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Appendix: Graduate Studies in Classics Have They a Future?
The Date of Herodotus’ Publication

DAVID SANSONE

The communis opinio regarding the time at which Herodotus published his researches into the causes and progress of the conflict between the Greeks and the Persians is that the work which we now refer to as The Histories was brought before the public between approximately 430 and 425 B.C., the latter date being regarded as a secure terminus because of certain alleged references in Aristophanes’ Acharnians, produced at the Lenaea in that year.1 This view has recently been challenged by Charles W. Fornara,2 who uses arguments both negative and positive to show that Herodotus was still writing his history after 425. On the one hand Fornara argues that the passages in Aristophanes which have been considered to be allusions to Herodotus’ work do not in fact presuppose a familiarity with the writings of the historian; on the other he seeks to show that certain passages in Herodotus require the assumption that they were composed late in the decade of the 420s. I should like here to examine Fornara’s argument in order to see whether a revision of the traditional view is called for. I will concentrate on one of the passages that Fornara


discusses, namely the apparent reference to the first book of Herodotus at *Acharnians* 523 ff., because I believe that it admits of a definitive statement. The lines in question come from Dicaeopolis’ great speech in which he justifies his private peace-treaty with the Spartans on the grounds that the Spartans are not wholly responsible for the present hostilities. In giving his version of the origin of the Peloponnesian War Dicaeopolis first recounts the consequences of the Megarian Decree and then continues:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ} & \text{ τεῦτα μὲν} \text{ ἐὰν} \text{ σμικρὰ κάσπιχώρια} \\
\text{πόρρην} & \text{ δὲ} \text{ Σμαϊδαν ίὼντες Μεγαράδε} \\
\text{νεανία} & \text{ κλέπτουσα μεθυσοκότταβος} \\
\kappaάθι & \text{ οἱ} \text{ Μεγαρῆς ὁδώναις πεφυαγωγοῦν} \\
\text{ἀντεξέλειφαν} & \text{ Ἀσπασίας πόρνας δῶλο} \\
\text{κάτεθεν} & \text{ ἄρχῃ τοῦ πολέμου κατερράγη} \\
\text{Ἐλληνικά} & \text{ πᾶσιν ἐκ τριῶν λαοκαστριῶν.}
\end{align*}
\]

These lines are regularly regarded as a parody of, or at least an allusion to, the account with which Herodotus opens his history, according to which certain unnamed Persians allegedly attributed the origin of the hostilities between the Greeks and Persians to the series of abductions that involved Io, Europa, Medea and Helen. But those who consider the passage in Aristophanes to be a reference to Herodotus tend not to present arguments that would make this assumption convincing, and Fornara deserves credit for insisting\(^3\) that more is needed than a bald assertion of the comic playwright’s dependence upon the historian. Fornara does not commit himself to identifying the reference in Aristophanes’ lines—to be fair, Fornara is not concerned to do so, but merely to show that the reference is not to Herodotus—but he does hint at “the obvious possibility that verses 523 ff. allude to the *Telephus* of Euripides.”\(^5\) Since there are undoubted parodies of the *Telephus* in Dicaeopolis’ speech, it is not unreasonable to look to Euripides as the source of these lines in


Aristophanes. Indeed, this has been suggested previously but, again, without anything resembling a decisive argument.  

How are we to decide, then, whether Ach. 523 ff. are a parody of Herodotus or of Euripides’ Telephus? Let us look first at what we know of the latter, to see whether we can find anything in Euripides’ tragedy that might have prompted these lines. The speech of Dicaeopolis from which the lines come, like the speech of Mnesilochus in Thesmophoriazusae (466–519), is obviously based on the speech in Euripides’ play in which the disguised hero addresses an audience that is hostile to the argument which he advances. Thus we run the risk of arguing in a circle, since the evidence we must use to reconstruct Telephus’ speech is precisely the speech of Dicaeopolis, the relationship of which to its original we are seeking to determine. But we are fortunate in possessing the speech of Mnesilochus as well, as it provides us with an independent check on our reconstruction. To begin with, it is safe to assume that those elements which the speeches of Dicaeopolis and Mnesilochus share have a common origin in the speech of Euripides’ Telephus. Euripides’ hero appeared in disguise, lest the Greeks discover his true identity and recognize his personal motivation in urging the Greeks not to make war. And so Dicaeopolis and (with much greater dramatic relevancy) Mnesilochus deliver their speeches in disguise. Both Aristophanic characters begin their speeches in a similar fashion. Mnesilochus (Thesm. 469–70) and Dicaeopolis (Ach. 509) attempt to ingratiate themselves with their potentially hostile audiences by asserting that they too hate “the enemy,” respectively Euripides and the Spartans. Mnesilochus (Thesm. 472) and Dicaeopolis (Ach. 504) further identify themselves with their audience by adopting a confidential tone and saying, in effect, “We are alone. There is no danger that the enemy will find out what we say here. Therefore we can speak frankly.” Both Mnesilochus (Thesm. 473) and Dicaeopolis (Ach. 514) do then speak frankly and raise the awkward question of whether “we” are justified in assigning all the blame to “the enemy.” The remainder of each speech then consists of the

6 E. Schwartz, Quaestiones Ionicae (Rostock 1891), p. 10; W. J. M. Starkie ad Ach. 524 ff.; A. Rostagni, Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica 5 (1927), pp. 323–27 (although he does not rule out the possibility of Herodotean influence as well).


8 It does not, of course, follow that elements unique to one speech or the other do not derive from the speech of Telephus.
speaker’s reasons⁹ for believing that “we” are acting precipitately and for regarding the actions of “the enemy” as justifiable. Mnesilochus ends his speech (Thesm. 518–19 = Eur. fr. 711 N) with the rhetorical question, “Why are we angry with Euripides when we have suffered nothing worse than we ourselves have done?” Dicaeopolis ends his (Ach. 555–56 = Eur. fr. 710 N) by suggesting that, mutatis mutandis, “we” would have acted just as “the enemy” has done.¹⁰

Now, when we attempt to recover the Euripidean original on which Aristophanes’ two parodies are modeled, it is essential that we understand who “the enemy” is whose actions Telephus sought to justify. In other words, when Mnesilochus (Thesm. 473) asks τί ταύτ’ ἔχουσαι κείμων αἰτίώμεθα; and Dicaeopolis (Ach. 514) τί ταύτα τούς Δάκωςας αἰτίώμεθα; what was the object of the verb in the Euripidean line to which these lines refer? In their reconstruction, based on van de Sande Bakhuyzen, Handley and Rea¹¹ paraphrase this section of Telephus’ speech, “Why do we blame Telephus/the Trojans?” But Euripides must have written either the one or the other,¹² and it ought to be possible to decide which. The choice is easy. In the fragments that can be attributed to Telephus’ speech, Telephus is named twice (frr. 707 and 710 N), Paris and the Trojans not at all. What Telephus is concerned to do (apart from finding a cure for his wound) is to dissuade the Greeks from attacking his own territory in reprisal for the reverse which they had earlier suffered at his hands. He does this by showing that Telephus was justified in his attack upon the Greeks inasmuch as it was the Greeks who had initiated the hostilities and who had acted wrongly in so doing. Just so Mnesilochus seeks to dissuade the women at the Thesmophoria from attacking Euripides by showing that the women, by their immoral behavior, provoked and deserved Euripides’ verbal attacks upon them. And so Dicaeopolis seeks to dissuade the Athenians from prosecuting the war against the Spartans by showing that the Athenians (or, at

---

⁹ Note γάρ, Ach. 515, Thesm. 476.

¹⁰ Perhaps Telephus’ speech ended: τὸν δὲ Τήλεφον ὅκι, οἴσιμεθα; κριτά δὴ θωμοίμεθα. παθῶτες αὐδᾶν μάζῳ ἡ δεδρακότες.

¹¹ Above (note 7), p. 34.

¹² Or, perhaps, “the Mysians” or “Paris.” Perhaps merely “the barbarians.” Lest anyone suggest, following Thesm. 473, that Euripides wrote τί ταύτ’ ἔχουσες κάνων αἰτίώμεθα; it should be pointed out that this idiom, which differs from ἔχω + ptcl. (W. J. Aerts, Periphrastica [Amsterdam 1965], p. 160), does not seem to be tragic and is likely colloquial: Ar., Av. 341; Eccl. 853; 1151; Lys. 945; Nub. 131; 569; Ran. 202; 512; 524; Men., Sam. 719; Eubul. 107. 6; Greek Literary Papyri 67. 22 Page; Pl., Euthyd. 295C; Gorg. 490E; 497A; Phdr. 236E.
least, some of them) were at fault: first they imposed a boycott upon Megara and then they abducted the Megarian courtesan Simaetha. It is at this point that we are asked to believe that Aristophanes is parodying a passage in Telephus' speech in which "the disguised hero seems to have thrown contempt upon the motives which had induced the Greeks to undertake a campaign against Troy." That is to say, when Dicaeopolis speaks of the abductions of Athenian and Megarian courtesans, his words are based upon a passage in Euripides' tragedy in which Telephus referred to the abduction of Helen. But this is a specious view for, while Euripidean characters are known to cast discredit upon the causes of wars (and in particular of the Trojan War), there is a fatal objection to the assumption that Telephus included a reference to the rape of Helen. Apart from the fact that, as we saw above, Telephus is concerned to mitigate Greek hostility, not toward the Trojans, but toward himself and the Mysians, mention of Paris' crime can only detract from Telephus' main point, namely that the Greeks were in the wrong. Thus there is no reason to believe that Ach. 523 ff. had anything corresponding to it in Euripides' Telephus.

But if we can eliminate Euripides, does it follow that Ach. 523 ff. are a parody of Herodotus? Obviously it is not a necessary inference and, indeed, other possibilities have been explored. E. Maass\textsuperscript{15} implausibly proposed the suggestion that Aristophanes is here parodying Herodotus' source and, more recently, D. M. MacDowell\textsuperscript{16} has argued that the lines are not parody at all, but rather represent Aristophanes' comic version of the actual causes of the Peloponnesian War. I am not prepared to argue over the actual causes of the Peloponnesian War, but I do think it worthwhile to quote MacDowell's reasons for denying that Aristophanes is parodying Herodotus:

It is most unlikely that many Athenians were familiar enough with [Herodotus' book] to be able to recognize a parody of one particular part of it unless Aristophanes had given very obvious signals indeed

\textsuperscript{13} Starkie \textit{ad Ach.} 524 ff. Similarly Handley and Rea (above, note 7), p. 35 and Jouan (above, note 7), p. 234.

\textsuperscript{14} One could, perhaps, envision Telephus attempting to deflect Greek hostility from the Mysians by convincing the Greeks that the Trojans, not the Mysians, had wronged them. But this is unlikely in view of the fact that Telephus is Priam's son-in-law. Indeed P. Oxy. 2460 fr. 10 seems to preserve part of a scene in which Telephus attempted to avoid acting as the Greeks' guide in their expedition against Troy, presumably on the grounds of his relationship with the Trojan royal family; so Handley and Rea (above, note 7), pp. 7 and 37; Jouan (above, note 7), p. 240; Rau (above, note 3), p. 26.

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Hermes} 22 (1887), pp. 590–91.

to warn them that a parody of Herodotos was coming. But in fact there are no such signals. Dikaiopolis does not mention the name of Herodotos; nor does he mention the Persians or the Phoenicians or the Trojans or any of the other people who occur in Herodotos' opening pages. He mentions three prostitutes, but that would hardly have made the Athenians think of all those daughters of kings. Above all, Dikaiopolis does not use any Herodotean vocabulary or turns of phrase. Whereas the beginning and end of the speech do quote a few words from Euripides, the middle does not quote any words from Herodotos. There is really nothing in the speech which bears any resemblance to Herodotos at all.\(^{17}\)

MacDowell is right to demand that specific parallels be pointed out, but his final sentence contains a considerable exaggeration. For surely it must be considered a "resemblance" between Ach. 523 ff. and Hdt. 1. 1–4 that both attribute the origin of a great war to the abduction of a woman and to the subsequent abduction of two further women.\(^{18}\) For, according to the Persians whom Herodotos cites, the barbarians first abducted Io and, later, the Greeks abducted Europa and Medea. Aristophanes comically transforms these daughters of kings into three harlots, making the causes of the war even more ludicrous. As far as verbal similarity is concerned, it is not true that "Dikaiopolis does not use any Herodotean vocabulary or turns of phrase." The resemblance between Hdt. 1. 2. 1 (ταύτα μὲν δὴ ἵσα πρὸς ἱσα σφι γενέσθαι \(\mu\)\(\epsilon\)τά \(\delta\) ταύτα . . . ) and Ach. 523–24 (καὶ ταύτα μὲν δὴ \(\sigma\)μκρα \(\kappa\)πι\(\iota\)κ\(\iota\)\(\iota\)κ\(\iota\)τα \(\pi\)ρνην \(\delta\) . . . ) has often been noted, but its real significance has not been recognized. For the particle combination \(\mu\)\(\epsilon\)ν \(\delta\) is quite rare in Aristophanes.\(^{19}\) While the word \(\delta\) itself occurs some three hundred times in Aristophanes, I am able to find it following \(\mu\)\(\epsilon\)ν only here and in four other places. And the combination is used in a way that is, if not unparalleled in Aristophanes, at least strikingly unusual. It is here, to quote Starkie's note ad loc., "used in summing up, so as to pass on to another subject." It is not so used at Thesm. 805, where its use is characterized by Denniston (above, note 19)

---

17 MacDowell (previous note), p. 151. Similarly Fornara, Journal of Hellenic Studies (above, note 2), p. 28: "there is no trace of verbal similarity. Yet I think that we have a right to expect it in a case such as this."

18 This point, which also tells decisively against the view that we are here dealing with an Aristophanic reference to Euripides' Telephus, was first made by G. Perrotta, on page 108 of an article that is too rarely consulted in this connection: "Erodoto parodiato da Aristofane," Rendiconti dell' Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere 59 (1926), pp. 105–14. Cobet (above, note 2), p. 11 note 46 also rightly points out that this motif is attested only in Aristophanes and Herodotus.

19 Ach. 523 is the only example cited from Aristophanes by J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particles (2nd ed. Oxford 1954), p. 258.
396 as "progressive," nor at Plut. 728–29, where we find καὶ πρῶτα μὲν δῆ . . . ἔπειτα. In νῦν μὲν γὰρ δῆ (Lys. 557) the δῆ is not to be taken with μὲν; rather it emphasizes γὰρ, as in Xenophanes I. 1 West νῦν γὰρ δῆ.²⁰ The only real parallel in Aristophanes for the usage at Ach. 523 is to be found at Plut. 8: καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δῆ ταῦτα. τῷ δὲ λαοῦ. . . . On the evidence of [Aesch.] P. V. 500, Hdt. I. 94. 1 and III. 108. 4, however, this may represent a common, stereotyped expression.

So the phrasing of Ach. 523 stands out as being uncharacteristic of Aristophanes. But, uncommon as the usage is in the comic poet, "μὲν δῆ is frequently used by the historians," according to Denniston (above, note 19), "as a formula of transition, the μὲν clause often summing up the preceding section of the narrative." Denniston cites seven passages from Herodotus, five from Thucydides and one from Xenophon. We are fortunate to possess J. E. Powell's reliable Lexicon to Herodotus, which informs us exactly how frequent the combination is.²¹ Not only is the combination exceedingly common in the historian but, with Powell's help, it does not take us long to discover that its most common use, as at I. 2. 1, is as a formula of transition.²² That this is a characteristically Herodotean locution is made even clearer by a comparison of the usage of the fifth-century tragedians. The combination μὲν δῆ occurs only ten times in the surviving works of each of the three dramatists,²³ and in only a handful of instances (e.g. Aesch. Pers. 200, Eur. Alc. 156, Hec. 603, Suppl. 456, Hel. 761) is it employed as a formula of transition. Therefore, while we cannot say that, when he uses the combination at Ach. 523, Aristophanes is "parodying" Hdt. I. 2. 1, it is fair to say that he is using a characteristically and recognizably Herodotean idiom. And this, combined with the fact that the idiom does occur in the passage concerned with reciprocal abductions and with the fact that the motif of reciprocal abductions is known to occur only in Herodotus and Aristophanes, makes all but inescapable the conclusion that the poet is parodying the historian's account of the origin of the hostilities between Greeks and barbarians.

But this is not in the least surprising. For there is other (although, I believe, less convincing) evidence in the Acharnians of Aristophanes'  

²⁰ For γὰρ δῆ see Denniston (previous note), p. 243.  
²¹ Cambridge 1938. Under the heading δῆ A.III we find that Herodotus uses the combination μὲν δῆ 390 times.  
²² In the first 20 pages of Book I alone: 2. 1; 9. 1; 11. 1; 14. 1; 21. 1; 26. 3; 32. 1; 36. 1.  
²³ In Aeschylus only Pers. 200, Eum. 106 and fr. 102 M without a preceding γε; in Sophocles only Ant. 150, 162, Phil. 350 and 1308 without a preceding ἀλλά.
knowledge of Herodotus' work. And there is also good reason to believe that, in his Cresphontes, a tragedy which was produced at about the same time as Acharnians, Euripides was influenced by a passage in Herodotus' fifth book. Finally, Fornara presents an excellent argument to the effect that Herodotus' influence is to be found in Euripides' Electra. Now, Fornara believes that this play was produced in 414 B.C., which date gives no more support to his view that Herodotus' history was published at the end of the Archidamian War than it does to the traditional view, that it was published in the first half of the 420s. But in fact, to date Electra to 413 or 414 is to ignore the potent arguments of G. Zuntz, who shows that the play belongs rather in the period 422–416. Thus we have a fair amount of evidence for the influence of Herodotus on works of literature produced in the decade between 426 and 416 B.C. Fornara dismisses this evidence because, as he believes, Herodotus was still writing his history at the time of the Peace of Nicias. But what Fornara and, in his attack on Fornara, Cobet fail to perceive is that there is no inconsistency between Herodotus' influence on works written around 425 and his continuing to write after 421. The passages in Acharnians which are likely to be references to Herodotus are references to Book I. Fornara plausibly explains Euripides' reference to Helen at El. 1280–83 as inspired by Herodotus' account of Helen in Book II. Euripides' Cresphontes alludes to a Herodotean passage in Book V. It is not necessary to reject this evidence and all that it implies in order to accept Fornara's view that Herodotus refers in his history to events that occurred after 424. According to Fornara, Herodotus included a passage that "was written after the death of Artaxerxes and very probably after 421" in Book VI; he refers to the Athenian occupation of Cythera (424) in Book VII; he implies that the Archidamian War

24 See, in addition to the works cited in note 3 above, Perrotta (above, note 18) and, especially, J. Wells, Studies in Herodotus (Oxford 1923), pp. 169–82.


had come to an end by the time he wrote Book IX. If Fornara is right, we need only believe that a portion of Herodotus' history equivalent to what we now know as the first four books and the beginning of the fifth was written and "published" before the mid-420s B.C., and that Herodotus continued to compose and make available to the public the remainder of his history, "in substantially the same order in which we now have it," until some time around the end of the Archidamian War.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign


29 I must admit that I find decision difficult. On these three passages, see also J. A. S. Evans, Athenaeum 57 (1979), pp. 146–47, who is less convinced than is Fornara of the unambiguosness of the evidence. Recently R. Meridor (Eranos 81 [1983], pp. 13–20) has plausibly shown that certain elements of the plot of Euripides' Hecuba (produced before 423 B.C.; for the date, see Lesky [above, note 27], p. 330) were suggested to the poet by events that occurred in Sestos after the end of the Persian War, when Xanthippus allowed the people of Elaeus to punish the Persian Artayctes. If she is right to argue that Euripides knew of these events from reading of them in Herodotus (IX. 116–20), then we are forced to admit that the final section (and, therefore, perhaps all) of Herodotus' work was published before the mid-420s. But it is not unlikely that this anecdote concerning Pericles' father circulated in Athens in versions other than that of Herodotus.

2

How Did Pelasgians Become Hellenes?
Herodotus I. 56–58

R. A. McNEAL

These chapters are a nightmare. Anyone who comes unwarned upon Herodotus' first ethnographic digression is bound to share Reiske's despairing judgment: "Haec de vetusta nationum duarum principum Graeciam incolentium origine narratio obscura, intricata et inconstans maleque cohaerens esse videtur." Suddenly the sunlit landscape of the tale of Croesus disappears, and we are plunged into the fog and quicksand of an antiquarian mire. What is wrong? Clearly Herodotus is none too precise about his theories. This much it may be fair to say. But these chapters also bristle with major textual and grammatical problems.

This paper is a discussion of four separate topics: textual emendation, narrative structure, vocabulary and grammar, and Herodotus' own logic. What ties all these topics together is their relevance to internal criticism, that is, the establishment of the text. What, in short, does the text say?

Apart from trying to clarify an important but very difficult passage, I want to emphasize the necessity of recognizing internal and external criticism as separate operations. To establish a text is one thing; to discuss its significance in the light of other sources is something else. The historian can of course be his own textual critic; but the editing of a text has to precede its use as a historical document. Failure to

make this distinction has caused unnecessary problems in the interpretation of chapters 56–58.

1. *The Initial Antithesis*

The first problem (56. 2) has been recently treated elsewhere.\(^2\) We are to read ταύτα γὰρ ἦν τὰ προκεκριμένα ἕθνεα τὸ ἀρχαῖον, τὸ μὲν Πελασγικὸν, τὸ δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν ἔθνος.

