor original to Propertius. To my knowledge it appears first in Tibullus 1.2, where Tibullus is consciously developing new ways to characterize the uneven progress of the elegiac couplet (see below).

Throughout Tibullus’ poetry, metapoetic foot imagery often either imitates or inverts the iambic poets’ self-disparaging habit of alluding to the “limp” of their meter. Like Callimachus and Catullus, Tibullus sometimes pokes gentle fun at his genre’s metrical defect, using images of stumbling feet: *offensum in porta signa dedisse pedem* (“my stumbling foot gave bad signs at the door,” 1.3.20); *agricola . . . inoffensum rettuleritque pedem* (“the farmer . . . has carried back his unstumbling foot,” 1.7.61–62, ); weak feet: *deteret invalidos et via longa pedes* (“the long road will weaken feeble feet,” 1.9.16); or gout: *corpora foeda podagra / et senis amplexus culta puella fugit* (“a sophisticated girl flees an old man’s body, foul with gout, and his embrace,” 1.9.73–74) to

<sup>22</sup> See Hinds (above, n.2)13–32; O. Lyne, “Introductory Poems in Propertius 1.1 and 2.12,” *PCPS* 44 (1998) 176; Morgan (above, n.2) 107. Cicero used “limping” at *Or.* 170, 173 as a metaphor for rhetorical ineptitude: see K. Freudenburg, *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton 1993) 165.

<sup>23</sup> Although Ovid prefers the pentameter as the appropriate place for his metametrical foot puns (cf. Wyke [above, n.5] 123 on *Am.* 3.1), Propertius and Tibullus are inconsistent in this, and a metapoetic pun should not be discounted because it falls in the hexameter. As in other respects (e.g., ending the pentameter with a two-syllable word), Ovid here develops into a mannerism what in other elegists had been a tendency.

<sup>24</sup> Lyne (above, n.22) 177.

allude humorously to elegy's limp.<sup>25</sup> These allusions are often—but not always—in the pentameter, and they form part of a well-thought-out system, in which the apparent reality of Tibullus' poetic world expresses metaphorically the literary and poetic issues he faces as an elegiac poet, including generic decorum and the necessary relationship between love, love poetry, and the elegiac meter.

The pervasiveness of Tibullus' system becomes clear when we look at foot puns that involve chains and other types of foot binding, particularly in connection with the important elegiac motif of *servitium amoris*. Chains are a distinctly Tibullan innovation on this traditional motif,<sup>26</sup> and it is attractive to see his cultivation of this image as a subtle, humorous allusion to the limp of the elegiac couplet (perhaps following Callimachus' metapoetic use of δεσμός, both "chain" and "gout," at *Iamb* 1, fr. 191.41). Tibullus refers six times to chains and foot bondage as an aspect of *servitium amoris* (1.1.55–56, 1.2.91–94, 1.6.37–38, 1.9.79, 2.3.79–80, 2.4.1–4). By adding chains—specifically foot shackles (*vincula pedum*, 1.6.38)—to the conventional erotic motif of *servitium amoris*, he characterizes himself not only as a slave to his mistress and to love/Love (*amor*/*Amor*), but also to elegiac love poetry (*amores*), a genre with metrical shackles, so to speak, that account for the limp of his poetic feet.<sup>27</sup>

In passages like those below, however, Tibullus does not imitate choliambic poetry's self-deprecatory habit of alluding to its limp, but rather inverts this pattern with images of feet moving slowly and haltingly, but carefully, surely, even sometimes daintily. While the chain imagery above suggests that Tibullus knew that the elegiac couplet, like the choliamb,

<sup>25</sup> One might wonder at 1.9.73–74 why the *culta puella* would reject a lover with the same metrical features as elegiac poetry (gout: *corpora foeda podagra*), but Tibullus insists that both love and love poetry are unsuitable for old men (see below).

<sup>26</sup> P. Murgatroyd ("Servitium Amoris and the Roman Elegists," *Latomus* 40 [1981] 596–97) notes that Tibullus leads the way in playing on this motif's conventions (601).

<sup>27</sup> Even apart from *servitium amoris*, Tibullus shows a surprising fondness for images of chains and binding, which allude throughout his work to the distinctive, halting rhythm of his meter: 1.1.63–64, 1.5.65–66, 1.6.67–68, 1.7.5–6, 1.7.41–42, 1.8.5–6, 1.8.13–14, 1.9.69–70, 1.9.83–84, 1.10.27–28, 2.1.7, 2.1.15–16, 2.1.28, 2.2.18–19, 2.5.5, 2.5.97–98, 2.5.117–118, 2.6.25. F. Cairns (*Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* [Cambridge 1979] 95) and R. Maltby ("The Limits of Etymologizing," *Aevum Antiquum* 6 (1993) 271–75; *Tibullus: Elegies* [Cambridge 2002]) argue that Tibullus' use of chains (*vincula*) stems from Varro's etymology deriving *Venus* from *vincire*, "to bind" (*DLL* 5.61); on the limits of etymologizing "Venus," see S. Hinds, "Venus, Varro and the *vates*: Toward the Limits of Etymologizing Interpretation," *Dictynna* 3 (2006) 2–15, <http://dictynna.revues.org/206>.

could be represented as limping or lame, these images of careful sure-footedness show him developing other images to characterize the meter's progress in more complimentary ways. Tibullus has taken evident care, moreover, to integrate these metapoetic images into the general scheme of his poetry: he develops most of them out of traditional erotic motifs, and he makes sure that all of them engage with his speaker's interests (literary, erotic, or otherwise) throughout the corpus.

As early in his corpus as poem 1.2, Tibullus begins this effort at re-characterizing elegy's limping feet by developing its metrical unevenness into the careful footsteps of a lover or his beloved, who moves slowly and haltingly—thus unevenly—through the night to avoid detection. This image is an important part of the *paraclausithyron* in 1.2, where a lover's careful, silent feet are important to the success of his deception: Venus will help the brave lover, the poet says, by teaching him stealth of foot: *illa docet molli furtim derepere lecto, / illa pedem nullo ponere posse sono* (“that one teaches [the lover] to sneak secretly from a soft bed, to know how to place his foot without a sound,” 1.2.19–20), but passersby must be warned not to expose the lover through their noisy feet: *parcite luminibus, seu vir seu femina fiat / obvia . . . neu strepitu terrete pedum* (“let them avert their eyes, whether man or woman should meet you . . . nor frighten with the din of feet,” 1.2.35–37).<sup>28</sup> The fullest development of this image comes in 2.1, where Cupid teaches the *puella* to step quietly and daintily through the night to evade her guards (75–78), just as Venus had taught the lover to step carefully in 1.2. The *puella*'s gait in this passage is slow and halting, but not because of any deformity of foot: “Strung up with fear, she feels out the path with her feet, and her hand feels out the blind ways in advance” (*et pedibus praetemptat iter suspensa timore, / explorat caecas cui manus ante vias, 77–78*). It would be unseemly for an elegiac *puella* to limp (thus the humor in *Ov. Am.* 3.1), so Tibullus instead hobbles this one with fear (she is perhaps also barefoot, as Delia is at 1.3.91–92), so that the halting and uneven progress of her feet reflects the uneven progress of the elegiac couplet.<sup>29</sup> These images are not, as Keith suggests, quite like Cynthia's smooth-moving feet in *Prop.* 2.12, but they do accomplish the same goal

<sup>28</sup> Feet, motion, and chains are further emphasized at 1.2.29–30, 50, 92; see further below on *strepitus*.

<sup>29</sup> That *pes* here falls in the hexameter should not be seen as evidence against metapoetic intent in this passage (see n.25 above). Indeed, Tibullus' use of *via* at 2.1.78

of recharacterizing elegy's limp in a more positive way; Propertius later takes the extra step of combining this Tibullan strategy, at work as early as 1.2, with his own emphasis on the contrast between elegy's softness and epic's hardness (e.g., 1.7.19), thus replacing Tibullus' uneven metapoetic feet with the "softly-moving," graceful feet we see on Cynthia at Prop. 2.12.24.<sup>30</sup> Tibullus, by contrast, embraces the metrical unevenness of his chosen meter, just as Ovid does later in *Amores* 3.1. What Ovid will present baldly as the elegiac *vitium pedis*, however, Tibullus remakes into a skill—feet that feel the way—that is central to the success of elegiac love.<sup>31</sup>

The opposite of silent, sneaking lovers are the ones with noisy feet, and we may see in these a metapoetic reference to noisy, graceless poetry such as Hellenistic and Augustan poets prominently disavow. The problem of noisy feet is presupposed by the lover in 1.2 who moves his feet "without a sound" (*nullo sono*, 1.2.20), but in two passages Tibullus refers to foot noise specifically with the unusual noun *strepitus* ("raucous noise," "din"): *neu strepitu terrete pedum* ("nor terrify with the din of your feet," 1.2.37); *cognoscit strepitus me veniente pedum* ("she knows the din of my feet as I come," 1.6.62).<sup>32</sup> Roman poets use *strepitus* several times in literary-critical contexts, where they seem to have regarded it as a translation of Greek θόρυβος, which Callimachus used in the *Aetia* prologue to characterize bad poetry as "noise," saying that he sang "among those who love the clear voice of cicadas, not the clamor of asses" ([θ]όρυβον ὄνων, fr. 1.29–30). Vergil uses the verb *strepere* to characterize bad poetry in *Eclogue* 9, in a passage that ancient critics saw as literary polemic against a poet named Anser: *argutos inter strepere anser olores* ("to din as a goose (*anser*) among melodious swans," *Ecl.* 9.36).<sup>33</sup>

---

(*explorat caecas cui manus ante vias*; see below on metapoetic *via*) supports a metapoetic reading of 2.1.77.

<sup>30</sup> Keith 1999 (above, n.6) 48 n.24. Cf. the *teneri pedes* at Prop 1.8.8, following Verg. *Ecl.* 10.49; see above on tender feet as an elegiac motif.

<sup>31</sup> Ovid in *Am.* 3.1, where feet are a central metapoetic feature of the poem, follows Tibullus in emphasizing the importance of sneaky feet to elegiac love. At 3.1.45–52, Elegy uses the same erotodidactic conceit as Tib. 1.2 and 2.1, and feet are an important part of her argument that elegy is more efficacious than tragedy (47, 52); indeed, Ov. *Am.* 3.1.51–52 seems specifically to allude to Tib. 1.2.19–20 and to Tibullus' first deployment in that poem of the unevenness-as-careful-sneaking motif.

<sup>32</sup> See Tib. 1.8.65–66 for noisy feet without *strepitus*.

<sup>33</sup> See W. Clausen, ed. *Virgil: Eclogues* (Oxford 1994). Vergil here follows this passage of the *Aetia* prologue not only in using *strepere* for θόρυβος, but also in using birds

And Horace uses the word in a passage of *Epistles* 2.2 that literalizes a number of metaphors from the *Aetia* prologue (*Epist.* 2.2.77–80).<sup>34</sup> Only Tibullus uses *strepitus* of feet.<sup>35</sup> When he warns, therefore, against the “din” of noisy feet, we may justly suspect that these two literalized literary-critical metaphors (*pes*, *strepitus*) constitute a subtle, humorous allusion to the Callimachean program of Roman elegy.

Aside from the lover’s loud passage or silent sneaking, however, other Tibullan foot imagery develops elegy’s uneven feet in directions that are different from, but still related to, the halting progress of a nighttime tryst. The most charming of these is the imagined reunion that closes 1.3, where Tibullus appears as if from nowhere and tells Delia to run to meet him “as she is”; *tunc mihi, qualis eris, longos turbata capillos, / obvia nudato, Delia, curre pede* (“ . . . with her long hair tousled and her foot bare,” 1.3.91–92). This image is related both to Tibullus’ unevenness-as-daintiness motif we saw in 1.2 and 2.1, and to the “tender feet” of Tib. 1.7.46, 1.9.30, and of elegy more generally.<sup>36</sup> We may imagine that Delia’s barefoot steps are halting, like the progress of Tibullan elegy itself, and it may be significant that Tibullus uses the singular (*nudato pede*) rather than the plural—emphasizing both the impression of unevenness and the analogy to elegy with its one short line—and that this bare foot falls in the pentameter.

### III. A Closer Look at Tibullus 1.1

There are many more metapoetic feet in Tibullus,<sup>37</sup> but I confine myself to those above as most directly responsive to the motif of elegy’s *vitium pedis*. For the rest of this paper, I will look more closely at poem 1.1, which uses foot-based imagery to enact a metapoetic *recusatio* from

---

to talk about aesthetics: see D. Steiner, “Feathers Flying: Avian Poetics in Hesiod, Pindar, and Callimachus,” *AJP* 128 (2007) 177–208.

<sup>34</sup> See D. Francis, “ΟΝΟΣ ΛΥΡΑΣ: Horace and the *poetae argutae* (Horace, *Epistles* 2.2.65–86),” in M. Whitby et al., eds., *Homo viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Oak Park, Ill., 1987) 141–45. Horace also uses *strepitus* in literary criticism at *Ars* 82 and *Epist.* 2.1.203, both times disdaining the din of the theater.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Fineberg 1991 (above, n.11) 99 n.6.

<sup>36</sup> On the elegiac self-reflexivity of Osiris’ *teneri pedes* at Tib. 1.7.46, see P. L. Bowditch, “Tibullus and Egypt: A Postcolonial Reading of Elegy 1.7,” *Arethusa* 44 (2011) 108.

<sup>37</sup> See Fineberg 1995 (above, n.11) on feet and the darkening of Tibullan elegy between Delia’s disappearance (1.8) and the appearance of Nemesis (2.1).



panegyric epic. I make no claim that my discussion constitutes a full reading of this poem: I will focus broadly on Tibullus' metapoetic approach to the question of genre, and more specifically on his use of feet and related images (chains, binding, etc.) to do this.

The generic question addressed in Tibullus is the same one that confronts Propertius and Ovid in their polemical letters and *recusationes*: whether to write elegy or epic. But while Propertius and Ovid frame this as a choice between elegy and epic, generally (including mythological epic, as in Prop. 1.7 and Ov. *Am.* 2.18), Tibullus focuses specifically on panegyric military epic of the type that was popular in Rome between Ennius and the *Aeneid*. We know of around two dozen panegyric epics written during the late Republic and early Empire—including one for Messalla himself (the lone surviving example).<sup>38</sup> They were clearly a common part of the complex exchange between poets and their patrons, and Tibullus' generic self-positioning responds to the apparent expectation—whether real or a literary convention—that he would write such a poem for Messalla.<sup>39</sup>

In the dramatic conceit of Tibullus' poetry, Messalla seems to have invited Tibullus to accompany him on campaign, an invitation that he first refuses (1.1.53–56), then later seems to have accepted, only to abandon it because of illness (1.3.1–4). Based on these poems, lines from 1.7 and 1.10 (1.7.9, 1.10.13) and on a notice in the *Vita Tibulli*, many have considered that Tibullus, despite deploring war throughout his poetry, did serve on the military staff of his patron.<sup>40</sup> Poetic *vitae* are notoriously unreliable, however, and some have suggested that the *Vita's* notice simply expands the line from 1.7.<sup>41</sup> Regardless of what happened in real life, the

<sup>38</sup> See P. White, *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993) 78–82; T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet and other Roman Essays* (Leicester 1974) 36–38; we can judge the popularity of this genre both from the many surviving *recusationes* in which Augustan poets decline to sing the military accomplishments of generals, and from Cicero's speech defending the panegyric poet Archias.

<sup>39</sup> For an overview of the varied assessments of the poet–patron relationship, see B. K. Gold, "Patronage and the Elegists: Social Reality or Literary Construction," in B. K. Gold., ed., *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy* (Malden, Mass., 2012) 303–17.

<sup>40</sup> See T. McLoughlin, "Nunc ad bella trahor. . . . Tibullus I, x, 13," *Latomus* 25 (1966) 287–90.

<sup>41</sup> J. P. Postgate, *Selections from Tibullus and Others* (New York 1903) 181; D. Konstan, "The Politics of Tibullus 1.7," *RSC* 26 (1978) 173–85; P. Murgatroyd, *Tibullus I* (Pietermaritzburg 1980) 1–2. Although some critics read 1.7.9 biographically as proof of Tibullus' service, it might refer to Tibullus' role in glorifying Messalla through poem 1.7; Konstan suggests it refers to his presence at the triumph. On the parallel unreliability of the *Vitae Vergilii*, see N. M. Horsfall, *A Companion to the Study of Vergil* (Leiden 1995) 1–25.

motif of going to war with Messalla functions also in Tibullus as a met-literary stand in for writing his patron a panegyric epic, and Tibullus' refusal/inability to go functions as a *recusatio* from this genre.<sup>42</sup> Whatever opinion the historical Tibullus held, the elegiac speaker of his poetry condemns war in favor of the life of a lover (1.1, 1.10), but he continues to bring it up, seemingly in order to continue rejecting it—a pattern that corresponds to the treatment of epic by Propertius and Ovid, who bring up epic as a foil for their own polemical devotion to elegy.

The speaker's choice of love over soldiering in Tibullus 1.1 dramatizes a *recusatio* from the genre of panegyric epic, and it sets up a metapoetic narrative arc that operates throughout Tibullus' poetry, focused largely on the rejection of panegyric.<sup>43</sup> In the first half of this poem (1–48), Tibullus' speaker disavows the monetary gain that comes from military service and enumerates the virtues of the life he claims to prefer: a simple, pious, agricultural life with Delia by his side. In the poem's central lines he explicitly disavows the military life for an erotic life of *servitium amoris* (49–58), then closes the poem with an erotic fantasy about his own death (59–74) and a conclusion that figures the speaker as a soldier of love (75–78). Others have argued that Tibullus' choice of lifestyle in this poem is an implicit statement of his poetic program;<sup>44</sup> I would say specifically that the speaker's life functions here, as elsewhere, as a metaphor for Tibullus' elegiac poetics and a vehicle for his participation in anti-epic polemic. Aside from the choice of love over soldiering, which develops the speaker's life as a broad metaphor for literary genre, the rejection of wealth in this poem also corresponds to the literary concerns of other early-Augustan poets and so supports reading this poem as a *recusatio*. Vergil, according to Servius and others, had won the restoration of his confiscated estates

<sup>42</sup> When Tibullus does honor his patron in verse (1.7), it is not with panegyric hexameter epic, but with an elegiac poem on Messalla's triumph and birthday.

<sup>43</sup> James (above, n.9) argues that Prop 1.7 and 1.9 also dramatize the *recusatio*.

<sup>44</sup> See Cairns (above, n.27) 11–35; E. W. Leach, "Poetics and Poetic Design in Tibullus' First Elegiac Book," *Arethusa* 13 (1980) 79–96; B. W. Boyd, "Parva seges satis est: The Landscape of Tibullan Elegy in 1.1 and 1.10," *TAPA* 114 (1984) 273–80; on metapoetic aspects of this poem, see Wray (above, n.8); Putnam (above, n.8). Other approaches to the speaker of Tibullus 1.1 have included semi-biographical (e.g., R. J. Ball, *Tibullus the Elegist: A Critical Survey* [Göttingen 1985] 11–12); psychoanalytical (P. A. Miller, "The Tibullan Dream Text," *TAPA* 129 [1999] 181–224; Wray [above, n.8]); and intertextual (Putnam [above, n.8]). For a recent treatment of the question, "What is, in fact, the world wished for here and who are we to imagine wishing for it?" see P. A. Miller, "Tibullus," in B. K. Gold, ed., *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy* (Malden, Mass., 2012) 57–60.

through his *Eclogues* (whatever truth there is to this claim, even near contemporaries read the *Eclogues* allegorically in this way),<sup>45</sup> and the author of the *Panegyricus Messallae*, which may be as early as 31 B.C., all but asks Messalla for the restoration of his own ancestral lands (181–211).<sup>46</sup> Since Tibullus was an *eques*, his embrace of poverty in 1.1 probably has more to do with poetic commonplace than with personal economic circumstances,<sup>47</sup> but when he says specifically that he does not require the “riches and income of his fathers” (*non ego divitias patrum fructusque requiro*, 1.41), we may think of the exchange of money or property for poetry that characterized contemporary patronage (e.g., Horace’s Sabine farm), and particularly of the restoration of ancestral lands referred to in the *Eclogues* and the *Panegyricus*.<sup>48</sup>

In addition to treating life broadly as a metaphor for poetry, Tibullus 1.1 makes metapoetic points about genre by literalizing specific literary-critical metaphors, including two that are directly related to feet—chains and roads. Like chains, roads form an integral part of Tibullan metapoetic foot imagery and are a central component of Tibullus’ *recusatio* from panegyric in poem 1.1. Fineberg has clearly shown that road images, like foot images, are an important part of Tibullus’ style, and she has argued that long roads in Tibullus allude to epic through the heroic journey often characteristic of this genre.<sup>49</sup> It is also possible, however, to see Tibullan roads as a literalization of the important literary-critical metaphor that figures poetry as a “road” or “path” along which the poet progresses while singing/composing. This metaphor is known as early as Homer and is prominent in important programmatic declarations by both Callimachus and the Augustan poets.<sup>50</sup> As such, the “long road” alludes to epic not only through the journey that characterizes Odyssean

<sup>45</sup> Serv. *Buc. proem* 2.25–3.13, ad *Ecl.* 9.1; VSD 262–280. On contemporary biographical readings, see Horsfall (above, n.41) 12–13.

<sup>46</sup> On the dating and authorship of this poem, see references at L. Andreozzi, “Dal *Panegyricus Messallae*, 91–94 alla *Laus Pisonis*, 49–54,” *Paideia* 61 (2006) 27–28.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Maltby 2002 (above, n.27) 40.

<sup>48</sup> On literary patronage as a form of gift exchange, see P. L. Bowditch, *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage* (Berkeley 2001).

<sup>49</sup> On roads generally, see Fineberg 1991 (above, n.11) 130–54, 172–76; on long roads and the connection to epic, see 133–43.

<sup>50</sup> On the metaphor’s early history, see K. Volk, *The Poetics of Latin Didactic* (Oxford 2002) 20–24. Callimachus uses it in the very influential *Aet.* fr. 1.25–28, where Apollo warns the poet to avoid the wide road in favor of “untrodden paths” (κελεύθους / [ἀτρίπτο] υς, 27–28; cf. *Epigr.* 28.1–2); in Augustan poetry, see Verg. *Geo.* 3.8–9; Prop. 3.1.18–19.

epic but also through epic's customary length, a characteristic that Callimachus eschewed prominently (at least as a criterion for judgment) in the *Aetia* prologue and elsewhere.<sup>51</sup> Metapoetic roads appear twice in Tibullus 1.1, both times as part of the speaker's rejection of riches and soldiering (25–26, 51–52), and in the first of these passages, he bases this rejection pointedly on the soldier's dedication to “the long road”: *iam modo iam possim contentus vivere parvo / nec semper longae deditus esse viae* (“now only may I be able to live content with little, and not always be dedicated to the long road,” 1.1.25–26)—a metapoetic disavowal of long but profitable panegyric/epic for the comparatively briefer and less lucrative genre of love elegy. Not only does metapoetic road symbolism function in the same way as metapoetic foot symbolism—that is, by literalizing literary-critical metaphors—but the two dovetail remarkably well, expanding the range of metapoetic resonance to produce a system that operates not only here but throughout Tibullus' many references to feet and roads.<sup>52</sup>

Metapoetic road imagery appears side by side with metapoetic chain imagery in the passage of Tibullus 1.1 most directly comparable to the *recusationes* of other Augustan poets: the poem's central comparison of soldiering with the life of the lover (49–58). The two foot-based images act together in this passage, (a) to articulate the speaker's rejection of soldiering on account of its necessary travel (metaphorical “roads”) and (b) to present this rejection as a necessary consequence of the speaker's love for Delia—a necessity represented through the metaphor of chained servitude:

hoc mihi contingat. sit dives iure, furorem,  
 qui maris et tristes ferre potest pluvias.  
 o quantum est auri pereat potiusque smaragdi,  
 quam flet ob nostras ulla puella vias.  
 te bellare decet terra, Messalla, marique,  
 ut domus hostiles praeferat exuvias;  
 me retinent vinctum formosae vincla puellae,  
 et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores.  
 non ego laudari curo, mea Delia; tecum  
 dum modo sim, quaeso segnis inersque vocer.

(Tib. 1.1.49–58)

<sup>51</sup> On brevity vs. length in Callimachus see *Aet.* fr. 1.9–18; *Epigr.* 8, 11 Pf. (= *AP* 9.566, 7.447); fr. 398; M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge 2004) 69–70.

<sup>52</sup> See below on the conjunction of feet and roads in Tib. 2.6.

May this happen to me. Let him be justly rich who can bear the fury and the sad rains (*pluvias*) of the sea. O however much exists of gold and emerald, may it all perish rather than any girl cry on account of our roads (*vias*). It is appropriate for you, Messalla, to make war on land and at sea, so that your home will bear the spoils (*exuvias*) of the enemy; as for me, the *chains* of a beautiful girl hold me *bound*, and I sit as doorkeeper before her hard doors. I do not care to be praised, my Delia; as long as I am with you, let me be called slow and idle.<sup>53</sup>

As both Fineberg and Putnam have noted, lines 49–54 are bound together by the rhyming repetition of *vias* at the end of each pentameter line (*pluvias*, 50; *vias*, 52; *exuvias*, 54).<sup>54</sup> In the first and last couplets of this group (49–50, 53–54), Tibullus describes soldiering as an honorable life and one that rightly brings gain to those, like Messalla, who pursue it. This praise of his patron's lifestyle, however, amounts to a foil for Tibullus' own polite refusal (*recusatio*) to pursue it himself. The image of dangerous seas that begins this passage (*furorem . . . maris et tristes . . . pluvias*, 49–50) is not only a commonplace reference to the dangers of seafaring, but also adapts the motif—especially common in Augustan poetry—that figures epic as a dangerous voyage on the open sea.<sup>55</sup> And when the central couplet (51–52) renounces the material gain of foreign military service on the grounds that no girl should cry “on account of our roads” (*ob nostras . . . vias*, 52)—that is, because of Tibullus' poetry—Tibullus is both alluding to the elegiac motif of foreign military service separating lover from beloved and adapting this motif as a metapoetic disavowal of epic.<sup>56</sup> The speaker's wish that “no girl cry” (*quam fleat . . . ulla puella*, 52) can be compared with Propertius' use of *flere* (1.9.10) as a technical term for epic, tragedy, and poetry on similarly sad themes.<sup>57</sup> As a symbol for his elegiac poetry, Tibullus' *viae* must conduce not to upsetting his *puella*, but rather to flattering and bedding her, as he later bluntly admits is the object of his poetry: *ad dominam faciles aditus per*

<sup>53</sup> Quotations from, and references to, Tibullus are according to Maltby's text (2002; above, n.27); all translations are my own.

<sup>54</sup> Fineberg 1991 (above, n.11) 135–36; Putnam (above, n.8) 124–25.

<sup>55</sup> See M. Santirocco, *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes* (Chapel Hill 1986) 27–30, with bibliography at 189 n.47; F. Williams, *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo, a Commentary* (Oxford 1978), 2.105–113 on Homer as Ocean.

<sup>56</sup> See Maltby 2002 (above, n.27) on the separation of lover and beloved.

<sup>57</sup> See Fedeli (above, n.9) 229–30.

*carmina quaero* (“through poems I seek easy approach to my mistress,” 2.4.19).<sup>58</sup>

In lines 55–56, metapoetic roads give way to metapoetic chains (*me retinent vinctum formosae vincla puellae, / et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores*, 55–56), which appear here for the first time in connection with *servitium amoris*. These metaphorical chains are a central element in the structure of this poem, and they function simultaneously in at least three different ways. First, they act most evidently as an erotic metaphor that symbolizes the elegiac condition of servitude to an inconstant *domina*, and they further Tibullus’ self-recusal (*recusatio*) from military campaigning (*viae*) by providing a notional physical restraint against his going (*me retinent*, 55). Second, they act metapoetically as a literary-critical metaphor symbolizing the constraints of generic decorum, which binds an elegiac poet-lover to erotic subject matter rather than panegyric. And finally, they constitute Tibullus’ first major attempt to develop the metrical-unevenness-as-limping motif that elegy inherits from iamb, by which Tibullus’ chained feet figure the halting, uneven progress of his elegiac couplets.

In figuring the elegiac genre as a matter of compulsion instead of choice, Tibullus follows Propertius 1.7, where, as in Tibullus, this idea is bound up with the poet’s disregard of fame and reputation. In this explicitly polemical letter to Ponticus, Propertius says that in rejecting epic for elegy he is “forced to consult his grief more than his talent” (*ne tantum ingenio quantum servire dolori / cogor*, 7–8), and that since his lifestyle (*vitae modus*) and reputation (*fama*) are those of a lover, this is what his literary reputation (*nomen carminis mei*) should reflect as well (9–10). By rejecting epic, Propertius also rejects the literary acclaim (*laudes*) and wider readership that comes with that genre.<sup>59</sup> If people praise him, he says, it should be for his love and erotic sufferings (11–12), and if he is to have a devoted reader, it should be the neglected lover (*me legat assidue post haec neglectus amator*, 13). Like Propertius 1.7, Tibullus 1.1 also figures elegy as a matter of constraint (*me retinent vinctum*, Tib. 1.1.55), and Tibullus too says that he “does not care to

<sup>58</sup> Tib. 2.4.13–20; see James (above, n.9) 71–107 on elegy generally as a means of gaining sexual access.

<sup>59</sup> Compare Vergil’s projection that fame and literary immortality will accompany his future composition of Caesarian epic (*Geo.* 3.8–48) with his characterization of writing the *Eclogues* as “inglorious leisure” (*Geo.* 4.563–566).

be praised" (*non ego laudari curo*, 57). But whereas Propertius' explicit polemic unambiguously links his life and literature, Tibullus' metapoetic polemic uses the poet's elegiac life as an implicit metaphor for his elegiac poetics.

Consequently, whereas Propertius argues at length that love drives him to compose elegy (1.7; cf. 1.9), Tibullus gives relatively little attention to erotic compulsion (*me retinent vincunt formosae vincla puellae*, 1.1.55). Instead, as I will presently argue, Tibullus develops more fully a metapoetic argument that blames his literary vocation on generic decorum, an important but largely unrecognized factor in all Augustan poets' approaches to genre.<sup>60</sup> The doctrine of stylistic propriety (τὸ πρέπον, *decorum*, *aptum*) was developed mainly by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 3.7.1) and Theophrastus for rhetoric, but it became a central principle of many later theories of rhetoric, ethics, and poetics; it is a major concern of Horace's poetics in the *Ars Poetica* (especially 73–92), and, as Roy Gibson has recently shown, it was important for both aesthetics and ethics in Ovid's later *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*.<sup>61</sup> In its fullest form, this doctrine entails many considerations,<sup>62</sup> but the most relevant to both Tibullus 1.1 and the Augustan *recusatio* are (a) the decorum between a material (*res*) and its treatment (*verba*), and (b) that between a speech (or poem) and its speaker (*persona*).

The most important aspect of generic decorum is that between the subject material of a poem (*res*) and its treatment (*verba*), a broad category that includes both style and meter/genre. Augustan poets are visibly concerned with both these considerations in their *recusationes*: they often protest that a theme (usually encomium) is too grand for the humble style of their genre (e.g., Verg. *Ecl.* 6.1–9; Prop. 2.13.3–8), and they have a clear sense that certain topics are appropriate only to certain meters or genres. This latter point is addressed at some length by

<sup>60</sup> Despite the currency of decorum in ancient literary theory, few scholars discuss Augustan *recusationes* in these terms; see W. H. Race, "Odes 1.20: An Horatian *Recusatio*," *Cl. Ant.* 11 (1978) 180–81, 91–93; W. J. Tatum ("Aspirations and Divagations: The Poetics of Place in Propertius 2.10." *TAPA* 130 [1995] 405) paraphrases the conclusions of A. Cameron, *Callimachus and His Critics* (Princeton 1995) 459–71.

<sup>61</sup> See C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry*, 3 vols. (Cambridge 1963–1982), on Hor. *Ars* 86–92; R. K. Gibson, *Excess and Restraint* (London 2007) 115–47; on the applicability of rhetorical theory to poetics, see W. W. Batstone, "Dry Pumice and the Programmatic Language of Catullus 1," *CP* 93 (1998) 125–35; Keith 1999 (above, n.6).

<sup>62</sup> See H. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, D. E. Orton and D. Anderson, eds., M. T. Bliss et al., tr., (Leiden 1998) §1055–62.

both Horace (*Ars* 73–92) and later Ovid (*Rem.* 371–388), both of whom agree that wars must be treated in the hexameter: *res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella / quo scribi possent numero, monstravit Homerus* (“Homer showed in what meter are the accomplishments of kings and the sad wars of generals to be written,” Hor. *Ars* 73–74; cf. Ov. *Rem.* 373–374). About the elegiac couplet, Ovid says that “quivered Loves” are the appropriate subject (*pharetratos Amores*, *Rem.* 379), clearly representing the view of the Roman elegists. Horace, on the other hand, says that elegy was for lamentation and dedications: *versibus impariter iunctis querimonia primum, post etiam inclusa est voti sententia compos* (“in verses unequally joined was first lamentation embraced, then afterwards sentiment about the fulfillment of a vow,” *Ars* 75–76). As Brink points out, Horace’s exclusion of love elegy (along with narrative elegy) was almost surely an intentional slight, but the generic fundamentalism of tying the meter to its early use in threnody does represent an important strain of contemporary literary-critical thought, which we see borne out in Tibullus as well.<sup>63</sup>

The approach to decorum in Tibullus 1.1 alludes both to the Roman elegiac position seen in Ovid and to the position of literary-historical fundamentalists like Horace. When Tibullus says in line 53 that it is “appropriate” for Messalla to go to war (*te bellare decet . . . Messalla* 53), the verb *decet* nods metapoetically toward Aristotle’s τὸ πρέπον, which Horace translates as *decor* at *Ars Poetica* 157.<sup>64</sup> Tibullus himself cannot follow Messalla because he is restrained by the “chains of a beautiful girl” (*formosae vincla puellae* 55), now seen as a metaphor for the bonds of poetic decorum, which tie wars and military conquests to hexameter poetry but elegy to the poetry of love, including Tibullus’ love for his *formosa puella*. This chain metaphor, moreover, gains point through its simultaneous allusion to elegy’s limp—precisely the defect that distinguishes the elegiac couplet from the hexameter and makes the former unfit for panegyric. Yet as if to appeal to the generic fundamentalists who

<sup>63</sup> See Brink (above, n.61), *Ars* 75–78 on Horace’s possible debt to the Alexandrian scholar Didymus. In line with Horace’s prescription, Roman elegists often conceive of their poetry as laments (*querimoniae, querelae*) for their unhappy love: see James (above, n.9) 108–52; Keith 1994 (above, n.6) 35; C. Saylor, “*Querelae*: Propertius’ Distinctive, Technical Name for His Elegy,” *Agon* 1 (1967) 142–49.

<sup>64</sup> Vergil uses the synonym *oportet* in his *recusatio* in *Ecl.* 6 (no such word occurs in the Callimachean original). Compare Race (above, n.60) on Horace’s use of decorum terminology in his *recusationes*.



saw elegy as a genre for lamentation, Tibullus turns immediately from this metapoetic *recusatio* to consider death and lamentation: lines 59–72 are a morbid fantasy about the poet’s own death and Delia’s mourning at his funeral (somewhat ironic after his insistence that no girl should cry on account of his *viae*, 51–52).

In the midst of this morbid fantasy, Tibullus uses metapoetic chains once again to present elegy as a genre with rules of decorum specifically at odds with those of hexameter epic. In doing this, moreover, he also furthers his metapoetic polemic against epic by borrowing and inverting a traditional image from epic’s own generic rhetoric. After imagining his own death and cremation (59–62), Tibullus insists that Delia will cry at his funeral because her heart is “tender,” not “bound with iron” (63–64). In Delia’s tender heart, Tibullus adapts a traditional erotic motif that uses “hard-heartedness” as a metaphor for insensitivity, but in adapting this motif, he uses chain imagery to cultivate metapoetic double meaning, as he had done with *servitium amoris*: he combines the image of a hard heart with that of a metallic heart, which epic poets since Homer had used to express their insufficiency for an exceptionally demanding poetic task. Homer first used this motif when he claimed in *Iliad* 2 that he would need the help of the Muses to sing the catalogue of ships, since he could not do this on his own “even if [he] had ten tongues, ten mouths, an unbreakable voice, and a heart made of bronze (χάλκεον ἦτορ) inside [him]” (*Il.* 2.489–490). Ennius adapted the image in an apparently similar context in his *Annales*, saying, “not if I should have ten mouths inside me, with which my tongue knew how to speak, and my heart and breast were bound with iron (*ferro cor sit pectusque revinctum*,” *Enn. Ann.* 469–470 Skutsch). Tibullus adapts the image as it appears in Ennius, but he transfers to his beloved the metallic heart that in Homer and Ennius (as best we can tell) had belonged to the poet: *non tua sunt duro praecordia ferro / vincta, neque in tenero stat tibi corde silex* (“your breast is not bound with hard iron, nor does flint stand in your tender heart,” 1.1.63–64).<sup>65</sup> Although poetic insufficiency is a common claim in other Augustan *recusationes* (Verg. *Ecl.* 4.53–54; Prop. 2.1.41, 2.10.1–6, 3.9; Hor.

<sup>65</sup> See O. Skutsch, ed., *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford 1985) on the uncertain Ennian context and later allusions to this passage. Vergil had adapted both Homer and Ennius at *Geo.* 2.42–44, where these passages are preserved in the *Scholia Bernensia*; on Vergil’s influence on Tibullus 1.1 see Putnam (above, n.8), references at 130 n.18.

*Sat.* 2.1.1–29; *Epist.* 2.1.245–270; cf. Hor. *Ars* 38–40), Tibullus here inverts the motif, alluding not to his own poetic insufficiency but that of epic poets. Instead, through the opposition of hard iron chains (*duro . . . ferro vincita*) to Delia’s tender heart (*tenero . . . corde*), he metapoetically contrasts “hard” epic with “tender” elegy, making a different point about epic and elegy: it is not that Tibullus himself is too weak for the grand style of panegyric epic, but rather that his *puella*—a figure that in other elegists represents elegiac poetry itself—is stylistically too *tenera* for him to treat this grand theme decorously.<sup>66</sup>

In the lines that close the speaker’s death fantasy and immediately precede the end of the poem (69–72), Tibullus addresses generic decorum yet again, but focuses here on the decorum between a poem (analogous here to a speech) and the speaker’s persona, a broad category that includes all aspects of his self-representation. Augustan poets often appeal to this aspect of decorum when they plead in their *recusationes* that their own modest talent is insufficient to a grand genre or theme (see above). Tibullus, however, specifically disclaims this plea when he inverts the epic metallic-heart motif; instead, he appeals in this last passage to the relationship between genre and a poet’s age—a motif often related to the theme of poetic insufficiency. Like other Augustan poets, Tibullus asserts here that the lower genres, like bucolic and elegy, are appropriate for a poet in his youth, while the grander genres like epic should be postponed for his future maturity (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 4. 53–54, 8.7–10.; *Geo.* 3.8–48;<sup>67</sup> Prop. 2.10.7–10, 19–26; Ov. *Am.* 3.1.27–30).<sup>68</sup> As elsewhere, moreover, Tibullus makes his metapoetic point by adapting a traditional motif, here the commonplace exhortation, “let us love while we are young:”<sup>69</sup>

interea, dum fata sinunt, iungamus amores:  
iam veniet tenebris Mors adoperta caput,

<sup>66</sup> On the equivalency of elegiac poems and *puellae* see Wyke (above, n.5) 46–77, 115–54; Keith 1994, Keith 1999 (both above, n.6).

<sup>67</sup> There is disagreement over the interpretation of *Ecl.* 8 and *Geo.* 3: on *Ecl.* 8, see R. R. Nauta, “Panegyric in Vergil’s *Bucolics*,” in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papanghelis, eds., *Brill’s Companion to Greek and Roman Pastoral* (Leiden 2006) 185–86; although *Geo.* 3 seems a preview of the *Aeneid* rather than a simple *recusatio*, its formula resembles *recusationes* in Vergil and elsewhere (*modo vita supersit*, 10; cf. *Ecl.* 4.53–54, 8.7–8, Prop. 2.10.20).

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.1, where philosophy, not lyric poetry, is befitting (*decens*, 11) to the poet’s old age.

<sup>69</sup> See Maltby 2002 (above, n.27).

iam subrepet iners aetas, nec amare decebit,  
dicere nec cano blanditias capite.

(Tib. 1.1.69–72)

Meanwhile, while fate allows, let us join together our loves: soon will come Death, head covered with shadows, soon idle old age will creep up, and it will not be appropriate to love, nor to speak blandishments with an old, white head.

Here again, the choice of the elegiac life reflects metapoetically on the choice of elegy as a genre, and Tibullus highlights this metaphorical overlap by pairing love specifically with “blandishments” (*blanditiae*), a recognizable feature of elegiac poetry: in old age, Tibullus says, it will no longer be “decorous” either to love (*nec amare decebit*, 71) or to cajole one’s lover with “blandishments” (*dicere nec . . . blanditias*, 72). This last word is nearly a technical term for elegiac poetry, and it connects this passage with elegy’s specific project of winning sexual access to the poet’s beloved.<sup>70</sup>

Throughout poem 1.1, we see that Tibullus’ *recusatio* from panegyric epic relies heavily on the rules of generic decorum for the meter in which he is writing. One might expect, therefore, that the protection of this *recusatio* would expire at the end of the book, when the subject and meter of his next project were up for grabs. In fact, we do find that panegyric epic, again under the metaphorical guise of military service, encroaches on Tibullus’ poetic world both in 1.10, at the end of book 1, and in 2.6, at the end of book 2. In 1.10 Tibullus decries war and military service as he finds himself dragged off unwillingly to war (*nunc ad bella trahor*, 1.10.13), a development that represents the poet as again feeling pressure to compose panegyric now that his book of elegies is complete—just as Propertius says in his poem 2.10 that he “will sing wars, since [his] girl [i.e., poetry about Cynthia] has been written” (*bella canam, quando scripta puella mea est*, Prop. 2.10.8).<sup>71</sup> In Tibullus 2.6, which many scholars have seen as a polemical letter like Propertius 1.7 and 1.9 and Ovid *Amores* 2.18, Tibullus considers voluntarily joining

<sup>70</sup> For *blanditiae* as love poetry, see Tib. 1.2.93, 1.4.71, 1.9.77; Prop. 1.16.16; Ov. *Am.* 2.1.21; Keith 1994 (above, n.6) 32; D. Bright, *Haec mihi fingebam: Tibullus in his World* (Leiden 1978) 147; on elegy as sexual enticement see n.58 above.

<sup>71</sup> On Prop. 2.10.8, see Wyke (above, n.5) 51–59.

the army (paired here again with the “long road,” 2.6.3<sup>72</sup>), but he is unable to do it because his “foot itself” returns to his *puella*’s threshold: *iuravi quotiens rediturum ad limina numquam! / cum bene iuravi, pes tamen ipse redit* (“How many times I swore I would never return to those thresholds! But although I swore in good faith, still my foot returns on its own.” 2.6.13–14).<sup>73</sup> The elegiac meter of his books, in other words, is responsible for his inevitable return to elegiac love songs, as represented by the stereotypical *paraclausithyron*, the song at the threshold, before the closed door of one’s mistress (*rediturum ad limina*, 13).

#### IV. Conclusion

More light could be shed on Tibullus through a complete reading of his books in this manner, but for now I hope that the passages I have discussed show that Tibullus’ use of foot-related metapoetic images is both more pervasive and more sophisticated than has been recognized. Tibullus is not the only Augustan poet, however, to use foot and binding images in metapoetic contexts that pertain to the elegiac genre. Roman love elegy was one of the most important and influential literary movements of its day, and even Horace and Vergil, who wrote no elegy themselves, respond to this genre using the motifs I have discussed above. Barchiesi has suggested that the influence of elegy might account for much in the early works of Horace, and specifically that *Epode* 11 uses a clever foot pun to highlight its engagement with this newly booming genre.<sup>74</sup> Vergil, for his part, shows the influence of Gallus in *Eclogues* 6 and 10, where the elegist appears as a character alongside some of the very motifs I have just discussed. Chains, for example, feature prominently in *Eclogue* 6 in the binding of Silenus (18–19), and one might even suggest—perhaps somewhat perversely—that Gallus’ well-known utterance from *Eclogue* 10, *omnia vincit amor* (69), usually translated

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Fineberg 1991 (above, n.11) 142–43.

<sup>73</sup> On Tib. 2.6 as literary polemic, see E. O’Neil, “Tibullus 2.6: A New Interpretation,” *CP* 62 (1967) 163–68; Keith 1999 (above, n.6) 51; Bright (above, n.70) 217–19; R. J. Ball, *Tibullus the Elegist: A Critical Survey* (Göttingen 1983) 222–23; P. Murgatroyd, *Tibullus: Elegies II* (Oxford 1994), 2.6.1. Keith notes the significance of *pes ipse*, and recognizes that the boast of strength that accompanies Tibullus’ proposed defection from love to soldiering (10–11) resembles language other Augustan poets use of the strength needed for epic and the grand style.

<sup>74</sup> Barchiesi (above, n.2).

“love conquers all,” could be read as a form of *vincire*, “to bind,” as well as *vincere*, “to conquer.”<sup>75</sup> Also in *Eclogue* 10, Gallus expresses concerns about Lycoris’ tender feet as she goes off to follow a soldier to the North: *a, te ne frigora laedant! a, tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas!* (“ah, may the frosts not harm you! ah, may the harsh ice not cut your tender soles!” *Ecl.* 10.48–49).<sup>76</sup>

It seems that some of these motifs constituted elegiac buzzwords, which the elegists and their opponents troped in different directions in a congenial exchange of literary polemic. Silenus in *Eclogue* 6 refuses to sing until he is unchained: *solvite me, pueri; satis est potuisse videri* (“release me, boys; it is enough to have seemed to be able,” 24), after which, of course, he proceeds to sing in hexameters. And Lycoris’ tender bare feet in the pastoral *Eclogue* 10 are not an advantage for evading detection, but a liability on her trip to the frozen north. I do not intend to go any farther into the messy business of determining the source of poetic motifs, but it may be that part of Gallus’ importance for Augustan poetry lay in starting a dialogue between elegy and other genres (especially epic), which we see played out explicitly in the polemics of Propertius and Ovid, but metapoetically in the poetry of Vergil and Tibullus, among others. Tibullus at least, whatever his inspiration, was engaged in such a dialogue through his humorous and characteristically subtle use of metapoetic foot imagery. By recognizing this aspect of his poetry, we stand, I believe, to make important gains in our understanding both of Tibullus’ poetry and of its relationship to the contemporary literary context.

GEORGETOWN COLLEGE

john\_henkel@georgetowncollege.edu

<sup>75</sup> On the etymology of *Venus* from *vincire*, see above, n.27.

<sup>76</sup> Vergil uses *tenerae plantae* instead of *teneri pedes*, perhaps wishing to avoid elegiac diction. Following Serv. ad *Ecl.* 10.46, most scholars believe that these lines on Lycoris’ feet are closely adapted from Gallus himself: see A. S. Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry, c. 60 BC–AD 20* (Oxford 2007) 236–37; Clausen (above, n.33) 291–92. C. G. Perkell (“The ‘Dying Gallus’ and the Design of *Eclogue* 10,” *CP* 91 [1996] 135) suggests that *omnia vincit amor* evokes Gallus.



---

# Imperial Geographies in Tibullan Elegy\*

ALISON KEITH

ABSTRACT: This paper explores the extent and significance of “imperial geographies” in Tibullan elegy. I document the contemporary currency of the toponyms of Mediterranean geography in Tibullus’ elegies 1.3, 1.7, 2.2, and 2.3 and argue that Tibullus’ invocation of these sites is intimately correlated with both Roman imperialism and the poet’s own Callimachean commitments. By incorporating non-Latin vocabulary into its artistic matrix, Tibullus’ poetry participates, in its very linguistic texture, in the larger imperial projects of Augustan Rome while simultaneously illustrating its aesthetic engagement with Alexandrian poetics.

Propertius and Ovid have been the prime beneficiaries of almost fifty years of sustained critical attention to Roman erotic elegy, far outstripping Tibullus as the focus of scholarly articles and monographs, though the latter is now very well equipped with commentaries.<sup>1</sup> The commentators’ important work, however, has seemingly not spurred the sustained critical investigation of rhetorical conventions, literary allusions, narrative economy, and political commitments in the Tibullan corpus

---

\* I am grateful to Erika Zimmermann Damer for the invitation to participate in the panel on “Rethinking Tibullus” at the 140th annual meeting of the American Philological Association in Philadelphia in 2009; to my fellow panelists Erika Zimmermann Damer and John Henkel for their stimulating papers; to members of the audience on that occasion, especially Barbara Weiden Boyd and Richard Thomas, for their challenging questions; and to CW’s two anonymous referees, whose reports have helped me to refine my argument. Of course I bear responsibility for the errors that remain.

<sup>1</sup> K. F. Smith, ed., *Tibullus: The Elegies* (New York 1915); J. André, ed., *Tibulle. Élégies, livre premier* (Paris 1965); F. W. Lenz, ed., rev. G. K. Galinsky, *Albi Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres*<sup>3</sup> (Leiden 1971); M. C. J. Putnam, ed., *Tibullus. A Commentary* (Norman, Okla., 1973); F. Della Corte, ed., *Tibullo: le elegie* (Verona 1980); A. G. Lee, ed., rev. R. Maltby, *Tibullus: Elegies. Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes*<sup>3</sup> (Leeds 1990); P. Murgatroyd, ed., *Tibullus I. A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (Pietermaritzburg 1980); P. Murgatroyd, ed., *Tibullus: Elegies II* (Oxford 1994); R. Maltby, ed., *Tibullus: Elegies. Text, Introduction and Commentary*. ARCA 41 (Cambridge 2002).

*Classical World*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2014) Pp.477–492

that they invite.<sup>2</sup> This paper exploits the valuable findings of Tibullus' commentators but draws its broader analytic from the political turn in contemporary Latin literary studies to explore the extent and significance of "imperial geographies" in Tibullan elegy.<sup>3</sup> In particular, I argue that Tibullus' invocation of geographical settings is intimately correlated not only with Roman imperialism but also with his own Callimachean commitments. My study aims to document the contemporary currency of the toponyms of Mediterranean geography in Augustan Rome, where they are resonant of Roman imperial conquest, and to argue that Roman elegy is intimately correlated with Roman imperialism in its celebration of the luxury products and sexual spoils of military conquest.

Robert Maltby has shown that Tibullus exploits non-Latin vocabulary (primarily Greek loanwords) not uniformly but rather for specific effect "in poems where Hellenistic influence is particularly noticeable."<sup>4</sup> Thus Hellenistic sources have been proposed to explain Tibullus' rehearsal of Greek geographies and literary themes in elegy 1.3,<sup>5</sup> whose opening lines invoke the aesthetic realm of Homer's *Odyssey* in a *propempticon* bidding farewell to the Roman general Messalla and his company on their departure for the eastern Mediterranean on imperial service:<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See, however, P. A. Miller, *Subjecting Verses: Latin Erotic Elegy and the Emergence of the Real* (Princeton 2004); L. Houghton, "Tibullus' Elegiac Underworld," *CQ* 57 (2007) 153–65; K. Nikoloutsos, "Beyond Sex: The Poetics and Politics of Pederasty in Tibullus 1.4," *Phoenix* 61 (2007) 55–82; K. Nikoloutsos, "The Boy as Metaphor: The Hermeneutics of Homoerotic Desire in Tibullus 1.9," *Helios* 38 (2011) 25–57; M. Drinkwater, "His Turn to Cry: Tibullus' Marathus Cycle (1.4, 1.8 and 1.9) and Roman Elegy," *CJ* 107 (2012) 423–48.

<sup>3</sup> A. Barchiesi, "The Search for the Perfect Book," in K. Gutzwiller, ed., *The New Posidippus* (Oxford 2005) 320–42; C. Connors, "Imperial Space and Time: The Literature of Leisure," in O. Taplin, ed., *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A New Perspective* (Oxford 2000) 492–518; T. N. Habinek, *The Politics of Latin Literature* (Princeton 1998); S. Hinds, "Cinna, Statius, and 'Immanent Literary History' in the Cultural Economy," in E. A. Schmidt, ed., *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine* (Geneva 2001) 221–57; A. Keith, *Propertius, Poet of Love and Leisure* (London 2008) 139–65. Cf. P. Bing, "The Politics and Poetics of Geography in the Milan Posidippus Section One: On stones (AB 1-20)," in Gutzwiller (above) 119–40; A. Kuttner "Cabinet Fit for a Queen: The Αἰθικά as Posidippus' Gem Museum," in Gutzwiller (above) 141–63.

<sup>4</sup> R. Maltby, "Tibullus and the Language of Latin Elegy," *PBA* 93 (1999) 381.

<sup>5</sup> See F. Cairns, *Tibullus as a Hellenistic Poet* (Cambridge 1979), 44–60; Maltby (above, n.1) 184, 186, 1.3.3.

<sup>6</sup> I cite the Latin text and English translation of Tibullus from Lee, rev. Maltby (above, n.1). I cite the texts of Propertius and Horace's *Epodes* from P. Fedeli, ed., *Propertius*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Stuttgart 1984) and D. Mankin, ed., *Horace: Epodes* (Cambridge 1995) respectively; all other translations are my own.



Ibitis Aegaeas sine me, Messalla, per undas,  
 o utinam memores, ipse cohorsque, mei!  
 me tenet ignotis aegrum Phaeacia terris,  
 abstineas auidas Mors modo nigra manus.

(Tib. 1.3.1–4)

Alas, Messalla, you will sail Aegean seas without me—you and the company—but not, please God, forgetting the sick man, captive in Phaeacia, land of the unknown, if only the Black Goddess withholds her grasping hand.

Tibullus' opening line, *ibitis Aegaeas . . . per undas* (1.3.1), evokes the wording of two slightly earlier Latin poetic *propemptica* by his contemporaries Horace (*ibis Liburnis inter alta nauium, | amice, propugnacula*, "you will go on Liburnian crafts, my friend, among the high bulwarks of ships," Hor. *Epod.* 1.1–2) and Propertius (*ibis, et accepti pars eris imperii*, "you will go and you will be part of the reception of imperial rule," Prop. 1.6.34), both written for the departures of similarly highly placed Roman officials on imperial missions abroad—Maecenas on Octavian's staff at Actium in 31 B.C.E. and Volcacius Tullus on the staff of his uncle, sent out as the governor of Asia in 29 B.C.E., respectively.

We know little about Messalla's Aegean expedition, apparently undertaken at Octavian's request at some point after the battle of Actium, though it has been suggested that the eastern Mediterranean itinerary Tibullus offers in 1.7.13–22 (quoted below)—from Bulgaria and Cilicia through Syria and Tyre to culminate in Egypt—may reflect Messalla's route.<sup>7</sup> In elegy 1.3, the conjunction of *Aegaeas . . . per undas* (1.3.1) with the site of the poet's illness, *Phaeacia* (1.3.3), seems to locate the Roman general Messalla and his military staff in the eastern Mediterranean on specifically military and imperial business. A century later the elder Pliny explains that "Homer called Corcyra [modern Corfu], Scheria and Phaeacia" (*Corcyra Homero dicta est Scheria et Phaeacia*, Plin. *Nat.* 4.4.52); and we know that in this period it was "an important military station on the way to the East."<sup>8</sup> But as Maltby observes, "by using the name Phaeacia for what was known in his day as Corcyra . . . T[ibullus] transposes his experience to the world of mythology and suggests parallels between himself and the wandering Odysseus who was

<sup>7</sup> Cairns (above, n.5) 43–44.

<sup>8</sup> Maltby (above, n.1) 185.

shipwrecked there in *Od.* 6 and 7.”<sup>9</sup> In this way the elegist aestheticizes Rome’s military presence in the Greek Mediterranean as a Latin poet’s sojourn on a Homeric isle, redescribing Roman hegemony of the Mediterranean littoral as a literary excursion through Greek mythology.

Nonetheless, specifically Roman settings and cult practices dominate the first half of the poem, from the poet’s reflections on the absence of his kinswomen from his deathbed in Corcyra (1.3.5–10) to his reminiscences of Delia’s ritual observances in Rome before his departure (1.3.23–34), and an extended reverie on the Italian golden age under Saturn (1.3.35–48) before the discovery of travel for military and financial ends (1.3.49–56). Yet individual details reveal the extent of Rome’s material benefit from her geographical reach. The Assyrian perfumes that the poet expects his sister to mix with his bones (*non soror, Assyrios cineri quae dedat odores | et fleat effusis ante sepulcra comis*, “no sister to bestow Assyrian perfumes on the ashes | and weep beside the grave with streaming hair,” 1.3.7–8) are linguistically marked as foreign by the Greek adjective *Assyrios*, though the epithet likely reflects not the perfume’s provenance but the site of the trade center through which it entered the Roman empire.<sup>10</sup> The lover’s mistress, Delia, too, is marked by her name as a Greek import at Rome, whether we accept Apuleius’ identification of her name as a Greek gloss on the Roman gentilician *Plania* (Delia < δῆλος = *planus*, Apul. *Apol.* 10), or view it as a statement of the poet’s literary allegiances in its feminization of a cult title of Apollo, patron of literature, used by Callimachus (*Hymn* 4.269), and/or in its application to Apollo’s sister Artemis/Diana by Vergil (*Ecl.* 7.29), who also uses the name of a rustic figure’s mistress (*Ecl.* 3.69).<sup>11</sup>

As the poem develops, Tibullus mingles Roman divinatory practices, such as consultation of the gods (1.3.10), the lots (1.3.11), and omens (1.3.12, 17, 19–20), with foreign cult observances, such as the Jewish

<sup>9</sup> Maltby (above, n.1) 185–86; H. Eisenberger, “Der innere Zusammenhang der Motive in Tibulls Gedicht I 3,” *Hermes* 88 (1960) 960; D. F. Bright, “A Tibullan Odyssey,” *Arethusa* 4 (1971) 197–214.

<sup>10</sup> On spikenard, see J. I. Miller, *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire, 29 B.C. to A.D. 641* (Oxford 1969) 88–92; A. Dalby, *Empire of Pleasures: Luxury and Indulgence in the Roman World* (New York and London 2000) 196–7; cf. Hor. *C.* 2.11.15–17 with R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, eds., *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book II* (Oxford 1978) 175, on *Assyriaque nardo*.

<sup>11</sup> On the name Delia, see J. G. Randall, “Mistresses’ Pseudonyms in Latin Elegy,” *LCM* 4 (1979) 27–35; Maltby (above, n.1) 42–45.

Sabbath (*Saturniue . . . diem*, 1.3.18)<sup>12</sup> and Isis-worship, which he specifies as Egyptian: )

Quid tua nunc Isis mihi, Delia, quid mihi prosunt  
 illa tua totiens aera repulsa manu,  
 quidue, pie dum sacra colis, pureque lauari  
 te (memini) et puro secubuisse toro?  
 nunc, dea, nunc succurre mihi—nam posse mederi  
 picta docet templis multa tabella tuis—ut mea uotiuas persoluens  
 Delia noctes  
 ante sacras lino tecta fores sedeat  
 bisque die resoluta comas tibi dicere laudes  
 insignis turba debeat in Pharia.

(Tib. 1.3.23–32)

What help, O Delia, your Queen of Heaven now—devout percussions of the bronze rattle, observance of the ritual ablutions, nights apart so memorably pure? Haste, Goddess, to my aid, for many a painted tablet on temple walls proclaims your saving power; and then my Delia, in payment of her vow, linen-clad shall sit before your holy door and twice a day with loosened hair duly tell your praises, conspicuous among the congregation of Egyptian Pharos.

Although the poet-lover implies Delia's credulity in his depiction of her futile observance of Isis' rituals (1.3.23–26), he himself begs the goddess's assistance and promises Delia's continuing observance of her rites, linen-clad and conspicuous among the priests of Isis (*turba . . . in Pharia*, 1.3.32), singing her praises (1.3.27–32). The commentators note that although "the worship of this Egyptian fertility goddess . . . was introduced to Rome in the time of Sulla (Apuleius, *Met.* 11.30) [ , i] n the Augustan period it was particularly popular with women of Delia's class" and of foreign origins.<sup>13</sup> The poet-lover himself disavows Isis-worship in the couplet that concludes this section, where he undertakes to worship his ancestral Penates and ancient Lar, the domestic divinities of

<sup>12</sup> Maltby (above, n.1) 190.

<sup>13</sup> Maltby (above, n.1) 191, 1.3.23–32; cf., Smith (above, n.1) 241, 1.3.23–24; Putnam (above, n.1) 77–78; Murgatroyd (above, n.1, 1980) 108. On the prominence of Isis (and Osiris, cf. Tib. 1.7) in Italy in the late republic and early principate, see F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain* (Paris 1929) 127–34; R. E. Witt, *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World* (London 1971) 70–88, 222–23; M. Beard, J. North, and S. Price, *Religions of Rome*. 2 vols (Cambridge 1998). On Isis Pharia, and the Augustan establishment of her cult on the island of Pharos in the harbor of Egyptian Alexandria, see Cairns (above, n.5) 64–65.

native Italic ritual observance: *at mihi contingat patrios celebrare Penates | reddereque antiquo menstrua tura Lari* (“but grant that I may worship the Penates of my fathers | And offer incense every month to the ancient Lar,” 1.3.33–34). This couplet points to a stark contrast in language and geography, religion and history, with the preceding couplets—between the recent influx of Egyptian priests and their goddess Isis into Rome, and the native-born Latin poet and his ancestral Italian gods—but the whole section vividly dramatizes the ongoing Augustan project of absorbing Egypt into the Roman imperial matrix.<sup>14</sup>

Denouncing the loss of Italy’s golden age with the advent of seafaring (1.3.35–56), Tibullus continues with reflections on the mercenary and military motives that destroyed pristine Italy in a litany of rhetorical clichés and literary allusions. The conventional elegiac denunciation of war and commerce, however, cannot obscure the poet-lover’s participation in the imperial project of securing Roman hegemony in the Mediterranean: *HIC IACET IMMITI CONSUMPTVS MORTE TIBVLLVS | MESSALLAM TERRA DVM SEQVITVRQVE MARI* (HERE LIES TIBULLUS, WASTED BY INEXORABLE DEATH | WHILE SERVING WITH MESSALLA ON LAND AND SEA, (1.3.55–56) ). Yet instead of the expected rehearsal of his travels around the Mediterranean on service with Messalla, Tibullus follows his lachrymose epitaph with an impressionistic geography of the underworld, from the Elysian Fields, where he expects Venus to lead him (*Sed me, quod facilis tenero sum semper amori, | ipsa Venus campos ducet in Elysios*, “My spirit, though, as I have always welcomed tender love, | Venus herself will lead to the Elysian fields,” 1.3.57–58) as the appropriate resting place for tender lovers (1.3.57–66), to the infernal regions of Tartarus (*scelerata . . . sedes in nocte profunda*, “the place of wickedness . . . deep in night,” 1.3.67), where the criminals of Greek mythology are punished (1.3.67–82). He draws this picture of the underworld largely from Homer’s *Odyssey*, where the Elysian Plain is first mentioned (*Od.* 4.563–569) and where Odysseus in his descent to the netherworld encounters the famous female lovers (*Od.* 11.225–332) and sinners (Tityos, Tantalus, Sisyphus, *Od.* 11.576–600) of classical mythology.<sup>15</sup> The closing

<sup>14</sup> See P. L. Bowditch (“Tibullus and Egypt: A Postcolonial Reading of Elegy 1.7,” *Arethusa* 44 [2011] 89–122) on Tibullus’ imperialist engagement with Egypt and P. L. Bowditch (“Palatine Apollo and the Imperial Gaze: Propertius 2.31 and 2.32,” *AJP* 130 [2009] 401–38) on Propertius’ imperial gaze at Egypt in elegies 2.31–32.

<sup>15</sup> See Houghton (above, n.2) on elegiac underworlds.

portrait of Delia as a faithful Penelope (1.3.83–94), weaving while she awaits her absent lover, complements the opening portrait of the Tibullan speaker wasting away on Phaeacia and the Homeric geography that opens and closes the poem.

Tibullus' displacement of Roman military adventurism in the eastern Mediterranean onto Homeric geographies assimilates contemporary Roman imperial expansionism to the literary and mythological spheres, aestheticizing the poet-lover's participation in Messalla's tour of duty on Augustus' imperial service as an occasion of elegiac love and death. Mary Louise Pratt, Edward Said, and Anne McClintock, among others, have made a compelling case for interpreting such an acquisition of culture as an index of imperial violence.<sup>16</sup> Although we are not used to assessing the impact of Homeric epic on Roman literature in quite this fashion, Said's sensitive discussion of the latent imperialism of Jane Austen's novel *Mansfield Park* can be repurposed, *mutatis mutandis*, to bring to light the imperialist rhetoric that subtends Tibullus' literary itinerary in elegy 1.3:

We must not say that since [Tibullus' elegy 1.3] is a[n elegiac poem], its affiliations with a sordid history are irrelevant or transcended, not only because it is irresponsible to do so, but because we know too much to say so in good faith. Having read [elegy 1.3] as part of the structure of an expanding imperialist venture, one cannot simply restore it to the canon of "great literary masterpieces"—to which it most certainly belongs—and leave it at that. Rather . . . the [elegy] steadily, if unobtrusively, opens up a broad expanse of domestic imperialist culture without which [Rome's] subsequent acquisition of territory would not have been possible.<sup>17</sup>

A similar aestheticization of Roman imperialism animates elegy 1.7, which commemorates, in a *genethliakon*, the celebration of Messalla's

---

<sup>16</sup> M. L. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York 2008 [1992]); E. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York 1993); A. McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York and London 1995). Literature and libraries are but two of many features of Greek culture that became "fair game for seizure," as Dalby (above, n.10) 120 puts it, in the aftermath of Roman military conquest: see Plut. *Aem.* 28.11, on Aemilius Paulus' disposition of the Macedonian king Perseus' library after the Macedonians' defeat at Pydna in 168 B.C.E., and 32.4–34.8 and on Paulus' three-day triumph at Rome and the artistic treasures and other spoils of war that graced it; cf. Cic. *leg. Manil.* 40, 66; Livy 39.6. See further E. S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1992), 223–71.

<sup>17</sup> Said (above, n.16) 95.

triumph for his Aquitanian victories, dated by the surviving *Fasti* to September 25, 27 B.C.E.:

Hunc cecinere diem Parcae, fatalia nentes  
 stamina non ulli dissoluenda deo:  
 hunc fore Aquitanas posset qui fundere gentes,  
 quem tremeret forti milite uictus Atur.  
 euenere: nouos pubes Romana triumphos  
 uidit et euinctos bracchia capta duces;  
 at te uictrices lauros, Messala, gerentem  
 portabat nitidis currus eburnus equis.

(Tib. 1.7.1–8)

Of this day sang the Fates, as they spun the threads of doom that no God can unwind: this would be the day of rout for tribes of Aquitaine, of dread for the Adour, conquered by brave cohorts. And so it came to pass. Our Roman race has seen new Triumphs, chiefs with captive wrists in chains, and you, Messalla, wearing the victorious laurel, drawn by shining steeds in the ivory chariot.

The poet himself claims a share in his patron's victory, calling to witness the mountain range of the Pyrenees; the Gallic tribes of Santones, located between the Charente and the Garonne (Caes. *BG* 1.10), and Carnutes, located between the Seine and the Loire; and the rivers Saône, Rhône, Garonne, and Loire:

Non sine me est tibi partus honos: Tarbella Pyrene testis et  
 Oceani litora Santonici,  
 testis Arar Rhodanusque celer magnusque Garunna, Carnutis et  
 flauī caerulea lympha Liger.

(Tib. 1.7.9–12)

Not without me was your glory gained: witness the Tarbellian Pyrenees and shores of the Santonic Ocean; witness Saône and rapid Rhone and great Garonne and Loire, blue stream of flaxen-haired Carnutes.

The impressive run of foreign names and places in these lines bears witness not only to Tibullus' metrical artistry, but also to the extent of Roman military interests in the western Mediterranean.<sup>18</sup> The display

<sup>18</sup> On these lines, and the extent of Messalla's imperial travels in Gaul, see J. P. Elder, "Tibullus, Ennius, and the Blue Loire," *TAPA* 96 (1965) 97–105.

continues in the following couplets with the survey of eastern Mediterranean sites that we have already had occasion to note:

An te, Cydne, canam, tacitis qui leniter undis caeruleus  
 placidis per uada serpis aquis?  
 quantus et aetherio contingens uertice nubes  
 frigidus intonso Taurus alat Cilicas?  
 quid referam ut uolitet crebras intacta per urbes alba  
 Palaestino sancta columba Syro?  
 utque maris uastum prospectet turribus aequor  
 prima ratem uentis credere docta Tyros? qualis et,  
 arentes cum findit Sirius agros,  
 fertilis aestiua Nilus abundet aqua?

(Tib. 1.7.13–22)

Or shall I sing of Cydnus, whose quiet waters glide softly through smooth blue shallows? Of Taurus, cold and huge, with airy summit cloud capped, unshorn Cilicia's livelihood? Why tell of white doves flying, safe through crowded towns, sacrosanct in Syropalestine? How the tall towers of Tyre, the mother of sailing ships, survey the sea's expanse? How fertile Nile floods in summer when Sirius cracks the thirsty fields?

Francis Cairns has suggested that Tibullus' rehearsal of Messalla's eastern itinerary here evokes "part of the route taken by Alexander in the first half of his conquest of the Persian empire,"<sup>19</sup> and the Greek musical texture of these couplets may imply as much, with a succession of Greek proper names (*Cydne*, 1.7.13; *Taurus*, *Cilicas*, 1.7.16; *Palaestino* . . . *Syro*, 1.7.18; *Tyros*, 1.7.20; *Sirius*, 1.7.21; *Nilus*, 1.7.22). The eastern sites Tibullus here surveys would thus bear double witness to ancient imperialism, originating in Macedonian military adventurism in the Aegean and subsequently overtaken by Roman expansion into the Greek-speaking eastern Mediterranean.

Messalla's eastern itinerary culminates in his arrival at the Nile, to whom Tibullus offers a short hymn:

Nile pater, quanam possim te dicere causa aut  
 quibus in terris oculuisse caput?  
 te propter nullos tellus tua postulat imbres, arida  
 nec pluuiio supplicat herba Ioui.

<sup>19</sup> Cairns (above, n.5) 44.

te canit atque suum pubes miratur Osirim barbara,  
Memphitem plangere docta bouem.

(Tib. 1.7.23–28)

Where or wherefore, Father Nile,  
can I say you hide your head?  
Thanks to you your country never prays for rain;  
no withered grass petitions pluvial Jupiter.  
Your folk in barbarous lamentation for the Memphian bull  
praise and worship you as their Osiris.