Croesus discovered that the Spartans and the Athenians were the most powerful peoples of Greece, the former Doric and the latter Ionic. "The Spartans and Athenians were of old the pre-eminent nations, the one Pelasgian, the other Hellenic. The former never migrated, but the latter moved a good deal." This reading involves (1) Porson’s substitution of ἔθνεα for ἔωντα and (2) the use of the medieval punctuation.\(^3\)

Herodotus gets off to a bad start by insisting on an antithesis which is dubious at best and which even he will shortly confound. The Spartans were Doric, Hellenic, and migratory. The Athenians were Ionian, Pelasgian, and stationary. The repeated τὸ μὲν refers first to the Athenians, then to the Athenians who were once Pelasgians.

Despite some good arguments in favor of this interpretation of τὸ μὲν, the best argument remains to be made. Lines 23–27 of Hude’s Oxford text show a carefully contrived chiastic structure which immediately explains the seeming difficulties of reference beginning with τὸ μὲν Πελασγικὸν.

A: Lacedaemonians  
B: Athenians  
A: Doric  
B: Ionic  
B: Pelasgian  
A: Hellenic  
B: Stationary  
A: Migratory

Chapters 56–69 constitute a so-called digression embedded within the logos of Croesus. Having mentioned the result of Croesus’ inquiries, that is, the conclusion of the story, Herodotus goes backward to sketch the historical events which will justify his statement that, in Croesus’ time, the Spartans and Athenians were the most powerful


of the Greek peoples. Retrospective narrative, as van Groningen has called it,\(^4\) begins with the end point and then works forward. By its very nature the narrative assumes a circular form, beginning where it ends. Thus in chapter 69 Croesus, having learned why the Spartans because of their past were more powerful than the Athenians, concludes an alliance with them. The narrative then resumes the statement of events in their proper temporal sequence.

But chapters 56–58 play a special part in this narrative. A. G. Laird deserves credit for having seen this point over fifty years ago.\(^5\) Chapters 59–64 give us a tale of the establishment of Peisistratos’ tyranny at Athens, and 65–68 the early history of Sparta. Chapters 56–58 form an introduction to this larger digression. Having established an initial antithesis in 56. 1–2, Herodotus expands this antithesis twice, once in 56. 3–58 and again in 59–68. The following pattern emerges:

A: Primitive Dorian movements: 56. 3
B: Primitive times in Athens: 57–58
A: Peisistratos’ tyranny: 59–64
A: Early Sparta: 65–68

The early wanderings of the Hellenes who were to become Spartans follow directly on the statement that the Dorians were migratory. Then, abruptly shifting to the second term of his antithesis, Herodotus speculates on the original language of the Pelasgians, some of whom would become Athenians: ἡμιτων δὲ γλῶσσαν κτλ. All of chapters 57 and 58 refers to the Pelasgians and their relationship with the early Athenians. There is no question of original Hellenes becoming Pelasgian, or of the Dorians as a whole emerging from some barbaric Pelasgian ancestry.

2. Creston / Croton

The major difficulty with the start of chapter 57 is the vexed question of Πελασγῶν τῶν ὑπὲρ Τυρσηνῶν Κρηστῶνα πόλιν οἰκεύοντων. Dissatisfaction with the state of the text began at least as early as the sixteenth century, and it is not hard to see why. Herodotus himself always uses Τυρσηνοὶ to refer to Etruscans in Italy. If we read Κρότωνα, or Κροτώνα, that is Cortona in Etruria, then his Pelasgians are to be thought of as having migrated in the past to Italy, where they


maintained their non-Greek language down to the fifth century.\textsuperscript{6} Thus Herodotus’ use of “Tyrsenians” can be made consistent.

But the argument from internal consistency cuts two ways. Though there is no mention of a town of Creston in Thrace which must be wholly independent of Herodotus, the historian himself does elsewhere mention a town of Creston in Thrace (V. 3) and says that Xerxes’ army twice passed through Thracian Crestonia, which lay east of Mygdonia and the river Echeidorus (VII. 124; VIII. 116). These statements at least are quite compatible with a Thracian Creston in chapter 57. And of course Thucydides, who knew the north Aegean well, says specifically (IV. 109) that the Crestonians living in Thrace were Pelasgian and Tyrrenian.

The major reason why editors want to change the text of Herodotus is to bring it into conformity with that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (I. 28 and 29).\textsuperscript{7} Dionysius, in discussing the origins of the Etruscans, quotes Hellanicus, who, in his Phoronis, had equated the Pelasgians and Etruscans (fr. 4). Having been expelled from Greece, the Pelasgians captured the city of Croton, from which they began their settlement of the country now called Tyrrenia. Presumably Herodotus, though he prefers to derive the Etruscans from Lydia (I. 94), had some knowledge of Hellanicus’ view that the Pelasgians once lived in Thessaly and migrated to Italy. Hence the text of Herodotus must have read “Croton” and “Crotoniatai.”

This line of argument is perverse. Herodotus nowhere else mentions the town of Croton in Etruria and nowhere else says anything about Pelasgians migrating to Etruria. Indeed, the Lydians under Tyrsenus came “to the Umbrians.” If Herodotus is going to be made a partner with Hellanicus in the equation of Pelasgians and Etruscans, some rather dubious assumptions have to be made about the relationship of their texts in antiquity. To say that the reading of Herodotus “... deriva evidentemente da una correzione forse ancora ignorata o giustamente repudiata da Dionigi, sotto l’influenza del luogo di Thucydide IV, 109 ...”\textsuperscript{8} is to resort to purely futile speculation. We simply have no knowledge of the history of either

\textsuperscript{6} H. Stephanus (ed.), \textit{Herodoti Historiarum Libri IX\textsuperscript{2}} (Paris 1592), p. 23. “Crotona” and “Crotoniatai” appear only in the marginal commentary to the Latin translation which accompanies the Greek text.


\textsuperscript{8} Costanzi, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 205–06.
text before the Middle Ages (papyrus fragments do not affect the argument here), and it makes no sense to say that a manuscript of the one author was used at some time in antiquity to “correct” and thereby falsify a manuscript of the other author. The only reasonable course is to leave Herodotus’ “Creston” alone unless there is some legitimate palaeographical reason for making a change.

Mere internal consistency will not suffice as a reason since, as I have already indicated, Herodotus will be inconsistent with some other part of his text in either case. Indeed, his carelessness in matters of consistency is so notorious that few readers will be troubled by one more nod.

There is of course no manuscript evidence for anything but “Creston.” MS b does read Ἀρητωνα. Though perhaps a falsification of “Croton,” this is just as likely a mistake for “Creston.” Thus there is no help here.

Changing the text to make it refer to Italy is the usual course; but some historians, who accept Thrace, still want to introduce unnecessary emendations. Reiske set the fashion for this alternative by reading ὑπὲρ Γυρτηνῶν, a city in Macedonia.9

What this textual crux illustrates very well is one of the more dubious legacies of the Lachmannian school of editing—the tendency, one might almost say the psychological need—to force a text into submission at all costs. Not content to leave a problem unresolved, the radical critic rushes to bend the text into compliance with predetermined views. Readers who are willing in this case at least to tolerate a measure of ambiguity are in the minority.10

3. Fifth-century Pelasgians

Whatever position one takes on the problem of Creston, this textual crux has no real bearing on the logic of the chapter. Herodotus sets

---


out to make a linguistic judgment on the basis of two groups of fifth-century Pelasgians: (1) τῶν . . . Κρηστώνα . . . οἰκεόντων: those of Creston, who once were neighbors of the present Dorians when the Dorians still inhabited Thessaliotis (here Herodotus gives the Dorians a name which, by his own admission, they did not have until they had entered the Peloponnesus!); and (2) τῶν Πλακίην τε καὶ Σκυλάκην . . . οἰκησάντων: the settlers of Plakie and Skylake on the Hellespont, who were once dwellers with the Athenians and (with) other communities which, though once Pelasgian, changed their name.

A serious grammatical problem is involved with δόσα ἄλλα Πελασγικὰ . . . μετέβαλε. All modern editors take the first three words as the equivalent of ἄλλων πολισμάτων and make the clause a third group of fifth-century Pelasgians. Supposedly Herodotus is also including in his linguistic judgment some other groups of Pelasgian speakers whose position he does not specify. Thus δόσα ἄλλα . . . πολισματα is effectively a third genitive dependent on τοῖς νῦν ἐτὶ ἔόντοι.

But this reading is wrong. Herodotus is saying that, just as some Pelasgians moved away from the Athenians, who then changed their name, so other Pelasgians lived elsewhere in the southern Aegean in the early days and retreated, allowing their former communities to take on a new character and new names. The Peloponnesus, for example, was once full of Pelasgians. The Arcadians too were once Pelasgian, but changed their name and language (I. 146). Herodotus seems to be consistent in his view that ancient Pelasgia, or what would become the later Greece, had many communities which, like Athens, were to see far-reaching ethnic changes with the appearance of the Hellenes.

The phrase δόσα ἄλλα . . . πολισματα is the equivalent of ἄλλως πολισμασι δόσα and ought to be connected closely with Ἀθηναίωσι.

4. The Mechanism of Cultural Change

Herodotus' second group of Pelasgians, the settlers of Plakie and Skylake, is the source of much trouble. What relationship had these Pelasgians with the Athenians, with whom they once dwelt?

This second group, originally resident in the south Aegean, was pushed aside by the arriving Hellenes; and some of them went to the north Aegean, where Herodotus found their descendants in his

---

own time. The Pelasgians of Plakie and Skylake had come from Athens, where they had resided for some unspecified time. The inhabitants of Athens before this departure were autochthonous, that is, Pelasgian and non-Greek. A body of them went off to the north Aegean, where they and their descendants maintained their aboriginal character and language in foreign surroundings right down to the fifth century. But the inhabitants of Athens, presumably because of the contact which they had with the Hellenes who came to live with them, adopted a Greek character. This change involved language of course, but it must have involved much else. Unfortunately Herodotus does not specify what else the change consisted in.

Over against this idea must be set the words οἱ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναῖοι. This clause is totally at variance with the notion of a unified body of autochthonous Pelasgian Athenians. Indeed, Herodotus seems to be thinking of two separate groups of people. The Pelasgians are almost resident aliens. Precisely the same confused interpretation appears in II. 51. 2, where the Pelasgians “dwell with” the Athenians, just as the latter are passing into the Hellenic body: Ἀθηναῖοι γὰρ ἦδη τηνικάτα ἐς Ἑλληνας τελέουσι Πελασγοὶ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ χώρῃ, ὅθεν περ καὶ Ἑλληνες ἥξαντο νομισθήναι.

Herodotus is inconsistent about the Pelasgian background of the Athenians. He is probably conflating different traditions without reconciling them, something which he does often enough elsewhere. The notion of Pelasgians as a distinctly separate group of resident aliens appears again in greater detail at VI. 137, where there is no question of a unified Athenian population, some part of which departed from the main body for a new home in the northern Aegean. In Book VI Herodotus clearly thinks that the Pelasgians were a separate population of guest workers, however autochthonous, and were then expelled because of their rapacious behavior. That I. 57 and VI. 137 should give different versions of the Athenians’ Pelasgian past is no surprise. What is surprising is the confusion which runs through the relatively short account in chapter 57: within the space of four lines appear two separate definitions of “Pelasgian.”

5. The Meaning of τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν

The next major problem is the subject of the participle ἀποσχισθέν. This participle must refer to τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν, since no other subject is introduced after the start of the chapter. But what is meant by τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν? Since at least the time of Valla’s Latin translation of 1474,

12 Laird, op. cit., p. 102.
the phrase has been universally understood to mean “the Greek
nation,” or “the Greeks.” But it really means “the Greek part,” or
“element.” And yet “the Greek part” of what? Surely Herodotus
means the Greek-speaking Athenians. The population consisted of
an aboriginal part which spoke a Pelasgian language and an intrusive
Greek-speaking part. With the departure of at least some of the
Pelasgians, the population as a whole came to speak and to be Greek.
Thus a Pelasgian town became Hellene. Herodotus refers to the
Athenians in their new role as Hellenes. After the departure of the
Pelasgians, the Athenians were weak, but later grew in numbers and
power. Laird is right to say that we do not have here a digression on
the growth of the Hellenic people generally, but we are dealing with
an increase in the power of the Athenians prior to the time of internal
strife and the foundation of the tyranny.\(^\text{13}\) Thus chapter 58 is
concerned with the Athenian half of the introductory antithesis, not
with the Spartan half. There is no question here of a discussion of
the Dorians or of their supposed origin from a Pelasgian people.

Indeed, Herodotus nowhere derives the true (that is, original)
Hellenes from a barbarian background. They are remarkably pure
in their origins. Except for the Cynurians (VIII. 73), the Dorians do
not attach to themselves any barbarian peoples.

That the phrase τὸ Ἐλληνικὸν is partitive, that it can include more
or fewer Greeks as the context demands, is evident from the difficult
and commonly misinterpreted sentence in I. 60. 3: ἐπεί γε ἀπεκριθη
ἐκ παλαιότερου τὸν βαρβάρου ἔθνος τὸ Ἐλληνικὸν ἑών καὶ δεξιότερον καὶ
εὐθίς ἡλιθίων ἀπηλλαγμένων μᾶλλον ("they contrived a device by far
the silliest that I can discover since the time when, in the distant
past, τὸ Ἐλληνικὸν was distinguished from the barbarian nation by
being [ἐὼν] more clever and more free from idle folly"). The correct
interpretation in this sentence is not “the Greek nation” as a whole,
but “the Greek part” of the Athenians. The Athenians’ separation
from the Pelasgians (βαρβάρου ἔθνους) set them on the road to greater
cleverness. One can expect folly from barbarians, but not from
Athenians once they transcended their barbarian origins.\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{13}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 113.

\(^{14}\) I follow the reading of MS b and of Aldus, which is the modern consensus. The Florentine MS A, together with P and e, gives τὸ
βαρβάρου ἔθνος τὸ Ἐλληνικὸν, which must be wrong. Whatever credit Herodotus gives the barbarians, he does not
believe that they are superior in intelligence to the Greeks. In this regard Paul Shorey, “A Note on Herodotus I.60,” \textit{Classical Philology} 15 (1920), pp. 88–91, rightly
refutes Wilamowitz. But Shorey’s interpretation of the final clause of the sentence (α’ καὶ τότε γα ὠντι Ἀθηναίων τὰς πρῶτας λεγομέναν ἐναὶ Ἐλληνωσθοῦσιν μηχανάμενα
tοιάδε) is strangely labored. Believing, as many do, that ἐναὶ γα is causal, he makes α’
6. A Case for Editorial Conservatism

If the issue of τὸ Ἐλληνικῶν is satisfactorily resolved, there remains one last major textual problem. I give below the readings of the two important manuscripts A and b, just as the relevant text appears. The Roman family of manuscripts, chiefly D and R, omits this part of the Histories.

A. αὐξέσται ἐς πλήθος τῶν ἑθνών πολλῶν μάλιστα προσκεχωρηκότων αὐτῷ καὶ ἄλλων ἑθνῶν βαρβάρων συχνῶν

b. αὐξέσται ἐς πλήθος τῶν ἑθνών πολλῶν μάλιστα προσκεχωρηκότων αὐτῷ καὶ ἄλλων ἑθνῶν βαρβάρων συχνῶν

Aldus has the same text as b, but replaces the first two upper, or full, stops with commas. This text continued to be printed until Gronovius' edition of 1715, when the comma after πλήθος was placed, for no reason that I can discover in Gronovius' notes, after πολλῶν.15

Modern attempts to improve the text fall into three main categories: (1) Matthiae's simple deletion of τῶν ἑθνῶν πολλῶν as a gloss of ἑθνῶν βαρβάρων συχνῶν; (2) Reiske's ἐς πλήθος ἑθνῶν πολλῶν μάλιστα, προσκεχωρηκότων κτλ.; and (3) Sauppe's ἐς πλήθος ἑθνῶν πολλῶν, <Πελασγῶν> μάλ. προσ. κτλ., a course adopted by Stein and Hude. Legrand inserts Πελασγῶν before πολλῶν.16

Sauppe's option, which is the modern consensus, is the most violent. The fact that it has no manuscript support is perhaps the best argument against it. But the redefined subject of διαχράται, ἀποσχισθέν, αὐξέσται provides further ground for rejecting Πελασγῶν. Is Herodoti

καὶ τοὐδέ a second and even stronger confirmation of the judgment implied in ἐνθράτατον. The clause ἐκ τοῦ τοὐδέ is supposed to mean "inasmuch as." This clause does mark even stronger surprise or indignation on the part of Herodotus. But both clauses are temporal. Reiske at least understood this point, though he unnecessarily wanted to emend ἐπά γε τὸ ἐπάτε (loc. cit.). How absurd, says Herodotus, if even then [at a time when the Greek element had long been separated], the Peisistratidai could concoct such a scheme in the hope of deceiving the Athenians, said to be foremost in wisdom among the Greeks.

15 Aldus Manutius (ed.), Herodoti Logoi Ennea (Venice 1502); J. Gronovius (ed.), Herodoti Halicarnassae Historiarum Libri IX (Lugdunum Batavorum 1715). The notes are more readily accessible in Wesseling, op. cit., p. 62 (Notae Gronovii).

dotus telling us that, after the initial departure from Athens of the Pelasgians, the Athenians grew powerful because of the adhesion of more Pelasgian tribes? He may imply such an idea because the terms “Pelasgian” and “barbarian” have a habit of being synonymous for him. But he nowhere states specifically that the Athenians themselves later gained Pelasgian adherents after passing into the ranks of the Hellenes.\(^\text{17}\) He does say that the Ionians as a whole (I. 146) were a notoriously motley group who had all sorts of diverse origins, but the Hellenized Pelasgians who constituted the population of Athens grew to power precisely in proportion as they gave up their Pelasgian-barbarian character and language. The point which Herodotus seems to want to make is that after the Pelasgians’ departure, still other barbarians helped the Athenian people to grow. Who were they? He does not say. But Sauppe’s Πελασγῶν is misleading and unnecessary.

The most conservative editorial treatment of this passage (and the best way to deal with it) would do no more than enclose the words τῶν through μάλιστα in daggers to alert the reader to a possible crux. The corruption, if corruption there really is, lies here.\(^\text{18}\)

But can we do any better? I suggest the following: ἐς πλῆθος τὸ ἄνω ἐπὶ Πολλάν, μάλιστα κτλ. As a variant of Reiske’s solution, this conjecture tries to remove the dubious τῶν ἔθνων and to change the punctuation to show just how Herodotus understood μάλιστα.

If one keeps the manuscript reading of A and B, then the words τῶν ἔθνων, the worst problem, must be either dependent on πλῆθος or they must be the first part of a compound subject in a genitive absolute. In either case ἔθνων has to be explained. What are these many mysterious tribes which have attached themselves to the Hellene-Athenians? Herodotus nowhere mentions them, and a search through the tangle of Athenian mythology will not reveal them. Of course precisely the same argument can be applied against ἄλλων ἔθνων βαρβάρων. These tribes too must remain a mystery, whatever we do with the preceding words. Even Sauppe’s conjecture will not solve this latter problem.

\(^{17}\) Laird, \textit{op. cit.}, passim, is correct to dismiss the theory of Myres and Meyer that there was a late Pelasgian migration into Attica, after the departure of some of the autochthonous inhabitants. Herodotus at least nowhere says that Pelasgians came to Attica. The theory of Myres can be traced at least as far back as H. Riedel, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 592.

\(^{18}\) I include the adverb only because E. Powell, \textit{Herodotus} (Oxford 1949), Vol. II, p. 688, wants to omit it. I find nothing offensive in its presence.
This journey through the wastes of textual criticism may bore the historian, but it is necessary to go back to basics if we are to have any hope of understanding this digression. I have tried to assemble the evidence, and in particular to see how the text has been interpreted over the centuries. Apart from playing the antiquarian, I have set out the possible avenues which alternative explanations might take.

Implicit in this handling of the evidence is a very conservative editorial method: the text should be left alone, even at the expense of ambiguity, unless there are good palaeographical reasons for making changes.

What has emerged from an analysis of the textual problems and of Herodotus' own logic are some ethnographical theories which may not suit our own modern taste. Herodotus gets himself into verbal difficulties because on the one hand he wants to establish an antithesis between Spartans and Athenians and carry it into the distant past, and because on the other hand he has to square this contrast with the respective traditions of these two peoples. Autochthonous Pelasgian Athenians must somehow become Greek. They do so by adopting the new language of the intrusive Hellenes. As for the Hellenes themselves, they were always, since the time of their divine and heroic begetters, a recognizable body of people. As flawed as these ideas may be, we should at least accord Herodotus the credit which he deserves for a truly intelligent and honest inquiry, in the best Ionian tradition, into what clearly was for him a very difficult problem. The wonder is that he managed as well as he did.

Northwestern University
Herodotus disentangled prose sufficiently from myth, setting Thucydides a standard of comprehensiveness and purity that he could better only by a more rigorous purity. If indeed Herodotus is included in the nameless writers whose principles he abjures (I. 20–22), he abjures not all of Herodotus, but rather, among other things, Herodotus' penchant for the exotic and for faits divers. Thucydides' pejorative for him, μυθώδες, "story-like" or "mythy," can certainly be stretched to cover Herodotus' sense. It is because he exercises a somewhat loose control on particulars that with Herodotus, or those like him, the details "prevail into the mythy."