Lowell Bowditch has recently discussed Tibullus' rhetoric of conquest in connection with the triumphal imagery that opens the elegy, while Richard Hunter has explored the Graeco-Egyptian background of the poem, drawing particular attention to the Latin poem's relation to late-second- and early-first-century Isaic texts and to the literary and religious culture of Ptolemaic Alexandria more generally.<sup>20</sup> I can accordingly be brief and selective here. In the extraordinary final couplet of the prayer, the run of Greek words with Greek case-endings (*Osirim | barbara Memphitem*) underlines the exotic nature of the Egyptian rites, which the Latin poet self-consciously marks as doubly foreign, both Greek and Egyptian, in his application to the worshippers (the *pubes* of 1.7.27) of the loaded term *barbara*. Yet Tibullus also domesticates the exotic god worshipped in foreign parts through his adaptation into limpid Latin of a line from Callimachus' epinician for Berenice II, which opened *Aetia* 3 (*SH* 254.16 [= Call. Fr. 383.16Pf]): εἰδυῖαι φαλὶὸν ταῦρον ἠλεμίσσαι ("women knowing how to bewail the white-spotted bull"). The phrase *plangere docta bouem* (1.7.28) constitutes an exact translation into Latin of Callimachus' Greek description of the exotic Egyptian rite and in its very directness and lucid Latinity normalizes the ritual for Tibullus' Italo-Roman audience.<sup>21</sup>

The celebration of Osiris/Bacchus as a culture-hero that follows (1.7.30–42) relies on a similarly imperialist gesture in the union of multiple linguistic and religious traditions:

<sup>20</sup> Bowditch (above, n.14); R. Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus* (Cambridge 2006), 50–67.

<sup>21</sup> See Zimmermann Damer in this volume (*CW* 107.4) on Tibullus' translation and phonemic allusion to Callimachus, *Hymn* 5.



Non tibi sunt tristes curae nec luctus, Osiri, sed  
 chorus et cantus et leuis aptus amor,  
 sed uarii flores et frons redimita corymbis, fusa sed  
 ad teneros lutea palla pedes,  
 et Tyriae uestes et dulcis tibia cantu  
 et leuis occultis conscia cista sacris.

(Tib. 1.7.43–48)

Not sorrow or dull care, but song and dance, Osiris,  
 and fickle love suit you, and flowers of every colour,  
 brows with ivy-berries bound, robes of saffron  
 flowing down to tender feet,  
 Tyrian fabrics, dulcet melodies upon the pipe,  
 and the wicker casket for your holy mysteries.

Greek dance (*chorus*, 1.7.44) mingles with Latin song (*cantus*, 1.7.44); Latin flowers (*flores*, 1.7.45) with Greek clusters of ivy-berries (*corymbis*, 1.7.45); Roman yellow (*lutea*, 1.7.46) with Phoenician purple (*Tyriae*, 1.7.47); Greek cloak (*palla*, 1.7.46) with Roman robes (*uestes*, 1.7.47)—all facilitating the absorption into Latin poetry and Roman rule of the exotic implements of foreign worship, the reed-pipe (*tibia*, 1.7.47) and wickerwork chest (*cista*, 1.7.48) associated with the mysteries of Greek Bacchus and Egyptian Osiris. Moreover, as Bowditch has demonstrated, the Roman appropriation of Greco-Egyptian culture on display in these lines further domesticates the already hybrid union of religious and linguistic cultures that characterized Ptolemaic Egypt (and Alexandrian literature) through Tibullus' transformation of the Egyptian god Osiris into an emblem of Latin love elegy: "Osiris' actual gendered status as an effeminate male correlates with the elegiac lover, [but] the very potency of the feminized god corresponds [still] more [closely] with elegy's construction of the powerful, dominant mistress than with her submissive paramour."<sup>22</sup> She has well discussed how "the feminizing and orientaling attributes of Osiris simultaneously reinforce his status as foreign Other *and* inscribe him in a familiar generic paradigm."<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Bowditch (above, n.14) 109. On the hybrid culture of Ptolemaic Egypt and Alexandrian literature, see P. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols (Oxford 1972); D. Selden, "Alibis," *CA* 17.2 (1998) 299–412; S. A. Stephens, *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 2003). On the Augustan poets' appropriations of Alexandrian literature, especially Callimachus, see Hunter (above, n.20).

<sup>23</sup> Bowditch (above, n.14) 110 (italics hers), with full discussion of the co-implication of Roman imperial and Latin elegiac discourses in this passage at 110–15.

Tibullus frames his own Latin domestication of Greco-Egyptian culture with Messalla's contributions to the Roman imperial project—his patron's conquest of the Aquitanians and eastern mission in foreign parts, and his repair of the Via Latina at home:<sup>24</sup>

nec taceat monumenta uiae quem Tuscula tellus  
 candidaque antiquo detinet Alba Lare.  
 namque opibus congesta tuis, hic glarea dura sternitur,  
 hic apta iungitur arte silex.  
 te canat agricola a magna cum uenerit Vrbe serus  
 inoffensum rettuleritque pedem.

(Tib. 1.7.57–62)

May visitors to Tusculum and white Alba's ancient Lar  
 talk of your memorial, the road—for here is hard-packed  
 gravel laid at your expense and here are stone blocks  
 fitted skillfully together. May farmers sing of you, as  
 they come from the great city, returning in the dark  
 without a stumble.

Tibullus' deployment of non-Latin diction in the Greek literary geographies he puts on display in elegies 1.3 and 1.7 may be interpreted as both expressing and enacting contemporary Latin literary and Roman imperial expansion and consolidation in the Mediterranean, just as the road that bears the Italian peasant back to his fields from Rome in elegy 1.7 facilitates the material movement into the great city of exotic luxury goods transported from the edges of empire.<sup>25</sup> On the linguistic plane, Tibullus' Latin elegy moves from Italian center to imperial periphery and back again, demonstrating its contact with Greco-Egyptian culture by bringing foreign words back to Rome. On the military plane, the elegy documents imperial expansion from the Italian capitol to its foreign provinces, facilitated by the construction of an Italian road financed from the spoils of foreign wars. And on the material

<sup>24</sup> On the Roman imperial apparatus set up in the provinces in the wake of Augustus' victory in the civil wars, and its goal (as in the republican period) of directing wealth from provincial periphery to imperial center, see C. Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire* (Berkeley 2000); on Egypt as a source of luxury products, see Dalby (above, n.10) 173–81.

<sup>25</sup> On the military construction and use of roads across the empire, see Ando (above, n.24) 151–52 and esp. 322–23, with further bibliography; cf. Dalby (above, n.10) 14–20, on non-military elite use of Roman roads.

plane, the importation of people, poems, and products from imperial margins to metropolitan center both implies the prior circulation of Roman generals and armies from center to margins (and back again) and also inspires the recirculation of Roman elite to the borders of empire on a variety of imperial pursuits, leisured and commercial, public and personal.

In this connection, we may conclude by examining Tibullus' deployment of foreign loanwords from the near east (appropriated into Latin through Greek though not necessarily Greek in origin) in elegies 2.2 and 2.3. The impact on the Italian elite of the influx of foreign goods to Italy in this period can be seen in Tibullan poetry most clearly in another *genethliakon*, elegy 2.2. On the occasion of his friend Cornutus' birthday, Tibullus calls for incense and perfumes from wealthy Arabia to be burned:

urantur pia tura focis, urantur odores quos tener  
 e terra diuite mittit Arabs.  
 ipse suos Genius adsit uisurus honores,  
 cui decorent sanctas mollia sarta comas. illius  
 puro destillent tempora nardo,  
 atque satur libo sit madeatque mero.

(Tib. 2.2.3–8)

Burn upon the brazier holy incense, burn the perfumes  
 which the supple Arab sends from his rich land.  
 Let the Genius be present to behold the honours paid him  
 and let soft woolen fillets adorn his hallowed hair.  
 With oil of spikenard dripping from his temples let him eat  
 his fill of cake and drink deep of the unmixed wine.

Arabia Felix, glossed by Tibullus as *terra diuite* (2.2.4), was the most important source of incense for Roman consumption, and its inhabitants a byword for opulence and soft living, as the adjective *tener* (2.2.4, perhaps a translation of the Greek adjective ἄβρός “soft,” encoding an etymological play)<sup>26</sup> may suggest. Incense (*tura*), perfumes (*odores*, 2.2.3), and spikenard (*puro nardo*, 2.2.7), an Indian aromatic from the Himalayas, were all imported into the Roman empire from the east and were once again available to the Roman elite in this period as a result of the Augustan conquest of Egypt and stabilization of the eastern

<sup>26</sup> Cairns (above, n.5) 96–97.

Mediterranean.<sup>27</sup> The opening sequence of elegy 2.2 encapsulates the tight conceptual association of leisure, luxury, and love at home with Roman imperialism abroad, for Cornutus' birthday also seems to be the occasion of his marriage:

auguror uxoris fidos optabis amores;  
 iam reor hoc ipsos edidicisse deos.  
 nec tibi malueris totum quaecumque per orbem fortis  
 arat ualido rusticus arua boue,  
 nec tibi gemmarum quicquid felicibus Indis  
 nascitur, Eoi qua maris unda rubet.

(Tib. 2.2.11–16)

I prophesy that you will pray for a wife's faithful love:  
 the Gods, I guess, already know that prayer by heart.  
 Nor would you change that choice for all the cornfields in the world  
 ploughed by sturdy peasants and the straining ox,  
 or for all the jewels that grow by India the Blest  
 where the waves of the Eastern Sea are red as blushes.

The elegiac speaker congratulates Cornutus on his choice of a wife, whom he would not exchange for all the land and treasure in the empire. Yet the particularity of the luxuries the speaker here adduces (jewels, 2.2.15), as well as their distant and exotic provenance (from the Indies, 2.2.15, via the Red Sea, 2.2.16),<sup>28</sup> implies the exquisite elegance of the addressee and his bride, their membership in the Roman aristocratic elite, and their familiarity with the choicest of imperial spoils.

In elegy 2.3, moreover, Tibullus ruefully acknowledges the appeal of exotic luxury goods to the elegiac *puella*, herself a foreign luxury import to Rome:<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> See above, n.10.

<sup>28</sup> On Rome's trade with India, and the Red Sea trade route, see Dalby (above, n.10); J. Starkey, P. Starkey and T. Wilkinson, eds., *Natural Resources and Cultural Connections of the Red Sea* (Oxford 2007); R. Tomber, *Indo-Roman Trade: From Pots to Pepper* (London 2008).

<sup>29</sup> On the elegiac *puella* as a Callimachean literary construct, see M. Wyke, "Written Women: Propertius' *Scripta Puella*," *JRS* 77 (1987) 47–61; as a Greek courtesan, see S. James, *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 2003); N. Davidson, *Courtesans & Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens* (London 1998); as a foreign import in both respects, see Keith (above, n.3) 86–114.

At tibi laeta trahant Samiae conuiuia testae fictaque  
 Cumana lubrica terra rota.  
 eheu diuitibus uideo gaudere puellas:  
 iam ueniant praedae si Venus optat opes, ut mea  
 luxuria Nemesis fluat utque per urbem  
 incedat donis conspicienda meis.  
 illa gerat uestes tenues quas femina Coa texuit,  
 auratas disposuitque uias.  
 illi sint comites fusci quos India torret, Solis et  
 admotis inficit ignis equis.  
 illi selectos certent praebere colores  
 Africa puniceum purpureumque Tyros.

(Tib. 2.3.53–62)

For you let Samian ware extend a merry party  
 and cups of clay turned on the wheels of Cumae.  
 Alas, there's no denying that girls adore the rich.  
 Then welcome Loot if Love loves affluence.  
 My Nemesis shall float in luxury and strut  
 the Roman streets parading gifts of mine.  
 She shall wear fine silks woven by women of Cos  
 and patterned with paths of gold.  
 She shall have swart attendants, scorched in India,  
 stained by the Sun-God steering near.  
 Let Africa with scarlet and with purple Tyre  
 compete to offer her their choicest dyes.

In the contrast between the Italian simplicity of the speaker's tastes (2.3.53–54) and the exotic dress of his mistress, Tibullus projects the Roman rapacity for foreign luxury items onto the elegiac *puella*, implicitly representing it as characteristic of her gender and ethnos, and denouncing her on both counts.<sup>50</sup> The vignette of Nemesis parading like the strumpet she is through the great city evokes the rich spoils of empire but frames Roman wealth and luxury as a reproach to the foreign mistress, whose diaphanous dress of “Coan” silk, rich dyes of scarlet and purple, and exotic Indian attendants, all expensive eastern

<sup>50</sup> In two important studies, P. L. Bowditch (“Propertius and the Gendered Rhetoric of Luxury and Empire: A Reading of 2.16,” *CLS* 43 [2006] 312) discusses Cynthia as a “metaphor for Roman imperialism” (308), whose conventional greed emblemizes “the state of Rome’s imperialistic attitudes” (312); and, more broadly (P. L. Bowditch, “Roman Love Elegy and the Eros of Empire,” in B. Gold, ed., *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy* [Malden, Mass., 2012] 127) on the “elegiac mistress as a trope for Roman imperialism and economic exploitation.”

luxury imports at Rome, advertise their wearer's sexual availability and thereby leave her open to the familiar denunciations of the Roman moralizing tradition.<sup>31</sup>

Elegies 2.2 and 2.3 locate both addressee and poet in the Italian center of Roman power, and illustrate the flow of luxury products into Rome from the eastern periphery of empire, in a move that both reverses and complements the imperial geographies elaborated in elegies 1.3 and 1.7. By incorporating non-Latin vocabulary into its artistic matrix, Tibullus' poetry participates in its very linguistic texture in the larger Roman imperial projects that it occludes in an ostensibly un- or anti-political presentation of elegiac themes.<sup>32</sup> This poetry thus fosters pleasure in the spoils of conquest and inspires interest in the exotic customs of foreign and subjugated peoples at the margins of empire as they are absorbed into Roman dominion. Two of the many pleasures of Tibullan elegy lie in the sentimental juxtapositions of Italian leisure with foreign geographies, and of elegiac love with exotic luxury goods, anchored as they are in the knowledge of the extent of Roman imperial power and legitimacy.<sup>33</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
akeith@chass.utoronto.ca

<sup>31</sup> On the eastern provenance of the articles of Nemesis' luxurious toilette, see Miller (above, n.10) 104–105, 108; Dalby (above, n.10) 168–72, 184; Maltby (above, n.1) 408–10 with further bibliography. On the moralizing tradition against the luxury associated with “effeminacy” (*mollitia*), see C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge 1993) 63–97. On luxurious dress and its association with Greek license, see J. Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (Chapel Hill 1986) 10.

<sup>32</sup> On the “counter-cultural” politics of elegy, see J. P. Sullivan, “The Politics of Elegy,” *Arethusa* 5 (1972) 17–34; J. P. Hallett, “The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism,” *Arethusa* 6 (1973) 103–24.

<sup>33</sup> Bowditch (2006, above, n.30) 320–21 argues that the functions of the sensuous fabrics and sparkling gems which Cynthia covets in Propertius' elegy 2.16 multiply, “as accoutrements for Cynthia and thus a target of the late republican moralistic discourse on luxury, as metonymies for the reach of Roman imperialism, as symbols of the cost of imperial poetry, and, finally, as seductive ornamentation for the poem.” Bowditch concludes that the elegiac audience's aesthetic pleasure in the poem is elicited by Propertius' systematic deployment of two systems of meaning, “the monologic desire and pathology of the lover, on the one hand, and the world of imperial expansion, on the other . . . as the poem slips into the alluring rhetoric of Hellenistic ornament.”

---

# Gender Reversals and Intertextuality in Tibullus\*

ERIKA ZIMMERMANN DAMER

ABSTRACT: This paper argues that Tibullus' practice of altering the gender of his intertextual references destabilizes gender as a biological, social, and even grammatical category in his elegies. In 1.8, Tibullus draws on images of women's adornment from Callimachus, Philitas, and Propertius to create the opening image of the *puer* Marathus. In 2.6, Tibullus draws from Catullus' lament for his brother in *carmen* 101 as he describes Nemesis' dead young sister and demonstrates his technical skill in manipulating the flexibility of grammatical gender in Latin.

## I. Introduction

Beginning as early as Ovid's elegies on Tibullus' death (*Am.* 3.9) and on his own poetic fame (*Am.* 1.15.27–28), poets and critics have charted Tibullus' influence on Augustan poetry, ranging from Horace's teasing discussions of a certain elegist, Albius, at *Odes* 1.33.1–4 and *Epistles* 1.4,<sup>1</sup> to the influence that Vergilian bucolic and agricultural poetry had

---

\* Many thanks are due to the audience members and to my fellow panelists in the panel on "New Approaches to Tibullus" at the 140th annual meeting of the American Philological Association in Philadelphia (2009); to Alison Keith, John Henkel, Sharon James, and Jim O'Hara for their generous and acute feedback throughout different stages of this project; and to Megan Drinkwater and Konstantinos Nikoloutsos for sharing advance copies of their work. The Faculty Research Council at the University of Richmond provided generous support for this project. I wish also to thank *CW*'s anonymous referees for their helpful feedback and its editors (both previous and current) Matthew Santirocco, Judith Hallett, Robin Mitchell-Boyask, and Lee Percy for being efficient, thorough, and fair.

<sup>1</sup> The Albius of these poems has traditionally been identified with Albius Tibullus. See R. J. Ball, "*Albi ne doleas*: Horace and Tibullus," *CW* 87 (1994) 409–14; R. Maltby and J. Booth, "Light and Dark: Play on *candidus* and Related Concepts in the Elegies of Tibullus," *Mnemosyne* 58 [2005] 125–26; A. Keith, "Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory," *Mnemosyne* 52 (1999) 41–62. On Tibullus' impact on Ovid in *Amores* 3.9, see J. Reed, "Ovid's Elegy on Tibullus and Its Models," *CPh* 92 (1997)

*Classical World*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2014) Pp.493–514

on Tibullus.<sup>2</sup> Few critics, however, have examined how Tibullus himself is an allusive poet engaged with his Latin Neoteric and Greek antecedents.<sup>3</sup> Tibullus' elegies, in two books of ten and six poems published between 30–27 B.C.E. and (posthumously) in 19 B.C.E., show a deep relationship with the poet's Augustan milieu and particularly with his elegiac antecedents and contemporaries. Through intertextual connections with Hellenistic, Neoteric, and contemporary authors, Tibullus demonstrates his learned and subtle version of elegiac Callimacheanism. Tibullan intertextuality, furthermore, offers a new avenue for examining elegiac gender play. Issues of sexuality and gender have been identified as a central problematic of Roman love elegy, and recent criticism has begun to interrogate how Tibullus' elegies engage with Roman gender ideologies (especially of masculinity).<sup>4</sup> I offer two test cases of Tibullus' practice of altering the gender of his intertextual references (1.8, 2.6) to explore his

---

260–69; S. Huskey, "In Memory of Tibullus: Ovid's Remembrance of Tibullus 1.3 in *Amores* 3.9 and *Tristia* 3.3," *Arethusa* 38 (2005) 367–86.

<sup>2</sup> W. R. Johnson ("Messalla's Birthday: The Politics of Pastoral," *Arethusa* 23 [1990] 95–113), D. Wray ("What Poets Do: Tibullus on 'Easy' Hands," *CPh* 98 [2003] 217–50), and M. Putnam ("Virgil and Tibullus 1.1," *CPh* 100 [2005] 123–41) offer sensitive treatments of Tibullus' response to Vergilian poetics. Prior examinations of Tibullan intertextuality have remarked how Tibullus imports and updates Vergilian pastoral into the elegiac mode. See for example J. H. Gaisser, *Catullus*, Blackwell Introductions to the Classical World (Malden, Mass., 2009); E. W. Leach, "Vergil, Horace and Tibullus: Three Collections of Ten," *Ramus* 7 (1978) 79–105; R. Maltby, *Tibullus: Elegies. Text and Commentary*. ARCA 41 (Cambridge 2002); M. Putnam (above).

<sup>3</sup> A. Bulloch ("Tibullus and the Alexandrians," *PCPS* 19 [1973] 71–89); F. Cairns (*Tibullus, A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* [Cambridge 1979]; "Tibullus 2.6.27–40: Nemesis' Dead Sister," *Eranos* 98 [2000] 65–74); and the commentaries of M. Putnam (*Tibullus. A Commentary* [Norman, Okla. 1973]), P. Murgatroyd (*Tibullus I. A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus* [London 1980]; *Tibullus, Elegies II* [Oxford 1994]), and R. Maltby (*Tibullus: Elegies. Text and Commentary*, ARCA 41 [Cambridge 2002]) offer notable exceptions.

<sup>4</sup> M. Wyke (*The Roman Mistress* [Oxford 2002]) offers a synthetic overview of research on sex/gender in Ovidian and Propertian elegy through the 1990s. Masculinity in Tibullus has recently received scholarly attention in the works of B. Fineberg ("Repetition and the Poetics of Desire in Tibullus 1.4," *CW* 92 [1999] 419–28) and P. A. Miller (*Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real* [Princeton 2004]), who both read the fragmented subjectivity and the anaphoric, dreamlike narratives of the Tibullan speaker as indicative of a fundamental instability of Roman manhood in the early years of the Principate. D. Wray (above, n.2) 217–50 contrasts the masculinity of the Tibullan speaker, who chooses the *vita iners*, with traditional Roman military masculinity, characterized by *labor*. In a series of two articles, K. P. Nikoloutsos ("Beyond Sex: The Poetics and Politics of Pederasty in Tibullus 1.4," *Phoenix* 61 [2007] 55–82; "The Boy as Metaphor: The Hermeneutics of Homoerotic Desire in Tibullus 1.9," *Helios* 38 [2011] 27–57) examines masculinity



own rich play with gender as a biological, social, and even grammatical category in the Roman world. Discussion of 1.8 demonstrates that references to Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 and to Propertius 1.2 create suspense and surprise when the gender of the character envisioned through the intertextuality is altered. Examination of 2.6, in turn, demonstrates how Tibullus reacts to Catullus 101 in the striking image of the dead little sister and points to Tibullus' technical skill in manipulating the flexibility of grammatical gender in Latin.<sup>5</sup> Tibullus' practice in these poems constitutes a system of gender inversion through intertextual references. It is my hope that this discussion will bring renewed attention to Tibullus' important contribution to elegiac practices and enrich critical understanding of Tibullus' play with elegiac gender.<sup>6</sup>

## II. Tibullus 1.8, Philitas, Callimachus, and Propertius

Tibullus 1.8 playfully incorporates the Propertian *topos* of the beloved's *cultus* alongside a reference to Callimachus' hymn to Athena, that poet's sole hymn composed in the elegiac meter, and to an epigram of Philitas of Cos. Tibullus' second poem to Marathus establishes, and then foils, expectations through his intertextual web of references. Tibullus'

---

in the Marathus cycle and argues that Tibullus' presentation of Marathus as a *scriptus puer* reveals the instability of available masculine roles of man and boy in post-civil-war Rome.

<sup>5</sup> Tibullus is not the only Latin poet to alter the grammatical gender of nouns. A. Corbeill ("Genus quid est? Roman Scholars on Grammatical Gender and Biological Sex," *TAPA* 138 [2008] 75–105) has demonstrated how Vergil's transformations of grammatical gender had canonical status in the work of late-Latin grammarians. R. Renehan ("On Gender Switching as a Literary Device in Latin Poetry," in P. E. Knox and C. Foss, eds., *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen* [Stuttgart 1998] 213–14) provides further instances of nouns of flexible gender in Latin poetry.

<sup>6</sup> P. E. Knox ("Milestones in the Career of Tibullus," *CQ* 55 [2005] 204–16), on the basis of internal dating evidence in Tibullus 1.7 and Ovid's catalogue of elegiac poets (*Tr.* 4.10.51–54), offers a reevaluation of the relative chronology of Tibullus book 1 and Propertius' *Monobiblos* and argues for the priority of Tibullus book 1. R. O. A. M. Lyne ("Propertius and Tibullus: Early Exchanges," *CQ* 48 [1998] 519–44) reinforces the traditional chronology that gives the *Monobiblos* priority. I adopt the position that Tibullus must have been aware of Propertius 1.2 before the publication of his own book 1. Yet, as Lyne has demonstrated, these poets were deeply aware of each other's poetry, and it is probable that each heard the other's poetry in performance even before it appeared in print. In this case, it seems impossible to determine the absolute priority of publication. As a result, I prefer to look at the exchanges between the two poets without presuming priority of publication.

innovation is to cross sex and gender boundaries by altering the biological sex of the characters described in these intertexts.<sup>7</sup>

Poem 1.8 has received infrequent critical attention in scholarship; most studies have examined the poem, along with 1.4 and 1.9, for evidence of male-male relationships and desire in antiquity. Nikoloutsos has demonstrated that Marathus is as tightly linked to Tibullan elegy's central concerns of "gender, poetry, economics, and the state" as the elegiac mistress.<sup>8</sup> Like the *puella*, Marathus is a literary creation and the poems that feature him cannot be considered autobiographical exemplars of contemporary same-sex love and desire in Rome. Booth looks at Tibullus 1.8 and 1.9 as a continuous narrative and argues that Marathus' salient feature is his lack of manliness.<sup>9</sup> Drinkwater has complicated studies of male-male love in Tibullan elegy by demonstrating that the Marathus series resists the claim that male-male relationships in elegy are different when she shows how closely the homoerotic experience parallels that of elegy's well-known heteroerotic one and how Tibullus has populated these elegies (1.4, 1.8, 1.9) with characters who both typify and reinforce the norms of Latin love elegy.<sup>10</sup> Verstraete places the Marathus elegies into their archaic, Hellenistic, and Roman background of same-sex love poetry in order to single out the "qualities of irony, dramatic engagement, and psychological finesse" of the love triangle formed by the poet-speaker, Marathus, and Pholoe in 1.8.<sup>11</sup> His thorough discussion of 1.8 allows me to concentrate here only on the introductory scene. My study demonstrates the instability of gender and sex roles in the poem by highlighting the complexity of Marathus' first appearance in

---

<sup>7</sup> In this practice, Tibullus builds on the precedent of Catullus, whose own gender-bending play in poems 51, 65, and 64 is well explored by M. Skinner ("Ego Mulier: The Construction of Male Sexuality in Catullus," in J. Hallett and M. Skinner, eds., *Roman Sexualities* [Princeton 1997] 129–50) and V. Panoussi ("Ego Maenas: Maenadism, Marriage, and the Construction of Female Identity in Catullus 63 and 64," *Helios* 30 [2003] 101–26).

<sup>8</sup> Nikoloutsos (above, n.4) 55.

<sup>9</sup> J. Booth, "Tibullus 1.8 and 1.9: A Tale in Two Poems?" *MH* 53 (1996) 232–47.

<sup>10</sup> M. Drinkwater, "His Turn to Cry: Tibullus' Marathus Cycle (1.4, 1.8 and 1.9) and Roman Elegy," *CJ* 107 (2012) 423–50.

<sup>11</sup> B. Verstraete, "The Originality of Tibullus' Marathus Elegies," *J Homosex*, 49 (2005) 299–313.

the poem, where it is far from clear whom the poet is addressing and to what purpose.<sup>12</sup>

Examinations of narrative technique in Tibullus 1.8 have demonstrated how long it takes to determine whether the addressee of lines 9–16 is male or female. The elegy thus works on the principle of surprise. Tibullus only gradually reveals that the narrative situation of this poem is a love triangle rather than the more typical address to the beloved or to a differently named addressee.<sup>13</sup> He directs the opening advice to an unknown addressee, whom he does not name until line 49, or define with a gendered pronoun until line 24. Up to this point, it is unclear whether the speaker's beloved is Delia (named most recently in poem 6), the boy Marathus (the beloved of poem 4, and the subject of poems 8 and 9), or some third party. Tibullus' use of previous elegiac antecedents helps maintain the suspense. The identity of the addressee is so unclear, I argue, not only because of Tibullus' narrative technique, but also because of the intertextual references present in the poem.

In 1.8, Tibullus' poet-speaker plays the role of *praeceptor amoris*. After stating his credentials as an advisor in love—because his own amorous failures have taught him how others can love successfully (1–8)—the speaker turns to his addressee and begins an elegiac complaint against excessive attention to personal appearance and cosmetics:

Quid tibi nunc molles prodest coluisse capillos  
 saepeque mutatas disposuisse comas,  
 quid fuco splendente genas ornare, quid unguis  
 artificis docta subsecuisse manu?  
 Frustra iam vestes, frustra mutantur amictus,  
 ansaque compressos colligat arta pedes.  
 Illa placet, quamvis inculto venerit ore  
 nec nitidum tarda compserit arte caput.

(Tib.1.8.9–16)

What good does it do now to have adorned your soft locks and to have arranged your oft-changed hair? What good does it do you to adorn your cheeks with bright rouge, what good to have your nails cut by

<sup>12</sup> Following W. Wimmel's observation (*Der frühe Tibull* [Munich 1968] 56) that it is unclear whom Tibullus is addressing, beloved *puella* or *puer*, P. Murgatroyd 1980 (above, n.3) and R. Maltby (above, n.3) 301–302, have followed suit.

<sup>13</sup> See F. Cairns 1979 (above, n.3) 147–51; P. Lee-Stecum, *Powerplay in Tibullus: Reading Elegies Book One* (Cambridge 1998) 227–32; R. Maltby (above, n.3) 301.

an artist's learned hand? In vain now your clothes, now your cloaks, are changed, and your narrow sandal cramps your feet. She pleases, although she has come with unadorned face, and she has not dressed her shining hair with time-taking art.<sup>14</sup>

Tibullus' description of the unnamed addressee above relies on a complex set of intertextual references to prior elegiac descriptions from Callimachus' hymn on the bath of Athena, from an epigram attributed to Philitas, and from Propertius' criticism of Cynthia's adornment in the second poem of the *Monobiblos*.

Callimachus' hymn invites celebrants to come worship Athena, but instructs them not to bring perfumes, scented oils, or mirrors to adorn the goddess' natural beauty (5.13–15). Athena's unadorned beauty contrasts with Aphrodite's, who takes up a mirror to fussily arrange and rearrange the same strand of hair: Κύπρις δὲ διαυγέα χαλκὸν ἐλοῖσα / πολλάκι τὰν αὐτὰν δις μετέθηκε κόμαν ("the Cyprian took up her shining bronze [mirror], and often altered the same strand twice," 21–22).

Tibullus' intertextuality highlights several unusual features of Callimachus' couplet. We are alerted to the reference through translation, punning, and correction of the Callimachean original.<sup>15</sup> Compare line 10 of Tib. 1.8 (*saepeque mutatas disposuisse comas*) with Callimachus' πολλάκι τὰν αὐτὰν δις μετέθηκε κόμαν. Tibullus precisely imitates the rhythm of Callimachus' pentameter and translates the Greek πολλάκι with the Latin *saepeque*. After the caesura, the practice changes, as the Latin incorporates the sound of the Greek original (δις) into the Latin *disposuisse* rather than offering a translation of the meaning. Callimachus' usage of the singular κόμαν for a single strand of hair is unparalleled,<sup>16</sup> and Tibullus changes this usage back to the plural and more standard one when he uses the Latin cognate *comas*. Tibullus thus engages in correction as well as emulation of the Callimachean original.

Bulloch notes that Callimachus' text itself looks back to earlier models; his use of διαυγέα χαλκὸν (22), a shining bronze mirror, cites an epigram of Philitas in which a *hetaira* dedicates her equipment to Aphrodite. Here Bulloch concludes that Callimachus "may be slightly

<sup>14</sup> The text of Tibullus throughout is from R. Maltby (above, n.3); all translations are my own.

<sup>15</sup> For the term "intertextual correction," see R. Thomas, *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor 1999) 127.

<sup>16</sup> See A. Bulloch, *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn* (Cambridge 1985) 151.

comparing Aphrodite to a human *hetaira*.”<sup>17</sup> Tibullus corrects his Callimachean source by returning his toilette scene to the human sphere of Philitas’ epigram.<sup>18</sup> Marathus adorns his hair, his face, his nails, changes his clothing, and tightens his sandals (1.8.9–16). Only this final detail is not to be found in dressing scenes of the *puella* in Augustan love elegy. Murgatroyd and Maltby comment on the rarity of the image of Marathus’ footwear at 1.8.14, noting that the terminology appears elsewhere only in Pliny’s *Natural History* 35.85.<sup>19</sup> While the primary allusion in the passage of 1.8 is to Callimachus’ Aphrodite through the phonemic reference,<sup>20</sup> the elaboration of details over Callimachus’ one-line image suggests that Tibullus may well have been aware of Philitas’ epigram and that the description of Marathus’ *cultus* stems from it. If so, Philitas’ epigram on the *hetaira*’s retirement of her erotic accoutrements contributes an image of sandals that is noticeably absent from other elegiac dressing scenes.<sup>21</sup> Nikias’ dedication to Aphrodite contains sandals, a window reference which may, I suggest, have provided the inspiration for Tibullus’ image of Marathus’ sandals in 1.8.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>17</sup> A. Bulloch (above, n.16) 131. For the source text, see *Anthologia Graeca* 6.210.2–4 (Philitas of Samos): Νικτιάς εἰς νηὸν Κύπριδος ἐκρέμασεν / σάνδαλα καὶ χαίτης ἀνελίγματα. τὸν δὲ διαυγῆ / χαλκόν . . . , (“In the temple of Kypris Nikias hung her sandals and a ringlet of her hair, and her shining bronze”). A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (*The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* [Cambridge 1965] 2: 476) attribute this poem to Philitas of Cos, although the attribution in the *Anthologia Graeca* is to a Philitas of Samos. Gow argues that there is not sufficient evidence to distinguish two Hellenistic poets named Philitas, and Bulloch (above, n.16) 130 follows in attributing the epigram to Coan Philitas, pace J. L. Lightfoot (*Hellenistic Collection. Philitas, Alexander of Aetolia, Hermesianax, Euphorion, Parthenius* [Boston 2009]).

<sup>18</sup> J. C. McKeown (*Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes. Vol. 1: Text and Prolegomena* [Liverpool 1987] 40) demonstrates that Ovid, at *Am.* 1.14.35–36, has recognized Tibullus’ reference back to Callimachus and thus offers an ancient agreement with our modern identification of the reference.

<sup>19</sup> Maltby (above, n.3) 306.

<sup>20</sup> For a definition of sound allusions as repetition across Greek poetry into Latin, including phonemic and phonological references, see J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford 1996) 18–19. See also discussion of Louis Zukofsky’s blending of phonetic homonymy with lexical synonymy, or “sonic approximation,” at D. Wray, *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood* (Cambridge 2001) 41, 50.

<sup>21</sup> While elegy offers many metapoetic references to feet—on which see J. Henkel in this volume (*CW* 107.4)—descriptions of elegiac *cultus* at Prop. 1.2.1–6, 2.1.1–12, 2.3a.9–22, Tib. 2.3. 51–58, 2.4.29–30 do not contain images of the *puella*’s adorned feet or of her footwear.

<sup>22</sup> For the definition of “window reference,” see Thomas (above, n.15) 130. Marathus’ sandals have been read as metapoetic. Their compressed feet represent an

Next to Callimachus, the Augustan elegists venerate Philitas as their most important generic forebear in Greek, so it is not surprising to find a reference to Philitas' erotic elegiac epigrams in a poem that contains an unmarked reference to Callimachus' elegiacs. Propertius and Ovid both explicitly name Philitas and Callimachus as important Hellenistic antecedents to Augustan love elegy.<sup>23</sup> In four passages of literary-critical homage, Propertius links Philitas with Callimachus. At 2.34.29–32, he proposes Philitas and Callimachus as better aids for capturing Cynthia's love than Socratic writings or scientific didactic poetry. Propertius opens the programmatic poem of his third book with an invocation of the deified spirits of Callimachus and of Coan Philitas and asks to be allowed membership in their poetic cult (*Callimachi manes et Coi sacra Philitae / in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus*, 3.1.1). He closes his Callimachean *recusatio* of epic by drinking from Philitean water (*Philitea aqua*, 3.3.51–52). In a further refusal to write the epic poetry that Maecenas has requested, Propertius asserts that it will suffice for him to be numbered among the books of Callimachus and to have sung in the elegiac meter of Philitas (3.9.43–44). Ovid continues to link Philitas with Callimachus: in *Ars* 3, the *praeceptor* exhorts women who wish to capture a man through their literary erudition to learn Callimachus and Philitas (329–330) before reading Propertius, Gallus, Tibullus, and his own *Amores* and *Heroides* (329–346). Later, in the *Remedia*, he urges lovers to flee Callimachus and the Coan poet when they wish to fall out of love (759–760). Apart from the elegists, Quintilian too links the two authors when he finds Callimachus to be the finest Greek elegist and grants Philitas second place (10.1.58). While Propertius and Ovid explicitly align themselves and their poetic practice with their Greek predecessors in

---

elegiac foot-pun on the shortened pentameter line of the elegiac couplet, and point to the refinement of Tibullus' verses in the Neoteric and Callimachean tradition. See Nikoloutsos 2011 (above, n.4) 35–36; B. Fineberg, "From a Sure Foot to Faltering Meters: The Dark Ladies of Tibullan Elegy," in M. DeForest, ed., *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King* (Wauconda, Ill., 1993) 249–56. These readings do not however foreclose the possibility that the source of this unusual shoe image is the sandal from Philitas' epigram on the retirement of a *hetaira*.

<sup>23</sup> For discussion of these references, see P. E. Knox ("Philitas and Roman Poetry," *PLLS* 7 [1993] 61–83, who argues that Propertius and Ovid look specifically back to Philitas' *Demeter*. P. Bing ("The Unruly Tongue. Philitas of Cos as Scholar and Poet," *CPh* 98 [2003] 330–48) remarks on the Roman reception of Philitas. See also R. K. Gibson (*Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book III* [Cambridge 2003] 231–32), who observes the Roman tendency to link Callimachus and Philitas as the greatest Greek elegists.

erotic elegy, Tibullus marks his allegiance through subtle, unmarked references, such as the window reference to Philitas' epigram in 1.8.

Critics following Wimmel have long looked to a Propertian parallel for the opening line of this passage. Propertius 1.9, addressed to the epic poet Ponticus, now in love, has been the touchstone for comparisons to Tibullus 1.8, on the basis of the similarity between the pose of the *magister amoris* in both poems, and the apparently precise recall of Propertius 1.9.9 (*quid tibi nunc misero prodest grave dicere carmen*) by Tibullus 1.8.9.<sup>24</sup> Nonetheless, as I will argue, the structure and theme of Propertius 1.2, the rejection of Cynthia's *cultus*, offers a closer parallel.<sup>25</sup> Tibullus draws on Propertius' poem alongside Callimachus' and Philitas' elegiacs on feminine *cultus*.

Tibullus' passage alludes to Propertius' critique of Cynthia's *cultus* at Propertius 1.2, where the speaker criticizes Cynthia for her ostentatious display of wealth and for her overly affected look. She has styled and perfumed her hair, she wears Coan silks, and she goes out to be seen by other prospective lovers. Next he sums up his critique: her natural beauty is more appealing than anything she could put on:

Quid iuvat ornato procedere, vita, capillo  
 et tenuis Coa veste mouere sinus,  
 aut quid Orontea crines perfundere murra,  
 teque peregrinis vendere muneribus,  
 naturaeque decus mercato perdere cultu,  
 nec sinere in propriis membra nitere bonis?  
 crede mihi, non ulla tuae est medicina figurae:  
 nudus Amor formam non amat artificem.

(Prop. 1.2.1–8)<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup> W. Wimmel (above, n.12) 58–59 establishes that the turn of phrase is characteristically Propertian, appearing both at Prop. 1.9.9 and 2.34.27–29. P. Murgatroyd 1980 (above, n.3) 252–58 adduces similarities between the openings of the two poems, the concept of nemesis, and the mocking tone of the *praeceptor amoris* in both poems. See also R. Maltby (above, n.3) 302, 305.

<sup>25</sup> P. Lee-Stecum's reading of 1.8 (above, n.13) 227–31, 244–45, in which the text prevents any attempt to gain a stable reading by continually eluding the poet-speaker's attempts to gain mastery over himself, Marathus, and Pholoe, and thus destabilizes even the reader's relationship to the texts, allows for both intertexts to be acknowledged in the Tibullan text.

<sup>26</sup> All Propertius texts are from P. Fedeli, ed., *Elegiarum Libri IV*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart 1994).

Why does it please you to walk out, my life, with arranged hair, and to move your slender bosom in a Coan dress, or why does it please to perfume your locks with Orontean myrrh, and to sell yourself for foreign goods, and to spoil nature's beauty with purchased adornment, and not to allow your limbs to shine in their own goods? Trust me, there are no cosmetics for your figure; naked Love does not love confected beauty.

Tibullus' addressee engages in *cultus* in a manner similar to that of Propertius' Cynthia, but the catalogue is more extensive, and the adornment is unsuccessful in attracting Pholoe. Marathus adorns and arranges his soft hair, he rouges his cheeks, manicures his nails, changes clothes multiple times, and binds his feet tightly in sandals (1.8.9–14). The unnamed *illa*, by contrast, is attractive although she wears no makeup (*inculto ore*) and has left her hair unstyled (15–16). While the Propertian speaker notes the efficacy of *cultus* in attracting other lovers and as a result asks Cynthia to put away her adornment, Marathus' attempts at *cultus* fail to persuade Pholoe to allow him in (1.8.27, 61–62).

The differences between Propertius' argument and Tibullus' are illustrative. Propertius' elegy is a tightly focused exercise in the anti-cosmetic tradition.<sup>27</sup> The opening image of Cynthia's *cultus* is rejected in favor of a moralizing connection between her use of cosmetics and adornment and her pursuit of other lovers. Propertius' speaker uses language characteristic of this trope when he links beauty, *forma*, with *pu-dicitia*, the Roman womanly virtue of sexual exclusivity: *illis ampla satis forma pudicitia* ("there was full enough beauty in them from their chastity," 1.2.24).<sup>28</sup> A Cynthia who promises to be exclusive to her lover is sufficiently adorned (*culta sat est*, Prop. 1.2.25). Tibullus' catalogue, by contrast, comes as part of a richly developed erotic-triangle poem. The speaker as *magister amoris* attempts to understand why the addressee has engaged in this fruitless *cultus* (1.8.9–16). The catalogue is not the subject of the poem but rather serves to introduce a warning to Pholoe to be generous with youths and not to seek out gifts (1.8.27–32). By line 27, the speaker has shifted his advice toward the haughty Pholoe, and Marathus, whom he once pursued, is the overly adorned youth in the opening passage who has now become the locked-out lover. The

<sup>27</sup> R. K. Gibson (above, n. 23) 21–25 charts the moralizing strand of the anti-cosmetic tradition from Plautus to Ovid.

<sup>28</sup> S. J. Heyworth (*Cynthia. A Companion to the Text of Propertius*. [Oxford 2007] 14) further illuminates this difficult line and emends *pudicitia* to *pudicitiae*.



complexity of Tibullus' narrative suggests that he writes in response to Propertius' more tightly constructed anti-cosmetic poem.

Tibullus 1.8, furthermore, responds to Propertius 1.2 in structural ways that suggest Propertius' priority: namely, its structured anaphora and repetition of a verbal connection. Each poet-speaker asks the same question—what is the utility of *cultus* in love—and the two poems structure the descriptions that follow in remarkably similar ways. Propertius 1.2 offers anaphora and parallel questions: *quid iuvat . . . aut quid* (1, 3); Tibullus 1.8 responds with a triple repetition and parallel questions: *quid tibi . . . prodest . . . quid . . . quid* (11–13). The third and most extensive parallel between Tibullus 1.8 and Propertius' poem comes in the traditional tagline to the warning against *cultus* in Tibullus: a lover delights even when she is unadorned (*illa placet, quamvis inculto venerit ore*, 15). By yoking *placet* with *cultus* (or its lack), Tibullus' ending looks to Propertius' reevaluation of *cultus* as *pudicitia* (*uni si qua placet, culta puella sat est*, 26).

This image from Tibullus 1.8 is an example of an ecphrasis wherein the human body's adornment becomes the objet d'art that is visualized. This scene, moreover, is an example of what we could term an elegiac type-scene of the beloved's toilette, used to attract would-be suitors.<sup>29</sup> In the rhetorical tradition, in which the elegists were well steeped,<sup>30</sup> this form of description looks like *effictio*, the vivid description of a person from head to toe.<sup>31</sup> *Effictio* is a subset of *enargeia* or *descriptio*, a description so vivid that the poem's auditor can see the scene as if it were before his own eyes.<sup>32</sup> This type of vivid description creates an

<sup>29</sup> See above, n.21.

<sup>30</sup> For a discussion of Propertius' training in rhetoric, see A. Keith, *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure* (London 2008) 19–44. See also T. Rheinhardt, "Propertius and Rhetoric," in H.-C. Günther, ed., *Brill's Companion to Propertius* (Leiden 2006) 199–215. Keith (above, n.1) demonstrates Tibullus' use of rhetorical features.

<sup>31</sup> The pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *effictio* thus: *Effictio est, cum exprimitur atque effingitur verbis corporis cuiuspiam forma, quoad satis sit ad intellegendum, hoc modo: 'hunc, iudices, dico, rubrum, brevem, incurvom, canum, subcrispum, caesium, cui sane magna est in 'mento cicatrix, si quo modo potest vobis in memoriam redire.'* ("Portrayal is when the physical appearance of somebody is described and represented such that it is sufficient to recognize him, like this: 'that man, judges, I say, the ruddy, short, bent, white and a little curly haired, the grey-eyed one who has a very large scar on his chin, if perhaps you can recall him into your memory,'" 4.49.63).

<sup>32</sup> G. Zanker ("Enargeia in the Ancient Criticism of Poetry," *RhM* 124 [1981] 297–99) demonstrates that *enargeia* caused the auditor to imagine himself as an eyewitness to the events described and to feel himself in the presence of the characters he hears described. This is also the stylistic effect of *descriptio*, the Latin translation of *enargeia*

immediacy whereby we can visualize for ourselves the person described and sense that we are experiencing reality rather than reading poetry. The simulation of this reality is the aim of ancient *enargeia*. The effect of an obvious intertextuality, by contrast, pulls in an opposite direction—the conspicuousness of the allusions to Hellenistic and Propertian antecedents pulls the reader back to an awareness of the textuality and of the created artificiality of the poem's description. This image is as much an amalgamation and reformulation of prior dressing scenes as it is a vivid description. The text thus performs Marathus' *cultus* as an immediate moment, as if drawn from life, while at the same time calling attention to the referential, literary origins for the scene of his adornment.

Through intertextuality, Tibullus 1.8 engages in a dynamic and complex fashion with the reader's expectations about gender in elegy. The force of recognition of these prior references leads the reader or auditor to expect a female object of description. Poem 1.8's description combines the images of Philitas' retired *hetaira*, Callimachus' Aphrodite at her toilette, and Propertius' Cynthia. The accoutrements described in the ecphrasis, and more compellingly created through its obvious reference to an Alexandrian–Augustan “type scene,” look back to the description of a *female* beloved. Yet poem 1.8's *cultus* turns out to be that of Marathus, the *puer delicatus* of 1.4, 1.8, and 1.9, who adorns himself in a vain attempt to attract the haughty Pholoe.

Thus, Tibullus makes use of a tendentious corrective reference, in which the reference clearly looks back to Callimachean and Propertian models but offers details that are shown to contradict the sources.<sup>33</sup> Here, that contradiction emerges only when the identity of the addressee is revealed as that of Marathus, not Delia, Pholoe, or another unnamed woman. Lyne, exploring exchanges between Tibullus and Propertius, has characterized Tibullus as a comic, clever, and amusing poet who invokes Propertian *topoi* parodically and in competition with his peer.<sup>34</sup> Lyne sees the figured descriptions of the *puella*, and especially of her *facies*,

---

(Zanker 298), defined as follows in the *ad Herennium*: *demonstratio est cum ita verbis res exprimitur ut geri negotium et res ante oculos esse videatur*, (“demonstration is when a thing is so expressed in words that the business seems to be carried out and the matter seems to appear before the eyes,” 4.55.68). On the tension between intertextuality and ecphrasis, see D. Fowler, “Narrate and Describe: The Problem of *Ekphrasis*,” *JRS* 81 (1991) 25–35.

<sup>33</sup> Thomas (above, n.15) 128.

<sup>34</sup> Lyne (above, n.6) 524–33.

as one arena of such competition.<sup>55</sup> Tibullus' transfer of a programmatically Propertian image of *cultus* to his boy-beloved can be seen in this light as well. Tibullus' first exploration of *cultus* engages a complex set of intertextual references that create an expectation of gender that the poet later corrects. A similar intertextual gender reversal also appears in the image of Nemesis' dead sister in Tibullus' final poem, 2.6.

Tibullus has often frustrated critics who wish to generalize about elegy's love relationships. While the Propertian speaker is almost exclusively interested in Cynthia for four books of poetry, and the Ovidian speaker of the *Amores* settles on Corinna for his love object, the Tibullan speaker has three different, named beloveds: Delia, Marathus, and Nemesis. Marathus, though a boy, performs many of the same behaviors that the elegiac speaker laments in his *puella*: he is greedy for presents, he spends too much time adorning himself, and he is unfaithful. Nikoloutsos has recently argued that Marathus is also, like the elegiac *puella*, a poetic creation shaped to fit the parameters of the Alexandrian elegiac aesthetic.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, elegy is not exclusively devoted to male-female love relationships. In the opening poem of the *Amores*, the *amator* allows that either a boy or a long-haired girl is an appropriate subject for love elegy (*Am.* 1.1.20). Given that Marathus engages in behaviors similar to those of the elegiac *puella*, and given the equivalence the Ovidian *amator* speaks of between the *puer delicatus* and the *puella*, it is perhaps unsurprising that Tibullus characterizes Marathus in language that elsewhere applies to a female character. But it may be that this common-sense explanation gives Tibullus less credit than he deserves. In the second half of this paper, I will explore Tibullan allusion and gender reversal in his final poem and suggest that gender reversal, whether as a biological or grammatical category, is a central aspect of Tibullus' incorporation of prior elegiac verse into his own poetry.

### III. Tibullus 2.6 and Catullus 101: Gender, Siblings, and Transgendered Allusion

The episode of Nemesis' sister in Tibullus 2.6.29–44 has received limited critical attention, and critics have chiefly demonstrated the literary

<sup>55</sup> Lyne (above, n.6) 538–44.

<sup>56</sup> Nikoloutsos 2007 (above, n.4).

heritage of this scene in early Greek epigram and Latin inscriptions.<sup>37</sup> In Tibullus' final poem, the speaker agrees to follow Macer off to camp, but love brings him back to Nemesis' door where no amount of prayers, supplications, or curses against the *lena* grants him entry to see her. The speaker's anger at her repeated refusals drives him to supplicate Nemesis by the ghost of her dead little sister. My discussion will explore how the elegiac heritage of 2.6 creates expectations about the biological gender of the sibling, especially when one views the opening lines of the passage in the context of Catullus' poems to his deceased brother. I argue that, through the use of similar images as well as precise lexical responses to Catullus 101, Tibullus 2.6.29–35 offers a second instantiation of the kind of intertextual engagement and transgendered characterization we have already seen in Tibullus' intertextual gender reversal in 1.8.

Commentators on this passage have noted allusion to Catullus 101, already well known in Augustan poetry by 19 B.C.E., in the image of the tomb of a sibling who has died too soon.<sup>38</sup> I argue for a deeper connection between the two poems and will discuss how Tibullus reacts to the images of Catullus' grief at the death of his brother in terms of word choice, phrasing, and tone:<sup>39</sup>

parce, per immatura tuae precor ossa sororis:  
 sic bene sub tenera parva quiescat humo.  
 illa mihi sancta est, illius dona sepulcro  
 et madefacta meis sarta feram lacrimis,  
 illius ad tumulum fugiam supplexque sedebo  
 et mea cum muto fata querar cinere.

(Tib. 2.6.29–34)

Spare me, I beg you, by the immature bones of your sister: thus let the little girl rest well under soft earth. She is holy to me; I shall bring gifts

<sup>37</sup> F. Cairns 2000 (above, n.3) has detailed Tibullus' relation to earlier Greek epigram and Latin inscriptions. See too M. Reeve, "Tibullus 2.6," *Phoenix* 38 (1984) 235–39.

<sup>38</sup> C. Nappa ("Catullus and Virgil," in M. Skinner, ed., *A Companion to Catullus* [Malden, Mass., 2007] 392) shows that citations of Catullus 101 appear at least eleven times in Vergil's *Aeneid*, whose publication after Vergil's death in 19 B.C.E. was nearly contemporary with the publication of Tibullus book 2. M. Putnam (above, n. 3) 198 and R. Maltby (above, n.3) 475 limit the connection to Tibullus 2.6.35. P. Murgatroyd 1994 (above, n.3) 137–39 allows a broader connection between Tibullus' image and Catullus 101.

<sup>39</sup> My discussion expands upon M. Putnam's brief observation (above, n.3) 198 on Tibullus 2.6.35 that "phraseology and tone may be borrowed from Catullus 101."

to her tomb and garlands dripping with my tears. I shall flee to her tomb and I shall sit as a suppliant there and I will lament my fate with her mute ashes.

Tibullus' lines show a suppliant lamenting his misfortunes before silent ashes and bringing garlands to the tomb of a sibling who has died too young. This image has been famously represented in Catullus 101, the epigrammatic poem that serves as the final farewell to Catullus' brother, dead near Troy. The image looks pointedly to the epigram's second couplet—*ut te postremo donarem munere mortis / et mutam nequiquam alloquerer cinerem* ("that I might bestow on you a final gift of death and address in vain your silent ashes," 101.3–4)—although Tibullus draws out elements from the entire poem. Tibullus' allusion operates by transforming both the biological and the grammatical gender of the sibling.

In each of Catullus' references to his brother's death, he addresses the deceased explicitly as "brother" (*frater*).<sup>40</sup> Tibullus' implicit addressee, by contrast, is Nemesis' sister (*tua soror* 2.6.30; *maesta soror* 38), referred to throughout the passage by the third-person feminine pronoun *illa*. Tibullus' evocation of the Catullan model thus transforms the biological gender of the sibling from male to female, from brother to sister. Brotherly language is most marked in Catullus 101, where *frater* or an adjectival form appears four times (lines 2, 6, 9, 10).<sup>41</sup> Tibullus emulates that triple repetition of *frater* with the anaphora of *illa*, *illius*, *illius* at lines 31, 32, and 33.<sup>42</sup>

There is a productive tension between the source and the target texts at work here: emulation of the Catullan model is used to create the effect of distance rather than closeness, and the gender of the sibling is

<sup>40</sup> Note for example *frater amabilior* (65.10); *fraterna mors, o misero frater adempte mihi, frater* (68a.19, 20, 21); *ei misero frater adempte mihi* (68b.91–93); *frater, heu miser indigne frater adempte mihi, accipe frater* (101.2, 6, 10).

<sup>41</sup> See discussion of this repetition, and how sound effects in Catullus 101 work with the poetic architecture at Gaisser (above, n.2) 118–21. Critics have long seen the apostrophe, *frater*, in 101, with its precisely placed appearance three times in the poem as a poetic illustration of Roman *conclamatio*, the ritual naming of the deceased three times during the last rites. On this feature, see D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus* (Toronto 2003) 537.

<sup>42</sup> R. Maltby ("Tibullus and the Language of Latin Elegy," *PBA* 93 [1999] 377–98) finds this pleonasm characteristic of Tibullus, and identifies it as a feature later taken up in Ovidian elegiacs. Wills (above, n.20) 400–403 has demonstrated that triple anaphora is characteristically elegiac and that Vergil, Lucan, Silius, and Valerius Flaccus completely avoid the practice.

changed from male to female.<sup>43</sup> In Catullus' famous epigram, he speaks to his brother, and the poetic audience is privy to an intense and direct exchange marked out by the vocatives and imperatives of the poem.<sup>44</sup> The poem emphasizes the immediate juxtaposition of first- and second-person pronouns (*quandoquidem fortuna mihi tete abstulit ipsum*, 5), and there are no intermediary connections between the two brothers except death.<sup>45</sup> Tibullus, though he quite precisely evokes this Catullan passage, considerably alters the interpersonal dynamic by addressing the beloved indirectly while speaking of, and not directly to, a third person. The emotional intensity of Tibullus' pleading, which does not affect Nemesis, is redirected at her sister. Tibullus' allusion has borrowed Catullus' sublime statement of immediate grief and folded it into a triangulation, a typically elegiac deflection of affective energy.<sup>46</sup>

Tibullus makes his closest response to Catullus at line 34, where he transforms the feminine gender of Catullus' *mutam cinerem* into the masculine-gendered *muto cinere* (*et mea cum muto fata querar cinere*, 2.6.34; compare Catullus 101.4, *et mutam nequiquam alloquerer cinerem*).<sup>47</sup> This line, I argue, points to Tibullus' technical skill in manipulating the gender of ash (*cinis*) in order to make an allusion to Catullan practice in 101. The correction of the gender of *cinis* from the rare feminine to the more typical masculine gender suggests that Tibullus' gender reversal operates on the grammatical as well as the biological level.

<sup>43</sup> Pace Murgatroyd (above, n.3) 138, for whom the speaker brings up his affection for the sister in order to arouse tenderness and pity in Nemesis.

<sup>44</sup> See Thomson (above, n.41) 537; Gaisser (above, n.2) 118–21.

<sup>45</sup> A. Feldherr ("*Non inter nota sepulcra*: Catullus 101 and Roman Funerary Ritual," *CA* 19 [2000] 209–31) shows that the performative aspects of the poem further strengthen the connection between the living and the dead.

<sup>46</sup> On the workings of emotional deflection from *puella* to others in Propertius book 4, see M. Janan, *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV* (Berkeley 2001) 85–99. See also E. Oliensis ("The Erotics of *Amicitia*: Readings in Tibullus, Propertius, and Horace," in J. Hallett and M. Skinner, eds., *Roman Sexualities* [Princeton 1997] 151–71), who observes that it is characteristic of elegiac style to create erotic triangles and triangulate relationships.

<sup>47</sup> The reference to Catullus 101 is additionally marked by phonemic allusion, or imitation of sounds of the source text. Tibullus not only draws from the image of the mute ash, but he also imitates the sound of Catullus' *alloquerer* with his own *querar*. On phonemic allusion, see Wills (above, n.20) 18–19. See also J. J. O'Hara (*True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* [Ann Arbor 1996]), who remarks that Latin poets typically made use of phonemic allusion when responding to Greek originals. Tibullus 1.8's incorporation of the sounds of Callimachus' hymn is comparable to his phonemic allusion to a Latin source text.

As with his earlier intertextual practice in 1.8, Tibullus again exploits a richly referential line of poetry in crafting the gender of the person described. Catullus' own poem, Wills has argued, participates in the Roman poetic tradition of marking allusion through gender-flexible nouns.<sup>48</sup> The Catullan line, through its use of the feminine *muta cinis* (101.4), looks back to Calvus' *fulva cinis* (*cum iam fulva cinis fuero*, fr. 27 Hollis).<sup>49</sup> *Cinis* shows flexibility of grammatical gender in Latin: though the word is typically masculine, Nonius, the fourth-century CE Roman grammarian, remarks that *cinis* takes the feminine gender in Caesar, Catullus, and Calvus (Non. 198, TLL iii, 1070.8).<sup>50</sup> Calvus' fragment comes from the *epicedion* of Quintilia, and the ash, *fulva cinis*, refers back to the deceased Quintilia. When Catullus uses the feminine-gendered *cinis* at 101.4 and 68.90, however, the gender of the deceased brother is masculine. Thus, Wills argues, the gender of the ash in Catullus' poem cannot be feminine in order to match the gender of the dead brother. It can, however, be seen as an imitation of Calvus' rare, feminine-gendered *cinis*.<sup>51</sup> Catullus' Latin maintains Calvus' play on the flexibility of the grammatical gender of *cinis* in Latin.

Tibullus, in his evocation of Catullus 101.4, returns the gender of *cinis* to the grammatically masculine form. This change is emphatic: Tibullus' Latin is very close in sound as well as in lexical and semantic content to the Catullan source. The meter would even allow maintenance

<sup>48</sup> See Wills (above, n.20) 20–21.

<sup>49</sup> Gellius, in a conversation on the flexibility of the grammatical gender of nouns in Vergil and Ennius, recalls Ennius' use of the feminine *aera fulva* as an alternative for the usually masculine *aer* in the *Annales* (see *Noct. Att.* 13.21.14.1). Gellius' speaker argues that Ennius chose the feminine gender for *aer* both on the authority of Homer, who uses the feminine form ἤερα βαθέϊαν (*Il.* 20.446) and because it seems more lovely and more sonorous. Similarly, Ennius' choice of the rare, feminine-gendered *pulvis fulva* (*Ann.* 9.315) may be formed on analogy with Greek usage (κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν, *Il.* 18.23, *Od.* 24.316). This epic tradition of gendering dust feminine in Latin may have influenced Calvus' decision to give *cinis* a feminine gender. See Wills (above, n.20) 21.

<sup>50</sup> E. Courtney (*The Fragmentary Latin Poets* [Oxford 1995] 207) offers a fuller discussion of this fragment.

<sup>51</sup> Wills (above, n.20) 21. Wills' argument is strengthened by the fact that Catullus shows familiarity with these fragments of the *epicedion* in c. 96, where the *certe* of line 5 (*certe non tanto mors immatura dolori est*) amplifies Calvus' line, *forsitan hoc etiam gaudeat ipsa cinis* (fr. 28 Hollis). On Catullus' friendship with Calvus and familiarity with his poetry, see also c. 14, 50, and 53.

of a grammatically feminine *muta cinere* in Tibullus' poem.<sup>52</sup> Nevertheless, Tibullus transforms *mutam cinerem* to *muto cinere* and rejects the rarer feminine form in favor of the more typical masculine grammatical gender. In Tibullus' poem, the ashes are those of Nemesis' little sister, not of Catullus' dead brother. Thus Tibullus not only rejects a precedent established in Ennius, Calvus, and Catullus, but he also assigns masculine gender to the ashes of a girl. This switch of grammatical gender is, I argue, a mark of allusion and a corrective nod to Catullus' own gender reversal that itself signals an allusion to Calvus' *epicedion*.

My reading of the gender switching in 2.6 foregrounds the elegist's tendency to make tendentious correction in his allusive practice, as we have already seen in the case of Tibullus 1.8. This technical demonstration of altering the gender of allusive references should be seen as part of the larger Tibullan intertextual practice of playing with gender in his transformation of brother into sister in 2.6. In poem 1.8, Tibullus used female-gendered poetic antecedents to create suspense about the addressee and narrative structure of his poem. Here, Tibullus manipulates the flexibility of grammatical gender in order to make a corrective reference back to his Catullan original that highlights a typically elegiac triangulation of affection. This second reference illustrates, in a precise and technical fashion, the gender-bending that is central to Tibullan allusive practice.

#### IV. Conclusion

Thus in 2.6, as in 1.8, Tibullus evokes well-known antecedents to arouse specific expectations about the gender of his referents. In each instance, he foils these expectations by changing the gender of his allusive targets. How do these gender reversals affect our understanding of elegy?

Critics have demonstrated that elegy is a genre built on subverting and questioning Roman expectations about gendered behavior: each elegist refers to his mistress by the term for a Roman "master"; she is a *domina*, while the normally masterful, elite Roman male plays the role of the "slave of love" (*servus amoris*), abandons military life or a political career, and

---

<sup>52</sup> While it is true that Tibullus may have chosen to use the more standard, masculine-gendered *muto cinere* simply to avoid a rhyme between *muta* and *fata*, the thematic implications suggest a deeper motive.



refuses to write epic poetry.<sup>55</sup> The genre itself is programmatically characterized as “soft” (*mollis versus*, Prop. 1.7.19), a term that serves both as a literary-critical allusion to the aesthetic polish and delicacy of Callimachean poetics and as a signal of the elegist’s refusal to write epic with its masculine values, which are figured as “hard” (*durus*).<sup>54</sup> *Mollitia*, furthermore, characterizes an effeminate male who fails to perform Roman masculinity correctly.<sup>55</sup> Although the elegiac speaker aligns himself and his poetry with an aesthetics of *mollitia*, feminist critics have demonstrated that the elegiac lover-poet’s perspective cannot silence the aspects of male dominance, female economic dependence, and the exploitation of the Roman lower classes that underpin the elegant poetic world.<sup>56</sup>

The psychoanalytic readings of Fineberg, Janan, and Miller have gone further to demonstrate the instability of gendered identities in Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid. Elegy’s discursive gender instability reflects the crisis in elite masculinity brought about by the emergence of the Principate in the late first century B.C.E. Augustus’ consolidation of

---

<sup>55</sup> Readings of elegy that see power reversals and play with gender dynamics as central to the elegiac genre have their origins in J. Hallett’s argument (“The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-cultural Feminism,” *Arethusa* 6 [1973] 103–24) that elegy expresses an early counter-cultural feminism. While many scholars have disagreed with her thesis, Hallett’s article continues to be a foundational exploration of the ways that elegy plays with Roman gender structures. D. Kennedy (*The Arts of Love. Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy* [Cambridge 1993]) responds by demonstrating elegy’s resistance to any consistent or stable discourse. These two strains of criticism have been further developed in respect to the instability of gendered positions by B. Gold (“‘But Ariadne Was Never There in the First Place:’ Finding the Female in Roman Poetry,” in N. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin, eds., *Feminist Theory and the Classics* [New York] 75–101); E. Greene (*The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry* [Baltimore 1998]); Janan (above, n.46); Wyke 2002 (above, n.4); Miller 2004 (above, n.4); S. L. James (*Learned Girls and Male Persuasion* [Berkeley 2003]); Keith (above, n.1); Nikoloutsos 2007 and 2011 (above, n.4).

<sup>54</sup> On *mollis* and *durus* in elegy, see the representative discussions at Kennedy (above, n.53) 31–33; Wyke (above, n. 4) 168–69; Miller (above, n.4) 137–43; Nikoloutsos 2007 (above, n.4) 60.

<sup>55</sup> See C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality* (Cambridge 1993) 63–97; G. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality. Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford 1999) 125–32.

<sup>56</sup> On the tension between masculine domination over text and *puella* and the elegiac aesthetics of *mollitia* in Propertius, see E. Greene, “Gender Identity and the Elegiac Hero in Propertius 2.1,” in E. Greene and R. Ancona, eds., *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry* (Baltimore 2005) 61–78. See S. L. James (above, n.53) on elegy’s erasure of the *puella*’s economic needs in favor of masculine persuasion-poetry, and Janan (above, n.46) on Propertius’ exposure of the exploitation of the Roman subaltern (slaves, prostitutes, bawds) in Propertius book 4.

power eroded traditional political methods for gaining status and for defining identity. The Tibullan lover has been seen as a subject divided, whose shifting roles (poet-lover, farmer, soldier, vituperative social critic, *exclusus amator*, country squire, *praeceptor amoris*) and shifting love relationships (Delia, Marathus, Nemesis) clearly represent the breakdown of elite identity.<sup>57</sup> Lee-Stecum furthers these readings when he argues that love elegy's "paradigmatic destabilizing force," causes the Tibullan text to acquire its characteristic instability.<sup>58</sup>

Tibullus' transformations of gender in poems 1.8 and 2.6 suggest that elegiac gender is established, however transiently, through intertextual performance. Mary Kay Gamel has demonstrated that the performance of Roman love elegy dramatizes the assumption of masculine, feminine, and effeminate gendered statuses in Roman culture.<sup>59</sup> The audience of Roman love elegy thus watched the performance of shifting gendered positions embodied through gesture, voice, and pose. Like Gamel, Maria Wyke, in her synoptic overview of critical work on love elegy, has argued that elegy's generic problematic is the performance of gender.<sup>60</sup> I wish to extend her discussion, as well as Gamel's, into the fields of poetic style and allusion.

Allusion and gender reversals are one way in which Tibullus contributes to the instability of gendered positions in Augustan elegy. Critical examinations of gender in elegy have often taken Propertius as the exemplar of elegiac gender play. Yet this essay points to Tibullus' own unique mechanism of engagement with elegiac sex and gender systems through the intertextual performance of gender reversal. Propertius presents his poet-lover as programmatically devoted to Cynthia alone in much of the first three books of his elegies. It is not until the fourth book that Propertius begins to experiment with staging different voices in a new form of aetiological Roman elegy. Tibullus, by contrast, in a much smaller

---

<sup>57</sup> See Fineberg (above, n.4) 423; Miller (above, n.4) 94–104. Janan (above, n.46), through a Lacanian reading, finds a similar incoherence within Propertius book 4 and demonstrates that women's voices become a lever to reveal failures within Roman ideological structures of male/female, pro- or anti-Augustan, Roman and non-Roman, and epic and elegiac.

<sup>58</sup> P. Lee-Stecum "Poet/reader, Authority Deferred: Re-reading Tibullan elegy," *Arethusa* 33 (2000) 212–13.

<sup>59</sup> M. K. Gamel "Reading as a Man: Performance and Gender in Roman Elegy." *Helios* 25 (1998) 79–95.

<sup>60</sup> See Wyke (above, n.4) 166–85.

corpus of sixteen poems, assigns his poet-lover three different beloveds: he alternates seamlessly between Delia (1.3, 1.5, 1.6) and Marathus (1.4, 1.8, 1.9) in the first book; assigns his poet-lover a third beloved, Nemesis, in his second book; and introduces elegy's only sustained relationship with a male beloved in the Marathus poems. Thus it is not surprising that play around reversals of biological and even grammatical gender emerges as a central aspect of Tibullan poetics.

By way of conclusion, Tibullus' intertextual performance in his alterations of biological and grammatical sex and gender categories in 1.8 and 2.6 highlights an unexpected connection between ancient rhetorical and contemporary critical theory. For the ancient rhetor, the assumption of another character *in propria persona*, through *ethopoeia*, was judged most effective when the orator persuasively assumed the ethos of the character staged. The orator's great skill lies in convincingly assuming the role of, for example, Medea before her murdered children (Libanius, *Ethopoeia* 11) or Appius Claudius Caecus before Clodia (Cicero, *Pro Caelio* 33–34), to name two disparate examples. Contemporary feminist and critical theory, meanwhile, stresses the performativity of gender. For Judith Butler, in her influential formulation of gender as a naturalized cultural construction, gender is a “repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being.”<sup>61</sup> These two forms of gender performativity differ insofar as the ancient orator consciously attempts to stage a persuasive and plausible performance of sexuality and gender. Rather, however, than seeing it as a temporary masquerade, Butler's definition of gender performativity explains the long-term process whereby a member of a given society repeatedly, and unconsciously, performs actions his or her society read as the effects of “natural” gender within a broader social and cultural matrix.<sup>62</sup> Yet ancient and contemporary theory both point to gender as a process and as a construction created through speech, gesture, action, and behaviors that become meaningful and intelligible as the performance of gender for their audiences. To understand Tibullus' gender play in light of these theories points to the deliberate way that his reversals of gender (as biological and grammatical signifier) unseat stable

---

<sup>61</sup> J. Butler, *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York 1990) 45.

<sup>62</sup> Butler (above, n.61) 185–193.

gendered positions, and it highlights the radical instability of male and female gendered roles within his elegiac corpus.

In the preceding analysis, I have examined two small slices from Tibullus' corpus of sixteen poems in an effort to describe Tibullus' intertextual practices. His art of reference alludes to prior elegiac moments in a way that alters the gender of the source texts. In 1.8, Tibullus fashions Marathus to appear like an elegiac *puella*, overly devoted to his own appearance and contrasted with the woman who pays no attention to *cultus*. In this respect, the passage looks back to Propertius 1.2, a poem exemplary in the Roman elegiac tradition for its attention to the anti-cosmetic tradition.<sup>63</sup> Tibullus also boldly incorporates the elegiac Callimachus, as he transforms Callimachus' mirror-gazing Aphrodite into the well-coiffed Marathus, thus transsexing as well as translating the gender of his intertextual referent. In 2.6, Tibullus looks back to Roman love elegy's first poet<sup>64</sup> as he evokes Catullus' lost brother of 101 in his own image of Nemesis' dead sister. These two passages not only reveal Tibullus' complex method of overlaying his own poetics onto the existing tradition of elegiac poetry, but also demonstrate how he uses allusion to play with gendered roles in Roman love elegy. Throughout, I have highlighted Tibullan allusivity and have shown how an awareness of his poetic practice further muddies attempts to distinguish between a poet's style and the poetic text's substance. Tibullus participates in elegy's performance of gender by exposing the mutability of his referents' genders. Marathus plays the woman's part and Nemesis' unnamed sister becomes a more richly detailed character through her textual family tree. Tibullus' sophisticated intertextual practice of gender reversal thus gives added justification to Quintilian's famous praise of Tibullus as the premier Roman elegist: *elegia quoque Graecos provocamus, cuius mihi tersus atque elegans maxime videtur auctor Tibullus* ("we also rival the Greeks in elegy, among whom Tibullus seems to be the most polished and elegant," *Inst. Orat.* 10.1.93).