Thucydides states, as he inserts his statement of principles between the "Archaeology" and the account of the war, that he rests upon inference (τεκμηρίον),1 and also on inference with a rigorous linear connection to his subject, "all inferential data in order" (παρτὶ ἕξες τεκμηρίω, literally, "every datum"). "All" points out explicitly that every particular detail is sifted, taken with "inferential data." Taken

1 A. W. Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides (Oxford 1959- ), I, p. 135, on 20. 1: "It should be remembered that τεκμηρίον is not evidence but the inference drawn from the evidence." The rigor Thucydides marshalled when siftiing evidence for a particular fact shows, for example, in his use of Homer's authority for the relation of the Greeks' early defenses to their later ones in the Trojan War, as Edwin Dolin lucidly and complexly demonstrates ("Thucydides on the Trojan War: a Critique of the Text of 1.11.1," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 86 [1982], pp. 119–49).
with "in order" it starts to remind us that Thucydides' focus will shortly change and that everything he says will bear still more directly on the war.

Writers who do not follow this recommended process may be poets (ποιηταί), an activity that engages them in setting up another kind of order: they write not ἐξῆς but κοσμοῦντες (21. 1), an "ordering" that is at the same time an adorning, in a dead spatial metaphor that implies a comprehensive "kosmos" and not a linear sequence. Poets are here coupled with those whom the reader, after Herodotus had written, and in the climate Havelock describes in Preface to Plato, might be tempted to distinguish from poets. These are the logographoi or "prose writers," who also put their material into order. Their procedure of doing so is designated by yet a different locution, ξυνέθεσαν, "put together." The three terms of ordering (ἐξῆς, κοσμοῦντες, ξυνέθεσαν) align the three types of writers according to the principle on which they organize their material. Thucydides is a fourth kind, and it may be said that he here emphasizes testing his data rather than ordering them himself because his ordering must evolve in the long presentation he is beginning.

The λογογράφοι "put together" their material, Thucydides says, so as to be more attractive to the hearer—and the term "hearer" assimilates them back to the more automatic persuasiveness of oral reception. The term προσαγωγότερον, "more attractive of access," also comes close to a notion of faits divers. They are "more attractive than true," and Thucydides then returns in this passage to his single explicit positive criterion, the checking of evidence, datum by datum.

It is, to be sure, by his account, a distance in time, and not in space or in logical ordering, that will make presented data "prevail with incredibility into the mythy" (ἀπίστως ἐπὶ τὸ μυθώδες ἐκνενικήκατα). The compound verb ἐκνενικήκατα, which might also be rendered "win over," indicates a dynamic process. The writer whom Thucydides rejects gradually succumbs to a "mythy" element in his data by failing to scrutinize them. As if in still fuller deference to what he has articulated here, he couples his declaration in the next chapter, that he has constructed or reconstructed the speeches on reliable evidence, with the assertion that in any case they bear directly on the war. Both of these statements may be taken as an implied rejection of Herodotus' scope. Thucydides' term ἡγησίς, inquiry by scrutiny, steps up the rigor of Herodotus' historia, "investigation," a term Thucydides wholly

---

avoids using.\(^3\) As for his initial look at events remote in time, Thucydides has already shown them to bear directly on the factors of the war. His opening is similar to Herodotus', except that Herodotus begins almost at once with a narrative as a causal explanation. Herodotus, after setting his theoretical premises briefly, at once begins by sifting stories in the search of a single cause for the enmity between Europe and Asia so as to account for the beginning of the Persian War. He settles on a single particular; Croesus, "pointing out this one man" (τοῦτον σημείως). It is from that vantage that he gets into his narrative: "pointing out this one man I shall proceed into the further presentation of my account" (ἐς τὸ πρόσω τὸν λόγον, I. 5).

Thucydides, by contrast, makes no attempt as he sets up his background to make a particular datum carry the burden of his general account. He stays on the plane of factorial semi-abstraction until he reaches the point in time and space that immediately involves his particular war, deferring even the fifty years preceding it, the Pentekontaetia, till somewhat later. In the "Archaeology," though the particular details are subject to the dimming and mythologizing falsification of time, Thucydides has proceeded by what he calls "most explicit signs" (ἐπιφανεστάτων σημείων), "sufficiently" (ἀποχρώνως, 21. 1). This final adverb suggests that in this instance he has contented himself with something like a minimum of data, but after having tested evidence that did prove testable. A sufficient condition has been met for moving from particular to general. The signs were "explicit"—for those who could test them. Again, if this is a revision of Herodotus, it is still very much along Herodotus' lines, except for the adjustment of particular to general, though it could be asserted that Herodotus, even when he doubts, does not usually hint that evidence is at a low state of verifiability. And the possibility here implied by Thucydides, that evidence might somehow be at once scanty and adequate for explicit reading, puts him in a different realm from Herodotus by raising the criterion not just of verifiability but of sufficiency (ἀποχρώνως).

None of this is directly counter-mythological, though it works even harder than Herodotus does the counter-mythological substructure of its organizational principle. This principle tests a relation between particular and general, whereas the myth is always easily both particular (Oedipus or Apollo) and general (man or god). Applying the myth, as the poet does, requires intelligence but not testing. On the contrary, the poet is free to invent within the outlines of his story, as

\(^3\) I have discussed the conditions implied by Herodotus' use of ἰωροῖν in Albert Cook, Myth and Language (Bloomington, Indiana 1980), pp. 69–106.
well as to emphasize some aspect of a known story. The historian must establish the aspects of a story that has happened but that he must coordinate from scratch. Plato strains his dialectic, as it were, to restore myth's easy congruence between particular and general without recourse to story, except as a supplement or as a movement onto another plane. For Plato, connections between the planes, between dialectic and myth, are left mysterious, and the philosopher's enterprise is neither confined nor fully defined by story-bound pattern types. The ideas are in heaven, but they are history-less, unlike either men or gods.

None of this is exactly counter-mythological either. Thucydides is of course still more negative than Plato on the uses of myth as a factor in the progress of his main narrative. "Having prevailed into the mythy," the abjured practice of others, suggests also for them an intellectual process—one which logically could include Plato's—to mediate that which has been allowed to become "mythy." Such a softening of rigor would work against Thucydides' task-in-hand.4

Thucydides leaves Herodotus' ethnographic inquiries almost wholly behind. He does not need those particulars. He differs from Herodotus more notably in that restriction than he does in his attitude towards

4 It is startling that Cornford (F. M. Cornford, Thucydides Mythistoricus [London 1907]) used this sentence as the epigraph for a work that then goes on effectually to misread its strictures. With the benefit of modern thematic analysis we may make the story of Pausanias (1. 129–35) conform to a mythic pattern, as Cornford does, but Thucydides does not. Still less would he effectually capitalize ἄπαρη as the goddess "Deception" in the first events surrounding Alcibiades (V. 35 ff.).

For the overall "mythic" cast of the Peloponnesian War itself, Cornford offers a convenient reference point to deny. This contemporary of Freud, as we may say, saw in Thucydides' History a sort of return of the repressed. As everyone realizes, we cannot seek the sense of this work in a crude equation of Athens' downfall through ὑβρίς and ἄπαρη with that in Greek tragedy. Indeed, the formula does not work too well for Greek tragedy either. Thucydides is not mythistoricus. For one thing the word ἄπαρη does not occur once in the whole of his work (A), and the six references to ὑβρίς are all limited to a very specific occasion. This is Thucydides'—and for that matter the historian's—normal use of such abstractions, even though there is a slight poetic cast to Thucydides' vocabulary (B). But whatever the dominant substratum we attribute to Thucydides' narrative, the relation he establishes between particular and general in his narrative radically divorces it from the procedures of myth-evocation.

(A) I have tried to deduce the implications of the exclusively poetic use of ἄπαρη in Albert Cook, Enactment: Greek Tragedy (Chicago 1971), pp. 69–76. For further examination of the personal psychological implications of this complex word, see William F. Wyatt, Jr., "Homerica Ate," American Journal of Philology 103 (1982), pp. 247–76.

(B) Dionysius of Halicarnassus was the first to notice the poetic cast of Thucydides' vocabulary, which is also touched on by Gomme (op. cit., I, p. 235, note on ἄγων in I. 75. 1). See also John J. Finley, Jr., Thucydides (Cambridge, Mass. 1942), p. 265.
the gods. Thucydides does differ from Herodotus in addressing a collective action that was going to be a failure rather than a success. It was also going to transform the Greek world, for the time being, much more radically that the larger-scale Persian conflicts did. Since he could not have known these two large results when he set himself the task of writing his history, his initial vantage could not have been conditioned by Cornford’s sense of a tragic sense in him. Still, it is well to keep Cornford in mind, though at a distance, if we wish to get a sense of how Thucydides, like his younger contemporary Plato, took the task of rejecting much previous discourse and much of the previous conditions thereof, as an impetus for his own. In the complicated dispute that he reports over the Athenians’ drawing water in sacred temple precincts when the Boeotians themselves abstained (IV. 97–98), Thucydides intrudes no doubt about the many factors implicit and explicit. One factor stated, indeed, is that the Athenians and the Boeotians share the same gods (IV. 97. 4). Nor does Thucydides question the myth of Tereus (II. 29) when he distinguishes a different Tereus in the background of Sitalkes. He actually provides the detail that poets have memorialized the nightingale incident, asserting in the same sentence that the distance between the countries would make a closer origin plausible (ἐικός) for the better-known Tereus. As the scholiast says, “It is significant that here alone he introduces a myth in his book, and then in the process of adjudication” (διστάζων, literally “doubting”). The significance would lie not in confirming his rejection of myth, and still less in his subordination to it, but rather in the austerity of a focus that rarely allows a myth to obtrude. Still, in this one instance, the veracity of a mythical past is used as a tool to sift facts; when he later brings in the myth of Alcmaeon, it serves to define a region. Even a myth will do as a focusing particular.

5 Though Herodotus is more explicit in this and other ways, the actual differences between the two historians with respect to the gods are relatively minor. As Syme points out, in Thucydides an appeal to the gods often fails (Ronald Syme, “Thucydides,” in Proceedings of the British Academy 48 [1962], pp. 39–56, esp. p. 52). But that is true in Herodotus as well, with the frequent elaborate mismatching of oracle to circumstance.

6 Gomme, ad loc.

7 Quoted in Gomme, II, p. 90, ad loc.

8 See also II. 15. 1, “in the time of Cecrops.” As Gomme says (ad loc., II, p. 48), “Another example to show that Thucydides did not doubt the truth, in outline, of the Greek ‘myths,’ though he might interpret the story in his own way.”
In the reckoning of time and the marking of stages for his History, Thucydides abstracts his work at once, demarcating time as related just to his event-series; he numbers the years according to the war, usually by summers and winters. “And the eleventh year ended for the war,” he says (V. 39). This particular time there is a tinge of ironic emphasis in the statement, since it marks events after the “Peace of Nicias” in 421. The flat statement works to keep his progression relentlessly even. His movement forward implies a prior reasoning: “If anyone were to doubt that the war continued just because a much-broken treaty of truce was in force, I will use the word war, as I did before, to characterize this particular year too.” Such sentences as “And the eleventh year ended for the war” place a purely temporal mark on the event-series, coming as they do regularly but unpredictably in the work, and sometimes with his own name attached to them. Their neutrality reinforces their inexorability.

This writer of prose has left behind him the ambition of Herodotus or of Ion of Chios. He can rest with his method, and with his verbal means. The relation between oral and written is not a problem for him, as it is posed in the Phaedrus of Plato and felt all through Plato’s work, or as it must have been for Heraclitus. Nor is Thucydides’ prose simply a convenient instrument, as for Lysias, Protagoras, and the medical writers. Thoroughly grounded in his principle of testing, Thucydides’ written account can then re-include the oral, and spectacularly, in the form of the complexly structured speeches of the work. His principle of testing reassures him to the point where he asserts he can reconstruct these speeches, if necessary, on the basis of reports of what the main arguments would have been (“the way each of them seemed to me to have spoken most likely what was needed [τὰ δέοντα μάλιστ’ εἴπεῖν] about what the present situation each time was,” I. 22). Such a confidence implies that the oral, to be congruent with the written and narrated, need not be poetic. The memorable need not be poetic.

Plato’s speeches, of course, are by contrast not remembered. They are fictive reports of conversations imagined to have taken place. Plato’s initial fiction corresponds to Thucydides’ reality. Thucydides asserts that in their essentials these speeches really did take place. The essentials are points in an argument, which thereby and therewith are put on a par with other historical happenings, the λόγοι with the ἐφραγμα— and in this passage he contrasts the two terms, words and deeds. This pair remains a key duet of terms throughout his work. The speeches show that a sequence of points in an argument is a
sequence of constated particulars. The enchained generalities and abstractions for which the speeches are notable actually attest to their verifiability. The generalities guarantee that the particulars have been tested by sifting.

What was spoken in the past, then, assimilates to, as well as assesses, what was done in the past—so long as it is within the living attention span of the writing historian.

This vision of the public experience arises from a new privacy of the literary act. The philosopher, the poet, the tragedian, and even the medical writer, had an audience defined somewhat by social sub-grouping and personal contact, or else by a ritualized occasion. If Heraclitus was a private writer, he would seem to have taught, and he is said to have laid his book in the temple of Artemis. In carrying out lessons before a band of faithful auditors, Socrates, and Plato himself, conform to the pre-Socratic prototype for the thinker’s communication channels. The historian, however, from Hecataeus on, is committed not only to prose but to the written book freed of such social constraints. The exile of Thucydides here offers a literary dimension as well as a vantage for research. He intensifies these conditions. He has no immediate audience for his book, but a long wait. And a certain randomness defines his potential readership; he has no theatre or academy or group of poetry enthusiasts or ritual throng or law court in which it will be taken up.

It is in the act of writing history that the comparatively free audience-expectation of the modern book suddenly comes into existence.

Moreover, while Herodotus undergoes a comparable wait, and compasses a long work in comparable privacy, he can expect some national accolade from the very success of the Panhellenic effort he so fully accounts for. There is a tradition that he read his work aloud to general acclaim. As with Livy, there is an element of patriotism in his history. Thucydides, however, resembles the gloomy Tacitus. Even before the failure of the war, since as he in effect tells us he set himself the task before knowing its outcome, his testing of factors implies a neutrality towards the parties that has a sharper cutting edge than Herodotus’. Thucydides’ vision of public events, while highly generalizable, is intensely private and personal, the more so that its generalities are based not on a prior social code, and not even on Herodotus’ neutral ethnographic stance, but on the writer’s principle of inference as it governs the enunciation of factors. Thucydides proposes no community, as Plato does, and in a sense he does not himself describe a community, though he lets others do so. Brasidas is as noble as Pericles, and there is more in his actions than
the specifically Spartan. Instead, Thucydides provides a basis in action for the principles on which community rests, though unlike Machiavelli he does not turn explicitly to such questions. The high degree of communal energy that characterizes Athens in Pericles' Funeral Oration, on the evidence, is a momentary increment from the prosperity whose evolution is described in the Archaeology and the Pentekontaetia. As Schadewaldt says, Thucydides "indicates general horizons for events (das Geschehen) and carries within himself a mode of the theory of categories. Both aspects determine the picture Thucydides offers us . . . in tension with each other."^{9}

The social implications of the "achievement laid up forever," the κτῆμα εἰς αἰεί, lodge Thucydides in a lonely universality, even though κτήμα in its regular Homeric and post-Homeric sense suggests personal use in a social context. Looking personally backwards, his events have to have been lived through in order to have validity, and they must be tested in order to have general relevance. Looking ahead, their effectiveness is indifferent with respect to the group that might be imagined as consulting the History.

Yet in one sense Thucydides is conservative and by implication community-minded. His narrative concentrates on military history, to as great a degree as the Iliad does. In this Thucydides is closer to Homer than Herodotus was. For the military hero that a poet celebrates, too, the poem is a perpetuation of his fame to generations that might otherwise forget, as Pindar reminds us. The poem, too, is a κτήμα εἰς αἰεί. What Thucydides memorializes, however, are events not only unique but also explicitly patterned and exemplary. So are Homer's events, to be sure, but the poet, in his social role at least, seems to be organizing the pattern to enhance the uniqueness, whereas for Thucydides it is the other way around. Homer already took the giant step of transforming the sort of battle frieze to be seen on Mycenaean reliefs, late geometric vases, and later on classical pediments. He transformed this persistent Near Eastern celebratory focus on awesome clashes by setting organizational principles over the clash. Thucydides goes Homer one better by abstracting these, but clashes are still far more particularized in his history than the clashes in Herodotus. Thucydides is a military historian to the degree that the coherence of so striking a cultural tribute as the Funeral Oration becomes a problem for the interpreter.

Thucydides' concentration on military operations also throws them

---

into perspective through the touching in of power motives, the more strikingly that the military is so preponderant.

In depicting military events, Thucydides is linear, but also expansive. The same thorny problem-states—Thebes, Corinth, Corcyra, Potidaea, Platea, Mytilene, Amphipolis, Syracuse—keep turning their thorns to the event. A complex particular moves in time towards generality. Yet in the imposition of power considerations, Thucydides' view seems to be at once cyclical and general. The same factors keep applying; the course from inception of campaign or attack to resolution keeps taking place. He demonstrates the fact that failure or success may not be clear, and he is consequently careful to point out those occasions when both sides claim victory. In Thucydides the word "circle," κύκλος, is always just spatial, though he uses the verb κυκλούμαι in a way that combines the linear and the cyclical. The verb implies making linear progress in getting past something by using a circling movement.

If we cannot press the buried metaphors in Thucydides so far, the sense he creates of constant ratiocination invites us to look for it in his very diction.

The war is involved uninterruptedly, though with unpredictable particular variations, in a forward linear flow. Thucydides shows it at every point gathering up, and pulling against, assumptions and causes—to such a degree that defining his use of terms such as αἰτία ("cause") and πρόφασις ("pretext") entails intricate comparisons and discriminations. In Herodotus the large, understood forces pause, as it were, for stocktaking. In Thucydides they never rest from their dynamic interaction. The spreading pool of ignorance about the past that Thucydides stresses can be taken to imply some ignorance about the present. And ignorance, signally the Athenian ignorance about the complexity of politics in Sicily, operates itself as a factor, dynamically. The speeches exhibit the tension, and the syntactic intricacy, of trying to construct present-oriented rationales for specific behaviors. This is true even of Pericles' Funeral Oration (II. 35–46). Its high abstractions and graceful definitions are aimed toward the propaganda purpose of boosting morale; Pericles' opening backward look at the past superiority of Athens is adduced as a factor in giving the Athenians an extra edge in the coming conflicts. Pericles ends the speech in a well-nigh Hitlerian injunction to replace the dead

---

soldiers with living children who may grow up to fight for Athens (II. 44. 3).

Still, there remains always such a surplus of factors and emphases that they get out of hand—not counting such natural disasters as the plague, which follows very soon after this oration. It brings about still more deaths, deaths that only most tangentially can be connected to the war. The multiplicity of factors jerks the linear flow ahead, as is shown in pairs or larger groups of speeches—the normal case. A second speaker will show this as against the first speaker, by his reliance on inevitably different emphases and possibly different factors, even when the geopolitical assumptions are the same. The speeches show general and particular in the process of refocusing their relations.

Such is the pressure from many quarters that events tend to outrun Thucydides' linear account of them. Often something has happened which his unavoidable focus at one point has kept out of his narrative in its proper sequence. Occasionally, and revealingly, he violates strict chronological order. So, in a specific instance, the very relaxedness that a new peace implies, and the necessity to realign forces once they are not firmly marshalled against one another, leaves participants in a position of overrunning themselves through an inevitable incapacity to cover all the factors. This is the case at the beginning, when Athens incurs the wrath of Sparta by trying to manage forces at the perimeter of her league. It is the case after the peace of Nicias once again, when in 420 many states—Argos and its confederacy, the Athenians and Alcibiades personally, the Boeotians, the Corinthians, the Megarians, and the Spartans—all re-expose themselves by negotiations in more than one direction.