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND  
edamer@richmond.edu

<sup>63</sup> See R. K. Gibson. *Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book III* (Cambridge 2003) 21–25.

<sup>64</sup> While Quintilian does not categorize Catullus as one of the Roman elegists in his list of Gallus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid (*Inst. Orat.* 10.1.93), H. Gardner ("Ariadne's Lament: The Semiotic Impulse of Catullus 64," *TAPA* 137 [2007] 147–79) persuasively demonstrates how the elegists included Catullus as one of their own forebears.

---

# Sexual Promiscuity of Non-Greeks in Herodotus' *Histories*

RICHARD WENGHOFFER

ABSTRACT: This paper examines Herodotus' characterization of the sexual customs and habits of barbarians (i.e., non-Greeks) in the *Histories*. The argument to be advanced in this study is that Herodotus describes non-Greek populations as sexually promiscuous and implies that, at least by Greek standards, their marital relations constitute a sort of *μοιχεία* (i.e., adultery/corruption). Moreover, since the *μοιχός* (adulterer/corrupter) was typically seen as an unmanly or emasculated figure in the Classical Greek imagination, this paper further argues that Herodotus is utilizing prevailing notions of gender and sexuality as a way of more broadly articulating non-Greek cultures as essentially unmanly in general.

The ethnographic digressions in Herodotus' *Histories* have attracted considerable scholarly attention for the light they can shed not only on Greek perceptions of non-Greeks (barbarians) in the aftermath of the Persian Wars, but also for what they can tell us about how Greeks understood themselves and their relationships to the non-Greek civilizations around them. One particular area of Herodotus' ethnography that has not been thoroughly explored, however, is his characterization of barbarian sexual mores. Herodotus frequently draws his audience's attention to the sexual habits of non-Greek peoples and in so doing paints a fairly consistent picture of barbarian sexual libertinism. It is the contention of this paper that, in characterizing barbarians as sexually profligate, Herodotus is utilizing ideas about gender and sexuality prevailing in Classical Greece to articulate ethnic identity so as to depict non-Greek men as unmanly, in particular, by categorizing non-Greek sexual behavior as a sort of *μοιχεία* (adultery/corruption). Herodotus' description of barbarian sexual customs as *μοιχεία* thus simply reflects the image of the servile and weak barbarian male that was already coming to prominence in the fifth century B.C.E.

*Classical World*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2014) Pp.515–534

Herodotus characterizes many non-Greek societies as sexually over-permissive. Women in these societies are either routinely prostituted without a second thought by parents or husbands, or else held in common by all the men in the community and are freely available for their sexual gratification. The first such description is encountered in Herodotus' account of Lydian customs. In the reign of Croesus, we are told, the Lydians erected a tomb for Croesus' father, Alyattes, paid for primarily by contributions from Lydia's prostitutes. Herodotus then uses his account of the tomb and the role played by the prostitutes in financing it to introduce a claim concerning universal Lydian prostitution:

τοῦ γὰρ δὴ Λυδῶν δήμου αἱ θυγατέρες πορνεύονται πᾶσαι, συλλέγουσαι σφίσι φερνάς, ἐς ὃ ἄν συνοικήσωσι τοῦτο ποιέουσαι· ἐκδιδοῦσι δὲ αὐταὶ ἑωυτάς.<sup>1</sup>

(1.93.4)

All the daughters of the common Lydian people prostitute themselves, gathering together a dowry and they do this to contract a marriage. Moreover, the women give themselves in marriage.

After Herodotus pauses to give this ethnographic “fact” to his audience, he continues with his description of Alyattes' tomb. The remark regarding Lydian dowries is clearly out of place in a description of a royal tomb, and it has only the prostitution theme in common with the main narrative. Clearly, then, Herodotus considered the story of how Lydian women allegedly acquired their dowries—that is, through prostitution—sufficiently significant in its own right to merit mention, and the awkward placement of the account in a narrative otherwise devoted to the unrelated topic of Alyattes' tomb indicates that Herodotus intended to draw attention to this specific aspect of Lydian customs. More significant for our discussion, however, is what the Lydians do with these dowries raised through prostitution. Lydian women use their dowries to choose their own husbands, thus according them a sexual and social freedom that would be unthinkable in Greece. While there is considerable debate surrounding the question of just how secluded, segregated,

---

<sup>1</sup> Greek edition of Herodotus' *Histories* comes from *Perseus Digital Library* at <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.01.0125>. All translations are my own.

and controlled Greek women were in their daily lives,<sup>2</sup> there can be little doubt that they were not permitted to marry anyone they chose, let alone prostitute themselves in order to collect a dowry. Such arrangements would have been simply unthinkable in any Classical Greek polis.

Herodotus makes similar remarks regarding the sexual mores of the Babylonians. At one point in the distant past, Herodotus notes, the Babylonians had the custom of auctioning off their brides to the highest bidder (1.196). What follows reads like a bad off-color joke where the most attractive brides fetch the highest price, while the least attractive would have to pay a prospective husband to take them (1.196). More significantly, neither the bride nor her parents play any role in the arrangements.

ἐκδοῦναι δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα ὅτεφ βούλοιτο ἕκαστος οὐκ ἐξῆν, οὐδὲ ἄνευ ἐγγυητέω ἀπάγεσθαι τὴν παρθένον πριάμενον, ἀλλ' ἐγγυητὰς χρῆν καταστήσαντα ἢ μὲν συνοικήσειν αὐτῇ, οὕτω ἀπάγεσθαι . . . ἐξῆν δὲ καὶ ἐξ ἄλλης ἐλθόντα κόμης τὸν βουλόμενον ὠνέεσθαι.

(1.196.3–4)

A man is not permitted to give his own daughter in marriage to whomsoever he wishes, nor can the one who is paying carry off the maiden without security, but he provides surety that he will marry her. . . . It is also permitted for men wishing to do so to come from another village to purchase [a maiden].

Anyone from any village can thus come and purchase a bride of their own choosing, and neither the bride nor the parents have any say in the transaction. A similar practice is ascribed to the Illyrian Eneti as well (1.196.1). Now, Herodotus continues, this practice, which he calls their σοφώτατος (“wisest”) custom, has disappeared owing to their loss of independence and accompanying poverty, and every Babylonian commoner, much like the Lydians, now simply prostitutes their daughters in order to procure an income: ἐπεὶτε γὰρ ἀλόντες ἐκακώθησαν καὶ οἰκοφθορήθησαν, πᾶς τις τοῦ δήμου βίου σπανίζων καταπορνεύει τὰ θήλεα τέκνα (“For since, having been conquered, they have been despoiled and ruined, every one of the common people lacking a means of subsistence prostitutes their female children,” 1.196.5). Beyond the

<sup>2</sup> See D. Cohen, “Seclusion, Separation, and the Status of Women in Classical Athens,” *G&R* 36 (1989).

need to produce an income, moreover, Herodotus notes that all Babylonian women must also prostitute themselves before the sanctuary of Aphrodite at least once in their life and μιχθῆναι ἀνδρὶ ξείνῳ (“have sex with a strange man”), a custom which he describes as αἴσχιστος (“their most shameful,” 1.199.1). Again the women are not allowed to refuse any solicitation for sex regardless of the man or the amount of money offered: τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον μέγαθος ἐστὶ ὅσον ὦν· οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἀπόσῃται· οὐ γὰρ οἱ θέμις ἐστὶ· γίνεται γὰρ ἰρὸν τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον. τῷ δὲ πρώτῳ ἐμβαλόντι ἔπεται οὐδὲ ἀποδοκιμῶ οὐδένα (“The sum of silver is what it is; for she will not refuse it, since this is the custom; for this money becomes holy. She follows the first man who tosses [a coin], and she refuses no one,” 1.199.4). After the transaction has been completed, the women in Babylon will never surrender their honor for any amount of money. Even so, however, the main outline of the picture painted by Herodotus is one of the sexual availability of Babylonian women to *any* man.

Among the Massagetae, Herodotus notes, the men each marry only one wife, but they all make their wives available to others for sexual intercourse.

νόμοισι δὲ χρέωνται τοιοῖσιδε. γυναῖκα μὲν γαμέει ἕκαστος, ταύτησι δὲ ἐπίκοινα χρέωνται· τὸ γὰρ Σκύθας φασὶ Ἕλληνας ποιεῖν, οὐ Σκύθαι εἰσὶ οἱ ποιέοντες ἀλλὰ Μασσαγέται· τῆς γὰρ ἐπιθυμῆση γυναικὸς Μασσαγέτης ἀνὴρ, τὸν φαρετρεῶνα ἀποκρεμάσας πρὸ τῆς ἀμάξης μίσγεται ἀδεῶς.

(1.216.1)

They use the following customs: while each man marries a wife, they use them in common: the Greeks say that the Scythians do this, but it is not the Scythians who do this but the Massagetae. For, should a man desire a Massagetan woman, then, after hanging his quiver before her wagon, he has sex with her without fear.

Herodotus points out that most Greeks ascribed this behavior to all the Scythians in general, indicating that the belief in Scythian sexual promiscuity was not simply a product of Herodotus’ imagination, but reflects a broader Greek perspective on the sexual behavior of non-Greeks, although Herodotus himself limits this behavior solely to the Scythian tribe of the Massagetae. While the element of prostitution is missing from this particular account, the emphasis of the narrative is still upon Massagetan promiscuity.



The Scythian tribes are not the only peoples to practice “wife-swapping.” Herodotus records similar behavior among a number of the Libyan tribes as well:

Ἀγάθυρσοι δὲ ἀβρότατοι ἀνδρῶν εἰσι καὶ χρυσοφόροι τὰ μάλιστα, ἐπικοινωνοῦν δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν τὴν μίξιν ποιεῦνται, ἵνα κασίγηται τε ἀλλήλων ἔωσι καὶ οἰκῆιοι ἐόντες πάντες μήτε φθόνῳ μήτε ἔχθει χρέωνται ἐς ἀλλήλους. τὰ δὲ ἄλλα νόμια Θρήϊξι προσκεχωρήκασι.

(4.104)

The Agathyrans are the daintiest of men, and are especially adorned with gold, and they make common use of their women when it comes to sex, so that they might be brothers to one another and, being kin, they would have dealings with one another with neither ill will nor hatred. But their other customs resemble the Thracians.

In a manner similar to the Massagetae, Nasamonean men have multiple wives, but again, any Nasamonean woman is available to any man for sex: γυναικας δὲ νομίζοντες πολλὰς ἔχειν ἕκαστος ἐπικοινωνοῦν αὐτέων τὴν μίξιν ποιεῦνται τὴν παραπλησίῳ τῷ καὶ Μασσαγέται: ἐπεὰν σκίπωνα προστήσωνται, μίσγονται (“It is customary that each man has many wives; however they make common use of them for sex in a similar way to the Massagetae. Whenever they have sex, they place their staff out front [i.e., of the woman’s home],” 4.172.2). At weddings the bride is expected to have sex with all of the guests one after another, and the guests are to offer wedding gifts to the bride in an exchange reminiscent of prostitution: πρῶτον δὲ γαμέοντος Νασαμῶνος ἀνδρὸς νόμος ἐστὶ τὴν νύμφην νυκτὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διὰ πάντων διεξελεθῆναι τῶν δαιτυμόνων μισγομένην· τῶν δὲ ὡς ἕκαστος οἱ μιχθῆ, διδοῖ δῶρον τὸ ἂν ἔχη φερόμενος ἐξ οἴκου (“When a Nasamonean man is first married it is the custom for the young bride on the first night to pass among all the guests having sexual intercourse. And after each of those men has had sex with her, he gives as a gift whatever he has brought with him from home.” 4.172.2).

Sex among the Gindanes is similarly promiscuous:

Μακέων δὲ τούτων ἐχόμενοι Γινδᾶνες εἰσί, τῶν αἰ γυναικες περισφύρια δερμάτων πολλὰ ἐκάστη φορεῖ κατὰ τοῖόνδε τι, ὡς λέγεται· κατ’ ἀνδρα ἕκαστον μιχθέντα περισφύριον περιδέεται· ἢ δὲ ἂν πλείστα ἔχη, αὐτὴ ἀρίστη δέδοκται εἶναι ὡς ὑπὸ πλείστων ἀνδρῶν φιληθεῖσα.

(4.176)

After these Macae, the Gindanes hold sway, each of whose women wears many leather anklets, so they say, in this way: they tie on an anklet for each man who has had sex with them. She who has the most is considered to be the best since she has been loved by the most men.

Finally, the Auseans too “have intercourse with their wives promiscuously” (μίξιν δὲ ἐπίκοινων τῶν γυναικῶν ποιέονται) and “have sex in beastly fashion” (κτηνηδὸν τε μισγόμενοι 4.180.5). Paternity is then determined by a communal verdict as to which man the child most closely resembles.

Closer to home, the Thracians are not overly concerned with the sexual behavior of their daughters. Herodotus notes that while wives are kept under a strict watch to ensure their fidelity, Thracians allow their daughters “to have sex with any men they want” (ἐῶσι τοῖσι αὐταῖ βούλονται ἀνδράσι μίσγεσθαι, 5.6.1). Herodotus does not say what unmarried Thracian women do with this freedom, but the implied assumption is that Thracian women, or at least the unmarried ones, are, like their other barbarian counterparts, freely available for the sexual gratification of men at their own discretion. Again, such freedom accorded to unwed daughters would be unthinkable in any Classical Greek polis.

The ubiquity in the *Histories* of the theme of promiscuity and female sexual freedom and choice among barbarian societies ought, however, to raise a red flag for the critical reader. How much credence ought we to accord Herodotus on the question of barbarian sexuality? How would Herodotus know about the sexual habits of so many cultures? Attempts have been made to read some of these passages as cultural misunderstandings of certain non-Greek marital practices.<sup>3</sup> It is possible, though unlikely, that Herodotus is attempting to describe some form of polyandrous marriage among the Massagetae and Libyans. But anthropologists have noted that polyandrous arrangements account for less than one percent of all known marriage patterns past and present, and even among the few that are known, the tendency is toward “fraternal” or “adelphic” polyandry, where one woman will marry and have

---

<sup>3</sup> See R. A. McNeal (“The Brides of Babylon: Herodotus 1.196,” *Historia* 37 [1988] on Herodotus’ misunderstanding of Babylonian marital practices and the auctioning off of brides.

sexual relations with a set of brothers.<sup>4</sup> Cases of non-fraternal polyandry are virtually unheard-of. Strictly speaking, Herodotus does not describe polyandrous relationships in the case of the Massagetæ and the Libyan tribes. In none of these cases do we hear of one woman with multiple husbands. The Massagetæ have monogamous marriages but allow their wives to have sexual relations with whomever they please. The Namsoneans do likewise but are in fact polygamous. Herodotus does not inform his audience as to the marriage patterns among the Gindanes, Agathyrans, and Auseans; however, they all make common use of their wives for sexual intercourse. There are in fact no documented examples of this kind of institutionalized “wife-sharing” as described by Herodotus and so we must be skeptical of the image he has presented.

Herodotus tells his audience that Babylonians and Lydians prostitute their daughters in order to procure an income and to raise a dowry and that in both instances their daughters choose their own husbands. Again, such prostitution and female choice of a marriage partner seems unlikely in agricultural economies where land and inheritance are so closely tied to economic livelihood and social status. The general tendency in such economies is to control the sexuality of daughters and to carefully arrange their marriages, typically with a view to considerations of property and establishing social and economic relationships between families, however these are defined. Here too then we must employ considerable skepticism when reading Herodotus’ description of the sexual habits of the Babylonians and Lydians. We might therefore consider the possibility that Herodotus has a specific authorial objective in mind when he ascribes such widespread sexual freedom among non-Greeks.

Herodotus was, of course, as much an ethnographer as he was a historian, so it should come as no surprise that he would seek to contrast Greek and non-Greek sexual behavior among various other points of cultural comparison. Herodotus does not say where he got his information concerning the sexual habits of non-Greek societies, although it is improbable that he invented them out of whole cloth. It is far more likely that he simply tapped into prevailing stereotypes regarding barbarian sexual behavior in order to surprise and entertain a Greek audience

---

<sup>4</sup> A. Trevithick, “On Panhuman Preferences for Monandry: Is Polyandry an Exception?” *J Comp. Fam. Stud.* 28 (1997); D. P. Schmitt, “Fundamentals of Human Mating Strategies,” in D. M. Buss, ed., *The Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*, (Hoboken, N. J., 2005) 263–64.

for whom such behavior would have been unusual. However, it is also important to consider what role these descriptions play in Herodotus' broader narrative. It is not unreasonable to read Herodotus' depictions of barbarian sexual libertinism against the backdrop of the growing sense of Hellenic consciousness of superiority over non-Greeks consequent to the Greek victories over Persia in the early fifth century B.C.E., as this was the cultural milieu in which Herodotus lived and worked. A number of scholars have argued that the Persian Wars resulted in an increasing Greek interest in foreign customs and how they related to their own cultural practices (*nomoi*).<sup>5</sup> Herodotus was certainly interested in comparative ethnologies and he clearly saw culture as a crucial feature of historical explanation,<sup>6</sup> which is why he writes so expansively on matters ethnographic. Moreover, Herodotus' interest in comparing cultural practices in order to define a strictly Hellenic cultural identity is in fact reflective of a broader intellectual trend that seems to have grown in prominence over the course of the fifth century B.C.E., although its origins can be traced to earlier periods.<sup>7</sup>

More controversial, perhaps, is the argument that the Persian Wars resulted in the creation of the barbarian as a pejorative anti-Greek figure.<sup>8</sup> This argument holds that after the Persian Wars non-Greek *nomoi* were increasingly characterized as the antithesis of, and inferior to, Greek habits and thus comparative ethnography came to play a crucial role in

---

<sup>5</sup> H. Diller, "Die Hellenen-Barbaren-Antithese im Zeitalter der Persekiere," *Grecs et barbares. Six exposés et discussions par Hans Schwabl, Hans Diller, Olivier Reverdin, Willy Peremans, H. C. Baldry, Albrecht Dihle* (Geneva 1962) 37–82; F. Hartog, *Le Miroir d'Hérodote: Essai sur la représentation de l'autre* (Paris 1980); E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford 1989); J. Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago 2002) 172–89.

<sup>6</sup> R. Winton, "Herodotus, Thucydides, and the Sophists," in C. Rowe and M. Schofield, eds., *Greek and Roman Political Thought* (Cambridge 2000) 103; W. Nippel, "The Construction of the 'Other,'" in T. Harrison, ed., *Greeks and Barbarians* (New York 2002) 289.

<sup>7</sup> L. Mitchell, *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Swansea 2007) 10–25; J. E. Skinner, *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus* (Oxford 2012).

<sup>8</sup> Hartog (above, n.5); Hall (above, n.5); J. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge 1997) 44–48; E. E. Cohen, *The Athenian Nation* (Princeton 2000) 23; M. A. Flower, "From Simonides to Isocrates: The Fifth-Century Origin of Fourth-Century Panhellenism," *CLAnt* 19 (2000) 65. Mitchell (above, n.6) 25–31 and J. Grethlein ("Die Griechen-Barbaren Dichotomie im Horizont der *conditio humana*," *Heidelberger Jahrbuch* 54 [2012] 135–47) note that the argument that Greek writers began to represent the barbarian as a wholly negative anti-Greek caricature has been largely overstated.

explaining Greek military successes over the Persians and in cementing a Hellenic identity. Some, however, have argued that Herodotus did not possess the cultural chauvinism of many of his contemporaries and that the *Histories* in fact advocates cultural tolerance and relativism.<sup>9</sup> More recently more nuanced positions have emerged. Jonas Grethlein in particular has recognized that while the Greek–Barbarian antithesis can be identified throughout Classical Greek literature, including Herodotus’ *Histories*, that antithesis is often unstable, frequently undermined, and not always used to cast the “other” in a pejorative light.<sup>10</sup> But whether or not we agree with any one of these positions, there is little doubt that the climate of public opinion in which Herodotus was writing was such that many did indeed regard certain non-Greek customs as inferior, as we shall see below. Herodotus certainly could not have been immune to such widespread prejudices in the Greek-speaking world, and he no doubt crafted his narrative so as to reflect the tastes and interests of his wider Greek audience, as any Greek author who wished his work to be well received might well have done. We must therefore consider how Herodotus’ Greek audience would likely have understood the barbarian sexual mores he describes.

How, then, would a Greek audience have understood Herodotus’ description of the sexual liberalism of non-Greeks? In formulating a response to this question a useful parallel might be found in Helene Foley’s remarks regarding how an Athenian audience would have reacted to the presentation of those remarkably strong women who stepped outside their expected domestic roles in tragedy:

. . . the Athenian audience must have brought to their experience of the remarkable women of drama a way of understanding these characters which grew out of their psychological, religious, political, and social lives and problems.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Diller (above, n.5) 32; J. A. S. Evans, “*Despotes Nomos*,” *Athenaeum* 57 (1965) 142; C. Dewald, “Women and Culture in Herodotus’ *Histories*,” in H. P. Foley, ed., *Reflections on Women in Antiquity* (New York 1981) 113; K. H. Waters, *Herodotus the Historian: His Problems, Methods, and Originality* (Oklahoma 1985) 110–15; Winton (above, n.6) 104–105; B. Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton 2004) 261–77.

<sup>10</sup> Grethlein (above, n.8).

<sup>11</sup> H. P. Foley, “The Conception of Women in Athenian Drama” in H. P. Foley, ed. (above, n.9) 133.

There can be no doubt that Herodotus too would have interpreted the stories he had heard about non-Greek sexual behavior in terms of his own cultural experiences, and that his audience would have similarly contextualized the sexual behavior he ascribes to barbarians in terms of their own social and cultural frame of reference. To most Greek audiences then, the sexual behavior that Herodotus ascribes to non-Greek societies would likely have been considered *μοιχεία*, or at least something analogous to *μοιχεία*. *Μοιχεία* is a term frequently used in Athenian courts to mean simply “adultery,” that is marital infidelity, but which in fact carried a much broader meaning extending to the physical corruption of any member of a freeman’s *oikos*, whether his wife, daughter, son, mother, or slave.<sup>12</sup> In the case of the sexual licence among Libyan women, the Massagetae, and the ritual prostitution of Babylonian women, we have an act of *μοιχεία* in the sense of marital infidelity sanctioned by local *nomoi* and by the presumed male head of the household, while the Lydians and Thracians allow their daughters to be corrupted by any man who catches their fancy or who is willing to pay.

It is perhaps tempting to view Herodotus’ description of the sexual habits of non-Greek women in the context of the cultural relativism that is often ascribed to Herodotus. Carolyn Dewald argues that when Herodotus describes gender relations among non-Greeks he is in fact declaring that “[n]o particular pattern is necessarily better than another,”<sup>13</sup> and concerning Herodotus’ description of barbarian sexual customs specifically she notes:

In reports of exotic sexual customs, if anywhere, one would expect to find some of the darker aspects of Greek folk culture to assert themselves. Here, however, Herodotus once more pointedly avoids the theme of gynocracy, female domination of the male. Although some of the habits reported are strange and even shocking in the context of Greek custom, in Herodotus’ ethnographies women never threaten the men of their own society or arrogate to themselves a power not rightfully theirs.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> C. Patterson, *The Family in Greek History* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998) 114–21. For a narrower definition of *moicheia* as marital infidelity and its treatment under Athenian law, see D. Cohen, *Law, Sexuality, and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1991) ch. 6; cf. Lysias 1. 32–33.

<sup>13</sup> Dewald (above, n.9) 102.

<sup>14</sup> Dewald (above, n.9) 102–105.

But while it is true that Herodotus nowhere ascribes gynocratic social practices to non-Greek peoples, we cannot conclude from this that when it comes to the sexual behavior he describes Herodotus is attempting to convey the message that “[n]o particular pattern is necessarily better than another.” He certainly does not say so explicitly. Instead, he simply presents his account with little in the way of commentary, and in the few instances where he does provide moral judgments these are typically negative. He thus refers to the Babylonian practice of ritual prostitution as “most shameful” (αἴσχιστος) and the promiscuity of the Auseans as “bestly” (κτηνηδόν). The Indians too are said to copulate like cattle (κατά περ τῶν προβάτων, 3.101.1). As Dewald herself points out, the sexual habits Herodotus describes would have been “shocking in the Greek context.”<sup>15</sup> It is thus far more reasonable to assume that Herodotus’ audience would have found much of what he presents as shocking as Herodotus himself would have done. Moreover, he says nothing explicitly to ameliorate the shock with which his audience would surely have heard such tales. To a Greek audience, then, the sexual habits of non-Greeks would have appeared adulterous. Herodotus of course never applies the Athenian legal term μοιχεία to the sexual habits of barbarians, but there can be little doubt that most Greeks, and Athenians in particular, would have viewed the behavior Herodotus describes as some form of it. In any case, to use the legal term μοιχεία would be a logical non sequitur in that Herodotus was not writing exclusively for an Athenian audience.

More importantly, however, Herodotus’ implicit suggestion that barbarian marital relations constituted a sort of μοιχεία also carries with it certain ethnological assumptions of a highly gendered character, insofar as the μοιχός (“adulterer/corrupter”) was an effeminized figure in Classical Greece.<sup>16</sup> Women were believed to possess a voracious sexual appetite that they could not control and so required close surveillance, while men were held to possess σωφροσύνη (“self-control”).<sup>17</sup> It would come

<sup>15</sup> Dewald (above, n.9), 102–103.

<sup>16</sup> Patterson (above, n.12) 123; M. B. Skinner, *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture* (Malden, Mass., 2005) 14–15. cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.332–334 where Menalaus describes Penelope’s suitors as “impotent” or “cowardly” for wishing to violate Odysseus’ marriage bed: ὃ πόποι, ἢ μάλα δὴ κρατερόφρονος ἀνδρὸς ἐν εὐνῇ / ἢ θελὼν εὐνηθῆναι ἀνάγκιδες αὐτοὶ εὐντες.

<sup>17</sup> Foley (above, n.11) 132; P. Wolcott, “Greek Attitudes toward Women: The Mythological Evidence,” *G&R* 34 (1984) 37–47; L. A. Dean-Jones, “The Politics of Pleasure: Female Sexual Appetite in the Hippocratic Corpus,” *Helios* 19 (1992) 72–91; M. B. Skinner (above, n.16) 291, n.10.

as no surprise to a Greek audience that barbarian women should behave promiscuously. But what would shock a Greek audience is that barbarian men would allow their women to behave in this way and would themselves evince such a lack of self-control. Herodotus effectively emasculates barbarian men by characterizing them as lacking σωφροσύνη, thus equating them with μοιχίοι in the minds of his audience. Herodotus therefore is articulating ethnic *otherness* by employing constructed gender dichotomies as Greeks understood them. Barbarian/feminine/sexually voracious is thus constructed as the antithesis of Greek/masculine/self-controlled, a tendency, as we shall see, that became prominent in both literary and artistic representations of the image of the barbarian after the Persian Wars.<sup>18</sup> Thus, in keeping with the prevailing intellectual tastes current in first half of the fifth century B.C.E., Herodotus depicts non-Greek sexual behavior as the inverse or polar opposite of Greek custom. Barbarians allow the women of their household to be corrupted and in turn corrupt the wives of others. Herodotus has thus characterized barbarian sexual customs as μοιχεία and has provided his reader with a highly gendered interpretation of their sexual *nomoi*.

Nor is his account of barbarian sexual mores the only place where Herodotus uses images of gender as a lens for articulating the differences between Greek and foreign *nomoi*.<sup>19</sup> The most obvious and often cited example is Herodotus' description of the division of labor in Egypt. Specifically, Herodotus notes that in Egypt the gender roles are exactly the opposite of what one would find in Greece. Women work outside the home while men work inside. Weaving, a woman's task in Greece, is performed by men in Egypt. Men carry loads on their heads while women carry them on their shoulders. Women urinate while standing up while men do so squatting (2.35.2–3). The mere fact that Egyptian men remain at home and perform women's activities would surely have been quite sufficient to characterize them as effeminate, and therefore

---

<sup>18</sup> E. Hall, "Asia Unmanned: Images of Victory in Classical Athens," in J. Rich and G. Shipley, eds., *War and Society in the Greek World* (New York 1993) 108–33; V. Gray, "Herodotus and the Rhetoric of Otherness," *AJP* 116 (1995) 208; M. B. Skinner (above, n.16) 95.

<sup>19</sup> M. Rosellini and S. Saïd, "Usages de femmes et autres nomoi chez les 'sauvages' d'Hérodote: essai de lecture structural," *Annali della Scuola normale superior di Pisa* 8 (1978) 997–1003; Gray (above, n.18).



as weak and servile in the Greek imagination.<sup>20</sup> Herodotus does not state explicitly that Egyptian men are effeminate because he does not need to do so. To his audience this would seem obvious in the Egyptian gender-role reversals as Herodotus has articulated them. If Herodotus meant to convey the message that “no particular pattern is necessarily better than another,” we should expect him to say so clearly in such instances, but in fact he does not defend Egyptian practice. The gender roles of Egyptians, as Herodotus understands them, are simply presented without gloss or comment, and there can be little doubt that a Greek audience would have evaluated what Herodotus has presented according to their own cultural ideals. The ideal aimed at by any Greek man was autarky (self-sufficiency), which implied land ownership, its concomitant agricultural work, the maintenance of an orderly *oikos*, the obligation to participate in political and military activities of the polis,<sup>21</sup> and, of course, σωφροσύνη. These are male prerogatives anywhere in Classical Greece. Egyptian men, however, remain at home performing what to a Greek audience would appear to be women’s work.

So much for the Egyptians, but what of those very peoples whom Herodotus describes as sexually profligate? To what extent does Herodotus effeminize them beyond his description of the sexual conduct of their women? The Agathyrsians are referred to as ἀβρότατοι (“most delicate, pretty, dainty, or luxurious of men,” 4.104). This is hardly a term conjuring images of masculinity, so when Herodotus notes that they share their wives in common, thus playing the μοιχός, it is doubtful that a Greek audience would have been surprised that they were also ἀβρότατοι. In the case of the Scythians, gender identities and roles are further confounded beyond what is implied by the sexual behavior of their women. Herodotus notes how in the reign of the Egyptian king Psammetichus the Scythians had plundered the temple of Heavenly Aphrodite at Ascalon in Syria, an act of hubris for which they were punished.

τοῖσι δὲ τῶν Σκυθέων συλήσασσι τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἐν Ἀσκάλωνι καὶ τοῖσι  
τούτων αἰεὶ ἐκγόνοισι ἐνέσκηψε ὁ θεὸς θήλεαν νοῦσον· ὥστε ἅμα

<sup>20</sup> On the daily work expected of women in Classical Athens, see E. Fantham et al., *Women in the Classical World*. (Oxford 1994) 101–109. On the frequent identification of servility and servile activity with femininity in Classical Greece, see M. M. Sassi, *The Science of Man in Ancient Greece*, P. Tucker, tr. (Chicago 2001).

<sup>21</sup> M. M. Austin and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece: An Introduction* (Berkeley 1977) 11–18.

λέγουσί τε οἱ Σκύθαι διὰ τοῦτο σφέας νοσέειν, καὶ ὄραν παρ' ἑωυτοῖσι  
τοὺς ἀπικνεομένους ἐς τὴν Σκυθικὴν χώραν ὡς διακέεται τοὺς καλέουσι  
Ἐνάρεας οἱ Σκύθαι.

(1.105.4)

Upon those Scythians who had plundered the temple in Ascalon, and upon all their descendants for all time, the goddess inflicted female disease: for just as the Scythians themselves say that they are afflicted with disease for this reason, they also tell those who visit Scythian territory to see those whom the Scythians call Enareis.

Herodotus does not elaborate on the precise nature of this θήλεα νοῦσος (“female disease”) afflicting the Scythians, but the impression implicit in his remarks on the Scythians is that this condition is quite common among them, a “fact” borne out by their willingness to display them for tourists. Herodotus thus erases any distinction between Scythian males and females in the most literal sense possible and has clearly absorbed the tradition, popular in Greece,<sup>22</sup> that the Scythians are effeminate. The author of *Airs, Waters, Places*, a rough contemporary of Herodotus, reflects a similar view when he notes that sexual impotence was a particularly acute problem among the Scythians (Hp. *Aer.* 21), thus similarly undermining the Scythians’ manly credentials. There can be little doubt then that Herodotus is working within an atmosphere of cultural chauvinism that characterizes Scythian males as unmanly, even if not universally so.

Perhaps less directly, Herodotus also uses his account of Scythian relations with the Amazons in order to further reduce the masculinity of Scythian men. He notes that the Amazons, women of the Scythian steppe who lived as warriors without men, plundered the Scythians themselves (4.110). The Scythians, once they learned the identity and gender of these foes, sent forth a group of young men in an attempt to subdue them by having children with them (4.111).<sup>23</sup> It was the Amazon women, however, who, according to Herodotus, actually initiated sexual relations (4.113). After some time the Scythian men then asked the

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Hdt. 1.216.1.

<sup>23</sup> On the use of sex to “tame” women, see P. Vidal-Naquet. “Esclavages et gynécocratie dans la tradition, le Mythe, l’utopie,” *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l’antiquité classique* (Paris 1970) 75–80; J-P. Vernant, *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne* (Paris 1974) 57–81, 141–76; F. S. Brown and W. B. Tyrrell, “ἐκτιλώσαντο: A Reading of Herodotus’ Amazons,” *CJ* 80 (1984) 297–302

Amazons to return home with them and live as their wives, an offer the Amazons found unappealing and so rejected (4.114). Instead, the Amazons tell the Scythians to return home and to bring back to them their share of their inheritance, if they wish to marry (4.114). The Scythian men agree, and, after they return with their property, they also acquiesce in the Amazons' suggestion that they move away to settle beyond the Tanaï River (4.115). Finally, after they migrate, the Amazon women, who have now become the Sauromatian women, continue to live as warriors, going to war or to the hunt, with or without their husbands (4.116). Frieda Brown and William Tyrell argue that this episode not only renders the Amazon/Sauromatian women masculine and as savage beasts that must be "tamed," it also transforms the Scythians into Greek women. The Scythian men at first attempted to subdue these women through sexual intercourse, then through marriage, but failed to do so in both instances. Instead, they were "tamed" themselves.