Those Spartans "who most wanted to dissolve the treaty" (V. 36)—thus calling into play the factor of internal factionalism, as Alcibiades will soon effectually do—secretly urge the Boeotians and the Corinthians first to ally themselves with Argos (and its allies), and then subsequently with Sparta. This project, if it were to be actualized, as often in Thucydides, would kill two birds with one stone for these hostile Spartans: it would offend the Athenians by violating the condition of the truce that no new alliances be formed, and by forming them it would strengthen Sparta. However, on their way home the Boeotians (V. 37) encounter, again privately, some Argives who are waiting there for the purpose of urging the very same alliance; persuasion is not necessary. Back home the rulers of Boeotia

11 Ibid., I. p. 209, on I. 57. 6, with examples.
endorse this policy, but the four councils that constitute the decision-making group in Boeotia see it differently:

πρὶν δὲ τοὺς ὅρκους γενέσθαι οἱ Βοωτάρχαι ἐκώσωσαν ταῖς τέσσαρις βουλαῖς τῶν Βοιωτῶν ταύτα, αίτερ ἄπαν τὸ κύρος ἔχοντα, καὶ παρῆνεν γενέσθαι ὅρκους ταῖς πόλεσι, ἦσαν βούλονται ἐπὶ ὑφελία σφία ἐξουμώνει. οἱ δ’ ἐν ταῖς βουλαῖς τῶν Βοιωτῶν ὄντες οὐ προσδέχονται τόν λόγον, δεδομένης μὴ ἐναντία Δακεδαμονίας ποιόσως, τοῖς ἐκείνοις ἀφεστότης Κορυθᾶς ἐξουμώνετε: οὐ γὰρ εἶπον αὐτοῖς οἱ βοωτάρχαι τὰ ἐκ τῆς Δακεδαμίους, δι᾽ τῶν τε ἑφόρων Κλεόβουλος καὶ Ξενάρης καὶ οἱ φίλοι παραμόνουσι Ἁργείων πρῶτον καὶ Κορυθῶν γενομένους ἐξεμάχους ὕστερον μετὰ τῶν Δακεδαμονίας γέγρασθαί, ἀδόμενοι τὴν βουλήν, καὶ μὴ εἶπωσιν, οὐκ ἄλλα γηφεύσατε, ἢ ὑφελία προδοσιών παραμόνουσιν. ὡς δὲ ἀντέστη τὸ πράγμα, οἱ μὲν Κορύθου καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ Θρῆς ἕκες πράσβεις ἀπρακτοὶ ἀπῆλθον, οἱ δὲ βοωτάρχαι μέλλοντες πρότερον, εἰ ταῦτα ἐπιτευσαν, καὶ τὴν ἐξουμαχίαν περάσασθαι πρὸς Ἀργείοις ποικίν, οὐκέτι ἐσήμεναν περὶ Ἀργείων ἐς τὰς βουλαῖς, οὐδὲ ἐς τὸ Ἅργος τοὺς πράσβεις οὗς ὑπέσχοντο ἐπεμπὼν, ἀμέλεια δὲ τὶς ἐν ἧν καὶ διατριβή τῶν πάστων.

Before these oaths could be carried out with Corinthian, Megarian, and Thracian envoys, the Boeotian rulers publicized these events to the four councils of the Boeotians, who carry the whole authority, and advised them to carry out oaths with those cities who would wish to swear a common oath for defense (ὑφελία). But those who were in the Boeotian councils did not accept this rationale (λόγον; also "speech"). They feared to act in opposition to the Spartans by swearing a common oath with the Corinthians, who had defected from them. For the Boeotian rulers did not tell the councils the events in Sparta, that among the Ephors Kleoboulos, Xenares, and their friends had advised alliances with the Argives and Corinthians to be carried out first and then alliances with the Spartans. They thought that the councils in deliberation (Lit., singular, βουλή), even if they did not tell them this, would not vote otherwise than they themselves had determined beforehand and alone. But when the affair took a contrary position, the ambassadors from Corinth and Thebes went off without success, and the Boeotian rulers, who had previously intended, if they had persuaded them of this, to try to make an alliance with the Argives as well, no longer brought anything about the Argives before the councils, nor did they send to Argos the ambassadors they had promised, but there was a certain lack of care (ἀμέλεια) and delay in all these matters. (V. 38)

“Lack of care” and “delay” are constant threats in the tension between the forward progress of events and the instability of factors pressing upon them. And shortly, in fact, Alcibiades plays a double game by courting both Sparta and Argos, which is itself playing the double game of courting both Athens and Sparta. Alcibiades is actually playing a triple game, because, by lying himself, he tricks the truthful
Spartan envoys into looking like liars before the Athenian Assembly (V. 44–45). But then another factor, one from the different realm of natural catastrophes, supervenes over this already complicated situation. "But an earthquake occurring before anything had been confirmed, this assembly was adjourned."

In the war a state is itself a complex factorial entity. The weight or permanence of one such factorial entity—say Corcyra or Sicily—cannot be assessed in its magnitude of importance with relation to that of another entity, until after the fact. Corcyra in the first place could not have been assessed beforehand as incurring the set of events that would place it at the center of the conflict between Athens and Sparta over her handling of Epidamnus (I. 25–56), which drew the Spartans' protesting attention and helped precipitate the huge war. Four years and a vast complex of events later, this trouble spot, as it turns out, re-erupts, and the same set of dominoes tumbles against one another in a different order—Epidamnus-Corcyra-Corinth-Athens—this time centering on the sort of internal struggle between oligarchy and democracy (III. 69–85) that later develops as a parallel threat to Athens itself. Corcyra is caught as an entity in a linear sequence of power-events, whose unstable timing of recursion in a stable repertoire of factors is guaranteed by the steadiness, and the dynamism, among those factors. A census of the relevant factors would include Corcyra's (or any other entity's) geographical distance from a friendly or a hostile power, its relation to colonial ties, both originally (Corcyra is a colony of Corinth) and as it develops (Epidamnus is a colony of Corcyra). Financial status, too, is an important factor, stressed by Thucydides in the "Archaeology": the ability of a state to translate its resources into an army, a navy, and defensive installations. There are, further, the local political factions, and also a state's prior relations to such more powerful entities as Athens or Sparta, as well as the history of the state's prior role in the common effort of the Persian War: A state's geography comes into play somewhat differently, too, through its relation to war operations in close or distant theatres, and even to holding operations on or near its own terrain.

By adducing all these factors and at the same time often keeping them implicit, Thucydides allows for their permutation, for the subjection of their particular manifestation to the linear progression, and also for their coordination into usually unstated generality. The factors are never quiescent and never isolated, he implies—even though his conception obliges him to be silent about them when, as inevitably on these very grounds, his attention is drawn elsewhere. The naïveté of the Athenians in not seeing, and in not listening to
Nicias about, the inevitable interplay of such factors on the large Sicilian terrain, is implied by what has already been shown to bear on the picture. If this is so with little Corcyra, all the more so with huge Sicily. The roll-call of the Sicilian allegiances as they have shaped up (VII. 57–58) carries with it an implied demonstration of how force, racial ties, prior allegiances, prior colonial ties, and geographical proximity all permute beyond the power of Athens to control them, or even to influence them very much.

As against the interrelations of the political entities in Herodotus, which happen pretty much on a binary or a ternary basis, those in Thucydides permute in the face of a common but relentlessly evolving situation that presses on each state differently but on all alike. The forces are, as it were, centripetal, in spite of the geographically centrifugal relations—often across much water or over rugged mountains—of the Greek states. The relations in Herodotus may be themselves called centrifugal: a state, once it has solved a stress point, is left to itself for a while in a stable condition. There is no general center of common interest or high permutation of factors between Persia and Ionia, or between Persia and Lydia. And for the big conflict mainland Greece has pretty much been left out, except for occasional consultations, until Persia turns by elimination in her direction. State marriage in Herodotus (never except remotely in space or time for Thucydides) may involve a number of state-groups, as that of Astyages involves the Medes, the Persians, the Lydians, the Scythians, the Cilicians, and the Babylonians (Herodotus I. 73–77). But the factors are static, and separable. As these peoples go their separate ways, or take up their places within the Persian Empire, they tend to stay in place.

The speeches, either antithetical or propagandistic in character, serve to externalize the counterpoise of forces in the History. Just so the forces drawn up for conquest will meet either prevailing or succumbing counter-forces. But then, whichever the case may be, other forces will be operating against them. And the speeches are oriented to the military action their own situation-orientation and usually their antagonistic stance serve to mirror. The speeches address the war; they are the speeches of those "either about to make war or already in it" (I. 22).

This practical relation of the speeches to force, and their subjection to force as in some ways just another manifestation of it, differentiates Thucydides from debaters in the law courts, from philosophers like Protagoras and tragedians like Euripides, with whom he has been

compared. Any lawyer is less involved, any philosopher more theoretical, any speaker in a tragedy more oriented to his own subjective needs, than the speakers in the History. Even Alcibiades, the most self-centered of his actors, must try to force a yield of personal gain out of collocating unremittingly public factors. Those are, therefore, the forces to which he addresses himself, like everybody else in Thucydides. In this sense we can almost see the leaders in the History bringing to bear upon events the critical view of the historian himself. And, though he may not offer the abstract political science of Machiavelli, he does indeed show a "latent systematization of power." The generalities are always being tested, from the very first sentence of the History, by the particulars held in a tension that reveals the force organizing them.

In the History a speaker may be said to aim at an equilibrium, a stability among factors. "Stable" (βήβαλος) is a favorite term of Thucydides. He has Pericles say that the Spartans, as farmers, will offer their bodies rather than their material resources (χρήματα), because the latter "would not be stable against the possibility of being exhausted" (I. 141. 5). The envoys of threatened Mytilene, speaking at the Olympic banquet upon Sparta's urgency, speak of a "stable friendship," while twice invoking ἀρετή in international relations. They go on to say that if all states were independent, they themselves would have been "more stable against innovating" (III. 10). In urging death for the men of the rebel city, Cleon declares "the worst thing of all is when nothing remains stable in what we are concerned about" (III. 37. 3). Brasidas' excellence creates a "stable expectation" that others will be like him (IV. 81. 3). In the upheavals and proscriptions caused in 412 by the Four Hundred, a "stable mistrust" is created (VIII. 66. 5).

Moreover, as these quotations illustrate, the term "stable" is applied under the most diverse circumstances. There is no set of general principles that would allow Thucydides to enunciate laws governing stability. In military operations—and they are his subject—he may give specific tactical rationales, but he is not only silent, as Gomme points out, about the relation of tactics to strategy. He must be silent, except about specific factors at a given place and time, on the principles we may deduce from the History. Especially is this the case in a Panhellenic conflict taking place in what might be called a weak

---

13 See Finley, op. cit., pp. 46-70.
14 This is Schadewaldt's phrase, by way of qualifying Reinhardt's and Schwartz's comparisons of Thucydides to Machiavelli.
macro-system: Corcyra, Corinth, Potidea, Naupactus, Thebes, Samos, Lesbos, Melos—to say nothing of the various Sicilian states—all are subject, taken together, to an idiosyncratic congeries of factors, even if the factors taken singly are the same. It is a stable fact that they will be unstable, and variously unstable. The tension between general and particular operates unpredictably in accordance with predictable laws. The weak macro-system is balanced, by contrast, against what might be called a micro-system that is stable or at least potentially stable, based on the internal organization of a given state by itself, whether small like Melos or large like Athens and Sparta. And the event-moment in space and time—say the siege of Mytilene—is itself a stable micro-system, rendered in turn unstable by the incursion of other systems. This is borne out vividly by what Dover calls "the complexity of classification" in the lineup of combatants before the Sicilian conflict.16

Buildups have a tendency, as in this impressive one, to work up to a grand slam of alliances. Since the kind of equilibrium which will obtain at a given moment is unpredictable, in the linear progression of the History the length and complexity of a buildup may be cut short at any time. So in one among other earlier intrusions of Athens into Sicilian affairs, twenty ships are sent in the summer of 427 to aid Leontini against Syracuse; and then the Athenians establish themselves at Rhegium. Thucydides reports this buildup right after, and implicitly as a consequence of, the petering out of the Corcyrean rebellion. He makes his transition by the lightest of contrasting particles, a δέ. Such a δέ introduces the next transition qualifying and curtailing this buildup; the second plague in Athens; and then earthquakes. Consequently it might be said—this time a μέν marks the transition—that the Athenians turn away from their original purpose when they attack the islands off Sicily (III. 88), and unsuccessfully. Then the following summer they do prevail at Mylae and win Messina, other events intervening to give the buildup and deployment a still further twist. Finally for this campaign they sail from Sicily to Locris, an action they perform in implied concert with a prior Athenian force there (III. 96–98), and become masters (ἐκράτησαν) of Locris. The whole final development is swift enough to be recounted, as though by interrupted aftermath, in a single not lengthy sentence (III. 99).

The balance between predictable factors and their unpredictable development correlates with the principle governing the speeches,

which take up a fourth of Thucydides’ text. Cornford makes the distinction in the speeches between “infiguration,” or fitting in what is already known, and “invention,” or adding new matter.17 As the Corinthians say while pressing their case for war at the beginning, “war least of all proceeds on specified conditions (ἐπὶ ἡπτοτοίς), but manages the many factors (τὰ πολλά) of itself according to contingency (παρατυγχάνων)” (I. 122).

This stated rule succeeds in a simultaneous declaration and ironic qualification, a contradiction of effects it can embed because the “contingency” can be predictable if seen for its factors or unpredictable if seen for the impossibility of knowing what direction the particular combination of their multiplicity (τὰ πολλά) may take. The Corinthians are in fact here revealing their ignorance and overconfidence—traits which elsewhere in Thucydides, as here, accompany bloodthirstiness. Here we have the curious mechanism of whistling in the dark by calling the dark dark. The speeches are, in Schwartz’s words, “willed showpieces (Glanzleistungen) of his political-rhetorical thinking.”18 In them the intelligence of the historian converges with the intelligence of the participants. He attains his pitch by assuming they can rise to his intelligence on occasion. He envisages an intricacy in their thought comparable to his own by putting it on the same plane as his own. “Intelligence,” ξύνεσις, is a special word for Thucydides, and as he uses it the prefix, ξύν ("together") is active.19 It is an active intelligence, brought to bear on keeping particular events open to the possibility of the sort of general subsumption that the historian brings it to bear on his narrative. Twice Thucydides pairs the term with ἀρέτη (IV. 81. 2; VI. 54. 5). Intelligence here allows for the “reckoning by probability” (εἰκάζειν, εἰκός), and for an attempt to avoid that “irrationality” (παράλογον) that characterizes human life generally (VIII. 24. 5) and especially wars (III. 16; VIII. 24; II. 61). Intelligence is the chief safeguard against that which it cannot reach to, the “unapparent” (τὸ ἀφανές). The long range is distinguished from the short. It is only after his death, on a long range, that the long range of Pericles’ “foresight” becomes apparent. The Spartans expect it to be the short war they have no firm grounds for

17 Cornford, op. cit., p. 132.
conjecturing, thus expectation being against "good sense" or "the best opinion" (περὶ ἡγεμονία, V. 14). ἡγεμονία is a term Thucydides uses well over a hundred times, more than twice as many times as Herodotus. In this term intelligence is conceived as an activated natural faculty, often spoken of as "applied" (προσέχειν) to the particulars of a situation.

Nicias, in the debate before the Sicilian expedition, declares that his reasoned speech would be weak (ἀθετεῖς ὁ λόγος) if he did not try to avoid speaking against his best opinion (VI. 9. 3). Pericles links the possibility of stability to the active use of intelligence:

Overconfidence (ἀχθυμα) can come about through lucky ignorance even for a coward, but disdain is our resource who can rely on good sense (ἡγεμονία) to prevail over our enemies. And under equal fortune an intelligence (ἐπισημα) on which his superiority of feeling depends will provide a more tenacious daring; and it relies less on hope, which is the strength of someone without resources, than it does on good sense from the resources it has, a good sense whose foresight is more stable. (II. 62. 4–5)

This complicated sentence at its conclusion comes down hard on three key words: "good sense's more stable foresight," ἤ (ἡγεμονία) ἐβεβαιότερα ἦ πρόνοια. Mere Hope, ἐλπίς, is often given a pejorative cast in Thucydides.

In the stylistic flow of Thucydides' own presentation, these definitions of the mind at work on events crop up with special saliency in the speeches. They evidence a high self-consciousness in the speakers. In the narrative they tend to cap a presentation, as Regenbogen20 points out of the moment when the Athenian ships are setting sail and "the foreigners and the rest of the crowd came for the spectacle as to a conception (διάνοια) that was sufficient [to draw so large a crowd] and incredible" (VI. 31). The term I have rendered "conception", διάνοια, is hard to translate here. Presumably the unprecedentedly large fleet is visible evidence of a thought process in the leaders of Athens. It is the result of thought, not thought itself, the usual sense of διάνοια. Thucydides has been consistently proceeding at a level of factor-collocation that would justify the odd transfer here from thought to what it produces. As for the crowd, the sight is "sufficient" to draw them (ἀξιώχρεων), but at the same time "incredible." The crowd has a somewhat easier thought process than the leaders, that of wonder, and their reaction may be taken as part of a cautionary series with the earlier dissuasions of Nicias and the much earlier warnings of Pericles against such expeditions.

20 Otto Regenbogen, Kleine Schriften (Munich 1961).
In his repeated corrections about the overthrow of the Pisistratidae (I. 20; VI. 54–59), Thucydides uses a particular fact, the distinction between Hippias and Hipparchus, as the thread which will provide the proper sequence for an interactive situation. "Factual accuracy," Edmunds emphasizes, "is not the sufficient condition for history in the Thucydidean sense, but only the necessary condition for τὸ σαφὲς" ("that which is clear"). The rebels from Mytilene use the same term during a summary moment of their defense at Olympia: "Possessing such demonstrable grounds (προφάσεις) and motives (αἰτίας), O Spartans and allies, we revolted; they are clear enough to make our hearers know (γνώσει) that we have acted in accordance with sound inference (εἰκότως)" (III. 13). Here, actually, the term "clear" is an adjective, σαφὲς, applied to two terms themselves intricate, separately and in relation to each other, προφάσεις and αἰτίας. Further, σαφὲς here gathers up and organizes a whole interlocking set of intelllections: the lengthy ones of the Mytileneans, the inference of the Spartans and their allies, and the Mytileneans' thought that what they have thought will make the Spartans and their allies think (γνώσει) they have carried out their thought on sound inferential grounds (εἰκότως).

Nathan Rotenstreich speaks of "a paradox implicit in historical knowledge. This knowledge is always causal, yet it is not based on material laws." Thucydides works his way steadily and alertly through this paradox. "Pretext" is a more ordinary sense of προφάσεις in Greek and "cause" of αἰτία. Taking the terms that way, they would provide a ladder of certainty for the principals in the History. But they cannot be taken just that way. The ladder is always collapsing because the situation changes so radically and frequently as to suggest at once the inadequacy of these intelllections and the presence of some force of the same type beyond the reach of summary, though comprised of the same factors. For all their alertness, the Mytileneans do not extricate themselves. Nor in the whole History do the Athenians either. Later, replying to the Athenian claim that the weak go to the wall (V. 89), the Melians enunciate Thucydidean principles, "It is useful for you not to dissolve the common good, but for what is sound (εἰκότα) to be also just for the one who from time to time finds himself in danger; and for one who is persuasive, even when what he says is somewhat short of accuracy (ἀκρίβεια), to be able to have the advantage of them" (V. 90). Still they are massacred.

"Everything that has to do with war is difficult," Hermocrates tells the Sicilians (IV. 59). Archidamus says much the same thing to the Spartans, "Things having to do with war are unclear" (ἀδηλος, II. 11. 4). Gomme observes that the reflection is a recurrent one in the History,24 and Thucydides, from the beginning, adduces the terms "clear" and "unclear" as alternate characterizations for the dispositions of particular events.

The elusive factors bear impersonally on states, but it is men who personally make the decisions that activate them. The contrast between factors and persons, brought to a head in Thucydides' method, carries within it at once a permanent disparity and a perilous resolution. Such a contrast is another aspect of the oscillation between clarity and its opposite. Men are generalizing particulars in a particular situation governed by general factors. Thus is a comparable interaction in Herodotus made dynamic. Resolution into clarity, in a sense, always bears on the situation Thucydides depicts, since the factors can only be activated, and thereby raised as it were to the second degree, by being taken up in the calculations of participants. After the peace of Nicias, and on the heels of a calculated rapprochement with Argos, the Spartan ambassadors who go to Boeotia decide to return the Athenian prisoners they have been given and to announce the razing of Panactum to the Athenians, who had been promised it back (V. 42). The different interpretations put by the Athenians and by the Spartan envoys upon this double announcement, and the different weight given to each event, precipitate a hostility that immediately opens a path for Alcibiades and his rivalry with Nicias (V. 43).

Events, by their very nature as crystallizations of decisions, lead to persons, and to particular kinds of persons. The Spartans may be slow and the Athenians swift, as the Corinthians tell the Spartans (I. 70–71). However, the clarity, the resignation, and even the particular brand of selfishness in Nicias, transcend national boundaries and heavily qualify the notion that he is weak. Thucydides rarely expresses estimates of his persons directly25 and when he does so, he is, as it were, assessing the man as by himself an extraordinary factor, as in the praise of Themistocles (I. 138) or the cautionary words about Alcibiades (VI. 15).

24 Gomme, II, p. 13, ad loc.
Leaders, in fact, under whatever form of government, are clearly shown in Thucydides to determine initiatives. They manage the forces to which in turn they cannot help being subject. These forces include other leaders; Nicias loses to Alcibiades the debate over the Sicilian expedition, and he reconciles himself to it, leading the expedition. But then he is subject to another constraint on the lives of statesmen. Unless they have the precocious gifts of an Alcibiades, they will be along in years when at the helm. And war itself increases the risks of mortality. Nicias suffers through the Sicilian expedition and dies there, as Pericles had died and Archidamus, Demosthenes and Brasidas, Phormio and Cleon.

Precocity brings with it another risk, which Alcibiades has come to stand for more than anyone else, the risk of brilliant narcissism. He might trick the Spartan envoys, but over the long run a man's character shows. It was inevitable, whatever his guilt, that he would be accused of the sacrilege against the herms and the Mysteries. Thucydides underscores this inevitability by giving us insufficient evidence to decide his guilt either way, where usually it is accuracy in just this sort of affair that he seeks. The fact that Alcibiades is accused, as he inevitably would have been, impels this rapid and adaptive politician to avoid probable death by fleeing when the Athenians send to have him returned for trial. Other Athenians had fled to avoid prosecution, not always so successfully. And later Alcibiades repeats this success, slipping away from a Spartan death sentence to the entourage of Tissaphernes. He would inevitably be using his talents to intrigue with the Persians and with the Spartans. And through the irony of developments he escapes the disastrous Sicilian campaign he had urged, contriving his way back finally into the good graces of the Athenians.