Viewed in this light, the Scythians are representations of Greek women, for outside of patriarchal marriage, it was the female who was considered by definition to be in a state of savagery and bestiality, since within patriarchal marriage, she was, equally by definition, in a state of civilization, that is, tamed. Greek polar vision allowed for nothing in between. Thus the Scythians are made to live out the existence allotted in myth to the bestial woman. In addition, they renounce war, a male occupation, to pursue the Amazons, and do not resume that activity; and they perform the functions demanded exclusively of women in the culture by bringing dowry to the Amazons and leaving their fathers' houses behind to follow their mates. On this level their sex roles are clearly reversed, for the Amazons behave as males, the Scythians as females.<sup>24</sup>

Brown and Tyrell have perhaps overstated their point here. Herodotus does not actually say that Sauromatian men are subservient to their wives and perform female activities as Egyptian men do. But to a Greek audience they would certainly have appeared emasculated insofar as the terms and conditions of their marriages are dictated to them by their women, who choose their own husbands, initiate sex, and perform the same roles in public and private life as the men. Such gender equality would have been unthinkable to a Greek public. As Foley observes, "woman in Greek myth is associated with animals and the wild; the

---

<sup>24</sup> Brown and Tyrell (above, n.23) 300.

untamed female must submit to the civilizing effects of the marriage yoke before she can begin to be envisioned as cultured.”<sup>25</sup> Thus, in Greek myth, Amazons are either mastered in battle, as when Achilles masters Penthesileia (Apollod. 3.4.5) or Theseus defeats them in the *Amazonomachy* (Plut. *Thes.* 26), or else are mastered sexually, as when Herakles recovers the girdle of Hippolyte (Apollod. 2.5.9). In other words, the Amazons are not masculine at all when confronted by “real” Greek men. They are penetrated, mastered, and reduced to their expected subservient status.<sup>26</sup>

In the *Histories* the Lydians too are similarly effeminized in yet other ways. Before Cyrus’ defeat of Croesus, Herodotus tells us, the Lydians used to be excellent warriors. After Croesus’ defeat, however, Lydian *nomoi* underwent a profound change. Herodotus notes that when Sardis had risen up in revolt against Persian rule, Cyrus considered reducing the entire Lydian population to slavery. But instead he preferred to follow the advice on how to deal with the rebellious Lydians given to him by their erstwhile king Croesus:

Λυδοῖσι δὲ συγγνώμην ἔχων τάδε αὐτοῖσι ἐπίταξον, ὡς μήτε ἀποστέωσι μήτε δεινοί τοι ἔωσι· ἄπειπε μὲν σφι πέμψας ὄπλα ἀρήγια μὴ ἐκτῆσθαι, κέλευε δὲ σφέας κιθῶνάς τε ὑποδύνειν τοῖσι εἴμασι καὶ κοθόρνους ὑποδέεσθαι, πρόειπε δ’ αὐτοῖσι κιθαρίζειν τε καὶ ψάλλειν καὶ καπηλεύειν παιδεύειν τοὺς παῖδας, καὶ ταχέως σφέας ὧ βασιλεῦ γυναικας ἀντ’ ἀνδρῶν ὄψεαι γεγονότας, ὥστε οὐδὲν δεινοί τοι ἔσονται μὴ ἀποστέωσι.’

(1.155.4)

Have lenience toward the Lydians and impose the following things on them so that they neither revolt nor are a menace to you: Send an order to them that they are forbidden to acquire weapons of war, order them to wear tunics upon their garments and to bind buskins upon their feet, tell them to play the cithara, to pluck, and to teach their sons to be merchants. You will quickly see that they have been transformed from men into women, so that there will be no danger that they would rise against you.

<sup>25</sup> Foley (above, n.11) 134.

<sup>26</sup> L. Hardwick, “Ancient Amazons—Heroes, Outsiders or Women,” *G&R*. 2.37 (1990) 17–20.

It is obvious that Herodotus could not have known what, if any, advice Croesus gave to Cyrus. What Herodotus is doing here is passing judgment upon Lydian customs. Like the Egyptians and the Scythians, then, the Lydians are also unmanly. While Egyptian men play the part of women in the domestic and public spheres, and Scythians exhibit dual genders and have their marital arrangements determined by their wives, the Lydians are figuratively transformed into women, as Herodotus notes, by becoming adepts at banausic activities and in the way they dress.

Significantly, it was an act of *μοιχεία* that sealed the fate of the Lydian people in the first place and transformed them from free and manly warriors into effeminized Persian subjects. Herodotus relates the tale of Candaules, a king at Sardis who was infatuated with the beauty of his own wife. In his desire to convince others of his wife's beauty, Candaules arranged to have one of his bodyguards, Gyges, surreptitiously steal into the royal bedroom in order to catch a glimpse of the naked queen. The horrified Gyges at first refused but was cajoled by Candaules to agree to his plan. Unfortunately for Candaules, the queen noticed Gyges hiding behind the bedroom door, but she remained silent about the matter, summoning Gyges later and telling him that, because he had seen her naked, he must either kill Candaules and marry her, replacing Candaules as king, or he must die himself. Gyges chose the former option rather than the latter and killed Candaules (1.7–12). The queen thus displayed the masculine quality of *σωφροσύνη* that Candaules clearly did not possess. The Lydians were furious at this usurpation of power, but they agreed that they should let the oracle at Delphi decide if Gyges should be recognized as king. The oracle confirmed Gyges in the royal title at Sardis but warned him that his line would face vengeance in the fifth generation, which was in the reign of Croesus (1.13.2). In Croesus' reign, then, the Lydians were transformed from men into women owing to this corruption of the marital bed. Herodotus could have simply related a tale about a palace coup. Instead, he decided to draw his audience's attention to the most lurid element of the tale so as to suggest that this moral transgression on the part of Candaules was the specific cause of the current unmanliness of Lydian men. The behavior of Candaules and Gyges would no doubt have been perceived by Herodotus' audience as a kind of *μοιχεία*, and, with a perfect sense of the tragic, Herodotus demonstrates how the sin of marital corruption results in the Lydians' loss of freedom and the transformation of Lydian men into women, thus assigning the *μοιχός* his properly effeminate image.

At first glance it might seem that Herodotus is simply commenting upon the perceived sexual behavior of women in general, articulating the well-worn theme of a bottomless female sexual appetite so ubiquitous in Greek literature from Homer on.<sup>27</sup> But to read Herodotus' account of the promiscuity of barbarian women in this way is to miss his point. If it is a given that women will behave indulgently when it comes to sex, then the fact that barbarian women do so should come as no surprise. The difference between Greek and barbarian attitudes toward female sexuality for Herodotus is that Greek men control the sexuality of the women in their *oikos* as well as their own, while barbarian men do not, or else for some reason cannot, do the same. Greek tales about Amazons underscore this point well. Amazons are monsters to be overcome, not examples to be imitated. They are independent women who fight like men, make their own sexual choices, and are effectively the heads of their households. Thus it is the task of the Greek male hero to destroy the Amazon or to use sexual domination (i.e., rape) to restore the expected gender relations between male and female.<sup>28</sup> Scythian men, however, insofar as they have the terms of their sexual and reproductive lives determined for them by women in their relations with the Amazons, are effectively "representations of Greek women." In Athens at least, to seduce another man's wife was an act thought to be worse than rape<sup>29</sup> and opened the perpetrator to dire punishments. Yet when commenting on the sexual practices of the Massagetae, Herodotus marvels that any man can have sex with the wife of any other man without any consequences (*ἄδεῶς*), for such behavior would surely be followed by retribution in any Greek polis. The message here is that barbarian males are in general unmanly in comparison with free Greek men and cannot or will not control their women or themselves and therefore are not in control of their *oikoi*.

David Cohen has rightly warned us against taking the often idealized (or even demonized) image of women, marriage, and gender roles expressed by classical male authors too literally and has noted the probable discrepancies between expressed ideals and lived realities.<sup>30</sup> But in constructing a Hellenic identity against, or in contradistinction to, a barbarian identity, insofar as contrasting *nomoi* form part of Herodotus'

<sup>27</sup> Wolcot (above, n.17) 37–47.

<sup>28</sup> Brown and Tyrell (above, n.23) 297.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Lys. 1.

<sup>30</sup> D. Cohen (above, n.2) 5.

understanding of historical causation, we should fully expect Herodotus to be employing Greek ideal conceptions of gender roles, however distant they might be from lived realities. Moreover, while one might object that the above analysis relies upon a comparison between barbarian marital practices and specifically Athenian expectations of marital conduct, it should be noted that limited evidence from other poleis reveals broadly similar attitudes toward adultery and the proper function of marriage.<sup>31</sup> Also, while one might argue that Herodotus is providing his audience with examples of gender equality and female empowerment within the context of marriage as a point of contrast and/or criticism of patriarchal Greek marital practices, such a reading would be anachronistic, as it is doubtful that any Greek audience would have approved of such *laissez-faire* sexual customs. Herodotus nowhere justifies barbarian sexual behavior, and indeed at times shows his own disapproval of the barbarian sexual mores he describes.

In depicting non-Greek men as feminine, Herodotus was certainly not alone or unique. We have already noted what many Greeks said about Scythian effeminacy and Hippocrates' remarks regarding Scythian impotence. In *Airs, Waters, Places*, Asian softness is simply taken for granted (Hp. *Aer.* 16). Edith Hall has observed a similar tendency in Aeschylus' *Persians* (472 B.C.E.), in which Persia is depicted as empty of men in a literal sense, owing to their defeat at the hands of the Greeks, and also figuratively, in that the Persian men themselves are unmanly.<sup>32</sup> In visual media too the effeminate nature of non-Greek men can be detected in pieces such as the Eurymedon Vase, which depicts a Greek warrior with an erect penis who is about to rape a bent-over and dismayed barbarian warrior.<sup>33</sup> To a Greek audience the penetrated partner in a sexual act, whether heterosexual or homosexual, is taking on a distinctly female role,<sup>34</sup> and, as Marilyn Skinner observes, "anal penetration was

---

<sup>31</sup> See Patterson (above, n.12) ch. 3 for a discussion of marriage and adultery in Sparta and Gortyn.

<sup>32</sup> E. Hall (above, n.18) 130.

<sup>33</sup> M. Miller, *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC: A Study in Cultural Receptivity* (Cambridge 1997) figs. 1–2. For a full discussion of the Eurymedon vase as a sexual metaphor, see H. A. Shapiro, "The Invention of Persia in Classical Athens," in M. Eliav-Feldon, B. Isaac, and J. Ziegler, eds., *The Origins of Racism in the West* (Cambridge 2009) 66–72.

<sup>34</sup> D. M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love* (New York 1990) 19–38; M. B. Skinner (above, n.16) 77–78.

an expression of superior power, considered degrading for the passive partner.”<sup>55</sup> Herodotus, who is writing on the very same subject matter as that depicted on the vase, Greece’s victory over barbarians, likewise elaborates upon this theme of the unmanly barbarian. Therefore, a firm understanding of how Herodotus uses implicit assumptions about sex and gender throughout the *Histories* in order to articulate ethnicity sets the context for a critical interpretation of his remarks regarding non-Greek sexual behavior. The sexual practices of barbarian men render them highly effeminate. This reading is reinforced when it is noted that Herodotus ascribes inverted gender roles and effeminized behavior in yet other ways beyond the issue of sexual conduct, as discussed above, to these very same people.

The image of barbarian sexual license thus fits within, and so reinforces, the broader framework of assumptions that were made about the effeminacy of non-Greek men in the aftermath of the Persian Wars. Such assumptions appeared in visual and literary media soon after Persia’s humiliation. To the Greek mind the most basic feature of civic freedom was control over one’s *oikos* and all that occurred in it. This control the barbarian did not, would not, or could not possess. In characterizing the barbarian men as lacking control over themselves and their women, Herodotus has thus implicitly equated them with women by ascribing to them characteristics that a Greek audience would have seen as feminine. The characterization of barbarian men as a species of *moichoi*, and as cuckolded husbands with no control of their *oikos*, so implicit in Herodotus’ account of barbarian sexual mores, would no doubt have further solidified the image of unmanly barbarians in the minds of a Greek audience.

NIPISSING UNIVERSITY  
richardw@nipissingu.ca

---

<sup>55</sup> M. B. Skinner (above, n.16) 95.



## Croesus, Xerxes, and the Denial of Death (Herodotus 1.29–34; 7.44–53)\*

WILLIAM N. TURPIN

ABSTRACT: Herodotus portrays both Croesus and Xerxes as resolutely unaware of their own mortality, despite conversations about the life span of an ordinary human (Croesus), and the mortality of his massive army (Xerxes). Part of what makes Croesus and Xerxes hubristic, for Herodotus, is their obliviousness to this salient aspect of their humanity.

Herodotus presents two complementary conversations about the human condition, between Croesus and Solon in book 1, and between Xerxes and Artabanus in book 7.<sup>1</sup> This paper will argue that an important dimension has usually been overlooked by scholars: both Croesus and Xerxes are reminded that death is the inevitable fate of all human beings, but neither king sees that he is just as mortal as everyone else.

Croesus, confident in his worldly happiness, raises the question of human happiness in general. Solon's reply reveals a surprising, almost morbid, interest in death. He speaks first about Tellus the Athenian, who concluded a rich and full life by dying for his country (1.30.3–4), and then about Cleobis and Biton, whose main claim to happiness was dying for their mother and for Hera (1.31). Croesus, however, shows no interest in the way these men died, and remains focused on their status and wealth: ὦ χεῖνε Ἀθηναίε, ἢ δ' ἡμετέρη εὐδαιμονίη οὕτω τοι ἀπέρριπται ἐς τὸ μηδέν, ὥστε οὐδὲ ἰδιωτέων ἀνδρῶν ἀξίους ἡμέας ἐποίησας; ("That's all very well, my Athenian friend; but what of my own happiness? Is it so utterly contemptible that you won't even compare me with mere common folk like those you have mentioned?" 1.32.1).<sup>2</sup>

\* I am very grateful to my colleague Rosaria Munson for her thoughtful comments.

<sup>1</sup> For comparisons of the two episodes in general, see T. Harrison, *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford 2000) 35–51. For the parallel between Croesus contemplating his treasures and Xerxes surveying his troops, see D. Konstan, "Persians, Greeks and Empire." *Arethusa* 20 (1987) 68.

<sup>2</sup> Greek is cited from the OCT of Hude; translations are from J. Marincola, ed., A. de Sélincourt, tr., *Herodotus, The Histories* (London 1996).

So Solon spells out what he means. Moving on from Tellus, who died in the prime of life, and Cleobis and Biton, who were young, Solon introduces a hypothetical man living out his allotted span of seventy years. Solon calculates, with a startling focus on the arithmetic, that a seventy-year-old man would have 26,250 days on which something could go wrong (1.32.2–4). Wealth, therefore, is no guarantee of happiness, and the poor have a better chance of being happy (1.32.5–6). Given how much time there is for disaster to happen, you can only decide that a life is happy when it is over.

Thus far, on the face of it, Solon has been focused on Croesus' particular situation, and on the importance of death in assessing it. But as he continues, Solon sounds more and more as if he is talking about people in general, and the fact of their mortality:

εἰ δὲ πρὸς τούτοισι ἔτι τελευτήσῃ τὸν βίον εὖ, οὗτος ἐκείνος τὸν σὺ ζητέεις, <ὁ> ὄλβιος κεκλησθαι ἄξιός ἐστι· πρὶν δ' ἂν τελευτήσῃ ἐπισχεῖν μηδὲ καλέειν κω ὄλβιον, ἀλλ' εὐτυχέα.

(1.32.7)

Now if a man thus favored dies as he has lived, he will be just the one you are looking for: the only sort of person who deserves to be called happy. But mark this: until he is dead, keep the word “happy” in reserve. Till then he is not happy, but only lucky.

This is a clear enough reminder of human mortality, but Solon makes the point again:

τὰ πάντα μὲν νυν ταῦτα συλλαβεῖν ἄνθρωπον ἔοντα ἀδύνατόν ἐστι, ὡσπερ χώρα οὐδεμία καταρκεῖ πάντα ἑωυτῇ παρέχουσα, ἀλλὰ ἄλλο μὲν ἔχει, ἑτέρου δὲ ἐπιδέεται· ἢ δὲ ἂν τὰ πλεῖστα ἔχη, αὕτη ἀρίστη. ὡς δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπου σῶμα ἐν οὐδὲν αὐταρκές ἐστι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔχει, ἄλλου δὲ ἐνδεές ἐστι. ὅς δ' ἂν αὐτῶν πλεῖστα ἔχων διατελέῃ καὶ ἔπειτα τελευτήσῃ εὐχαρίστως τὸν βίον, οὗτος παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ οὖνομα τοῦτο, ὦ βασιλεῦ, δίκαιός ἐστι φέρεσθαι.

(1.32.8–9)

Nobody of course can have all these advantages, any more than a country can produce everything it needs: whatever it has, it is bound to lack something. The best country is the one that has the most. It is the same with people: no man is ever self-sufficient—there is sure to be something missing. But whoever has the greatest number of the good things I have mentioned, and keeps them to the end, and dies a peaceful death, that man, Croesus, deserves in my opinion to be called happy.

The principle gets extended to entire nations, which can fall victim to hubris as well as individuals.<sup>3</sup> But Solon returns to the individual human being, and to death as the final arbiter.

Solon concludes with a sweeping statement about the human condition: πολλοῖσι γὰρ δὴ ὑποδέξας ὄλβον ὁ θεὸς προρρίζους ἀνέτρεψε (“Often enough God gives a man a glimpse of happiness, and then utterly ruins him,” 1.32.9). In theory this could be yet another comment on the problem of assessment, on the fact that you never know what is going to happen. But it is framed by a much more pointed remark about death in general: σκοπέειν δὲ χρὴ παντὸς χρήματος τὴν τελευτὴν κῆ ἀποβήσεται (“Look to the end, no matter what it is you are considering. Often enough God gives a man a glimpse of happiness, and then utterly ruins him,” 1.32.9). Any failure to forget the basic fact of human mortality is likely to lead to disaster.

Croesus thinks Solon is fool for insisting on this fact, and sends him away:

ταῦτα λέγων τῷ Κροίσῳ οὐ κως οὔτε ἐχαρίζετο, οὔτε λόγου μιν ποιησάμενος οὐδενὸς ἀποπέμπεται, κάρτα δόξας ἀμαθῆα εἶναι, ὅς τὰ παρεόντα ἀγαθὰ μετεῖς τὴν τελευτὴν παντὸς χρήματος ὁρᾶν ἐκέλευε\*.  
(1.33)

These sentiments were not of the sort to give Croesus any pleasure; he let Solon go with cold indifference, firmly convinced that he was a fool. For what could be more stupid than to keep telling him to look to the “end” of everything, without regard to present prosperity?

Croesus does not understand Solon’s initial point, that “present prosperity” is no guarantee of future happiness. And he does not yet understand that “the end” is coming. He simply does not see that the fact of human mortality matters.

Xerxes, at Abydos, raises the question of human mortality himself, but like Croesus he resolutely ignores the implications.<sup>4</sup> Surveying his enormous army and navy from a special throne set up at Abydos, and

<sup>3</sup> On this theme, see esp. C. W. Fornara, *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford 1971).

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion of various translations of this passage, see S. J. Willett, “Catching Xerxes’ Tears in English: The Styles of Herodotean Translation,” *Arion* 8 (2000) 119–45.

after enjoying a boat race, Xerxes at first takes pleasure in his great good fortune.<sup>5</sup> But he is soon overwhelmed with sadness:

ὡς δὲ ὅρα πάντα μὲν τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ὑπὸ τῶν νεῶν ἀποκεκερυμμένον,  
πάσας δὲ τὰς ἀκτὰς καὶ τὰ Ἀβυδηῶν πεδία ἐπίπλεα ἀνθρώπων, ἐνθαῦτα  
ὁ Ξέρξης ἑωυτὸν ἔμακάρισε, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἐδάκρυσε.

(7.45)

And when he saw the whole Hellespont hidden by ships, and all the beaches and plains of Abydos filled with men, he called himself happy—and the moment after burst into tears.

Many readers understand this response as thoughtful and compassionate.<sup>6</sup> But in my view Herodotus is presenting us with yet another example of Xerxes' hubris, as powerful in its way as the flogging of the Hellespont.<sup>7</sup> Xerxes, unlike Croesus, is actually interested in the fact of human mortality, but only in the abstract; he fails to see the relevance to himself.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Polycrates had already come to grief because of an excessive preoccupation with his possessions (Hdt. 3.41). On Xerxes' subsequent countings of his soldiers and his ships, see Hdt. 7.59.2, with Konstan (above, n.1) 64–65.

<sup>6</sup> Ph.-E. Legrand (*Hérodote, Histoires: Livre VII* [Paris 1951] 85 n.2) refers to "tristesse philosophique." H. R. Immerwahr (*Form and Thought in Herodotus* [Cleveland 1966] 42) calls this "the ancient lyric sentiment that life is so short." S. Flory ("Laughter, Tears, and Wisdom in Herodotus," *AJP* 99 [1978] 146) sees Xerxes' initial happiness as "mindless and innocent." D. Lateiner ("Tears and Crying in Hellenic Historiography: Dacryology from Herodotus to Polybius," in T. Fögen, ed., *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World* [Berlin and New York 2009] 121) refers to "generous tears for human ephemerality." E. Baragwanath (*Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* [Oxford 2008] 266) calls Xerxes' explanation "a quite profound insight."

For the view that Herodotus is generally quite positive about Xerxes, see K. H. Waters, *Herodotus on Tyrants and Despots: A Study in Objectivity* (Wiesbaden 1971) 75–79; D. Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto 1989) 152–53; J. A. S. Evans, *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past: Three Essays* (Princeton 1991) 60–67. N. R. E. Fisher (*Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece* [Warminster 1992] 376) says: "At times he is courteous, very ready to consult and listen to his advisers, generous towards friends, allies and servants, and, among his varied moods and emotions, there appears at times an appealing sympathy for the human condition." Cf. Immerwahr (above) 176–83, which remains a persuasive account of Xerxes in Herodotus as "an extreme example of the typical great ruler whose pride leads to his fall" (178).

<sup>7</sup> On hubris and Herodotus' account of Xerxes, see Fisher (above, n.6) 367–85. Fisher's book should be read in light of D. L. Cairns, "Hybris, Dishonour, and Thinking Big," *JHS* 116 (1996) 1–32.

<sup>8</sup> This seems to be the reading of W. C. Greene, *Moira: Fate, Good and Evil in Greek Thought* (Cambridge, Mass., 1944) 86–87, and of Harrison (above, n.1) 50: "He had been

Xerxes' tunnel vision on this point is underscored by his subsequent conversation with Artabanus, who wants to know more about those tears:

μαθὼν δὲ μιν Ἀρτάβανος ὁ πάτρως, ὃς τὸ πρῶτον γνώμην ἀπεδέξατο ἐλευθέρως οὐ συμβουλευὼν Ξέρξῃ στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, οὗτος ὄνῃρ φρασθεὶς Ξέρξῃν δακρῦσαντα εἶρετο τάδε· Ὡ βασιλεῦ, ὡς πολλὸν ἀλλήλων κεχωρισμένα ἐργάσαο νῦν τε καὶ ὀλίγῳ πρότερον· μακαρίσας γὰρ σεαυτὸν δακρῦεις.

(7.46.1)

Artabanus, his uncle, the man who in the first instance had spoken his mind so freely in trying to dissuade Xerxes from undertaking the campaign, was by his side; and when he saw how Xerxes wept, he said to him: "My lord, surely there is a strange contradiction in what you do now and what you did a moment ago. Then you called yourself a happy man—and now you weep."

The reappearance of Artabanus reminds us that the self-confidence of Xerxes is probably unjustified, given the explicit reference to his earlier misgivings about the invasion. Xerxes, in his reply, reveals that what he has been thinking about is life, and death. But he has not been thinking very clearly:

ὁ δὲ εἶπε· Ἐσῆλθε γάρ με λογιζάμενον κατοικίτῃραι ὡς βραχὺς εἶη ὁ πᾶς ἀνθρώπινος βίος, εἰ τούτων γε ἐόντων τοσούτων οὐδεὶς ἐξ ἑκατοστῶν ἔτος περιέσται.

(7.46.2)

"I was thinking," Xerxes replied; "and it came into my mind how pitifully short human life<sup>9</sup> is—for of all these thousands of men not one will be alive in a hundred years' time."

---

contemplating the brevity of human life, how none of the men beneath him would be alive in a hundred years. He does not comment on the brevity of his own life." See also Konstan (above, n.1) 64: "I should not want to take Xerxes' pessimistic reflection upon the brevity of life as the sign that he has, contrary to his customary confidence, momentarily acquired a deeper insight. I should say rather that it is the entirely characteristic view of a man who measures time as he does power, in terms of quantity."

<sup>9</sup> Literally, of course, what Xerxes says is that "the *whole* of human life is short." Though not the same as "*every* human life," which would be even more pointed, the phrase does suggest that Xerxes is thinking of human life in the abstract, and the common inheritance of every human being.

Instead of saying that “we” are all mortal, as might have been expected, Xerxes points dramatically to “all these people here” (τούτων γε ἐόντων τοσοούτων). Life is short, and his soldiers and sailors are all going to die, but Xerxes sees that only as *their* problem.

The problem with Xerxes’ thinking is then underscored by Artabanus, in some breathtakingly pessimistic remarks about the human condition. The key assumption is that death is, indeed, a fact of life for everyone:

ὁ δὲ ἀμείβετο λέγων· Ἔτερα τούτου παρὰ τὴν ζόην πεπόνθαμεν οἰκτρότερα. ἐν γὰρ οὕτω βραχεῖ βίῳ οὐδείς οὕτως ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν εὐδαίμων πέφυκε, οὔτε τούτων οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων, τῷ οὐ παραστήσεται πολλακίς καὶ οὐκὶ ἅπαξ τεθνάναι βούλεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ ζῶειν. αἴ τε συμφοραὶ προσπίπτουσαι καὶ αἱ νοῦσοι συνταράσσουσαι καὶ βραχὺν ἐόντα μακρὸν δοκέειν εἶναι ποιέῃσι τὸν βίον. οὕτως ὁ μὲν θάνατος μοχθηρῆς ἐούσης τῆς ζῆς καταφυγὴ αἰρετωτάτη τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ γέγονε, ὁ δὲ θεὸς γλυκὺν γέυσας τὸν αἰῶνα φθονερός ἐν αὐτῷ εὕρισκεται ἐόν.

(7.46.2–4)

“Yet,” said Artabanus, “we suffer sadder things in life even than that. Short as it is, there is not a man in the world, either here or elsewhere, who is happy enough not to wish—not once only, but again and again—to be dead rather than alive. Troubles come, diseases afflict us; and this makes life, despite its brevity, seem all too long. So heavy is the burden of it that death is a refuge which we all desire, and it is common proof amongst us that God who gave us a taste of this world’s sweetness has been jealous in his giving.”

Readers have little difficulty in seeing an allusion to Xerxes’ impending disasters, but we notice also that Artabanus, unlike Xerxes, is acutely aware that death is universal. Artabanus tries hard to make Xerxes realize that he’s no different from anyone else, telling him that “we all suffer” (πεπόνθαμεν, 7.46.2). He knows perfectly well that the host of soldiers and sailors are not the only mortals present at Abydos: the wish to be dead will occur to them, *and to others* (οὔτε τούτων οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων, 7.46.3).

Xerxes says that he agrees with Artabanus, but he is not really looking at things in the same way. He simply wants to bring the conversation to an end, and pointedly refuses to think about what Artabanus has actually said:

Ξέρξης δὲ ἀμείβετο λέγων· Ἀρτάβανε, βιοτῆς μὲν νυν ἀνθρωπίνης πέρι, ἐούσης τοιαύτης οἴην περ σὺ διαιρέαι εἶναι, πανσώμεθα, μηδὲ κακῶν μεμνώμεθα χρηστά ἔχοντες πρήγματα ἐν χερσὶ.

(7.47.1)

“Artabanus,” Xerxes replied, “the lot of men here upon earth is indeed as you have described it; but let us put aside these gloomy reflections, for we have pleasant things at hand.”

Here de Sélincourt’s translation is a little misleading. Xerxes dismisses not “gloomy reflections” but “evil things” more generally.<sup>10</sup> These surely include death. Having been invited to reflect on mortality, his own as well as everyone else’s, Xerxes simply refuses to listen.

Ernest Becker, in his *Denial of Death*, famously argued that human psychology is dominated by the unwillingness to accept mortality.<sup>11</sup> And while Herodotus was of course less psychological in his approach to the human condition, he anticipated Becker’s brilliant insight in his own way. Herodotus certainly did not see an unwillingness to face death as a part of the human condition in general. Like all Greeks he knew that only the gods were immortal,<sup>12</sup> and that for humans life is short and its pleasures fleeting. He also knew that some people could forget this, and that that was a bad sign: the denial of death was hubris.<sup>13</sup>

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE  
wturpin1@swarthmore.edu

---

<sup>10</sup> Thus R. Waterfield (*Herodotus: The Histories* [Oxford, 1998]) translates: “We shouldn’t talk about bad things when involved in good things like our current project.”

<sup>11</sup> E. Becker, *The Denial of Death* (New York 1973).

<sup>12</sup> M. P. Nilsson (*A History of Greek Religion* [New York 1964] 157) states: “The immortality of the gods drew a clear line of demarcation which man could not pass. In other respects no such line exists. The gods are stronger, wiser, more powerful than men, but this is merely a question of degree.” See also J.-P. Vernant, “Mortals and Immortals: The Body of the Divine,” in F. I. Zeitlin, ed., *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays* (Princeton, 1991) 27–49. See Hdt. 2.78 for the Egyptians and *memento mori*.

<sup>13</sup> See also Pi. *I.* 5.16: θνατὰ θνατοῦσι πρέπει.; Pi. *O.* 59–65; Aesch. *PV* 82–87; 545–551; Ag. 1022–1024; Eur. *Alc.* 123–129.





IN MEMORIAM

---

## Anna Shaw Benjamin (1926–2013)

FREDERICK J. BOOTH

One of the most distinguished classicists of her generation, Anna Shaw Benjamin died at her home in Piscataway, New Jersey, on July 21, 2013, listening to the Beethoven String Quartets she loved.

Having learned Latin and Greek at home from her father, Anna earned both her master's degree and doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania. While a graduate student, Anna attended the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, beginning her long association with that institution, and won two fellowships, including a Fulbright. She started her archaeological career while at the American School, doing pioneering work on dialect inscriptions and linguistic problems in the graffiti from the Athenian Agora. Anna later served as Director of the American School's Summer Institute and throughout her career she returned most summers to dig at the Agora, and later at Aphrodisias in Turkey.

Anna began her teaching career at Juniata College in Pennsylvania in 1951, and after receiving her Ph.D. in 1955, moved to the University of Missouri-Columbia, where she rose to being Chair of the Department of Classics and Archaeology. In 1964, she came to Rutgers University as Professor of Classics. Over the next two decades Anna served the Department at various times as Chair and/or Director of Graduate Studies, and also served as University Senator and as President of the Rutgers chapter of the American Association of University Professors. Anna was responsible for the establishment of the Archaeology program within the Classics Department and served as the editor of *Archaeology* for five years. While she officially retired from Rutgers in 1987, she continued to teach on occasion at Rutgers and at Drew University through the 1990s.

I first met Anna as a Classics undergraduate at Rutgers forty-five years ago, and over the years we became lifelong friends. She was always full of energy and fun, an inspiring teacher, and a mentor to me and generations of students.

Among the many awards and honors Anna received during her scholarly career were twice being named as a visiting scholar in Classical

*Classical World*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2013) Pp.543–544

Archaeology at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. In 1979, Anna was inducted as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London. She also served as a member of a National Endowment for the Humanities Advisory Panel, on the Executive Board of the American Philological Association, on the Governing Board of the American Institute of Archaeology, and on the National Coordinating Board for Archaeological Societies. The Classical Association of the Atlantic States celebrated Anna's career with an *ovatio* in 1992, and in 1994 the AIA recognized her lifetime achievements by awarding her the Martha and Artemis Joukowsky Distinguished Service Award. Anna was also a longtime member of the New Jersey Classical Association, and, in a final grand gesture of generosity, she left her classics library to the NJCA to support its Edna White Rome Scholarship.

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY  
frederick.booth@shu.edu

## Martha Davis

Hodie celebramus optimam et beneficissimam magistram, cuius tempus laborque curaque communitatem atque societatem nostras maxime muniverunt. Vires, artes, mores in civitate apricissima splendidissime coluit, ubi gradus Baccalaureae Artium Magistraeque Artium est adeptata.<sup>1</sup> Postquam doctrinam antiquitatis classicae et in terra cladis Varianae et civitate sideris solius persequabatur, tandem, “bona ire eruditione per medios hostes,”<sup>2</sup> in oppido nomine patriam Ulixis in memoriam redigenti, Doctoris Philosophiae gradum adeptata est, carmine epico inquirendo aetatis Flavianae de Argonautis. Multos annos docuit in hac urbe, praeclara propter caseum fervidum et liquescentem super carnem bovis, et perseverantia vicit in aedificandis et sustinendis studiis classicis apud Universitatem quae appellatione sacram aedem evocat;<sup>3</sup> operam studiosissimam dedit societati notae per litteras Graecas, sed salutari praeceptoribus discipulisque linguae Latinae. Ob merita extraordinaria in fovendis nutriendisque discipulis suis disciplinae nostra habebatur in maximum honorem. Plaudamus igitur Martha A. Davis.

JEAN HOLTHOUSE

RACHEL MULLERVY

YUVAL RAVINSKY-GRAY

JAKE SHILLING

ANGELINA WONG

JUDITH P. HALLETT

University of Maryland, College Park

*Today we celebrate a most excellent and generous teacher, whose time, labor, and care have immeasurably strengthened our classics community and our classical association. Exhibiting stellar qualities that personify its motto, she received her B.A. and M.A. degrees at Florida State University. After pursuing the study of classical antiquity in Germany and Texas, she triumphantly braved the challenges of higher learning to*

<sup>1</sup> Florida State University motto: *Vires, artes, mores.*

<sup>2</sup> *Tu medios gladio bonus ire per hostes,* Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* 1.438.

<sup>3</sup> Temple University motto: *Perseverantia Vincit*

*earn her doctorate at Cornell University, with a dissertation on Valerius Flaccus. She has taught in this renowned city of Philadelphia for many years, and emerged victorious, through perseverance, in building and sustaining the classics program at Temple University; she has accorded special attention to the undergraduate classics honor society, Eta Sigma Phi. For her outstanding accomplishments on behalf of her students, and our field, the American Philological Association has recognized her with its award for excellence in teaching. Let us thus applaud Martha A. Davis.*

---

## Andrew M. Miller

Meminerimus neque obliviscemur<sup>1</sup> huius magistri egregissimi, quem hodie honoramus. Huic filio Civitatis Aureae, non solum primus gradus Baccalaurei Artium sed etiam gradus excelsiores, Magistri Artium et Doctoris Philosophiae, apud Universitatem Ursorum Aureorum sunt dati concessique.<sup>2</sup> Prospectu Pontis Portae Aureae mox relicto, contemplari inceptit caerulea flumina urbis praeditae multis pontibus et Benigno Numine, postquam laboribus ingenioque suo illustravit Universitatem Urbis Ferreae.<sup>3</sup> Fulgens et aureus in caeruleo caelo, effecit ut lux almae matris suae quoque fieret in sua nova sede eruditionis, corroborans veritatem et virtutem eius scriptis doctissimis suis de Hymnis Homericis et carminibus Pindari.<sup>4</sup> Quamquam hic poeta quondam scripsit aquam esse optimum, scimus hunc virum, sapientissimum et carissimum praeceptorem multis discipulis, esse melius. Plaudamus igitur Andrew M. Miller.

CADANCE BUTLER  
PHILIP GALLAGHER  
NADAV KRAVITZ  
INNA KUNZ  
AVIVA POLLOCK  
RIAN SIRKUS  
JUDITH P. HALLETT

University of Maryland, College Park

*We will remember and not forget this outstanding teacher whom we celebrate today. A true son of the Golden State, he earned his B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley. But he*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Meminerimus neque obliviscemur*: cf. the first line of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*: μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἑκάτοιο.

<sup>2</sup> *Ursorum aureorum*: the sports teams at the University of California, Berkeley are nicknamed “the Golden Bears.” Coincidentally, blue and gold are the official colors of both UC Berkeley and the University of Pittsburgh.

<sup>3</sup> Pittsburgh is called “the city of bridges” and “the iron city”; *benigno numine* is the city’s motto.

<sup>4</sup> *Fiat Lux* is the motto of the University of California, Berkeley; *Veritas et Virtus* is the motto of the University of Pittsburgh.

*soon exchanged his vista of San Francisco Bay for that of the Allegheny and Monongahela waters, when he brought his toil and talents to the faculty of the University of Pittsburgh. Embodying the illuminating gold as well as the nourishing blue that together symbolize both universities, he made Berkeley's motto an intellectual reality in his new home, strengthening knowledge and excellence in its classics department with his learned publications on the Homeric Hymns and Pindar. Although Pindar's first Olympian ode praised water as the "best thing," we know that this man, a most wise and beloved mentor to many students, is something better. Let us therefore applaud Andrew M. Miller!*

---

## Paul Properzio

Sicut cives huius amantissimae urbis omnes incolas eius tamquam germanos germanasque diligunt, sic hodie celebramus magistrum doctum et alacrem ut fratrem dilectissimum nobis habendum. Postquam apud Universitatem civitatis ex duriore lapide factae gradum Baccalaurei Artium accepit, gradus Magistri Artium et Doctoris Philosophiae apud Universitatem se affirmantem ad maiorem dei gloriam in urbe ventosa meruit.<sup>1</sup> Multos annos laboravit in hac regione patriae nostrae et pro societate nostra, quibus servivit nobiliter in officio praesidis. Plurimos annos docuit in urbe pulchra propter pedes peregrinorum, illustri propter pedes textis rubris cinctos, apud venerabilem sedem disciplinae Latinae. Studiosus linguarum variarum, investigavit antiquas gentes tunsas longe resonantibus Eoissimis undis, causa comparandorum scriptorum et consuetudinum eorum cum operibus moribusque antiquorum Graecorum et Romanorum. Dux et vox foederis classici patriae nostrae, honoratus propter praestantiam docendi, sicut docta puella dicitur cepisse poetam antiquum eiusdem nominis ocellis, cepit nos diligentia.<sup>2</sup> Plaudamus igitur Paul Properzio.

LAURI DABBIERI  
ROBERT LANAR  
KENNETH SILVERMAN  
KATRINA SZABO  
ADAM WILLIAMS  
JUDITH P. HALLETT

University of Maryland, College Park

*Just as the citizens of this city, Philadelphia, cherish all of her inhabitants like sisters and brothers, so today we celebrate a most learned and energetic teacher who ought to be considered a most dearly beloved*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ad maiorem dei gloriam*, motto of Loyola University in Chicago.

<sup>2</sup> Propertius 1.1. *Cynthia primum suis miserum me cepit cepit ocellis.*

*brother figure to us. After he received his B.A. from the University of New Hampshire, the Granite State, he earned his M.A and Ph.D. degrees at Loyola University in Chicago. For many years he worked in this region and for our association, which he nobly served as president; for a great many years he has taught in Boston, at its esteemed Latin Academy. Proficient in many languages, he has studied ancient Chinese culture, comparing its customs and literature with those of Classical Greece and Rome. An exemplary leader of the American Classical League, whose newsletter he edited for ten years, honored by the American Philological Association for outstanding teaching, he has captured our affection and gratitude by his devotion to our common cause in the Propertian tradition. Let us thus applaud Paul Properzio.*



---

## *Gratulatio: Sally Sanderlin and the Classical World Editorial Team (1993–2013)*

Hodie honoramus non solum feminam magnae eruditionis, maiorisque ingenii, maximaeque industriae sed etiam alias aliosque egregios collegas, et praeditissimos multa doctrina et studiosissimos antiquitatis classicae. Tempus atque labor atque cura omnium horum harumque locupletaverunt Societatem Nostram muniendis rebus gestis Classici Mundi, decoris gloriaeque Societati Nostrae viginti annos. Inter filias politas more lapidum sustinentium regiam educata, nutrita ab universitate perpetuis futuris temporibus duratura atque inter lucem et pocula sacra <sup>1</sup> gradum adepta Doctoris Philosophiae apud universitatem illustrem perstando et praestando,<sup>2</sup> haec femina negotia securitatemque huius dilectissimae vocis investigandarum docendarumque rerum Graecarum Romanarumque administravit: domum servavit, scientiam fecit.<sup>3</sup> Plaudamus Sally Sanderlin, et totam cohortem gratias merentem ob edenda opera Classici Mundi.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> That our daughters may be a cornerstone, polished after the similitude of a palace: *Psalms* 144.12. Motto of Mount Holyoke College; *perpetuis futuris temporibus duraturum*, motto of Trinity College, Dublin; *hinc lucem et pocula sacra*, motto of Cambridge University.

<sup>2</sup> *Perstare et praestare*, motto of New York University

<sup>3</sup> *Domum servavit, lanam fecit*. From the second century B.C.E. epitaph of a Claudia, *CIL*1.2.1211.

<sup>4</sup> Editor Matthew S. Santirocco: 1993–2013

Associate Editors Judith P. Hallett: 1993–present; Lee T. Percy: 2000–2013

Assistant Editor (Latin) Lee T. Percy: 1993–2000

Assistant Editor (Greek) Deborah Boedeker: 1993–1997; Lowell Edmunds: 1997–2000; Andrew Ford: 2000–2003; Ralph Rosen: 2004–2009; Nancy Worman: 2009–2013  
Assistant Editor (History) Susan Guettel Cole: 1993–2004; Edward Harris: 2004–2008; Sarolta A. Takacs: 2008–2012.

Managing Editor: Sally Sanderlin: 1993–2013

Reviews Fred C. Mench: 1993–1998; David Sider: 1998–present

Textbook Surveys Judith L. Sebesta: 1993–2013

Bibliographical Surveys †Alexander G. McKay: 1993–2007

Books for Teaching Classics Alden Smith: 1993–1998

Audiovisual Surveys Kim A. Chappell: 1993–1995; Henry V. Bender: 1995–1998; Janice F. Siegel: 1998–2012

Notes and News/Announcements Henry V. Bender: 1993–2005; David J. Califf 2003–2010

*Classical World*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2014) Pp.551–552

Today we honor not only an immensely learned, talented and energetic woman, but also other outstanding colleagues, endowed with great learning and passion for classical antiquity. Their time, effort and care have enriched our organization by strengthening its scholarly journal, *Classical World*, for the past twenty years. Recipient of a BA from Mount Holyoke College and a PhD in medieval history from New York University, alumna of Trinity College, Dublin and Cambridge University, she has worked as the journal's managing editor since 1994, and served CAAS in multiple capacities: negotiating with aggregators such as JSTOR to include *CW* among their projects, and with Johns Hopkins University Press on new financial arrangements as well as overseeing CAAS insurance policies. To paraphrase an immortal Latin inscription, she kept our house in order, and created knowledge. Let us applaud Sally Sanderlin and the *Classical World* editorial team.

---

In the Schools Rudolph Masciantonio: 1993–2005

Scholia Timothy E. Gregory 1995–1995

Assistant Editor for Production Diana Pittet: 2006–2008

Production Coordinator Aaron DeLand: 2009–2013

Circulation Manager Lawrence E. Gaichas: 1993–2001; Robert Boughner:  
2001–2003

## REVIEWS

*Publishers are invited to submit new books to be reviewed to Professor Gareth Williams, Department of Classics, Columbia University, 1130 Amsterdam Ave., 617 Hamilton Hall, MC 2861, New York, NY 10027, email: gdw5@columbia.edu.*

Thomas Baier (ed.). *Götter und menschliche Willensfreiheit: Von Lucan bis Silius Italicus*. Zetemata: Monographien zur Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 142. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2012. Pp. 301. €78.00 (pb.). ISBN 978-3-406-62559-6.

Gods and human free will in Latin literature of the Imperial period from Lucan to Silius Italicus form the subject matter of this collection of essays put together by Thomas Baier as the proceedings of a 2010 Würzburg conference. The volume comprises sixteen essays, a short introduction, a bibliography, and an index locorum. In the first part of the collection (“Grundlagen”), Christiane Reitz examines the various councils of the gods in Flavian epic and the reintroduction of the divine apparatus in epic poetry after Lucan. In her typology, Reitz investigates how Silius, Valerius, and Statius employ the various meetings of the gods for their narrative purposes: Silius to convey an “ideological message” (34) concerning the eventual triumph of Rome, Valerius to pass on a “poetic message” (37) as his poem continues or picks up the threads of Homeric and post-Homeric epic narrative, and Statius to mark the “distance” of his opus from that of his predecessors.

The second and lengthiest part of the volume is dedicated to Lucan, with seven essays studying the role of fate, *fortuna*, and the gods in the *Bellum Civile*. After an informative set of observations by Christine Walde on the function of *fortuna* in Lucan, Shadi Bartsch offers an insightful analysis of the confusing and confused narrator of the poem when it comes to a consistent moral stance: the reader is led to believe that the gods may or may not exist and that the civil war is both a terrible evil and a cause worth fighting for. Such ethical inconsistency is directly linked to the many paradoxes of the poetic project undertaken, Bartsch argues. I would also recommend Paolo Esposito’s article on the function of similes that involve mythic figures from drama (Medea, Pentheus, Cadmus, etc.) in Lucan and the Flavian epicists (even though this essay seems to be out of place and less connected with the theme of the volume), as well as Paolo Asso’s entry on emotions in Lucan.

Each of the following three sections is dedicated to Flavian epic, Statius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus, respectively. Sylvie Franchet d’Espèrey examines the role of the divine in the *Thebaid*, while William Dominik focuses on the character of Jupiter in particular and the lack of free will on the human level. Eckard Lefèvre’s essay on the problem of free will in Valerius’ *Argonautica* concludes that the overall picture is quite complex, reflecting the poet’s own inability to make sense of the overarching *Ordnung* in the world. Finally, Marco Fucecchi and Jochen Schultheiß discuss two episodes from Silius Italicus’ *Punica*, Jupiter’s prophecy in book 3 and Scipio at the Crossroads in book 15 respectively. Fucecchi connects the divine prophecy with imperial legitimization, while Schultheiß juxtaposes Hannibal as the foil to Scipio.

There are many insightful discussions of various passages in this volume, but, as is often the case with edited collections, quality among the essays varies

*Classical World*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2013) Pp.553–570

(and not all articles are up to date in terms of the bibliography). These observations aside, *Götter und menschliche Willensfreiheit* is a welcome addition to the growing bibliography on religion in Imperial Latin literature.

ANTONY AUGOUSTAKIS

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

Peter W. Rose. *Class in Archaic Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xiii, 439. \$120.00. ISBN 978-0-521-76876-4.

Class, it seems, is back. From Warren Buffet's declaration that the rich are waging class warfare and winning to the Occupy Movement with its moral condemnation of the concentration of wealth among the 1%, the role of class in constituting our world has become topical. But class is not generally deemed relevant to the study of antiquity. Rose's brilliant study aims to correct this in a wide-ranging demonstration of the explanatory value of approaching archaic Greece (c. 800–500 BC) from a Marxist perspective.

The introduction provides an exemplary theoretical overview with an accessible discussion of what class is and how it can be used to understand precapitalist societies. Rose explores both *open* (e.g., the Solonian crisis) and *hidden* class struggle (operating on the ideological plane or *within* ideology); alongside wealthy and small landowners, women and slaves figure prominently. Central to Rose's project is the careful elaboration of the pitfalls of *not* engaging with a Marxist conception of class and ideology through generous and critical analyses of previous scholarship.

Chapter 1 sets out a plausible model for the emergence of the polis in the Dark Age with small, relatively egalitarian bands of raiders led by charismatic warrior chiefs transitioning to larger communities led by aristocrats/oligarchs. Rose emphasizes the "changing forms of economic exploitation, the means of accumulating and distributing a socially generated surplus" (68) and in good Marxist fashion takes seriously the relationship between the mode of production, relations of production, and the social formation (cf. 19–20): archaeology, military organization, religion, and iconography are thus analyzed in terms of the creation of the polis as a solution to wealthy landowners' conflict with monarchic chiefs. Chapters 2 and 3 tackle Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* respectively (rearticulating some of Rose's previously published work). Rose argues that the *Iliad* dialectically addresses its historical moment (750–700 BC) with both critique of the polis' ruling aristocrats and nostalgia for the meritocratic and relatively egalitarian Dark Age society. Rose acknowledges the *Odyssey*'s celebration of aristocrats' military prowess and inherited excellence, but these "sops for the ruling class" (144) do not constitute the "main ideological program" (146). Rather, the various identities assumed by Odysseus (e.g., trader, beggar) address the "colonizing element" (i.e., those marginalized from the new poleis). Rose has little sympathy for any assumed aristocratic bias in the poems and focuses instead on their relation to the "heterogeneous class audience" (105).

Chapter 4 tackles Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*. For Rose, the question of the form of rule was a flashpoint of ideological struggle. *Theogony*

offers “those in power a utopian projection as a flattering vision of what they *ought* to be” (181; cf. 173–74), while portraying the dilemmas of the poor; *Works and Days* defiantly assaults the power-grabbing ruling aristocracy and embodies the resistance of an oppressed class. These small landholders would soon rebel against the oligarchs and help usher in one-man rule in the form of tyranny. Chapter 5 explores class conflict in the emergence of tyranny and the ideological conditions it produced. Rose discusses property relations and the exploitation of poor / small landholders; calls for land redistribution lead to an analysis of Solon’s legislation and a materialist analysis of “greed” and hubris common in archaic sources. Tyrants emerged on the back of class struggle, but their policies (e.g., building programs, public festivals) helped forge a homogeneous identity (“polis” and “citizens”) that downplayed class divisions.

Chapters 6 and 7 turn to Sparta and Athens respectively. The Spartan class system was the creation of a political crisis stemming from class conflict, and Rose examines its political, military, economic, and ideological (e.g., education, marriage) systems. The key here was the military organization of Spartiates as full-time hoplites, thus necessitating the exploitation of helots and *perioikoi*; but perhaps most valuable are Rose’s trenchant observations about the “ideological state apparatuses” aimed at maintaining (unequal) property and social relations. Chapter 7 analyzes Athens as reconstituted by Solon, the Peisistratids, and Kleisthenes. Rose underscores the increasing consciousness of the demos—becoming more assertive as a result of tyrants’ policies designed to foster a collective identity while also distinguishing them from their aristocratic rivals—but stresses the lack economic measures benefitting the poor under Kleisthenes. The lesson of Solon was decisive: “They ask for land, let them eat politics” (360). Democracy in Athens would have its own class character.

This is an important, learned book. I would have enjoyed more detailed discussion on demographics, public festivals, vase-painting, and dedications in the late archaic period. But what Rose masterfully weaves together are the ways in which struggles over the chief means of production—land—related to different political, legal, and ideological structures throughout archaic Greece.

DAVID KOWALKO ROSELLI

*Scripps College*

Christos Theodoridis (ed.). *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*. Vol. 3, Ν–Φ. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015. Pp. xxvii, 600. \$266.00. ISBN 978–3–11–028266–5.

[This is the third volume of the new edition of Photius’ lexicon: the project was undertaken after L. Politis’ discovery (1959) of a thirteenth-century manuscript (z) in a monastery at Zavorda (Macedonia) with an almost complete text of this lexicon, previously known from the badly damaged ms. Cambridge, Trinity College O.3.9, also called *Codex Galeanus* (g). As it became clear shortly after its discovery, z contained also a good deal of new classical quotations, most of them previously collected in K. Tsantsanoglou, *New Fragments of Greek Literature from the Lexicon of Photius* (Athens 1984). This brief sketch may convey the striking importance of a new edition of Photius’ lexicon that takes into

account the uncharted z. After the appearance of the first two parts (1982 and 1998) containing A–M, this long-awaited third volume should have covered the last section of the lexicon (letters N–Ω). Theodoridis' regrettable death in 2009 prevented him from completing his invaluable task, which was sent to press for the letters N– , thanks to the efforts of his widow N. Papatriantaphyllou-Theodoridis; the final letters (–Ω) will subsequently be edited by S. Matthaïos. The circumstances involving the final stage of the volume and its long-term production are partly amended by the useful list of *addenda* at 595–96, but some minor deficiencies remain: for example, Lysias and Antimachus should have been quoted according to the new editions by C. Carey (2007) and J. Matthews (1996), respectively. Again, the preface to the *Prolegomena* is lacking (although it is quoted in the apparatus); this ought to have dealt with the highly controversial relationship between Photius and *Suda*. Theodoridis' final views on the issue can be found in B. Atsalos and N. Tsironis, eds., *Actes du VI<sup>e</sup> Colloque International de Paléographie Grecque* (Athens 2008) 1.633–38.

All the glosses are edited with the same masterly technique found in the previous volumes: continuous numbering of the glosses (as in Adler's edition of *Suda*), source-indications in bold type on the margins, double apparatus: (a) *loci similes* and brief remarks on the content of the glosses; (b) reading variants of the mss. and conjectures by modern scholars.

A methodological case in point concerns the usage of *cruces desperationis*, where a textual corruption appears or the text itself seems to be muddled: it has rightly been questioned since the publication of the first volume,<sup>1</sup> and the same qualification can be advanced here. I offer a few remarks on selected points. First, on the mss. in the *conspectus siglorum* (1): the dating of g (twelfth century) should probably be eleventh century; see B. L. Fonkič, *Manuscripts grecs dans les Collections Européennes. Études Paléographiques et Codicologiques 1988–1998* (Moscow 1999) 50–52. Second, on the identification of the sources: ν 59, ϖ 1218, and ρ 108 seem to be drawn from a source that Theodoridis marks as Q (= I. Bekker, ed., *Lexeis Rhetorikai*, *Anecdota Graeca* I [Berlin 1814] 195–318); in ϖ 46 and ν 223 the phrases οἱ ῥήτορες ἐχρήσαντο and κείται παρὰ τοῖς ῥήτορσιν strongly suggest that these glosses originated from a lexicon on the style of Attic orators merged into the *Lex. Rhet.* quoted above, as stressed by G. Wentzel, *ASBW* 1895, 483 (= *Lexica Graeca Minora* [Hildesheim 1965] 7). A parallel source that has always been overlooked is the Atticist glossary used by Priscian in the last section of his *Ars* (*GL* III 278.12–377.18 Hertz), which shows similarities with entries of other Atticist lexica incorporated into Photius' work. I give here a list (albeit not exhaustive): ο 698 ≈ *GL* III 338, 21; ο 218 ≈ *GL* III 331, 7–8; π 170 ≈ *GL* III 342, 17–22; π 177 = *GL* III 344, 13–15; π 999 ≈ *GL* III 348.17–19 and 350, 11; π 1320 ≈ *GL* III 357.3–8; ν 187 ≈ *GL* III 373.7 H.; ν 1397 = *GL* III 373.20–21 (leaving aside Pollux 1. 65 quoted by Theodoridis, the most compelling parallel). Finally, on the commentary: for πέμφιξ in ρ 569, see also G. B. D'Alessio, in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova, eds., *Callimaco: Cent'anni di papiri* (Florence 2006) 101–17; as for ρ 614 πέποσσα, see

<sup>1</sup> See E. Degani, *Gnomon* 59 (1987) 589 = id. *Filologia e storia* (Hildesheim 2004) 773: "Qualche riserva impone l'impiego della *crux* [ . . . ]. Questo segno diacritico dovrebbe infatti indicare—è noto—corruzioni intervenute nella trasmissione di un testo, non anteriori ad esso o imputabili allo stesso autore."

*PCairoZenon* 59482, 18 πέποσχε (third century BCE) and *P.Schubart* 41, l. 46 (= fr. dub. 365, 46 Austin) διὰ τὸ πεποσχέναι.

This enormous task provides an undoubtedly better text than the previous one; until new finds increase Photius' limited textual tradition (probably owing to its restricted circulation at Byzantium), classical scholars will remain grateful to Theodoridis for having produced the definitive edition of this lexicon with praiseworthy dedication.

GIUSEPPE UCCIARDELLO

*University of Messina*

Andrzej Wypustek. *Images of Eternal Beauty in Funerary Verse Inscriptions of the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman Periods*. Mnemosyne Supplements, 352. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013. Pp. xii, 246. \$133.00. ISBN 978-90-04-23318-8.

The book surveys Greek funerary verse inscriptions of the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman periods that express positive concepts of the afterlife in order to establish whether they reflect eschatological beliefs about the posthumous destiny of the deceased. While scholars have so far mostly concentrated on the possible associations of this category of epitaphs with mystery cults and other organized sets of beliefs, Wypustek reasonably argues that most of these epitaphs do not reflect specific doctrines. Descriptions of the deceased as either ascending to the stars or kidnapped by a god are basically poetic metaphors that may or may not reflect eschatological beliefs. The title thus somewhat summarizes the author's main conclusion (ch. 7), namely that the aim of such descriptions was to "beautify" and thus "eternalize" the dead as a means of consolation for the survivors based on "the human conviction that what was beautiful, dear and loved could not cease to exist and could not fall into oblivion" (199).

Chapter 1 discusses previous scholarly approaches to the topic and elaborates the useful interpretive category of "consciously formulaic" epigrams; that is, poems that use *topoi* and conventional language, while still reflecting the true beliefs of the people who selected them, and are thus reliable witnesses to their visions of the afterlife. Chapter 2 explores possible cases of direct apotheosis of the dead, and indirect forms, such as ascension to the ether and catasterism.

Chapter 3 is devoted to heroization: Wypustek argues that it was mostly reserved for those who died young and was a means of both securing the protective powers of the dead for the living and of preventing "the deceased child's misfortunes in the afterlife" (94). Chapter 4 deals with premature death described as marriage with the gods. It analyzes the motif of the "bride of Hades," where the deceased girl is portrayed as a new Persephone. Wypustek surveys the main interpretations of the *topos* (in particular, associations with Orphic themes and Eleusinian mysteries have often been detected by scholars). His reasonable conclusion is that, although it might have been used in association with specific doctrines, it mostly served the purpose of stressing the beauty of the deceased. Adonis is then suggested as a possible male equivalent for Persephone in the role of abduction victim: the hypothesis is fascinating, but is not supported by convincing evidence. It is almost exclusively based on a literary poem,

Ausonius *epigram* 53 Green, where the myth of Adonis serves the purpose of stressing, through the association with that of Ganymede, the androgynous appearance of the deceased, as a way to make “acceptable” the pederastic theme to a fourth-century A.D. audience, as I have recently argued in *Eikasmós* 23 (2012) 283–300. It is thus more likely to be Ausonius’ innovation than the only remnant of a no longer extant funerary tradition where the male deceased was identified with Adonis abducted by Persephone.

Chapter 5 analyzes epitaphs where the dead are represented as abducted by the gods to become their lovers. Particular attention is paid to the myth of Ganymede. Wypustek dismisses Eustathius’ explicit interpretation of Ganymedes’ abduction as a symbol of premature death, arguing for a late source (*in Il.* 1205.10, 4.396.5 van der Valk), and he does not mention Plato, *Phaedrus* 255c, whose reading of the story already prefigured the symbolic idealization that was to become common. Nevertheless, he admits that Ganymede’s abduction was an allegory of premature death, and unconvincingly reaches this conclusion through the association of the topos with the theme of deaths caused by the thunder of Zeus. For Ganymede as a symbol of the ascension to heaven in literature and art in general, a reference to J. Davidson, *The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece* (London 2007) 169–200 would have been useful. Chapter 6 explores the motif of the dead as a new Hylas abducted by the Nymphs. Since the Nymphs were famed as *kourotrophoi*, Wypustek plausibly suggests that this myth was used for younger children, while the abductions of Ganymede / Persephone were reserved to those who died in their prime. One would have liked to see this argued more fully (how many epitaphs using the myths of Ganymede / Persephone actually state the age of the deceased, and what was it?).

All in all, in spite of the minor criticisms raised above, this book is a careful investigation into a fascinating category of epigrams and it will be useful for those working on a wide range of fields, from ancient religion to philosophy, and from epigraphy to Greek and Latin literature.

LUCIA FLORIDI

*Università degli Studi di Milano*

Debra Hamel. *Reading Herodotus: A Guided Tour through the Wild Boars, Dancing Suitors, and Crazy Tyrants of The History*. Pp. xxv, 329. \$60.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-1-4214-0655-8; \$29.95 (pb.). ISBN 978-1-4214-0656-5.

“But hold! I hear you cry. I had a cup of bull’s blood with my breakfast this morning and I’m just fine. And so you are. Because in fact bull’s blood isn’t poisonous. . . .” So Hamel writes in just one of the witty passages in this loose retelling of Herodotus’ *History*. Her book, she promises, will contain only the “juicy bits,” leaving the “boring bits” safely out of sight on the cutting-room floor. Hamel delivers this and more: the “guided tour” of her title is in fact undergirded by considerable scholarship—just enough to introduce readers to alternative accounts of important elements in Herodotus’ work (the usurpation of Gyges, the death of Croesus) but not more than the general reader will be game for, and



giving due consideration to occasions when Herodotus may have been misled by his sources. I learned from reading the book several things that I had not known—that a mule, for example, had in fact foaled in Colorado in the spring of 2007! (This was confirmed by DNA testing. So much for the impossibility of such a thing.) And speaking of animals, the discussion of woman-on-goat (or goat-on-woman) sex in Egyptian Mendes, also mentioned in Pindar fragment 201, gives rise not only to a discussion of Mendesian goats and Satanism but inspired Hamel to include (65) a remarkable 1854 drawing by Eliphas Lévi of the “Baphomet of Mendes,” a memorable hybrid goat/human figure—with wings.

Hamel constantly draws her reader in with her use of first- and second-person pronouns—“you guessed it” appears frequently. The language is colloquial throughout. A man is often a “guy,” children “kids,” and lots of stuff is, well, “stuff.” One of her favorite words is “hightail.” Some readers will find this grating; others will be charmed (as I was). Chapter and section titles are designed to keep interest alive: the equine contest that led to Darius’ accession is labeled “The Neighs Have It.” Her reconstruction (59) of the conversation between Spako and Mitridates when Mitridates brings the infant Cyrus home and tells Spako of his orders to kill the baby is hilarious. (*Spako*: You can’t kill it! You just can’t! *Mitridates*: I must! *Spako*: You mustn’t. *Mitridates*: If I don’t, Harpagus will kill me. *Spako*: Okay, okay, I’ve got a plan. . . .)

Although the book has much to say to scholars, it is directed primarily to the general reader, and, at over 300 pages, of such readers it asks a lot. I myself hit the proverbial brick wall on page 206—not that there was anything wrong with page 205, but I had just had enough. Why, I said to myself in full Hamelesque mode, reading this book is a Marathon! Pruning by a good editor might have made it a better book, although, to be fair, much the same has been said of Herodotus, and with that I would not agree. Perhaps I am selling the general reader short.

The body of the text is preceded by a time line adapted from Robert Strassler’s *Landmark Herodotus*, plus a breakdown of each book of *The History* and four very clear maps. Still more welcome are the chronologies at the outset of each chapter. Hamel also includes, in addition to footnotes and a very full bibliography, a brief appendix on Xerxes’ Heralds and the Medizing of the Greek States (7.131–132). One minor drawback is the poor paper quality, but this is only an issue where there are illustrations, which are few and not central to the narrative (although one would not want to miss the electrifying Baphomet of Mendes).

JENNIFER T. ROBERTS

*City College of New York and CUNY Graduate Center*

Claire Louise Wilkinson. *The Lyric of Ibycus: Introduction, Texts and Commentary*. Sozomena, 13. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013. Pp. x, 318. €154.00. ISBN 978-3-11-029514-6.

This book, a revised version of the author’s doctoral thesis, offers us a commentary on “those fragments which offer the greatest scope for an analysis of Ibycus as a writer” (preface), along with a text based on Wilkinson’s examination of the papyri, her own translations, and a general introduction dealing with Ibycus as

an author. While the reader may regret the fact that Wilkinson was unable to pursue her original aim of providing a commentary on every fragment of Ibycus, we should not overlook how thorough a resource she has provided us with, for the detail and scope of this book far exceeds any other publication on this author.

The introduction is relatively short, but it covers all the main bases, and offers discussion of Ibycus' life and dates, the major themes of his poetry (myth, love, and praise), his use of imagery, likely performance contexts, dialect, meter, and the transmission of the poetry. For me, the most interesting section was that on myth, which begins with a helpful list of the range of myth categories to which Ibycus refers, and uses this to discuss where he is similar to other lyric poets (such as his interest in Trojan myth) and where he differs (in his use of Sicilian themes, which Wilkinson connects to the desires of local patrons). The discussion of Ibycus' relationship to epinicia, and the question of whether he can be considered an epinician poet, will also be useful, since, as Wilkinson notes (24), this is an issue that has been overlooked in Anglophone scholarship. The table of Ibycus' use of imagery (28) provides a quick overview of a dense topic, and helps the reader to draw out major strands.

The commentary itself forms the bulk of the book, and can fairly be described as exhaustive. Each fragment is given its own miniature introduction, dealing with questions such as the content and type of poem, the papyrus, metrical analysis, or further general points about style and imagery (as applicable). In the lemmatic commentary itself, almost every line of Greek included receives detailed discussion, whether for the choice of an adjective, the parallels for a usage in other authors, or papyrological description. Wilkinson is well versed in the scholarship on the relevant questions, and this is a rigorous and thorough piece of work. At times the commentary could have done with a little streamlining: for example, discussions of parallels could sometimes do with trimming, or with the author making it clearer what the payoff of discussing these parallels is for our understanding of Ibycus. Similarly, while Wilkinson's desire to take account of the full range of views in the scholarship is admirable, we can get a bit bogged down in the detail at times. Nevertheless, the level of commentary offered will certainly be useful for those wishing to pursue matters further. It is particularly valuable for the less famous fragments, which do not feature in anthologies of lyric or articles other than technical and papyrological ones, and Wilkinson's patient analysis of these fragments will make it much easier for scholars to see what is interesting or important about them in the future. A gripe aimed at the publisher has to do with the ease of navigation within the volume: it is irritating that the page headers list only the broad grouping of fragments (e.g., "Manuscript Fragments," or the number of the papyrus which preserves this set of fragments), instead of the individual fragment number, which means that readers cannot simply flick through and find the poems they are looking for, but must use the table of contents each time.

This is not a book for beginners to Greek lyric, and Wilkinson at times could ease the reader better into the material, or foreground the important issues more clearly. For graduate students and scholars working on Greek lyric, however, this detailed and scholarly discussion of Ibycus' poetry will be a highly worthwhile resource, and I have no doubt that the existence of the commentary will fuel further scholarship on Ibycus' poetics.

LAURA SWIFT

*The Open University, Milton Keynes*

Claire L. Lyons, Michael Bennett, and Clemente Marconi (eds.). *Sicily: Art and Invention between Greece and Rome*. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2013. Pp. 288, 144 color and 23 b/w illustrations, 1 map. \$60.00. ISBN 978-1-60606-133-6.

This volume accompanies an exhibition of the same name on the material culture of Sicily from the close of the Archaic period (marked by the Battle of Himera) and the Hellenistic period (the fall of Syracuse to Rome). As noted in one of several forewords, the show and the book itself are a product of an agreement between the J. Paul Getty Museum and the region of Sicily, concluded in 2010, that included the restitution of a number of antiquities to Italy, as well as other loans, exhibits, conferences, research, and (on the part of the Getty) conservation of objects sent or lent by Italy. Including many works from the Getty, from several museums in Sicily, from the British Museum, and others, the exhibition was on view at (and co-organized by) the Getty and the Cleveland Museum of Art during 2013, curated by Lyons and Bennett. It was also scheduled for Palermo in early 2014 (but with different curators). The volume is not, however, a catalog of the exhibition, strictly speaking (see below).

An introduction by the curators highlights the central importance of Sicily during this period, even to the point of insistence on its influence and innovativeness. A helpful time line follows, which correlates historical events across the Mediterranean with cultural and social developments. Five main themes structure the book: history, cultural politics, and identity; religion and mythology; Sikeliote culture; Hellenism; and Sicilian art and archaeology in this period. Each includes essays on particular topics and features called a "Focus" on specific objects or subtopics. Many of the latter deal with objects in the exhibit—including perhaps the most prominent, the stunning marble figure of a victorious charioteer found at Punic Motya, now restored and with a new anti-seismic base courtesy of the Getty conservators—but also other important works that were not in the exhibition, for example the important female cult statue, sometimes identified as Aphrodite, but likely to be another goddess, returned by the Getty to Sicily and now in the Museo Archeologico Regionale in Aidone near Morgantina.

The essays are written by a great diversity of scholars, some of whom will be well known to scholars specializing in Sicilian history, culture, and archaeology. Here it is only possible to highlight some of the contributions. In addition to the Focus on the cult statue noted above, Marconi offers an essay on sculpture that includes a number of late-Archaic works that help to place the Charioteer in context. This can be read with the essay by Ferruzza on terracotta sculpture, a major feature of Sicilian art, which also includes an unusual head of Hades in the Getty that has now been assigned to Morgantina and the sanctuary that produced Archaic acrolithic sculptures of Demeter and Persephone (not discussed in this volume and not on loan for the exhibition, as they date to the sixth century BCE) as well as the cult statue in Aidone; this sanctuary does, however, receive Focus treatment. Another Focus devoted to the extraordinary bronze ram from Syracuse, now in Palermo (and not in the exhibition in the United States), supports a suggested redating to the second century CE, which if accepted places the work well outside the period dealt with in the exhibition and the rest of the volume. Coins feature prominently in the exhibition, and are the subject of both Focus treatment and an essay. Another treats mural painting in Hellenistic Sicily,

an important tradition here that is usually eclipsed by Macedonia. It may be read with the Focus on the Hellenistic silver set from Morgantina by Bell, which deals not only with its original domestic context, but details its repatriation, also in 2010, from the Metropolitan Museum of Art. An essay and two Focus pieces bear on the figure of Archimedes and his context in Sicily and accompany one of the treasures of the exhibition that might be overlooked by the public: leaves from the celebrated Archimedes palimpsest now on loan to the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore.

Feature like the lavish illustrations, the Focus device, capsule histories, and time line seem to aim the book at the coffee tables of museum-goers, while the essays also offer many insights and contentions for scholars to consider. Its up-to-date survey of recent finds and developments in the study of this rich island recommend the book to a wide audience, though not every contribution is uniformly valuable.

CARLA ANTONACCIO

*Duke University*

Siobhán McElduff. *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*. Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies, 14. New York: Routledge, 2013. Pp. ix, 266. \$125.00. ISBN 978-0-415-81676-2.

This monograph aims to understand how the Romans conceptualized their translation of Greek literature. McElduff tackles a tremendous volume of material from a vast historical period, working with both poetry and prose in her search for a Roman theory of translation. Her basic assumption, as set forth in the introduction, is that the source text (ST) for Latin translators was not an entity to be faithfully adapted, but rather one to be competed against and, ideally, dominated in the cultural negotiation between Rome and conquered Greece.

Chapter 1 contains an overview of nonliterary translation. This introduction to topics such as bilingualism and official *interpretes* will be useful to beginners, though it offers little that is new. The book then proceeds roughly diachronically, beginning with Livius Andronicus' and Ennius' introduction of epic to Rome in chapter 2. Chapter 3 explores Roman comedy, arguing that the genre's appropriation of Greek literature via translation is a strategy of containment used "to present a stereotype of Greekness that would fix the colonial subject as a category within Rome" (78). McElduff surveys, inter alia, Plautus' didascalical references (66–72) and the Terentian prologues (85–94) in her effort to shed light on the contentious debate surrounding Latin adaptation of Greek New Comedy. In chapter 4, which is devoted to Cicero, McElduff observes an association between translation and elite Roman identity, asserting that the orator's writing on the subject is deeply implicated in his political and social maneuverings. She also argues that Cicero saw translation as a civic endeavor aimed at making Rome culturally self-sufficient, though, the author suggests, the risk of losing his own voice in the process brought about the ultimate collapse of the orator's project.

Chapter 5 covers the late Republican and early Augustan age, examining the works of Parthenius of Nicaea, Catullus, Horace, Lucretius, and Germanicus Caesar, in whom McElduff sees " . . . a complicated nexus where translation had

multiple functions" (156), among them philosophical, social, and literary. She concludes, however, that they find common ground in their use of Greek texts without regard for their original integrity. Chapter 6 closes the book by briefly considering the writing of the two Senecas, Polybius, Quintilian, Pliny the Younger, and Aulus Gellius. Here, McElduff emphasizes literary translation as an intellectual activity that served to delineate the boundaries of elite status, especially through its connection to rhetorical training. Once again, she sees free use of the ST as a persistent element of Roman translation. Following are a summarizing conclusion (187) and an appendix of Latin words for "translation" (189–96).