The forces, at every point, are there to be managed, and the very change of their configuration from present moment to present moment provides a clever man with the opportunity to take them up without necessarily being impaired by the way he had done so before. Finally Alcibiades' selfishness and skill at diplomacy come into their own under the conditions that prevail after the Sicilian disaster, in the eighth book. This, as Westlake reminds us, is "packed with reports of secret negotiations and intrigues."26

The disintegration of the Athenian empire provides a decentralization of forces that permits playing one force against another without effective checks. In this way the person of Alcibiades, at this moment in the war, functions doubly as an agent upon the factors and as a

26 Ibid., p. 231.
mirror of where they stand. Indeed, the very mode by which agency combines with mirroring will differ. Pericles' particular bearing on the general situation is resumed into the speeches that exhibit him. These speeches exemplify a particular phase of the war and serve as agencies to influence a particular kind of policy—or not to influence, since they are partially unheeded.27 "When he died his foresight about the war was still further recognized" (II. 65). For Nicias, and for the dark events around Syracuse, the man and the time are characterized first by a reasoned speech not forceful enough to prevail, and finally by the relative silence of desperate defensive maneuvers. The individual in this instance would seem to have developed under the pressure of circumstances, since at an earlier moment Thucydides has asserted that Nicias urged the peace "to leave a name to later time" (V. 16).

Thucydides' managed silences too, as Reinhardt and Schadewaldt have emphasized,28 preserve that neutrality. "What [your] nature always willed has been tested to the point of truth" (III. 64. 4: ἡ φύσις αἰεὶ ἐσθηλητο) are in the Greek plural and particular. The literal meaning is "The things which your nature always wished." The wish is general, and the truth is singular, a generalizing abstraction (τὸ ἀληθὲς). So the Boeotians say to the Plataeans, but the notion will apply to the whole History. Most of Thucydides' uses of φύσις "nature" mean "human nature." And of the twenty times he uses φύσις, "human" or its equivalent is attached in nine. This quality, however, is not taken for granted, nor does it operate on the surface. It must be "tested to the truth" by the participants, and overridingly by Thucydides himself, whose History constitutes such a testing.

Nor is war a special case. "Many difficulties (πολλὰ καὶ χαλεπά) fell upon the cities in the uprising," he says of the Corcyrean Revolution, "occurring and always bound to occur so long as the nature of man is the same, though more peaceful and changing in their forms according to how the particular transformations of events (ξυντυχίων) may impinge (ἔφιστώντας)" (III. 82. 2). "For all things by their nature (πέφυκε) do indeed diminish" (II. 64. 3), Pericles reminds the Athenians at the moment when he is assuring them that the glory of their empire will survive in memory. Nature, necessity (ἀνάγκη), and customary behavior (τὸ εἰσώθιος) are linked in his presentation.29

Thucydides' neutrality extends even to the presentation of himself

in the third person both as a writer and as a participant (IV. 104. 4), and it is significant that in his “second preface” Thucydides adopts for a few sentences the grammatical sleight of an imagined, neutral observer. “If someone does not consider the intervening truce to be accounted war, he will not judge rightly. Let him look to how it is discriminated by the events, and he will find it not a likely thing (οὐ κείμενος ἂν) for it to be assessed as peace” (V. 26. 2).

The elaborate negatives here, and the six different verbs for mental sifting, establish, as though through syntactic struggle, the neutrality of viewpoint that Thucydides everywhere aims at. A sense of the severity with which he maintains this steadiness of view impends upon this neutrality, and a sparkling clarity of presentation holds his details in unwavering coordination. The neutrality heightens the relational interaction between general and particular.

Many constraints bear on the historian’s task generally, and some obligation to preserve neutrality is one of them. Neutrality is the attitudinal aspect of the obligation to narrate events “wie sie eigentlich gewesen.” Another constraint obliges him to report only facts he can be reasonably sure were the case. This is Thucydides’ “accuracy” (ἀκριβεία). Still another constraint obliges him to select them for some kind of congruence to his purpose, as Thucydides is a military historian. Another constraint inhibits the historian from avoiding a mediation of his events, inducing him to adjudicate between general and particular in any case. He is obliged to steer somewhat clear of what could be taken for bare reportage. On the one hand he must suspend judgment while suspending his long-range connections. On the other hand mediation requires that he not give just a flat summary of events; he must not simply offer a chronicle. The balance of mediation obliges the historian to steer a constant middle course between tract and chronicle. Thucydides not only understood this requirement, as Herodotus had. The speeches offer him an indirect, “doubled” mode of introducing interpretation while maintaining neutrality.

In this sense he must hold to the narrative, and his skillful management of all these constraints strengthens his narrative, allowing it to take on details for which the necessity cannot be argued on any logical framework. In the case of Thucydides, these details sometimes stun through similarity; particulars worked on by a coordinating intellection evolve into generality. The narrative of the Sicilian campaign would presumably carry a comparable sense of the action if it were divested of half its details, and yet the extra details, what
I have elsewhere called "the visionary filler,"30 do not diffuse the narrative, but rather sharpen it; the particulars function as cumulative demonstration, and in the narrative mode a sense of their necessity does not vanish once a general view is sensed.

In any case, before the investigation of the theoretician, the hard outline of what we would call an "event" disappears.31 As Koselleck argues, history "as such" has no object at all, a condition that makes "bare history originally a metahistorical category."32

Any historian is thus pulled in two directions by the particular and by the general, and the mystery of his task resides in striking a balance between them that will operate along a narrative line. As Paul Ricoeur says, "it is the place of universals in a science of the singular that is at issue,"33 though even the word "science" is misleading here, since in the historical narrative hypothesis and conclusion are fused together. There is a mix of the two in the ongoing narrative that the historian mediates, and may mediate differently within a given work. Particular and general have a different relationship in the speeches of Thucydides34 and in the more directly narrative portions. The speeches have a double role as explanatory pauses establishing a general case, and as subsumed particulars globally aligned with the details of action, along the lines of Thucydides' constant distinction between λόγοι and ἔργα, words and deeds.

Thucydides' statements about persons or events are briefer than his narrative presentation of them. This seeming disproportion or spareness of interpretation actually creates, together with the management of other constraints, a sense that a general view is being gradually furthered. It permits Thucydides sharply to enunciate what all successful historians must, the partial synecdoche that constitutes his κτήμα ἐς αἰτί. Particular events have to have been selected for some general aim for them not to be a chaotic mass. The selection is partial even of those the historian can know—for Thucydides only those that have not been inescapably lost in the dimness of time. As

34 N. G. L. Hammond, "The Particular and the Universal in the Speeches of Thucydides," in The Speeches in Thucydides (Chapel Hill 1973), pp. 49–59. Aristotle makes too facile a judgment about this relationship by a simple contrast between poetry and history, "poetry tells us rather the universals, history the particulars" (Poetics 1451 b 2–3). I have discussed this question in Myth and Language, p. 299, note 6.
particulars they suggest a generality to which they relate; they are inescapably synecdochic. But the synecdoche does not operate the way it does in poetry; there is no whole for which the parts can stand. The whole is only adumbrated, and the synecdoche remains only partial, mediating perpetually between general and particular.

This mediation entails a sense of irony, and all or nearly all successful historians are ironic in ways that are also partial. One event is bound to throw another into an ironic light, or the historian offers us just a chronicle. The overlooking of Pericles’ advice, the escape of Alcibiades from the war he had urged, the fruitlessness of the articulations of the Melians to save their lives, the failure of the overweening Athenians in Sicily—the ironies of event multiply in Thucydides, who rarely makes an out-and-out ironic remark. Some irony in the historical narrative is unavoidable through the initial chaos of the referent, and yet an overall irony is impossible if the historian retains the order of the referent as a goal. The ironies play over the work as a sort of multiple running check against sliding back to mere particulars or against wholly backing some oversimplifying generality that would undo the tension of the narrative. The interpretative touch of ironic statement in later historians such as Tacitus or Gibbon or Burckhardt will jog the narrative along. Thucydides, we may say, shows his earliness in the intensity by which he stiffly refrains, by and large, from such touches.

The speeches, again, serve to double the ironic possibilities, not only between event and event, but between what is said and what happens, between λόγος and έργον. Any speech, as a complex of ratiocinative recommendations aimed at the future, is bound to be tested by that future, and bound to miss its mark somewhat, generating the implied irony of contrast. And even if the speech hits its mark, there is the irony that still the speech may not be heeded, as Nicias’ speech is not. There is generally an impelling onward movement toward conquest through the whole History, against which any speech, or any sequence of speeches, protests in vain. So there may be said to obtain a further, deeper irony between momentary if tensely reasoned arguments and silent, overriding motives. The Athenians do not listen to Pericles when he recommends restraint about campaigns, at his point of maximum prestige and maximum social authority. “Your knowledge (επιστήμη) is better than another force that has good fortune (εύνοια)” (VII. 63. 4). So Nicias says to troops whose morale is low as the Sicilians are pressing them hard. Not only does the disastrous outcome render these words ironic. Thucydides’ own principles do, since “knowledge,” here meaning military skill, ought to be sufficient to know that it will be a decisive
factor only if other factors are equal. This is what Pericles had insisted long before, weighing up the whole balance of factors, and there is the irony that Nicias, who seems to be imitating Pericles, is inadequate to his model. Of the factors that count, it is precisely strength or force (φῶμη) and happenstance (τύχη) that figure large.

So particular is the narrative of Thucydides that it often stays close to the maximum point of particularity. In its onward flow, however, it pauses most notably for the speeches, which do not halt the action but poise on the brink of futurity and decision. They themselves, seen not as ruminations over the events but as themselves an event, particularize still further. They are given not word by word as uttered, but word by word to delineate the arguments presented. This makes each clause, and sometimes each word, a microscopic encapsulation of dialectical relations between particular and general. Their reference is to a moment in an idea, and as such the terms in the speeches present a double face. With respect to their referents they are reconstructively concrete, and their character as signs must work more actively just because the individual words are constructive rather than reported. But the actual words are abstract with respect to their lexical origin, and also with respect to their syntactic function.

Because of his onward flow, and his intermittent nervous adduction of qualifying abstraction, Thucydides is not felt to be slipping from particular to general, or from concrete to abstract. He can get back again very fast. For this reason, as well as for those Finley gives,\textsuperscript{35} he operates, in a sense, midway between the paratactic (λέξις εἰρομένη) and the hypotactic or subordinate (λέξις κατεστραμμένη). Actually, even to describe him so may obscure the fact that the coordinates on which he operates permit of the occasional combination of these two styles, but not for their discrimination. His partial synecdoche makes him always potentially a subordinator, but the stringing of one event onto another in the narrative line pulls against this tendency.

To use Lloyd’s terms for persistent tendencies in Greek thought,\textsuperscript{36} Thucydides implicitly subsumes both the polarity that would make him subordinate his particulars under a general heading and the analogy which would make him coordinate them. Polarity and analogy are readapted to the constantly testing linearity of his presentation. In the sentences, frequent in his work, which seem to derive from, and distort, the isocola formalized as stylistic desiderata by Gorgias, the balances between clauses are almost always subverted. The feeling

\textsuperscript{35} Finley, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 253–69.

given by Thucydides’ wrenching style is of too much pressing upon the sentence to be distributed out in even clauses. Only in the tendentious argumentation of an advocate uttering a speech will they be pressed into balance, or in the high piety and enthusiasm of Pericles’ Funeral Oration. And even in such instances the abstractions brought into balance are themselves terms not usually polarized.

The compression of thinking into these terms individually shows in their somewhat unusual contrast collectively. Dionysius of Halicarnassus takes Thucydides to task for a number of stylistic sleights. All of these could be redescribed as distortions of language into imbalance under pressure: the substitution of noun for verb and of verb for noun; of active for passive and of passive for active; the change of tenses; the frequent use of parentheses and involution; the substitution of person for thing and thing for person. Dionysius speaks, too, of Thucydides’ enthymemes. These logical proofs with one term left out will serve well to indicate the onward “slippage” of Thucydides’ demonstration.

As Wille says of Thucydides, “Formal analogies can cover actual differences, while actual analogies are concealed in formal variations.”37 This happens especially when he is moving from more particular to somewhat less, and from concrete description to abstract reflection, as spectacularly in his transition to general observations after the Corcyrean rebellion:

πᾶσα τε ἡ ἰδέα κατάστη θεαντόν, καὶ οὖν φιλεῖ ἐν τῷ τουμῶτῳ γέγραψαν, οὔδὲν ὅτι οὐ ξυνεβή καὶ ἐτι περαιτέρω. καὶ γὰρ πατήρ πάντων ἀπέτεκεν καὶ ἀπό τῶν ἱερῶν ἀπεσπῶντο καὶ πρῶς αὐτούς ἐκτένωσον, οἱ δὲ τινες καὶ περιοικοδομήθεντες ἐν τὸν Διώνυσον τῷ ἱερῷ ἀπέθανον.

Ὅτανος ὡμή [ἢ] στάσις προιχώρησε, καὶ ἐδόξε μᾶλλον, διότι ἐν τοῖς πρώτῃ ἐγέμετο, ἐπὶ ὑπέρθεν γε καὶ πᾶν ὡς εἰπέω τὸ Ἐλληνικόν ἐκκρίθη, διαφορὰν αὐτῶν ἔκαστακόρ τοὺς τε τῶν ὰμέων προσατάτας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐπέγεισθαι καὶ τῶς ὀλέγους τῶς Δακεδαμονίως, καὶ ἐν μὲν εἰρήνη οὐκ ἀν ἔχωντων πρόφασιν αὐτοῦ ἐτοίμων περακακείν αὐτοὺς, πολιομετός δὲ καὶ εὐμμαχίας ἡμα ἐκατέρως τῆς ἔνωσιν κακώσει καὶ σφάσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ προσποίησεν ραδίως αἱ ἐπαγωγαὶ τοῖς νεωτέρεισι τι βουλαγμένοις ἐπορίζοντο. καὶ ἐπέπεσε πολλά καὶ χαλεπά κατὰ στάσις ταῖς πόλεαι.

Every form of death occurred, and as is wont to happen in such cases, there was nothing that did not transpire and yet more extremely. Yes, and father slew child, and people were dragged from the temples and killed near them, and some were walled up and died in the temple of Dionysus.

So the raw strife proceeded, and, because this was the first example

of it, it seemed even worse than it was; later, practically the whole of the Greek world was stirred up, because in every state quarrels gave occasion to the democratic leaders to ask for aid from Athens, to the oligarchs to ask Sparta. In peace, without the excuse and indeed without the readiness to summon them; but in war and with an alliance at hand for either side, to injury for their enemies and to advantage for themselves, inducements were easily furnished to those wishing to innovate. Many were the calamities that befell the Greek states through this civil strife. (III. 81.5–82.2: Gomme, revised)

Intermediate abstraction has already begun in the sentence about the father killing the son. This is not one instance but a type case of which there could have been more than one instance, though one single salient instance of horror, the walling up of suppliants in the temple of Dionysus, brings the sentence to its climax. The typification of the first instance modifies the horror of the last, while the actuality of the last instance concretizes the whole passage even further. There is also a shift between singular and plural for the verb here, and for “temple” (ιεράν), though the cases are suspended differently between particular and general.

The jump to much higher generalization in “raw strife” (ὡμή στάσεως) reveals, and incorporates, the horror. Thucydides controls and compresses his diction while his syntax forces into extreme terrors here. He goes on to describe another kind of slippage than the one his mastery is enlisting, a slippage of diction:

εὐστάσιάζε τε οὖν τὰ τῶν πόλεων, καὶ τὰ ἐφυστεριζόντα ποιος πόστε τῶν προγενομένων πολλὴ ἐπέφερε τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ καινοῦσθαι τὰς διανοίας τῶν τ’ ἐπιχειρήσεων περιτεχνῆσαι καὶ τῶν τιμωρίων ἀτοπίας. καὶ τὴν ἐσωθεν εἰσίων τῶν ἀνωμάτων ἕτ’ ἔργα ἀντῆλλαξον τῇ δικαιώσει. τόλμα μὲν γὰρ ἀλογιστος ἀνθρώπινος φιλότιμος ἐνομίσθη, μέλλησις δὲ προμηθῆς δειλία ἐνπρέπης, τὸ δ’ ἄνωφρον τοῦ ἀνανθρώπου πρόσχημα, καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἄπειραν εὐνυτῶν ἐπ’ πᾶν ἄργον.

So as the affairs of the cities kept going into revolt, the later outbreaks, by knowledge of what had gone before were marked by ever-increasing novelty of rationales, shown both in the ingenuity of attack and the enormity of revenge. They changed the customary validation of terms as men claimed the right to use them to suit the deeds: unreasoning daring was termed loyal courage; prudent delay specious cowardice; moderation the cloak of timidity; and understanding of the whole to be in everything inactive. (82. 3: Gomme, revised)

“As men claimed the right to use them” translates the single term δικαίωσις, “adjudication,” a term usually applied to court actions, and sometimes to the punishment assigned after judgment. All these senses tinge Thucydides’ use without modifying it. This word refuses to refer to that which it describes and unwittingly exemplifies—the
"judgers" are "judged" by Thucydides, and even self-punished by destroying the use of the language to get them out of such later enterprises as the Sicilian Expedition or the rule of the Four Hundred. Under such stress, however, the language must respond by a corresponding compactness and agility, as in this extraordinary case Thucydides is exemplifying when he takes the fairly unimportant Corcyrean rebellion as a typifying instance. When he gets to still bigger and more crucial events, he cannot digress for so long.

The increasing pressure not to digress confines Thucydides' presentational variation simply to relativizing his linear detail. Sometimes he offers a great deal of detail, in campaigns important for the war or for their emblematic force. Less often he scales down the amount of detail he gives. We cannot be sure that his omission of speeches in Book Eight indicates incompleteness and not the writer's decision to foreshorten from this point on. Having been initiated to the argumentative processes of speeches, the informed reader is in a position to make do with summaries so as to move forward more cogently.

The principle of relevance in the History operates simply at first; every detail must relate to the one all-embracing war. But the History starts out at a higher level of complexity and generality than the one it maintains, since Thucydides delays his prefatory theoretical remarks till after the "Archaeology" and delays the Pentekontaetia till after the beginnings of conflict. The shifts from one to another of these four initial units might tempt a critic to provide schematizations, but the onward pressure of events will undo such large-scale structural deductions. Thucydides cannot be found to have invented a structure more complex than his implied rule of explaining only what time has brought new to the conditions of the war. He could have built the History, after all, on a version of Herodotus' more complex pattern, the intertwining of distant with close time-frames and ethnographic monographs with narratives. As it is, his narrative almost mimetically changes course as the war changes course. The Olympian viewpoint of the Archaeology and the Pentekontaetia cannot be brought in to provide a Herodotus-like expansive disquisition about Persian politics in Book Eight.

By that point Thucydides has established his theoretical control over the factors governing the narrative. Those come as a gradual revelation, and their increasing explicitness reinforces the simple but

elusive near-pattern he is singlemindedly elaborating. The synecdoche can only be partial, but its theoretical force holds.

Plato, and later Aristotle, devised categories that would solve problems about the relation of general and particular. In the *History* Thucydides offers an ongoing instantiation of how one kind of relation evolves between general and particular through a complex temporal sequence.

*Brown University*
A recent book\(^1\) has raised again the important exegetical question of rhetoric and the Christian New Testament. But the topic of prose rhythm is advanced there only to be dismissed on the grounds that “evidence from inscriptions and papyri seems to indicate that long and short syllables were often not accurately and systematically differentiated in the pronunciation of koine Greek.” Later, when the Lord’s Prayer is found to display identifiable clausula endings, for the author this still does not make extensive analysis of New Testament prose rhythms of more than debatable value.

No doubt these difficulties exist. But evidently it was possible for writers of formal Hellenistic prose to pay attention to prose rhythms. One need look no further than Plutarch.\(^2\) The difficulty seems to be that the authors of the New Testament, and of the Gospels in particular, are not regarded as capable of that degree of sophistication.\(^3\)

Already so great a scholar as Eduard Norden presents a classic

---


\(^3\) Understanding is not helped by the blanket use of the term “koine Greek” for the often very subtle and complex language of the New Testament. It has about as much value to the literary historian as “Silver Latin” for anything post-Augustan.
example of this failure to read the evidence. In the first volume of his *Antike Kunstprosa*4 Norden supplies an analysis of the long Greek inscription discovered in 1890 and erected in the first century B.C. by King Antiochus of Commagene. He notes that there are 49 occurrences of cretic/trochaic combinations of which 19 are resolved into the *esse videatur* pattern. The inscription as a whole is for him “a dithyramb in prose,” a fine illustration of the second Asian style described by Cicero.5

Elsewhere,6 Norden speaks approvingly of an article proposing that the documents of early Christianity should not be considered part of literary history because they do not make use of the forms of real literature. He supplies another long comparison of the synoptic Gospels with one another in an effort to show that Luke is a more conscious stylist than his peers. But even so he prefaces his remarks with the statement that “Die Evangelien stehen völlig abseits von der kunstmäßigen Literatur.”

In fact, the Gospels are most carefully constructed examples of Greek dialogic literature, which is exactly the tradition evoked by Justin when he calls them *ἀπομνημονεύματα.*7 They and the Acts of the Apostles use, in telling contexts, the very rhythm that Norden regards as characteristic of the elaborate Asian style. St. Mark’s version8, for example, of the Cry from the Cross (a quotation from Psalms 22) is: Ὁ Θεός μου ὁ Θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλειπές με; (15:34). A comparison with Matthew 27:46 is instructive. St. John leads into the Last Word with πάντα τετέλεσται, (19:28). The Voice that interrupts St. Paul on the road to Damascus also uses the first paeon and spondee: Σαοῦλ Σαοῦλ, τί με διώκεις; (Acts 9:4; cf. 22:7; 26:14).

When Pilate is nettled by Christ’s refusal to speak, Matthew makes him ask: Οἶδ᾽ιν ἀποκρίνῃ . . . ; (26:62). Like the Cry from the Cross in Mark, this is an important “dialogic” example. In the very next chapter of the same Gospel, the plan to let the brigand Barabbas go free while Jesus is put to death calls for a spondaic/trochaic admixture that duly culminates in an *esse videatur* clausula: ἦνα αἰτήσωνται τὸν Ἡρακλῆν, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν (27:20). The contrast between the rhythms of the two long verbs, and the isocolic parallelism linking the proper names, is noteworthy.

---

5 Brutus 325: *verbis volucere atque incitatum, quasi nunc est Asia tota, nec flumine solum orationis sed etiam exornato et facto genere verborum.*
6 Ibid., II, pp. 479 ff. The quotation is from p. 480.
7 Norden, p. 481.
These initial examples from familiar passages suggest that, for the writers of the New Testament, the stereotyped clausula still had significant life. A list of further examples, which does not of course claim to be complete, repays study.

I. Matthew

6:19 and 20  

βρῶσις ἰδανίζει, . . .

From the Sermon on the Mount. A nuance of irony and contempt, whose repetitions remind us of similar tricks in Ovid,⁹ for the man who amasses this world’s goods? See the following instance.

6:24  

τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει:

(Cf. Luke 16:13.)  Also from the same context. “You cannot serve two masters.”

6:30  

οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ύμᾶς, ὄλιγόπιστος;

(Cf. 8:26; 16:8.)  A fourth example from chapter 6. Here certainly there is an ironic and impatient note in this “dialogic” question directed at those who doubt Providence. Ὁλιγόπιστοι, of which the Rabbinical κτν 'mnh looks like a calque, is first attested in this passage. Compare Luke 12:28, below.

When this rhythm next occurs in Matthew, we are in the middle of a rebuke by Christ to the disbelieving cities:

11:20  

ὅτι οὐ μετενόησαν.

Cf. 11:21  

πάλαι ἄν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ μετενόησαν.

and Luke 10:13, in the same context, where the insertion of a participle leaves the rhythm intact: πάλαι ἄν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ καθήμενοι μετενόησαν.

Two chapters later, the end of the world and the Last Judgment are in view:

13:47  

ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγούσῃ.

Another note of ironic disgust and condemnation?

19:20  

Ταῦτα πάντα ἐφύλαξα.

⁹ E.g. Metamorphoses III. 353 (positive) and 355 (negative), exactly the pattern of this passage from the Sermon on the Mount.
If the hiatus is tolerable, the Rich Young Man here confidently (over-confidently?) asserts his own blameless conduct. With the rhythm may be compared οὗτος ὁ τελῶνης (Luke 18:11), the prayer of the self-righteous man.

The effect of Pilate’s Οὐδὲν ἀποκρίνη . . . ; (26:62), and of Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν (27:20) was already noted.

A last example from Matthew is furnished by

28:17 καὶ ἰδόντες οὗτον προσεκύνησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν.

An emotional profession of faith by those who found themselves able to believe. Yet even this implies a dialogue. “Some were in two minds” (internal debate) and certainly Jesus is himself to speak shortly.

What is striking in all the examples adduced here from Matthew is the element of reproof and even savage satire found in them. At the end, the believers are balanced by the doubters. This pattern of meaning is not maintained by the other Gospels, but I suggest that it gives some indication of the primitive levels on which this rhythm draws.

II. Mark

3:4 ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σώσαι ἢ ἀποκτείνω, οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων.

A tense confrontation, again therefore an intended dialogue, but one in which one of the parties refuses to participate. The passage gains in pathos from the realization of this refusal, betrayed by the rhythms. Contrast Pilate’s Οὐδὲν ἀποκρίνη . . . ; where however Christ does at long last break his silence.

4:29 παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός.


8:24 ὡς δὲνδρα ὧρῳ περιπατοῦντας.

The blind man begins to recover his sight. A moment of extreme emotional release, perhaps with some metamorphosing comedy in it.

10 And if it is not, the heroic clausula has its own history!
9:7  ὁ δὲ ἄγας ἤστιν ὁ Θεὸς μοι ἀκαταπατήτος, . . .

The solemn revelation of Christ’s divinity. Compare John 1:32 and 33, and 36, below.

10:32 καὶ ἐν προάγων αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο, οἱ δὲ ἄκολουθοι ἔφοβοιντο.

Religious awe (θάμβος) and fear, the expression aided by homoeoteleuton and isocolon (10; 5; 11) as well as by the paemonic/trochaic rhythm.11

12:27 οὖς ἔστων Θεός νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων. πολὺ πλανάσθη.

Another tense confrontation: see 3:4, above. It is this emotion which perhaps allows us to ride over (or at least to attenuate in some way) the period after ζώντων. Contrast Matthew 22:29, where πλανάσθε is used in the same scene, but no attempt is made to exploit the paemonic rhythm.

12:44 δὴν τὸν βίον αὐτῆς.


13:11 καὶ ὅταν ἤγγισιν ὑμᾶς παραδίδοντες, . . .


13:28 ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἔστιν.


15:34 εἰς τί ἐγκατέλειπές με;

The anguished Cry from the Cross. A supreme example of this rhythm in dialogic question.

11 The effect of the periphrastic ἐν προάγων, which throws the stress onto the subject of the first clause, should also be noted: cf. H. B. Rosén, “Die ‘zweiten’ Tempora des Griechischen: Zum Prädikatsausdruck beim griechischen Verbum,” Museum Helveticum 14 (1957), pp. 133–54. See the article by Gerald M. Browne, below.
III. Luke

1:29 λόγω διεταράχθη, καὶ διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἰς ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος.

The Annunciation. Evidently another instance of dialogic mental turmoil.

2:35 καρδίῶν διαλογισμοὶ.

The prophecy of Simeon, and reminiscent of 1:29. With the noun διαλογισμοὶ may be compared the verb διελογίζετο there. It looks very much as if the more style-conscious Luke begins his Gospel with what Formalists call a “dénudation du procédé,” a “laying bare of the device” by which esse videatur rhythm is expressly associated with dialogue, with internal dialogue in particular.

6:9 ἥ κακοποιήσαι, . . .

Cf. Mark 3:4 above.

6:23 and 26 οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

(Cf. Acts 7:52.) Denunciation.

7:6 ἐπορεύετο σὺν αὐτοῖς.

On the way to cure the centurion’s servant. This is perhaps a first example of a type which could be catalogued as “scenery.”¹² The actual phrase may not refer to anything very striking, but its rhythm establishes a certain mood which conditions the reader to expect the marvelous.

7:22 τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται,

Christ’s message to John’s disciples, displaying a double example of the paemonic rhythm, aided by isocolon (7; 7; 7) and homoeoteleuton, of which there is more in the context. Cf. Mark 10:32, above.

8:5 καὶ κατεπατήθη, . . .

The fate of the seed that fell by the wayside.

9:44 μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι . . .

¹² I borrow this term from G. N. Knauer, who uses it in Die Aeneis und Homer (Göttingen 1964) to describe those occasions when Virgil evokes a background rather than any particular characterization from Homer for his actors.
We have already met this rhythm in a similar context (Mark 13:11, quoted above). No doubt for the earliest Christians it had a special resonance.

10:13 καθήμενοι μετενόησαν.
Cf. exactly the same rhythm in the same context at Matthew 11:21, quoted above.

11:18 εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατάνας ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν διεμερίσθη, . . .
Cf. below, 12:51. Here, an impossible suggestion is derided.13

11:22 αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν.
The same context, the same notion of violence.

11:40 ἐσώθην ἐποίησεν;
More tense confrontation.

12:28 ὑμᾶς, διεγόπιστοι.

12:51 ἡ διαμερισμὸν.
More violence. "I have not come to bring peace, but division."

15:6 μον τὸ ἀπολωλός.
and

15:7 ἀμαρτωλῶν μετανοοῦντι . . .
Pathos and joy over the lost sheep. Compare

15:10 ἀμαρτωλῶν μετανοοῦντι.

16:13 ἐτέρου καταφρονήσει.
Compare Matthew 6:24, exactly the same rhythm in the same context.

16:26  μηδὲ(ε) ἐκείθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαπερῶσιν.
The gulf fixed between heaven and hell. The cretics here leading into the paemonic/trochaic clausula would do credit to Cicero.\(^{14}\)

18:8  πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς;
An anguished question about the end of the world.

18:11  οὗτος ὁ τελώνης;

21:30  ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἔστιν
The end of the world. Cf. Mark 13:28, the same context and quotation.

24:17  Τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὓς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλην; λους περιπατοῦντες;
An extraordinary instance of the double occurrence of this rhythm in a dialogic question, here preparing the way for the revelation of the Resurrection.

IV. John

1:22  τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ;
Exactly the technique just noted in Luke. John the Baptist is asked to identify himself. His declaration will prepare the way for Christ.

Now four examples follow in quick succession.

1:32  τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαίνον . . .

Cf. 1:33  τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαίνον || καὶ μένον ἐπ’ αὐτόν,
The revelation of divinity calls for the same rhythms as at Mark 9:7 and Luke 24:17, noted above. Cf. fourthly

1:36  τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι . . .

\(^{14}\) Cf. τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολάσων, Matthew 27:20, cited above. Compare Cicero, Verrine V. 16. 40: infamiam fugerit quam sin(e) utta voluptate capiebat.
the recruitment of the first disciples.

4:8 τροφᾶς ἀγοράσωσιν.

Jesus is exhausted and thirsty, and is about to make an unexpected revelation of himself to the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well. A "scenic" use, which nevertheless sets the stage for a long dialogue, not without some touches of humor.

4:47 ἡμελλεν γὰρ ἀποθησεκεν.

The royal official's son saved from death. John is attracted by this rhythm with this verb: cf. ἡμελλεν ἀποθησεκεν (12:33) and ἡμελλεν ἀποθησεκεν (18:32). With this may be compared ἐν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανείσθε (8:21) and μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται (11:50).

11:29 ἡρχετο πρὸς αὐτῶν.

Lazarus' sister Mary goes out to meet Jesus. Scenery for a resurrection. Cf. ἐπορεύετο σὺν αὐτοῖς (Luke 7:6), quoted above, and the disputed 8:2, discussed below.

13:7 γνώσῃ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα.

A promise of future revelation made at the Last Supper, with a telling verb.

19:7-8 . . . Τίνω θεοῦ ἐαυτῶν ἐποίησεν. Ὅτε οὖν ἤκουσεν ὁ Πειλᾶτος τούτον τὸν λόγον, μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη.


19:28 πάντα τετέλεσται, . . .

The end approaches.

20:23 . . . κρατήτε, κεκράτηται.

The conferring of the Holy Spirit. It is interesting that the rhythm is associated with the negative pole.

The list of examples in John has not included the often questioned opening of chapter 8, where the woman taken in adultery is forgiven. In fact, this passage shows three interesting usages of this rhythm. At the beginning
8:2 ήρχετο προς αὐτούν... sets the scene. We expect something extraordinary. Exactly the same phrase introduces the resurrection of Lazarus (11:29), quoted above. Then two “dialogic” examples follow. Christ asks the sinner if anyone has condemned her:

8:10 οὐδείς σε κατέκρινεν;
And when she answers No, he rejoins:

8:11 Οὐδὲ ἐγώ σε κατακρίνω:
The repetition is reminiscent of the Sermon on the Mount: cf. Matthew 6:19 and 20, quoted above. The question in itself recalls that of Pilate (Matthew 26:62), and its so different sequel.

V. Acts

1:2 ἔξελέξατο άνελήμφθη'
The Ascension.

2:1 ὑμοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό;
2:47 καθ’ ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.
The Descent of the Holy Spirit and the first preaching of the Gospel. A striking instance of ring composition, marked both by recurrence of vocabulary and of rhythm, at the beginning and end of chapter 2, suggesting that here the division into chapters owed to Langton (1214) and the medieval Paris Bible corresponded to something in the author’s purpose.

7:32 ἐντρομος δὲ γενόμενος Μωυσῆς οὐκ ἐτόλμα κατανοῆσαι.
From the speech made by Stephen. The revelation at the Burning Bush. A dialogue with God.

7:43 ἐπίκειναι Βαβυλώνος.
Prophetic denunciation, also from the speech of St. Stephen.

7:51 οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν;
7:57  ὀμοθυμαδὸν ἐπ' αὐτῶν, ... 
and

8:2  κοπετὸν μέγαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

The beginning and end of Stephen’s execution, marked by recurring rhythms as in Acts 2. With the first phrase may be compared 21:32, below, where Paul is rescued from a similar onslaught.

9:5: cf. 22:7; 26:14  Σαουλ Σαουλ, τί με διώκεις; 

Although the rhythm is slightly varied (to give a pherocrates), we may note in the same passage:

9:5  'Ησοῦς δὲ σὺ διώκεις:

(Cf. 26:15, but contrast 22:7.) The question and answer, with their repeated verb, are strongly reminiscent of John 8:10–11, quoted above.

9:24  αὐτὸν ἀνέλωσιν:

A plot to kill St. Paul. St. John’s fondness for this rhythm in deadly contexts is comparable.

9:38  πρὸς αὐτὸν παρακαλοῦντες,

The background to a resurrection.

10:6  οἰκία παρὰ θάλασσαν.

Cf. 10:32  βυρσέως παρὰ θάλασσαν.

Scenery at the crucial discovery that even Gentiles may receive the Holy Spirit.

12:10  καὶ εὐθέως ἀπέστη ὁ ἐγγελος ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

The rhythm here marks the end of the story about Peter’s miraculous release from prison. Compare 16:37, quoted below.

12:22  ὁ δὲ ὅμος ἐπεφώνη, Θεῷ φωνῇ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου.

The Voice of God has already evoked this rhythm: Mark 9:7 and Acts 9:5. Here of course it is the prelude to a horrible death, described by the agricultural compound, applied with devastating irony to a man, σκωληκόβρωτος.
14:3  

\[\text{ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ...}\]

The background to the signs and portents mentioned shortly in the context. \(λόγῳ\) is telling. There is still dialogue.

16:26  

\[\text{ἣν εὐχήσαν δὲ παραχρῆμα αἱ θύραι πᾶσαι, ...}\]

The symbolic opening of the doors.\(^{15}\)

16:37  

\[\text{ἐξαγαγέτωσαν.}\]

Indignant protest. Part of a dialogue concluding the miraculous rescue. The similar rhythm at the end of Peter’s rescue (12:10) may be compared.

19:4  

\[\text{βάπτισμα μετανοίας, ...}\]

This picks up a rhythm often employed by the Gospels with this particular concept: cf. Matthew 11:20 and 21; Luke 10:13 and 15:10.

21:23  

\[\text{εἰσὶν ἡμῖν ἀνδρεὶς τέσσαρες εὐχήν ἔχοντες ἐφ’ ἕαυτῶν}\]

A religious context, and of course the start of Paul’s fateful involvement with the authorities. See 22:29, below.

21:29–30  

\[\ldots\text{εἰσῆγαγεν ὁ Παύλος, ἐκκληθῇ τῇ πόλις δή καὶ ἑγένετο συμβολή τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενοι τοῦ Παύλου ἐλκον αὐτῶν ἕξω τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ εὐθέως ἐκκλείσθησαν αἱ θύραι.}\]

The background to a riot, with the sentence following the esse videatur rhythm marked by isocolon (21; 20; 10) and homoeoteleuton. The closing of the doors is also a symbolic detail. The similar verb helps to link this closing with the earlier scene at Philippi (16:37, quoted above), where however the doors were opened.

21:32  

\[\text{κατέδραμεν\footnote{16} ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς}\]

The same context. A Roman tribune to the rescue. Contrast 7:57, the attack on Stephen, cited above.

\(^{15}\) Cf. O. Weinreich, “Gebet und Wunder” in Genethliakon Wilhelm Schmid (Stuttgart 1929), II Abhandlung (Türöffnung), pp. 280 ff., esp. 320 ff.

\(^{16}\) Allowing muta cum liquida to make position, as it does so often in Hellenistic literary Greek, e.g. in the Gyges fragment: see K. Latte, “Ein antikes Gygesdrama,” Eranos 48 (1950), p. 138. Cf. εθνος, John 11:50, quoted above.
22:29 εὐθεῖως οὖν ἀπέστησαν ἂπ' αὐτοῦ οἱ μέλλοντες αὐτῶν ἀνετάξειν.
The continuing story of Paul and the Roman authorities.

24:10 ἐμαυτῶν ἄπολογοῦμαι, . . .
A flourish in the course of the very first sentence of St. Paul’s apologia before Felix, perhaps an extempore response to the careful rhetoric of the opposition’s Tertullus.

25:7 οὐκ ἵσχυν ἀποδείξει, . . .
An echo of the heated arguments before Festus’ tribunal.

25:12 Καίσαρα ἐπικέκλησαι, ἐπὶ Καίσαρα πορεύσῃ.
The solemn judicial (and therefore dialogic) sealing of Paul’s fate. All the majesty of the Empire is now to be engaged, with what fateful consequences for the Church!

26:5 ἔζησα Φαρισαίος.
Paul’s apologia before Agrippa, fraught with memories and emotions.

The New Testament is of course filled with marvels, head-on challenges, reversals. There are many such passages where one might expect esse videatur rhythm, and where it does not occur. There are parallel passages, where one Evangelist uses it, and another does not. But these negatives (which of course do not prove that no other rhythms are used) cannot outweigh the positive evidence presented, which all suggests that this rhythm conveys a sense of excitement and agitation: the excitement of the Voice of God; of miracle, even of resurrection from the dead, of the end of the world; of the threat of death; of angry confrontation and denunciation; and then again of pathos and forgiveness.

Time and again in our lists we encountered this rhythm in dialogue, actual or implied, and this, I would like to suggest, is its basic usage. Its occurrence in rhetoric is to be explained by the fact that rhetoric is stereotyped dialogue, sometimes mechanized to the point of absurdity. The advantage of studying esse videatur in the New Testament is that it enables us to catch this rhythm in still living interchange, (which is nevertheless “kunstmäßig”). Hence the importance of those instances which occur in questions: Christ confronting his adversaries in debate; with the woman taken in adultery; wondering if at the end there will still be faith left on earth; before Pilate; before God
on the Cross; after the Resurrection teasing his disciples on the road to Emmaus; addressing Paul on the road to Damascus.

But of course in the Gospels and Acts this is also religious interchange, and here there is (pace Norden) a link with the Commagene inscription. When we read there τὴν ὀσιότητα (2), ἐν ἀγίω λόφῳ καθοσιωθείς (4), δαιμόνων ἐπιφανείας (7), ἐνιαύσιον ἐορτήν (8), ἔγω καθοσιώσας (9), ἀξίως ἐπιτελεῖτω (11), we find something of the same tension and emotion. The King however expects from his audience only a respectful silence. Study of the New Testament helps us to understand the enormity of his claim.17

Our investigation has implications therefore for more than the interpretation of the New Testament. Already Norden compares the style of the Commagene inscription with some of Cicero’s floridity, and certainly esse videatur was laughed at as early as Tacitus’ Dialogus.18 There are pages where this rhythm appears to run riot.