Several of McElduff's ideas are illuminating, such as her observations on Plautus' use of *vortere* as connected to physical transformation (72–73), on the orator *qua* translator of men, opinion, and literature (97–100), and on Horace's effective use of the lyric *I* (138–39). Nevertheless, this book is, in many ways, deficient in method and argumentation. The author's premise that ". . . from Livius [Andronicus] onwards, Roman literary translators *all translate in the same way*" (43) is flawed, based as it is upon only a very small sample of Latin translations actually comparable to their Greek originals. In reality, this question (particularly as it relates to Republican translation) is obscured by a gaping lack of evidence. But McElduff's choice not to study this literary phenomenon through close comparison of Greek originals to their Latin adaptations (4) weakens the import of this hypothesis, even when it might be borne out. Her statement, for instance, that the *Ilias Latina*'s "free attitude toward its ST shows that it stood within the main track of Roman translation" (170) goes unsubstantiated by textual evidence. When she does compare Greek models and their Latin translations, the Greek text is given only in English—a methodologically rather questionable procedure. For instance, when examining the adaptation of Augustus' *Res Gestae* into Greek, McElduff argues that the superscriptions of the two versions are "radically different," comparing the Latin inscription to Cooley's translation of the Greek version (36–37). Likewise, Sappho 31 (130) and Aratus' *Phaenomena* (153–54) are cited only in English. These problems are compounded by dubious and unsupported proposals, such as the claim that the alleged altercation between Naevius and the Metelli was ultimately about who was allowed to use the saturnian meter (54).

McElduff's failure to define translation and differentiate it from intertextuality within the parameters of her study is also problematic. This becomes evident in her discussion of Lucretius, whom she calls an "omnivorous translator" in his translation of "not just Thucydides, but poets such as Homer, Callimachus, Sappho, and Euripides, along with a range of Greek philosophers" (147). She offers no justification for viewing Lucretius' engagement with Greek texts as "translation," nor does she convincingly give grounds for grouping other highly allusive texts such as Ennius' *Annales* and the Horatian *Odes* together with explicit translations, such as Germanicus' adaptation of Aratus' *Phaenomena*.

Finally, this book is, regrettably, rife with errors and / or typos in translation of Latin excerpts. For example, a quotation of Isidorus of Seville *Etym.* 10.123, which reads *sed et qui Deum [quem] interpretatur et hominum quibus divina indicat mysteria, interpres vocatur [quia inter eam quam transferet]*, is significantly misconstrued, rendered as "[b]ut he who interprets and reveals divine mysteries is also called an interpreter, because he translates them" (24). What is more, phrases and sometimes entire paragraphs quoted in Latin are left out of the translation, such as in the excerpt from Aulus Gellius (179–81).

Despite these failings, McElduff's book is a useful introduction for nonspecialists in the topic of literary translation.

EMILIA BARBIERO  
*University of Toronto*

Leonid Zhmud. *Pythagoras and the Early Pythagoreans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp. xxiv, 491. \$185.00. ISBN 978-0-19-928931-8.

This is a major revision and expansion of *Wissenschaft, Philosophie und Religion im frühen Pythagoreismus* (1997), described by one reviewer as the most important contribution to Pythagorean studies in thirty years—a period that saw the publication of Burkert's *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, widely considered the foundation of modern Pythagorean studies. *Pythagoras and the Early Pythagoreans* is even better than Zhmud's previous book.

With an unsurpassed command of primary materials and meticulous scholarship, Zhmud gives a thorough treatment of Pythagoreanism through the fifth century, occasionally ranging into the Pythagoreans of the fourth as well. He presents a careful treatment of the source material on Pythagoras' life and activities, and discusses who are to count as Pythagoreans. He proceeds to discuss all things (allegedly) Pythagorean, including metempsychosis and vegetarianism, politics and the nature of Pythagorean "societies," *mathematikoi* and *akusmatikoi*, number theory and numerology, geometry and harmonics, cosmology and astronomy, and medicine and the life sciences, concluding with an examination of Pythagorean views on the soul and the doctrine that all is number.

Recent treatments of Pythagoreanism present early material, admitting that it is too scanty to yield a full picture of Pythagoras and his followers, and supplement it by selective use of the later material. Zhmud follows this method with two modifications: he is more consistent in rejecting later information that does not go back to the fourth century, and he infers Pythagoras' interests and activities from those of his followers—deriving conclusions that challenge widely held beliefs.

Consider the following examples:

- Pythagoras was not a shaman or a wonder-worker.
- Stories of his travels to Egypt and other lands are probably spurious.
- No single trait, aside from membership in Pythagorean societies, marks all known early Pythagoreans; some pursued mathematics, others natural philosophy, medicine, and / or athletics.
- Pythagorean societies were not religious groups or cults.
- There was no strict code of conduct regulating every aspect of Pythagoreans' lives.
- The early Pythagoreans did not attribute their own discoveries to Pythagoras.
- The distinction between *mathematikoi* and *akusmatikoi* was a later fabrication.
- It is likely that Pythagoras proved the Pythagorean theorem and discovered the theory of even and odd numbers and the arithmetic, geometric and harmonic means.

- Pythagoras was first to use deductive proofs in number theory.
- Early Pythagoreans and possibly Pythagoras himself made use of experiments to verify their physical theories.
- Alcmaeon was a Pythagorean.
- Alcmaeon alone taught that the soul is immortal, a theory with no connection to metempsychosis.

These conclusions radically undermine current interpretations of early Pythagoreanism. They are founded on close readings of relevant textual evidence and cannot be overlooked. Anyone wishing to challenge them must examine the assumptions on which they are based, engage with the textual evidence, and present alternative interpretations that fit the evidence as well as Zhmud's. This effort, even if its result is to reinforce previously held views, can only be healthy for Pythagorean studies. I believe that alternative views can be successfully sustained in a number of cases, since with Pythagoras there are no clear and certain starting points. Zhmud's view that Alcmaeon was a Pythagorean is an example. It is based on circumstantial evidence that nevertheless some may reject in the absence of reliable ancient sources that call Alcmaeon a Pythagorean.

Some interpretive strategies may also be questioned. One is the practice of inferring Pythagoras' activities from those of his followers, which gives us a robust picture of Pythagoras, but one not found in early sources. Another is the inference that something (for example, Pythagorean interest in number philosophy) was a later fabrication from the absence of early evidence for it. Yet another is the tendency to rely on Iamblichus' list of Pythagoreans since it depends on Aristoxenus. This takes us back to the fourth century, still over a century after the earliest Pythagoreans, during which it is not implausible that other notable Greeks from Southern Italy were added to an original list of Pythagoreans.

Despite these concerns, I want to conclude by saying that I regard this book as a landmark whose arguments and theses cannot be disregarded by anyone who wants to form an accurate picture of Pythagoras and the Pythagorean tradition. I say with confidence that it will remain a standard reference point for the foreseeable future.

RICHARD MCKIRAHAN  
*Pomona College*

Andreas Schatzmann. *Nikarchos II: Epigrammata. Einleitung, Texte, Kommentar. Hypomnemata*, 188. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012. Pp. 421. €99.99. ISBN 978-3-525-25288-8.

Was Oedipus right in identifying the four- / two- / three-legged creature of the Sphinx's riddle as man? Not quite: according to a Greek epigram found on papyrus and published by Peter Parsons in 1999 (*P.Oxy.* 4502 fr. 4), it is the passive homosexual (ἀνήρ παθητικός), who has two legs when standing upright, four when bending over, and three when he's got an erection. This witty little poem was authored by Nicarchus, a writer of the first century. A.D. whose skoptic epigrams (for the most part transmitted through the *Palatine Anthology*) have received surprisingly little attention. Besides a handful of articles, we had, up until now, only a

slim commentary by Hendrich Schulte (1999), which hardly provides more than the most rudimentary explanations. Andreas Schatzmann's substantial commentary, based on his 2006 dissertation, therefore fills an important gap. Over the past two decades, the genre of epigram has stood at the center of much scholarly work, which, however, has mainly focused on texts from the Hellenistic period. Satirical epigram is still a largely neglected subgenre, though this will hopefully change thanks to contributions such as this or Lucia Floridi's forthcoming commentary on Lukillios, a contemporary of, and important model for, Nicharchus.

Schatzmann's introduction offers, *inter alia*, a good overview of the poems' transmission, the development of satirical epigram, its place within the history of the genre, and its various non-epigrammatic models. He is surely right in regarding the seeming orality of the poems and their evocation of a sympotic setting as primarily *literary* phenomena, paying due attention to the significance of a bookish context for the poems' reception (pace G. Nisbet, whose 2003 study on *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire* subscribes to the rather one-sided view that collections of satirical epigram functioned only as handy sources for jokes at dinner parties, and not as literary works).

In the main part of his study, Schatzmann not only offers lemmatized commentaries to each text, but also interpretative discussions of the individual epigrams as well as their overarching themes. His explanations are, in general, very useful and he shows good instincts for the literariness of the poems, even if his readings do not sparkle with sophistication. Indeed, for a discussion of witty texts such as these, Schatzmann's remarkably dry prose does not always convey the poems' humor in the most vivid manner. Nonetheless, his commentary contains plenty of valuable insights. I very much like, for instance, his reading of *AP* 11.110, an *agon* between three *leptoi* who compete for the title of "skinnier-than-skinny" (*λεπτεπιλεπτότερος*, v. 2), as a metapoetic reflection on the *agon* between epigrammatists trying to outdo each other with ever more grotesque variations on the theme ("Der fiktive Wettstreit wäre gewissermaßen eine Chiffre für den epigrammatischen *Agon* in der Realwelt; die Grenze der Fiktionalität ein Spiegel für die Grenze, Epigramme über *λεπτοί* zu gestalten," 190).

The study contains a few mistakes, most blatantly Schatzmann's contention that epigrams by a Hellenistic namesake of Nicharchus (hence Nicharchus II in the title!) still stand in the alphabetical order that Meleager chose as an organizing principle for his edition (21): it has long since been shown that only Philip arranged his *Garland* alphabetically, whereas Meleager's *Stephanos* was ordered thematically. Curious, too, is Schatzmann's translation of vv. 11–12 in *AP* 11.328, a poem that brilliantly rewrites the division of the universe between Zeus, Hades, and Poseidon in *Iliad* 15 as the division of a woman sexually shared by three men. The epigram ends: γῆ δ' ἔμενε ξυνη πάντων· ψίαθον γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ / στρώσαντες τὴν γῆν ὡδε διειλόμεθα, which Schatzmann renders as "Die Erde aber blieb gemeinsamer Besitz von allen. Eine Matte also legten wir auf der Alten aus, und so teilten wir sie uns auf." Surely, though, the mat was spread out on the earth (ἐν τῇ γῆ), not on the old woman!

But these minor quibbles aside, one can only welcome Schatzmann's commentary as an important contribution and helpful tool in the study of satirical epigram.

REGINA HÖSCHELE  
University of Toronto



Christoph Helmig. *Forms and Concepts: Concept Formation in the Platonic Tradition*. Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca et Byzantina, 5. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012. Pp. xii, 395. \$154.00. ISBN 978-3-11-026631-3.

Ancient theories on concept formation are wildly different, and even within the Platonic tradition we find considerable divergences. Helmig's book covers almost the whole range of this tradition in antiquity, Proclus being the last author to be discussed substantially. The Platonist account of knowledge acquisition is centered on the notion of recollection (*ἀνάμνησις*), where Helmig suggests that the content of recollection is a set of universal concepts. In Plato, there can be no sudden leap from ignorance to knowledge, but only a long process involving reason. Traces of such a notion can be found everywhere in the dialogues. Helmig also argues—to my mind rightly—that the approach stating that recollection is confined to higher learning is misguided.

Among other Platonists in the early imperial period, he discusses Alcinoüs at length, arguing that his epistemology is purely Platonic without any significant Aristotelian input. This implies that the so-called *δοξαστικός λόγος* cannot be taken as a concept or proposition acquired in a purely empirical way. The Neoplatonists developed an elaborate epistemology based on innate knowledge. Plotinus anticipated much of what we find in Syrianus and Proclus, especially on the connection between sense perception and reason, as well as on the distinction between different types of concepts. An important innovation of Proclus seems to be that we cannot assume that comparing sense data and innate knowledge is a conscious act; we can make use of our innate knowledge, although we may not be able to account for it. It leads immediately to problems about our grasp of the content of the soul. Proclus, as well as Damascius, suggested that we possess confused notions of our innate knowledge that need to be articulated further. This articulation, however, is subject to error. Such a strong emphasis on the Platonic epistemology raises the more general question about the tendencies in that period to find harmony between Plato and Aristotle. We must admit that the efforts of reconciliation had very clear limits.

Two short remarks may be in place. In discussing the theory of recollection, Helmig lays particular stress on the sources of error involved in the process (317). He also registers the problem of continuity between *Meno* and *Phaedo*. We might suggest that one important difference between the two accounts can be explained with reference to the problem of error. The content of recollection in the *Meno* is propositional and therefore exposed to falsity. By contrast, recollection in the *Phaedo* concerns concepts (noted on 59) that are neither true nor false. It may be that Plato changed his view in order to avoid the difficulties of justification of innate propositions. This, of course, implies that recollection in the *Phaedo* is nothing but a prerequisite for knowledge, which may be a kind of causal explanation referring to the Forms. Moreover, one can agree that Proclus' notion of *προβολή* is not easy to interpret and translations (into “projection,” “putting forward,” or “advancing”) mirror the difficulty. Among other possibilities, projection onto *phantasia* in geometrical thinking might not be interpreted as a process whereby the soul alienates itself from itself (298). It might be an overstatement. After all, in Proclus' account, *phantasia*, along with a considerable range of sense perception, is fused with the rational element throughout. Callicles does not figure in the *Theaetetus* (322).

The book is furnished with extensive bibliography and indices. It is a highly rewarding reading for all students in ancient philosophy, especially for those interested in any aspects of epistemology and theory of the soul.

PETER LAUTNER

*Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest*

Robert Lamberton (tr.). *Proclus the Successor on Poetics and the Homeric Poems: Essays 5 and 6 of His Commentary on the Republic of Plato*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World, 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012. Pp. xlii, 322. \$43.95 (pb.). ISBN 978-1-58983-711-9.

Anyone interested in the intellectual aftermath of Plato's notorious banishment of Homer from his *Republic* (books 3 and 10) will find Proclus' commentary on that dialogue particularly inspiring. Two sections of Proclus' text are translated in the present book: essay 5 contains a swift general overview about the true essence and the ultimate goal of poetry and μουσική, whereas essay 6, in attempting to defend the poet from the charges of impiety and third-grade mimesis, provides a full-fledged allegorical reading of some famous Homeric myths (from the Theomachy in *Iliad* 20 to the love of Ares and Aphrodite in *Odyssey* 8), as well as a classification of the three kinds of poetry (inspired, didactic, and mimetic), allegedly emerging from Plato's dialogues.

Proclus' essays are pivotal to the development of poetics in Western culture, as Lamberton himself has already pointed out in a seminal study, *Homer the Theologian* (1986). The present book, by healing the lack of a complete English translation, should thus be welcomed not only by classicists, but also by theoreticians of literature and by historians of ancient and modern culture in general—all the more so because Proclus' Greek is far from easy or readable. Lamberton's achievement is generally good, though of course it occasionally leaves room for disagreement: at 46.9 K "vivid representation" is perhaps unfair to the Greek ζωτική ὁμοίωσις, "assimilation in the vital mode" (cf. Procl. in *Plat. Parm.* 903.26); at 47.10 K "The education of souls is also a form of medicine" should read "Education is medicine for the soul," with an allusion to a widespread definition of philosophy (e.g., Elias in *Porph. Isag.* 27.14 Busse, or, in a Christian sense, Origen's c. *Cels.* 1.63); at 51.9 K Greek drama does not "speak of the heroes in language unworthy of them," but rather "attributes" such language to the heroes; 52.10 K "That [higher soul] set out to make the [en]cosmic one" should read "That [total activity, ὀλικὴ ἐνέργεια] set out to render it [*viz.* the human soul] universal." One also regrets the absence of a glossary of philosophical terms (such as *logos*, *kosmos*, *eidolon*, *eikon*, etc.).

The Greek text has been typeset anew, although it follows *ad litteram* W. Kroll's 1899 edition: it was an excellent idea to keep Kroll's pagination and line numbers, and at the same time to break the text into paragraphs and subsections for the sake of readability—even though this subdivision is occasionally debatable; for example, the paragraph starting at 110.8 K (arguing that the

words of Penelope's suitors should not be passed as Homer's own thought—a typical case of “solution according to the character,” or λύσις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου) certainly belongs to Proclus' reply, not to the question posed. Given the constraints of the SBL series, one cannot complain over the absence of a critical apparatus, though perhaps the idea of underlining conjectural words in the text can strike one as neither common nor consistently followed (e.g., the reader is not told that at 50.14 K γέλωπας is actually Bernays' conjecture on the transmitted τελετάς).

What has to be more acutely regretted is something else: an opportunity has been missed to give the general reader a proper appreciation of Proclus' arguments both in detail and in the general framework of recent studies on symbol and allegory in antiquity, and Proclus' literary output. Thus, important books dealing also with these essays (such as P. Struck's *The Birth of the Symbol* or L. Brisson's *How Philosophers Saved Myths*) are simply neglected; no mention is made of R. M. van den Berg's 2001 book on *Proclus' Hymns*, which also tackles the issue of images and symbols in Proclus' commentaries and its bearing on his own poetry. The notes, a great many of which are simply textual, deriving directly from A. J. Festugière's pathbreaking 1970 French translation, seldom tackle philosophical or literary issues, omit some important cross-references (how should one know that, e.g., at 193.5–6 K “the distinction between the image and the soul that uses it” refers back to the discussion of the *Nekyia* in 172.9–30?), and do not systematically refer the reader to Lamberton's own earlier treatments of individual passages, as, for example the elaborated allegory of Proteus in 112.24 K (see *Homer the Theologian*, 224–27).

Other SBL volumes do provide the essential reference tools for orientating the reader in the manifold facets of the texts they present. Here, the introduction offers little more than a short summary of the essays, and an outline of the historical context of Athens' Neoplatonic school as well as of Proclus' relationship to his teacher Syrianus and to the Christian milieu. A proper appreciation of the “question-and-answer” (“zetematic”) format of both essays is also lacking, and so too is an overview of Proclus' debt to earlier scholarly approaches, from Stoic allegory to rhetorical exegesis. Finally, the idea of translating Kroll's Latin preface to his 1899 Teubner edition (pp. xxxiii–xxxv), beyond some embarrassing mistakes (*librarius quidem* as “some librarian”; *vitia sustulerit* as “introduced mistakes”), obliterates a century of studies on the *codex unicus* of Proclus' commentary on the *Republic* (Laurentianus 80.9 + Vat. Gr. 2197), a manuscript that has become in the meantime not only one of the main representatives of the so-called “philosophical collection” (an immensely important, and hotly debated, series of books copied in mid-ninth-century Constantinople, probably deriving *recta via* from Late antique schools such as Alexandria or Athens itself: see for example C. D'Ancona [ed.], *The Libraries of the Neoplatonists*, Leiden 2007), but also a book borrowed and annotated in the fifteenth century by the initiator of Western Neoplatonism, Marsilio Ficino.

FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI  
*Università Ca' Foscari, Venice*

**REVIEWS in This Issue**

**Regina Hoeschele:** *Nikarchos* (Schatzmann). 565

**Richard McKirahan:** *Pythagoras* (Zhmud). 564

**Jenny Roberts:** *Herodotus* (Hamel). 558

**Laura Swift:** *Ibycus* (Wilkinson). 559

**Peter Lautner:** *Forms and Concepts* (Helmig). 568

**Antony Augoustakis:** *Götter und menschliche Willensfreiheit* (Baier). 553

**David Roselli:** *Class in Greece* (Rose). 554

**Lucia Floridi:** *Beauty in Funerary Verse* (Wypoustek). 557

**Giuseppe Ucciardello:** *Photii Lexicon* (Theodoridis). 555

**Carla Antonaccio:** *Sicily* (Lyons et al). 561

**Emilia Barbiero:** *Roman Theories of Translation* (McElduff). 562

**Filippomaria Pontani:** *Proclus the Successor* Robert Lamberton (tr.). 568

## BOOKS RECEIVED, CW 107.4

Giorgio Agamben and Monica Ferrando. *The Unspeakable Girl: The Myth and Mystery of Kore*. London: Seagull Books, 2014. Pp. xii, 150. \$25.00. ISBN 978-0-8584-2-083-1.

Translated by Leland de la Durantaye and Annie Julia Wyman.

Marke Ahonen. *Mental Disorders in Ancient Philosophy*. Studies in the History of Philosophy of Mind, 13. Heidelberg: Springer, 2014. Pp. xi, 265. \$129.00. ISBN 978-3-319-03430-0.

Jed W. Atkins. *Cicero on Politics and the Limits of Reason: The Republic and Laws*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv, 270. \$95.00. ISBN 978-1-107-04358-9.

Ryan K. Balot. *Courage in the Democratic Polis: Ideology and Critique in Classical Athens*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xv, 408. \$65.00. ISBN 978-0-19-998215-8.

Mary Beard. *Laughter in Ancient Rome: On Joking, Tickling, and Cracking Up*. Sather Classical Lectures, 71. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2014. Pp. x, 319. \$29.95. ISBN 9-780-520-27716-8.

Peter Bing and Regina Höschele (trs.). *Aristaenetos: Erotic Letters*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World, 32. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. \$39.95 (hb.). ISBN 978-1-58983-882-6; \$24.95 (pb.). ISBN 978-1-58983-741-6.

A. J. Bowen (ed.). *Aeschylus*. Suppliant Women. Aris and Phillips Classical Texts. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2013. Pp. iii, 374. \$85.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-1-908343-78-9; \$34.00 (pb.). ISBN 978-1-908343-34-5.

With a translation, introduction, and commentary by the editor.

A. M. Bowie (ed.). *Homer*. *Odyssey Books XIII and XIV*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xi, 258. \$90.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-0-521-76354-7; \$34.99 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-521-15938-8.

A. J. Boyle (ed.). *Seneca: Medea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. cl, 481. \$199.00. ISBN 978-0-19-960208-7.

An edition with introduction, translation, and commentary.

Trevor Bryce. *Ancient Syria: A Three Thousand Year History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xiv, 379. \$50.00. ISBN 978-0-19-964667-8.

Averil Cameron. *Byzantine Matters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014. Pp. xix, 164. \$22.95. ISBN 978-0-691-15763-4.

Averil Cameron. *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*. Hellenic Studies, 65. Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2014. Pp. xi, 85. \$19.95 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-674-42835-5.

*Classical World*, vol. 107, no. 4 (2013) Pp.571–578

Pramit Chaudhuri. *The War with God: Theomachy in Roman Imperial Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xvi, 386. \$74.00. ISBN 978-0-19-999338-3.

Jessica H. Clark. *Triumph in Defeat: Military Loss and the Roman Republic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xviii, 240. \$74.00. ISBN 978-0-19-933654-8.

Eric. H. Cline. *1177 B. C.: The Year Civilization Collapsed*. Turning Points in Ancient History. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014. Pp. xxi, 237. \$29.95. ISBN 978-0-691-14089-6.

Radcliffe G. Edmonds III. *Redefining Ancient Orphism: A Study in Greek Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xii, 451. \$110.00. ISBN 978-1-107-03821-9.

Jackie Elliott. *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv, 590. \$110.00. ISBN 978-1-107-02748-0.

Christelle Fischer-Bovet. *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Armies of the Ancient World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pp. xxv, 447. \$125.00. ISBN 978-1-107-00775-8.

Charles Freeman. *Egypt, Greece, and Rome: Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Third Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xvii, 799. \$199.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-0-19-965191-7; \$65.00 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-19-965192-4.

Christopher J. Fuhrmann. *Policing the Roman Empire: Soldiers, Administration, and Public Order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xxv, 350. \$35.00 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-936001-7.

Francesca Fulminante. *The Urbanisation of Rome and Latium Vetus: From the Bronze Age to the Archaic Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pp. xx, 411. \$99.00. ISBN 978-1-107-03035-0.

Renaud Gagné and Marianne Govers Hopman (eds.). *Choral Mediations in Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. ix, 429. \$110.00. ISBN 978-1-107-03328-3.

With contributions by the editors and C. Calame, J. Grethlein, S. Goldhill, L. Swift, S. Murnaghan, B. Kowalzig, A. Bierl, G. Nagy, L. Prauscello, Jeffrey Henderson, J. Billings, F. Macintosh, and P. Meineck.

Margarita Gleba and Judit Pászttókai-Szeöke (eds.). *Making Textiles in Pre-Roman and Roman Times: People, Place, Identities*. Ancient Textiles Series, 13. Oxford and Oakville, Conn.: Oxbow Books, 2013. Pp. xvii, 238. \$60.00.

With contributions by the editors and J. P. Wild, S. Lipkin, K. Grömer, K. Gosten nik, I. Radman-Livaja, L. Larsson Lovén, J. Liu, M. Albaladejo Vivero, K. Droß-Krüpe, S. Gällnö, I. Benda-Weber, M. Flohr, J.-A. Dickmann.

Adrian Goldsworthy. *Augustus: First Emperor of Rome*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014. Pp. ix, 610. \$30.00. ISBN 978-0-300-177872-2.

Emily Gowers (ed.). *Horace. Satires, Book I*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xi, 370. \$103.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-0-521-45220-5; \$40.00 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-521-45851-1.

Jonas Grethlein. *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: 'Futures Past' from Herodotus to Augustine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xi, 422. \$110.00. ISBN 978-1-107-04028-1.

Tom Hawkins. *Iambic Poetics in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pp. xi, 334. \$99.00. ISBN 978-1-107-01208-0.

Geoffrey Hawthorn. *Thucydides on Politics: Back to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pp. xxiv, 274. \$85.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-1-107-03916-2; \$29.99 (pb.). ISBN 978-1-107-61200-6.

Stephen M. Hildebrand. *Basil of Caesarea. Foundations of Theological Exegesis and Christian Spirituality*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014. Pp. xx, 204. \$26.99 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-8010-4907-1.

Simon Hornblower (ed.). *Herodotus: Histories Book V*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xxi, 351. \$99.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-0-521-87871-5; \$38.99 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-521-70340-6.

J. Donald Hughes. *Environmental Problems of the Greeks and Romans: Ecology in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Second Edition. Ancient Society and History. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014. Pp. xi, 306. \$65.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-1-4214-1210-8; \$27.95 (pb.). ISBN 978-1-4214-1211-5.

"With new sections, chapters, illustrations, and the benefit of eighteen additional years of research, experience, and reflection" (from the new preface).

Richard Hunter. *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pp. viii, 338. \$99.00. ISBN 978-1-107-04690-0.

Richard Hunter, Antonios Rengakos, Evina Sistakou (eds.). *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts*. Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes, 25. Berlin: de Gruyter 2014. Pp. viii, 379. \$154.00. ISBN 978-3-11-034294-9.

With contributions by the editors and G. Massimilla, D. Sider, G. O. Hutchinson, K. Gutzwiller, A. Sens, A. Ambühl, F. Pontani, É. Prioux, M. Fantuzzi, A. Faulkner, A. Harder, I. Petrovic, and S. Barbantani.

Andromache Karanika. *Voices at Work: Women, Performance, and Labor in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014. Pp. xv, 300. \$59.95. ISBN 978-1-4214-1256-6.

Michael K. Kellogg. *The Roman Search for Wisdom*. Amherst, N. Y.: Prometheus Books, 2014. Pp. 364. \$28.95. ISBN 978-1-61614-925-3.

Paul J. Kosmin. *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014. Pp. xv, 423. \$49.95. ISBN 978-0-674-72882-0.

Paula Kouki and Mika Lavento (eds.). *Petra—The Mountain of Aaron. The Finnish Archaeological Project in Jordan. Vol. III: The Archaeological Survey*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2013. Pp. vi, 434. €125.00. ISBN 978-951-653-400-1.

With contributions by the editors and A. Annila, M. Barjous, C. Ben David, A. Eklund, J. Frösén, Y. Gerber, H. Haggrén, E. Hertell, E. Holmquist-Saukkonen, H. Junnilainen, K. Koistinen, J. Lindblom, M. Nasarat, L. Nehmé, S. Silvonen, M. Sinibaldi, T. Tenhunen, H. Ynnilä, and L. Zhu.

Pauline A. LeVen. *The Many-Headed Muse: Tradition and Innovation in Late Classical Greek Lyric Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pp. x, 377. \$99.00. ISBN 978-1-107-01853-2.

Barbara M. Levick. *Faustina I and II: Imperial Women of the Golden Age. Women in Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xi, 248. \$65.00. ISBN 978-0-19-537941-9.

Janet L. Lightfoot (ed.). *Dionysius Periegetes: Description of the Known World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xviii, 575. \$250.00 ISBN 978-0-19-967558-6.

With introduction, text, translation, and commentary.

A. G. Long (ed.). *Plato and the Stoics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. x, 199. \$90.00. ISBN 978-1-107-04059-5.

With contributions by the editor and M. Schofield, G. Reydams-Schils, J. Bryan, P. Scade, G. Boys-Stones, and T. Bénatouil.

Naoíse Mac Sweeney. *Foundation Myths and Politics in Ancient Ionia*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv, 239. \$99.00. ISBN 978-1-107-03749-6.

S. J. V. Malloch (ed.). *The Annals of Tacitus*. Book 11. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries, 51 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xxi, 538. \$150.00. ISBN 978-1-107-01110-6.



David Mankin (ed.). *Cicero. De Oratore. Book III.* Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011 [2014]. Pp. xi, 346. \$38.99 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-521-59657-2.

Regine May. *Apuleius. Metamorphoses. Book I.* Aris and Phillips Classical Texts. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2013. Pp. vi, 223. \$100.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-1-90834-380-2; \$39.99 (pb.). ISBN 978-1-90834-381-9.

With an introduction, translation, and notes by the editor.

Peter Meineck (tr.). *Sophocles: Philoctetes.* Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2014. Pp. xxx, 80. \$30.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-1-62466-123-5; \$10.00 (pb.). ISBN 978-1-62466-122-8.

With an introduction by Paul Woodruff.

Pamela Mensch (tr.). *Herodotus: Histories.* Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2014. Pp. xxvii, 540. \$45.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-1-62466-114-3; \$16.00 (pb.). ISBN 978-1-62466-113-6.

Edited with introduction and notes by James Romm.

Jeremy J. Mhire and Bryan-Paul Frost (eds.). *The Political Theory of Aristophanes: Explorations in Poetic Wisdom.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2014. Pp. vii, 362. \$95.00. ISBN 978-1-4384-5003-2.

With contributions by the editors and J. Lombardini, K. M. Habib, J. Zumbrunnen, A. W. Saxonhouse, S. Nelson, W. Ambler, K. DeLuca, C. Baldwin, P. W. Ludwig, T. W. Burns, P. Nichols, M. Meyer, A. L. Bonnette, and D. Stauffer.

Lorraine Smith Pangle. *Virtue is Knowledge: The Moral Foundations of Socratic Political Philosophy.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2014. Pp. ix, 276. \$55.00. ISBN 978-0-226-13654-7.

Ioanna Papadopoulou and Leonard Muellner (eds.). *Poetry as Initiation: The Center for Hellenic Studies Symposium on the Derveni Papyrus.* Hellenic Studies, 63. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014. Pp. xxiv, 272. \$24.95 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-674-72676-5.

With contributions by the editors and K. Tsantsanoglou, A. Bernabé, F. Ferrari, F. Graf, S. I. Johnston, W. Burkert, J. Rusten, Y. Z. Tzifopoulos, C. Calame, A. Bierl, E. Sistikou, D. Sider, and R. Hunter.

Seth D. Pevnick (ed.). *Poseidon and the Sea: Myth, Cult, and Daily Life.* London: Tampa Museum of Art in association with D. Giles Limited, 2014. Pp. 199. \$49.95. ISBN 978-1-907804-30-4.

With contributions by the editor and R. I. Curtis, N. T. de Grummond, A. Kokkinou, J. Maish, W. M. Murray, and E. Simon.

D. T. Potts. *Nomadism in Iran: From Antiquity to the Modern Era.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xxv, 558. \$85.00. ISBN 978-0-19-933079-9.

Jessica Priestley. *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xi, 274. \$99.00. ISBN 978-0-19-965309-6.

Karen Radner (ed.). *State Correspondence in the Ancient World: From the New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xiv, 306. \$74.00. ISBN 978-0-19-935477-1.

With contributions by the editor and J. Myná ová, M. Weeden, M. Jursa, A. Kuhrt, A. Bencivenni, and S. Corcoran.

Miguel Requena Jiménez. *Omina Mortis: Presagios de Muerte. Cuando los Dioses Abandonan al Emperador Romano*. Lecturas de Historia. Madrid: Abada Editores, 2014. Pp. 326. €19.00 (pb.). ISBN 978-8-41-528998-2.

Luke Roman. *Poetic Autonomy in Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. x, 380. \$195.00. ISBN 978-0-19-967563-0.

Ben Russell. *The Economics of the Roman Stone Trade*. Oxford Studies on the Roman Economy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. xxi, 449. \$150.00. ISBN 978-0-19-965639-4.

Michael Sebbane, Osnat Misch-Brandl, and Daniel M. Master (eds.). *Masters of Fire: Copper Age Art from Israel*. New York and Princeton: Institute for the Study of the Ancient World and Princeton University Press, 2014. Pp. 183. \$49.95. ISBN 978-0-691-16286-7.

With contributions by the editors and T. E. Levy, Y. M. Rowan, D. Shalem, and O. Shamir.

Carl A. Shaw. *Satyrical Play: The Evolution of Greek Comedy and Satyrical Drama*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xviii, 191. \$74.00. ISBN 978-0-19-995094-2.

Alan H. Sommerstein (ed.) *Menander*. Samia. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xii, 367. \$99.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-0-521-51428-6; \$38.99 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-521-73542-1.

Benjamin Eldon Stevens. *Silence in Catullus*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2013. Pp. x, 338. \$34.95 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-299-29664-3.

Simon Swain. *Themistius, Julian, and Greek Political Theory under Rome: Texts, Translations, and Studies of Four Key Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. vi, 224. \$95.00. ISBN 978-1-107-02657-5.

Koen de Temmerman. *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xxi, 395. \$150.00. ISBN 978-0-19-968614-8.

Thea S. Thorsen (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv, 435. \$99.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-0-521-76536-7 \$37.99 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-521-12937-4.

With contributions by the editor and R. Hunter, F. Bessone, E. Raymond, P. Lee-Stecum, M. Skoie, A. Keith, S. Harrison, A. Sharrock, P. A. Miller, L. Fulkerson, M. O. Drinkwater, R. Gibson, L. Piazza, J. F. Miller, R. P. H. Green, M. T. Kretschmer, L. B. T. Houghton, V. Moul, S. Loubère, A. Kahn, and T. Ziolkowski.

Garth Tissol (ed.). *Ovid. Epistulae ex Ponto. Book I*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pp. ix, 191. \$90.00 (hb.). 978-0-521-81958-9; \$36.99 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-521-52562-6.

Christopher V. Trinacty. *Senecan Tragedy and the Reception of Augustan Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. vi, 266. \$74.00. ISBN 978-0-19-935656-0.

Marek Wecowski. *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. xxv, 400. \$175.00. ISBN 978-0-19-968401-4.

Tim Whitmarsh and Stuart Thomson (eds.). *The Romance Between Greece and the East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv, 396. \$110.00. ISBN 978-1-107-03824-0.

With contributions by the editors and I. Rutherford, J. Dillery, K. Ryholt, S. West, S. Stephens, J. Haubold, S. Dalley, J. Wiesehöfer, D. L. Selden, E. Kneebone, J. Barbour, K. Ni Mheallaigh, S. Harrison, A. Tagliabue, E. Bowie, P. Avlamis, R. Webb, L. Kim, and P. Vasunia.

Christopher Whitton (ed.). *Pliny the Younger. Epistles. Book II*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pp. xiii, 328. \$95.00 (hb.). ISBN 978-1-107-00689-8; \$34.99 (pb.). ISBN 978-0-521-18727-5.