But Cicero knows how to control this mannerism too,19 and rather than join Tacitus’ Aper in accusing the great orator of automatism we must explain his fondness for these clausulae partly by studying particular effects, partly by the nature of his audience, and of the dialogic occasions of which he was so fond (including the altercatio), and partly by the difference of culture between the Romans and the peoples among whom the Asian style developed. This requires especial attention to the Roman (and Ciceronian) propensity for the comic and satirical, which meant that what emerged as serious and religious elsewhere for them took the stage (still therefore in “dialogic” guise) as farce, parody and wit. Something of this older spirit is still preserved in Aristophanes’ use of this particular rhythm,20 and with this may be associated the primitive element of satire and denunciation found notably in St. Matthew. But these large vistas open to another day.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

17 Cf. στόμα τ’ εὐφήμων ἄπας ἐξοσοφωθώ, Eur. Bacchae 69–70. Yet it is precisely this play which illustrates the closeness of the religious and the comic.
19 Cf. G. Panayiotou, Consistency and Variation in Cicero’s Oratorical Style, diss. Urbana 1984 (available on microfilm), especially pp. 117–25 and 245–47. Professor Panayiotou compares two pairs of speeches, the Pro Caecina and the De Imperio Cn. Pompei, the Pro Caelio and the Pro Balbo, both delivered around the same time, to show how the esse videatur clausula is more common in the De Imperio and the Pro Caelio. The frequency of this clausula in the comic Pro Caelio is enlightening.
20 See A. M. Dale, The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama (2nd ed., Cambridge 1968), pp. 97–103. The rhythms of Lysistrata 781 ff. (a negative parable forming part of an agon) and 805 ff. (a counter-example) may be compared with the effects registered here.
Notes on the Meaning of

Κολοκύντη

J. L. Heller

[0.01] Dio gives an account (LX. 35) of the hypocrisy of Agrippina and Nero after the death of Claudius—the man whom they had murdered and then pretended to mourn with a state funeral and laudation delivered by Nero but composed by Seneca (Tac. Ann. XIII. 3), and later with an official consecratio (Ann. XIII. 2) or deification—which includes the witty comment of Seneca's brother Gallio on their accomplishment. Tucked parenthetically into this account comes the now famous sentence: "Seneca too was the author of a composition which he called 'Αποκολοκύντωσις as if it were a kind of immortalization." The formation and meaning of this strange word have been discussed endlessly. Most scholars believe that it was applied as a title to the extant wickedly satirical parody of dramatic narrative in prose and verse (which, however, is titled differently in the manuscripts), and that Seneca coined it as a comic substitute for 'Αποθέωσις, the Greek word which might have been expected from the conversation in the central part of the satire and is actually used in the title of the Sangallensis: Divi Claudii 'Αποθέωσις per satiram. But why did he base his comic formation on κολοκύντη, the Attic form of κολοκύνθη, which LSJ defines as the plant called by Duchesne (1786) Cucurbita maxima, whose large round fruit we call a pumpkin or squash, the Germans (Riesen-) Kürbis, the French courge or potiron, the Italians zucca (commune or da mangiare)? Various answers have been given. What we may call the prevailing view has been restated in a recent article (Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 82 [1978],
265–70) by H. Eisenberg, "Bedeutung und Zweck des Titels von Senecas 'Apocolocyntosis'."

[0.02] Referring to the useful survey of M. Coffey and the fundamental work of O. Weinreich,1 Eisenberg concludes (270) that Seneca inscribed his newly coined Greek word as a formal title for his composition because he wished to stimulate his readers, to arouse their curiosity and put them in the right frame of mind for the reading of the satire, and to let them understand that what they held in their hands was directed against Claudius, a travesty of his deification. Though the readers might be disappointed on finding that the satire did not contain (265) any transformation into a kolokyntē—as the obvious analogy with apotheōsis might lead them to expect—and though the single word of the title did not mention Claudius (267), the sophisticated aristocracy of the court, for whose entertainment the work was designed (266), would understand, as they read along, the joke in this title. They would know that the Greek word kolokyntē had special prominence only in a few expressions which became proverbial, the ψιεστερον κολοκύντας of Epicharmus and Sophron and the η κρίνον η κολοκύντην of Diphilus and Menander (269 with footnotes 14 and 15; Eisenberg does not refer to the delightful fragment of Epicrates ridiculing the philosophers who were attempting to define the word, on which see Coffey, Roman Satire, 168).2 And here the vegetable stands as the embodiment of health or a symbol of life as a lily was of death. But in Latin the equivalent cucurbita had the extended meaning Dummkopf or "stupid" in popular speech (Apul. Met. I. 15. 2 and Petron. 39. 13 are cited [270] from Weinreich),3 and Seneca's readers, remembering (269) the laughter which had greeted Nero's laudation (Tac. Ann. XIII. 3) of Claudius' providentia and sapientia, and finding in the satire itself many references (e.g. 1. 1; 4. 1, v. 2; 7. 3; 8. 3) to Seneca's real opinion of the opposite

1 Lustrum, 6 (1961), 239–71; Coffey's views are repeated without much change in chapter 9 of his book, Roman Satire (London and New York 1976). See also O. Weinreich, Senecas Apocolocyntosis, die Satire auf Tod, Himmel- und Höllenfahrt des Kaisers Claudius . . . (Berlin 1923), especially p. 11 for a list of Greek, Latin, Italian, English, and German expressions in which the word for Kürbis, a large globular vegetable, is applied to a person, implying his empty-headedness or stupidity.

2 Eisenberg also neglects to mention the Aristophanic taunt (Nub. 327, λημάς κολοκύντας which R. Kilpatrick (in Class. Journ. 74 [1979], 193–96) coupled with the separative function of ἀπο in some Greek denominative verbs in order to suggest that Seneca's title implies that the deified Claudius was being relieved of the pumpkin-like impediments to his vision.

3 Here Eisenberg wisely omits Juvenal's ventosa cucurbita (14. 58; see below, 1.01) which Weinreich had listed on his p. 11.
qualities of the μῶρος Claudius, could not fail to grasp the point of the title. In an ἀποκολοκύντωσις Claudius would attain “die Gestalt der cucurbita” (270), a derisive name (i.e. Dummkopf as inferred from Petronius and Apuleius) which already applied to him “wegen seiner Torheit”—an altogether appropriate transformation. Thus the single word of the title is interpreted by Eisenberg, not so much as “transformation into a fool,” for Claudius was already that in his lifetime, as “transformation (by means of deification) of a fool (i.e. Claudius),” or as C. F. Russo put it, not “trasformazione in una zucca” but “deificazione di una zucca” or “zucconeria divinazzata.”

And thus Eisenberg would explain (though he did not mention them) the popular renderings of the title as Verkürbissung⁵ or Pumpkinification.⁶

[0.03] Before reaching this conclusion, Eisenberg had rejected some other theories about the formation of the title, namely (268, note 11) H. Wagenvoort’s 1934 proposal that it was modelled on the poorly attested ἀποραθανίδωσις, and (265) that of J. Gy. Szilágyi, who in 1963 suggested ἀποθίωσις, meaning “departure from life” with reference to Nero’s joke (Suet. Nero 33) that when Claudius ceased morari inter homines he also ceased to be a fool (mörari). As for the ingenious article by A. N. Athanassakis (Trans. Am. Philol. As. 104 [1974], 11–22), Eisenberg (266) welcomes his idea that “in satire we must always watch for the double-entendre” (see also Athanassakis’ previous article, Classical Philology 68 [1973], 292–94), but remains cool to the suggestion that at the end of this satire, when Claudius is passed around rapidly from one person to another in the infernal court—which Coffey (Lustrum 6, 247) called his final degradation—he is very much like the large round ball with which Romans exercised at the baths (see, e.g., Petron. 27), so that he is indeed transformed figuratively into something resembling a pumpkin or kolokyntē. In turn Athanassakis had been cool (12) to Russo’s (and thus Eisenberg’s) interpretation of the title.

⁴ Coffey (Roman Satire, note 10), pointing out that “deification of a pumpkin” is still open to objection, refers to p. 18 of the 4th edition (Firenze 1964) of Russo’s useful Latin text with Italian commentary. The objection to Weinreich’s 1923 theory (namely that apokolokynōsis could not mean “transformation into a fool” because Claudius was already that in his lifetime) was raised by the Czech scholar, F. Stiebitz, in an essay included (391–99) in a Festschrift (Μνημα) for J. Zubatěho (Praze 1926).

⁵ See the Tusculum edition and translation by W. Schöne (München 1957): Seneca Apokolokyntosis, Die Verkürbissung des Kaisers Claudius, with a vignette of a round pumpkin on the title page.

⁶ First used by C. Merivale in his History of the Romans under the Empire (1850–62); adopted by R. Graves for his translation in an Appendix to his novel, Claudius the God (London 1934).
[0.04] And Athanassakis had not neglected considerations of botanical and medicinal science. While here favoring the interpretation of *kolokyntē* as the fruit of *Cucurbita maxima* (see above, 0.01), he had noted (16) that Wagenvoort in 1934 had specified that the implement of the title, which he explained as addressed to Claudius and saying in effect, *me radicasti tu* (you punished me with a radish) *quidem* (when you exiled me), *iam te cucurbitabo* (now I'll pay you back with something more painful), was the pointed tip of the swelling fruit of *Lagenaria vulgaris* (Seringe [1825], elevating Linnaeus' *Cucurbita lagenaria* to a genus), what we call a (bottle-) gourd or calabash, the Germans (*Flaschen-*) Kürbis, the French cougourde or calebasse, the Italians zucca (da vino or dal collo), and the Spaniards calabaza. He had referred (ibid., footnote 16) to the important article by F. A. Todd, “Some *Cucurbitaceae* in Latin literature” (Classical Quarterly 37 [1943], 101–11), which also looked to the fruit, this time dried and empty, of a small bottle-gourd (see below, 1.02 and Figure 4) in order to explain the title of the satire and certain other passages.7 Then at the beginning of his article (12) Athanassakis had noticed the sensational letter to the Sunday Times of London for May 18, 1958, “New light on an old murder,” by Robert Graves. “Graves assumed that the *kolokyntē* of our title is the purgative colocynth, a dangerous alkaline poison, and that the meaning of the title [no longer to be rendered “Pumpkinification,” as he had done 20 years before: see note 6 above] is: deification by means of a colocynth.” See Coffey (Lustrum, 6, 253) for criticism: such an interpretation is impossible linguistically; the idea had been suggested long ago in the *Animadversiones* of the humanist physician H. Junius (1511–75) and was soon refuted by Heinsius and Fromond. But Athanassakis found it interesting as leading to a cluster of his double-entendres. For the purgative derived from the plant which Pliny called *cucurbita silvestris* or *colocynthis* and we call Bitter Apple, see below, 1.02 and Figure 6.

[0.05] For the nature of the poison, called colocynthine by the pharmacists who isolated it in 1948, classicists can—and by all means should—turn to an article in the (Harvard) Botanical Museum Leaflets, No. 5 (1973), 213–44, by F. Deltgen and H. G. Kauer. They were refuting an earlier article (Leaflets, No. 3 [1972], 101–28) by the scholarly mycologist, R. G. Wasson, who had examined the circumstances of “The death of Claudius, or Mushrooms for murderers.” After a very entertaining discussion of the use of various species of *Amanita* in various fictional or pseudo-historical murders (including

7 See Coffey (Lustrum, 6, 254) and my article, pp. 181–92 in Homenaje a Antonio Tovar (Madrid 1972), esp. p. 191.
acute criticism of the late Dorothy Sayers' *The Documents in the Case*), Wasson had accepted Graves' suggestion that colocynthise, administered *per clysteram* (Suet. Claud. 44. 3), might have done the trick after the dinner of poisonous mushrooms had failed. In their laborious reply, Deltgen and Kauer take up Wasson's points one by one and demolish them on various grounds, historical, philological, and pharmacological. In particular, an impossibly large amount of raw fruit would have had to be processed to produce a lethal dose, and colocynthise is not a rapid poison; in fact there is no record of a person's actually dying from it. They conclude by endorsing Russo's version of the title (*zucconeria divinazzata*) rather than English "Pumpkinification" or German *Verkürbissung*. They have noted the botanical definition (*Cucurbita maxima*) in *LSJ* (see 0.01) and they have accepted the old claim (on grounds indicated in 0.02) that "every educated Roman of the time knew that the Greek word stood for the Latin *cucurbita*, which was a commonly used metaphor for 'fool' or 'madman'."

[0.06] But in so doing Deltgen and Kauer neglected a very important point made by Wasson when objecting to Graves' former "Pumpkinification." "The botanist," he says (125), "is rendered uncomfortable by an anachronism; the pumpkins and squashes were introduced into Europe in the 16th century, being native to America. The Mediterranean shores knew other cucurbits, but not the pumpkins and squashes." If this is really so, all the interpretations of *ἀποκολοκύντωσις* in terms of pumpkins will have to be discarded, and the botanical definition in *LSJ* as *Cucurbita maxima* must be rejected. Actually it has been superseded already in the recent etymological dictionaries of Frisk and Chantraine, who define *κολοκύνθη* as *Lagenaria vulgaris*. The philological evidence which supports this conclusion will be discussed later on (see 2.03). Here we must look briefly at the botanical and archaeological evidence, much of it published in German, which the British scholarly botanist, who drew up the botanical definitions for *LSJ* during or just before the First World War, may perhaps be forgiven for ignoring in favor of French scholarship.

---


9 This was Sir William Thistleton-Dyer, F.R.S. See Sir Henry Jones' preface to the 1940 edition of *LSJ*, noting (p. vii) that Dyer had already communicated a number of his identifications to Sir Arthur Hort for use in the Loeb Classical Library edition (1916) of Theophrastus' *Historia Plantarum*. Three installments of Dyer's notes
Our purpose is to determine, if possible, the places of origin—whether Old World (Europe, Africa, and Asia) or New World (the Americas, Indonesia, and Australia)—of the family of cultivated plants known as Cucurbitaceae or (for short) cucurbits. The pioneering work in the field of plant geography was done by the French botanist, Alphonse de Candolle, whose Origine des plantes cultivées (Paris 1883) has become a classic, translated into many languages. His methods stressed first of all the location of wild or semi-cultivated varieties and only secondarily and with caution their classical or vernacular names, because identification of their species was often problematical. Of more importance was the archaeological evidence derived from ancient paintings, mosaics, and sculptured monuments or from pictures in medieval manuscripts and early Renaissance herbals. Since Candolle’s time the various kinds of evidence have been greatly enlarged by research in the records kept by early explorers and by the observation of botanists who are now included regularly on the staffs of archaeological expeditions. The resultant conclusions, which differ considerably from Candolle’s, were summarized in 1932 by Elisabeth Schiemann in her authoritative Entstehung der Kulturpflanze, published at Berlin as Bd. III, Teil L of the Handbuch der Vererbungswissenschaft edited by E. Baur and M. Hartmann; see especially her tremendous bibliography (336–75), her introductory chapter on methods of inquiry, and her pages (237–42) on “Cucurbitaceen.” This is the first section of a chapter (237–50) on “Weitere amerikanische Kulturpflanzen” which also discusses the Tomato and Tobacco. See also p. 64, Tabelle 9, III, for the spread from America to Africa and thence to Europe of the three species of Cucurbita (C. Pepo, moschata, and maxima) which have been called, in distinction to Linnaeus’ Cucurbita lagenaria (and the minor relative which Pliny called cucurbita silvestris, see 0.03 above and 1.02 below), the true cucurbits (echte Kürbisse), i.e. the pumpkins and squashes mentioned by Wasson. In general, Schiemann’s conclusions have been accepted with only minor corrections by later handbooks and special studies, and Wasson’s claim of anachronism is fully sustained.

The case of Lagenaria vulgaris Seringe (now known as Lagenaria
sicervaria Molina [1782] since the 1930 article by Standley in *Publ. Field Mus.* [Chicago], ser. bot. 3, 435) is peculiar in that it seems to have been cultivated from very early times in both the New and Old Worlds. A recent article by Richardson has collected and reviewed, area by area, the evidence from the earliest archaeological remains of *Lagenaria* in an attempt to evaluate "the hypotheses that have been formulated to explain its world-wide pre-Columbian distribution."\(^1\) He concluded (1) that *Lagenaria* is not a monotypic genus but enjoyed an ancient pantropical distribution, (2) that human utilization of *Lagenaria* is at least 15,000 years old in the New World (S. America, Peru) and 12,000 years in the Old World (Africa, Egypt), (3) that these dates are far too early to suggest transoceanic diffusion by man, though drifting from Africa or Asia may have occurred, (4) that the earliest *Lagenaria* used by man was probably a wild plant in the context of a hunt-and-gather society, and (5) that *Lagenaria* was domesticated independently in the Old and New Worlds.

[0.09] Assertions about the homeland of the true cucurbitas have been more controversial. In the English translation of his *Origine* (1886), Candolle added a paragraph admitting the cogency of the arguments raised by his American critics, Asa Gray and J. H. Trumbull, and based on the names and descriptions of plants reported by early travelers in America, to the effect that squashes and pumpkins had been known in Mexico long before the arrival of Columbus. He maintained, however, that *Cucurbita maxima* at least was originally at home in Africa, and this opinion was accepted by Dyer (see above, note 9). Dyer also noted some evidence, brought out later than Candolle, which favored an origin in ancient India. This evidence was countered by Schiemann when she noted in her 1932 book (240) that in America the cultivated forms were sharply divided geographically (*C. maxima* in South America, Peru to Bolivia; *C. moschata* in Colombia and Venezuela to Mexico; *C. pepo* the same as *moschata* but extending as far north as Texas), whereas in Asia their ranges overlap, the absence of geographical separation indicating an imported culture. For the counter to Candolle's claim for Africa see our next paragraph (0.10); here we note that well before Schiemann other German scholars had reached the negative conclusion that the true cucurbits were not among those garden-plants whose existence can be traced in reliable records from Pliny on, right through the Middle Ages (the Capitulary of Charlemagne) to Albertus Magnus and the earliest

illustrated herbals. The leader here was R. von Fischer-Benzon in his *Altdeutsche Gartenflora* (Kiel and Leipzig, 1894), discussing the history of the *Cucurbitaceae* on pages 89–92. This was soon taken up by the philologist Otto Schrader in the first edition (Strassburg, 1901) of his *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde* (see p. 483). Then in the fifth edition (1887) of Victor Hahn’s deservedly popular *Kulturpflanzen und Hausthiere* . . . (first published in 1870, with a third edition in 1877 which Candolle rather enviously disparaged in his preface of 1886), the botanist A. Engler noted that the homeland of the true cucurbits (e.g. *C. Pepo*) was most likely in America, and in the seventh edition (1902) Schrader added (319) the statement “dass die echten Kürbisse den Alten noch fremd waren.” These opinions were repeated by Orth in the *R-E*, bd. 7 (1912) on “Gurke” and bd. 11 (1922) on “Kürbis,” but Dyer failed to see any of them. So too most recent classicists (except Wagenvoort and Todd), misled by the definition in *LSJ*, have missed this important point. This includes Weinreich, Russo, Coffey, and others, including myself in my former article (see note 7). But with a sure hand, Frisk (above, note 8) pointed to the *Reallexikon* of Schrader and Nehring (1917–23).

[0.10] Candolle’s argument for an African homeland had been based on the report of a single traveler on the banks of the river Niger. In a thorough review of all the botanical evidence for and against an “American Origin of the Cultivated Cucurbits,” Whitaker¹² has shown how weak this evidence is in the face of the numerous investigations of related species in the Americas, and he has added the negative evidence of the late appearance of these species in European herbals of the sixteenth and even seventeenth century, from which he supplies eight figures in two plates. His argument would be stronger if he had also compared earlier herbals. Candolle had examined one such, a *Herbarius Pataviae Impressus* (1485), which he had reported (in his English *Origin*, 247) as containing a recognizable figure of *Lagenaria vulgaris* but not (256) of *Cucurbita Pepo* or *C. maxima*. But Whitaker’s arguments, when added to those of the German authorities, are convincing enough. I know of only one dissenting argument, that of Don and Patricia Bothwell. In their recent book, *Food in Antiquity* (London 1969), they say (127–28): “The genus *Cucurbita* seems to be about as confusing as that of *Lagenaria*, for whilst many species may be counted definitely American in origin, it seems likely that one, the pumpkin (*Cucurbita maxima*) was already wild in Africa before European or American contact was made there, and indeed some of

¹² T. W. Whitaker, *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden*, 34 (1947), 101–11. It is noteworthy that he does not refer to Schiemann or any of the German authorities.
the Greek and Roman references to cucurbita would fit in well with this genus.” That is, they are still accepting both Candolle’s argument, which I think has been discredited, and the botanical definition of κολοκύνθη in LSJ, which followed Candolle and was, I believe, a serious mistake on the part of Thiselton-Dyer.

[0.11] Here we should acknowledge that the lexical definition in LSJ is simply “round gourd,” followed by the botanical name, Cucurbita maxima. Previous editions of Liddell and Scott’s Lexicon had said “the round gourd or pumpkin, Lat. cucurbita, the long one being called σκύλα.” This is unobjectionable, going back to a passage in Athenaeus as interpreted in the great Thesaurus of Stephanus (see below, 2.02)—except that the implied equivalence of “gourd” and “pumpkin” seems curious to an American reader. But to an Englishman this would be quite natural. Candolle in his English Origin headed the section on Cucurbita maxima (249) with the word “Gourd,” though it was “Potiron” in the original French. And just before this, where the section on Lagenaria vulgaris (245) is headed by the words “Gourd or Calabash,” he placed a footnote: “The word gourd is also used in English for Cucurbita maxima. This is one of the examples of the confusion in common names and the greater accuracy of scientific terms.” The Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia (New York 1889) notes that formerly gourd designated the fruit of various cucurbitaceous genera, including melons, pumpkins, squashes, etc. as well as gourds themselves, but now, in a restricted sense, the fruit of Lagenaria lagenaria or the plant itself. There are other examples of this old-fashioned usage. One of the best occurs in the History of Merivale (above, note 6). In explaining his novel term “Pumpkinification” for Seneca’s skit, he refers (in a footnote on p. 463 of the fifth volume of the New York edition, 1864–79) to “the number of unwieldy and bloated gourds which sun their speckled bellies before the doors” in modern Rome, “to form a favorite condiment to the food of the poorer classes.”

[0.12] The history of the word “pumpkin” is also very pertinent here. Dictionaries trace it back to medieval Latin pepon, through Old French pompon and earlier English pompin, applied to any large round fruit, e.g. a melon (compare also English pippin). And classical lexicographers (e.g. Steier on “Melone” in the R-E 29 [1931], 562–67; Schrader and Nehring [1917–23, above, 0.09]; and of course LSJ and Frisk) trace the medieval pepon back through Latin sources all the way to the Greek adjective πεπων, properly meaning “ripe or mature” but applied metaphorically in Homer and Hesiod to persons in mild or affectionate reproach (ὁ πεπων, ll. VI. 55, IX. 252; Hes.
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Th. 544, 560, etc.). The adjective was frequently attached to the noun σικνος, "cucumber" (Hp., Morb. III. 17, Vict. II. 55, Pl. Com., fr. 64. 4, etc.) in a phrase indicated the (sweet) melon, which would not be eaten until fully ripe, whereas cucumbers were eaten green, whether raw or cooked. The adjective was also substantivized in Greek and was recognized by Pliny as the name for an unusually large (Nat. XIX. 65) and salubrious (XX. 11) variety of cucumis, probably the watermelon, which was known in ancient Egypt and was called Cucurbita Citrullus by Linnaeus, and Citrullus lanatus by Thuinberg in 1794. Steier also notes that Pliny's description (XIX. 67) of the golden color and sweet odor of the small quince-like fruits, called melopepones, of another variant of cucumis (which Pliny thought, mistakenly, had appeared spontaneously in Campania) is strikingly apt for the sweet melon. Later the originally Greek compound (e.g. μηκοπεπων, Galen VI. 566) was shortened to melones, whence come Linnaeus' trivial name (Cucumis) Melo and the familiar words in the modern vernaculars. But the word pepo, which continued to denote the watermelon, was sometimes applied to other fruits of similar shape (compare Fuchs' Pepones in my Figure 8, identified by modern botanists as fruits of Cucumis Melo), whence come the various words in the modern vernaculars noted above and Linnaeus' somewhat arbitrary (Cucurbita) Pepo, which even Candolle admitted was probably at home originally in America.

[0.13] In the sections which follow, I propose, first, to examine lexicographically all the contexts in which the word cucurbita occurs, especially in the writings of St. Jerome (where I think several expressions need clearing up), in order to determine the range and relative familiarity of its meanings, whether literal, figurative, or transferred, which cluster around its central meaning, i.e. a plant, Lagenaria vulgaris, or one of its fruits.13 Secondly, since Candolle said

13 The woodcut illustrations of plants in my Figures 3–7 are reproduced through the courtesy of the Hunt Botanical Library of Carnegie-Mellon University, from two rare books in their collection. The first (Figure 3) is from Lobelius (Matthias de l'Obel). Plantarum seu Stirpium Icones (Antverpiae 1581), p. 641 at the right-hand side. Whitaker (see note 12) agrees with Candolle that this is "the first illustration of a plant that is definitely referable to C. maxima." The other figures are drawn from the 1549 octavo edition (Vivae Imagines) of the De historia stirpium Commentarii (Basileae 1542) of Leonhart Fuchs. Secure identifications of its plants were made by T. A. Sprague, J. Linn. Soc. London, Botany, 48, 545–642, from which we note the following: my Figures 4 and 5, Lagenaria vulgaris Seringe; 6, Citrullus colocynthis (L.) Schrader; 7, Cucumis Melo L. But Fuchs' pages 402 and 403 (not shown here) have recognizable figures of Cucurbita Pepo L., labeled respectively Cucumer turcicus and C. marinus, and in both cases said (Commentarii, 702) to be recent introductions into
flatly (Origin, 246) "Greek authors do not mention the plant," though he recognized *Lagenaria vulgaris* in passages from Columella and Pliny describing *cucurbita* (see below, 1.25 and 26). I propose to examine similarly some (but by no means all) of the Greek contexts—especially those in Athenaeus which preserve fragments of Greek comedy (see above, 0.02)—in which the word κολόκυντη (or -ύνθη) or κολόκυντα (or -θα) or one of its derivatives is used. I hope to show that in the range of their meanings the words are not incompatible with Latin *cucurbita* and the nature of *Lagenaria*. Here Alexandrian papyri and at least one painting from Herculaneum will be useful in demonstrating that the plant and its fruits were well known to the Romans of Seneca's time. Then in the third and last section I will return to the problem of *apocolocyntosis*. Directing attention to the end of the satire, where the divine Claudius becomes a very minor civil servant in the underworld, I will suggest (as I did in my former study, see note 7) that here he was being made over into something very much like a living plant, still useful but to the wrong people and in very humble circumstances. This would be a figurative transformation (as Athanassakis suggested) and "a kind of immortalization." But I cannot believe Eisenberg's assertion that Seneca applied his coinage to the satire as a formal title. Everything suggests that it circulated among its first readers anonymously and with no more title than its opening words: *Quid actum sit in caelo*. . . . Perhaps the word was uttered in a private conversation (like the other comments reported by Dio), in answer to a question about the satire and in somewhat rueful acknowledgment of his authorship.

I. St. Jerome on *Cucurbita*

[1.01] In his Commentary (c. 406 A.D.) on Amos (II. 5, p. 289 Vallarsi; Migne 25, col. 1042) St. Jerome was concerned with God's action in raising the salt waters of the sea by means of heavenly heat and then transforming them into the sweet savor of the rains. In this action, he says, God is instar medicinalis cucurbitae, quae calore superioris gyri humorem et sanguinem sursum trahit. The fine simile was cited in Mayor's invaluable note (Thirteen Satires of Juvenal, vol. 2, 1881) on the phrase ventosa cucurbita (14. 58), together with references to ancient medical writers who describe the implement, necessarily made of fire-resistant material (metal, bone, baked clay, or glass) and

Germany; but there is no figure of *Cucurbita maxima*. The first illustration of *C. moschata*, according to Candolle and Whitaker, came in Rheede's *Hortus indicus malabaricus* (1688), more than a century after Fuchs.
prescribe its application by means of fire, which exhausts the air within the instrument and draws blood and the less material agent of disease from the affected parts of the body, including (Celsius, III. 18) the back of the head in cases of mental derangement—which is precisely what Juvenal implies here. In modern practice the hypodermic syringe has replaced the implement and the more dangerous expedient of venesection, but both methods of drawing blood were still popular in eighteenth-century Europe, and for the ancient world archaeology has revealed many examples of the actual metallic implements or their outlines in vase painting or in relief on sculptured stone or stamped coins. The implements are quite small, ranging from three to six inches in overall height and from two to four inches in gross diameter, measured at the base of the swelling top, which is either conical in profile (as in my Figure 1) or more or less perfectly semicircular. Below this diameter the neck or collar of the instrument stretches downward for a couple of inches, ending in a rounded lip where the mouth of the instrument, ranging from a bare inch in diameter to 2½ inches, would fit nicely over the skin of the patient. Jerome's “heat of the upper circle” fits admirably both the sun in the sky and the burning lint or oil in the swelling globe of the instrument—provided that it is visualized hanging empty by a ring on the wall of a surgeon's office. In actual use, of course, the implement was applied horizontally; otherwise whatever burned inside would fall down on the skin of the patient. Compare Paul of Aegina (VI. 41, cited by Milne, p. 102) and the famous riddle (I saw a person gluing bronze to a man with fire) in which χαλκὸν κολλήσαντα is explained (Arist. Rhet. III. 2, 1405 b 1; cf. Plut. Conv. [Moralia, 154 b] and Athen. X. 452 b) as σικόνα προσβαλόντα.

[1.02] The terms applied in antiquity to this vessel, known in modern times as a cupping-glass (Schröpfkopf in German, ventosa in Italian and Spanish, and ventouse in French), were studied long ago by G. Helmreich (Archiv f. lat. Lexicogr. u. Gramm. 1 [1884], 321–23). In Greek it was usually called σικόνα (as above) and in Latin cucurbita because in shape it resembled a small pyriform gourd. Compare my Figure 4, where two little gourds can be seen at the left of and below

---

14 See text and illustrations in J. S. Milne, Surgical Implements in Greek and Roman Times (Oxford 1907), T. Meyer-Steinig and K. Sudhoff, Geschichte der Medizin im Überblick mit Abbildung (Jena 1921), and John Scarborough, Roman Medicine (Ithaca 1969). The extensive collection of the modern Greek physician K. P. Lampros (Peri sikhôn hai sikhaseí̂s para tois archaios, a Festschrift for Ernest Curtius, Athens, 1895) is known to me only through the review by R. Fuchs in Wochenschr. f. klass. Phil. 12 (1895), 458–61.
the large gourd labeled by Fuchs (p. 209) *Cucurbita maior* or *Grosz Kürbsz*. Thus Scribonius Largus and (much later) Cælius Aurelianus use the expressions *cucurbitam adfigere*, *apponeere*, or *adhibere*, where the Greek expression in Hippocrates and elsewhere was regularly *σκύν προσβαλεῖν*. But since products of the plant *cucurbita* were also utilized in various medicinal preparations (see, e.g., Pliny, Nat. XX. 16–17), certain authors tried to distinguish the implement linguistically. In Celsus the plant and its fruit remained *cucurbita*, but the implement of similar shape was called *cucurbitula* regularly (see the Thesaurus for references). The diminutive was often used by later writers in this sense, so that it became the regular technical term for the implement in modern medical Latin. But Scribonius Largus (106) and others following him had also used the diminutive to denote the *cucurbita silvestris* or *colocynthis* (Pliny, Nat. XX. 14–15; cf. Diosc. IV. 176 [Wellmann] κολόκυνθα ἄγρια ορ σικύνα πικρά ορ κολοκυνθίς), Coloquinte or Bitter Apple, a plant which is cultivated today in various warm regions (northern Africa, Cyprus, southern India) for its dried fruits, which contain a drastic purge (as noted by both Pliny and Dioscorides), and for its oil-bearing seeds; see my Figure 6 (Fuchs 212). Hence Pliny and Juvenal found it necessary to add an adjective to *cucurbita* in order to designate the implement, Pliny *medicinalis* in a passage (Nat. XXXII. 122–23) that compares the use of natural leeches (*hirudines*) and of the instrument for drawing blood, and Juvenal *ventosa*, as we have seen. Pliny’s adjective denotes the instrument in a few places among later writers on medicine, including St. Jerome’s contemporary, Theodorus Priscianus (once only, IV. p. 110 N. according to Helmreich), but never became a regular designation. Juvenal’s *ventosa*, however, which Helmreich thought was drawn from popular speech, was taken up by others. Helmreich cites 12 places in Theodorus Priscianus where the simple *cucurbita* denotes the instrument, six places where *ventosa* is joined to *cucurbita*, and five places where *ventosa* alone is used. But in later Latin translations from the Greek of Alexander of Tralles and Oribasius the trend is reversed: *cucurbita* is rare, *ventosa* more frequent, until it emerges as the technical term in the Romance languages.

[1.03] We can conclude that in using the term *medicinalis cucurbita*

---

15 E.g. the physician Leonhart Fuchs added his translation of a libellus of Galen, *De hirudinibus, revulsione, cucurbitula, et scarificatione*, to his translation with commentary on the related work, *De curatione per sanguinis missionem* (Lugduni 1546).

16 Most children learn, as I did near beaches of the Atlantic Ocean, that if one holds any concave object, an open shell or a cup, or even a cupped hand, over his ear loosely, he will hear a wind or the roar of the surf. Compare Lucan’s phrase (IX. 349) *ventosa concha.*
Jerome had been consulting his copy of Pliny, and we shall soon find evidence that he drew from Pliny on earlier occasions, when he was speaking of the plant rather than the instrument whose shape resembled a small fruit of the plant. Mayor, however, concluded his long note by pointing to a cut, printed by Rich, which he said represented an instrument actually “made out of a pumpkin, preserved in the Vatican library,” and we must examine this bit of information before going on. The cut, shown in my Figure 2, is taken from the once deservedly popular illustrated Dictionary of Roman and Greek Antiquities by Anthony Rich, whose article (in his 3rd edn., London 1873) reads as follows:

**Cucurbita** and **Cucurbitula** (κολοκύκωθη, σικώα). A *pumpkin*, or *gourd*; thence, a *cupping-glass*, which the ancients made out of these fruits (*Juv. Sat*. 14. 58) as well as of horn or bronze (*Celsus* ii 11). The example represents an ancient original made out of a pumpkin, now preserved in the Vatican Library, and published by Rhodius.

But most of this is misinformation. The object was never in the Vatican Museums, and the woodcut which Rich copied was not published by the learned Danish physician, Johan Rhode, who died at Padua in 1659. After a deal of searching in various libraries I found it in an edition of Celsius’ eight books *De medicina* (which also contained Rhode’s *Vita Celsi*), published at Amsterdam in 1687. Here on p. 562 the cut, supplied by the editor, Th. J. van Almeloveen, illustrates one of three bronze and seven figline *cucurbitulae* catalogued (p. 80) in the *Antiquitates Neomagenses* (Nijmegen, 1678) by Johannes Smetius (father and son). Unfortunately, as I am told by the director, A. V. M. Hubrecht, of the present Museum van Romeins Nijmegen, the entire collection was sold in 1703 to the Kurfürst of the Pfalz. Later it was dispersed among various museums in Germany, and, while some of the bronzes have been located at a museum in Mannheim, this distinctive vessel was not one of them. Finally, the object has the shape of a small gourd (see again Figure 4), not a pumpkin. Except that its neck is closed and an open mouth has been made at the opposite bulbous end, it is not unlike the bronze implement of Figure 1, and it would work just as well. The object may still exist and it may be genuinely ancient, but it was probably made of baked clay if not of bronze, and Rich’s statement about its manufacture has no foundation. The article in the great *Dictionnaire* of Daremberg and Saglio, which superseded Rich, does not mention him or his cut and explains the semantic shift of *cucurbita* and *cucurbitula* from *courage* or *gourde* to *ventouse* just as we have done.
above (1.02), because the instrument was sometimes made ‘en forme de gourde.’

[1.04] Before going on in Jerome we digress to discuss one of the passages alleged by Eisenberg (above, 0.02) and others to mean Dummkopf. This is in Trimalchio’s reading of the horoscope (Petron. 39. 12): in aquario copones et cucurbitae. Since only people are mentioned as being born under the various signs, cucurbitae cannot have its literal meaning, and since most of the people are obnoxious in one way or another, the meaning ‘fools’ or ‘blockheads’ has been read into cucurbitae. But Friedlaender in his translation (1906) had rendered the word as Schröpfköpfe, giving the implement a figurative meaning, ‘persons who bleed or fleece one.’ I think this must be right. The metaphor is confirmed by the novel personal name Σιρώς, applied in jest to a fawning parasite, one of those ellogimoi kolakes, who clung to the hand of his indolent patron, according to a story from Clearchus of Soli reported by Athenaeus (VI. 257 a). Gulick in his Loeb translation (1930) quite missed the point when he rendered the name as ‘Cucumber’!

People who cling like leeches are still proverbial. In Jacobean England the older figure was applied to student drudges: ‘Still at their books, they will not be pull’d off; / They stick like cupping-glasses.’

[1.05] Our next set of references in St. Jerome concerns the plant in the Biblical story of Jonah which the Lord appointed to provide shade for Jonah (Vulg. Ion. 4:6) as he sat under the bower or booth (umbraculum, ibid. 4:5) which he had made for himself to the east of the city of Nineveh, watching to see what would happen to it. Jonah was grateful for the shade of the plant (4:6). But at dawn the next day the Lord appointed a worm to attack the plant (4:7) so that it withered away. Then when the sun rose the Lord aroused a hot, burning wind and the sun beat down on the head of Jonah until he was in great distress (aestuabat, 4:8) and begged to die. And the Lord said to Jonah, “Do you think you are right to be so distressed (irasci, 4:9) over a plant?” And when Jonah replied, “Yes I am right to be distressed even to death,” the Lord answered, “You grieve over a plant (4:10) for which you did not labor, neither did you make it grow, which came into being in one night and perished in one night, and am I not to pity (non paream, 4:11) that great city Nineveh?”

[1.06] In the five places above where the word “plant” occurs in the Revised (American) Standard Version of the Old Testament (1952),

17 Lines from a play by Fletcher (and others) cited in the Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia (1889) under “Cupping-glass.”
the version of the LXX had κολόκυνθα (or -ρα). This had been rendered as cucurbita in the Old Latin versions which St. Jerome followed in the translation from the LXX which he prefixed to his Commentary on the relevant verses of Jonah; see the recent (1956) and excellent text edited by P. Antin, pages 108, 113, and 115 (Vallarsi 425–28, Migne, PL 25, 1147–50). Thus it was recognized that this rapidly climbing, shade-producing plant was called in Latin cucurbita and in Greek kolokynthia. Compare also Ambr. Hex. V. 11. 35; Aug. Gen. ad lit. IX. 14, Epist. 102 (4 times in sections 30–36: CSEL 34, p. 570. 15, 574. 15 and 19, and 576. 11); and Jerome himself in his dedicatory preface to Chromatius (Antin p. 54: quod . . . cucurbitae sit delectatus umbraculo).

[1.07] If the Christian Fathers needed documentation for these two characteristics of the evidently familiar plant cucurbita, they could have found it in a passage of Pliny (Nat. XIX. 69–70) which is confirmed by another in Columella (X. 378–80). Both authors describe cucumis and cucurbita together. Pliny asserts that the nature of both growing plants is such that they are eager to reach aloft (natura sublimitatis avida) and often do climb (scandentis), fastening themselves by means of their creeping, whip-like shoots (reptantibus flagellis) to the rough places on walls (per parietum aspera), rapidly (velocitas pernix)—provided they do have some support (vires sine adminiculo standi non sunt)—all the way to the roof (in tectum usque), where they cover the vaults (camaras) and sheds (pergulas) or (in Columella) trellises (trichilas) with gentle shade (levi umbra). Hence, Pliny adds (70), there are two kinds, a genus camararium and a genus plebeium in which it (the plant) creeps along the ground (quo humi repit). In the former kind, Pliny continues, a heavy weight (i.e. the fruit) hangs balanced motionless in the breeze (libratur pondus inmobile aurae), dangling (i.e. from the camara) on a surprisingly slender foot-stalk (mire tenui pediculo). And he adds that the growth of cucurbita too (i.e. the fruit, like the fruit of cucumis, whose shape is artificially controlled; see 65, crescut qua coguntur forma) is controlled (crescit qua cogiturn forma) by wicker-work sheaths placed over the withering flowers so that the figure of a writhing serpent is often produced, but if the fruit is allowed to hang free (libertate vero pensili concessa) it has been

18 Saint Jérôme sur Jonas, introduction, texte latin, traduction et notes de Dom Paul Antin, O.S.B., moine de Ligugé (Paris 1956; Sources Chrétiennes, No. 43). Antin (p. 7) dates the Commentary to 396, the translation from the Hebrew to 391–94.

19 Or, if we adopt Mayhoff’s conjecture and translate: in which it (the fruit) grows along the ground (quo humi crescit).
known to attain a length of nine feet. With this the lines of Columella (X. 378–80) are to be compared: *Tum modo dependens trichilis, modo more chelydri / sole sub aestivo gelidas per graminis umbras / intortus cucumis praegnasque cucurbita serpit.* Here the epithet for *cucurbita* suggests the swelling belly of the cupping-vessel (Figures 1 and 2) and the pyriform shape of Fuchs’ *Grosz Kürbsz* (Figure 4). The longer cylindrical form may be seen in Fuchs’ *Lang Kürbsz* (Figure 5) and the frail, slender peduncle is apparent in both sixteenth-century figures.

[1.08] But when St. Jerome came to translate from the Hebrew in what has become the Vulgate Version, he substituted the word *hedera* for *cucurbita* in the five places noted above (1.06). This was to involve him in a long controversy—what he later called (*Epist. 115. 3 = Aug. 81. 3*) *ridicula cucurbitae quaestio*—with St. Augustine and others who in general objected to Jerome’s use of Hebrew sources which were at variance with the familiar Latin phrases based on the version of the LXX which had served the apostles and the early church so well. This particular problem has been discussed repeatedly and, given the nature of an age-old story, is perhaps insoluble. Hence the Revised Version used the neutral word “plant” (rather than the “gourd” of the King James Version or the “ivy” of the Douay translation) with a footnote: Heb. *qiqayon*, probably the *castor-oil plant*. Commentators on the Bible and on the plants of the Bible (e.g. H. W. and A. L. Moldenke, Waltham, Mass. 1952) generally agree, identifying the plant as *Ricinus communis* L. 20

[1.09] The conflict with St. Augustine began in 394 when “the younger man, wishing to open relations with the renowned scholar of Bethlehem, made the disastrous mistake of sending Jerome a letter questioning certain aspects of Jerome’s scholarship.” 21 The first of these was Jerome’s project of translating the OT prophets from the original Hebrew rather than from the LXX. Augustine thought this was both unnecessary and imprudent (see above). The second was Jerome’s opinion, expressed in his Commentary on Galatians and due ultimately to Origen, that the scene in which Paul rebuked Peter (Galatians 2:11–21) for his continued observance of the Old Law, was only a rhetorical device. Augustine worried that if this were

---

20 See also R. Delbrueck, *Probleme der Lipsanothek in Brescia* (Bonn 1932), who on p. 23 collects the evidence for each of the three possibilities for Jonah’s *Schattenpflanze*.

accepted it would legitimize the use of lies in teaching and would ruin Christian morality. But this letter, entrusted to the priest Profuturus, who died soon afterward, was never delivered. Subsequently (c. 398), Augustine, encouraged by a letter from Jerome reporting on his efforts to separate the bad from the good in Origen, repeated his former query about Galatians and added some new ones, tactfully asking for Jerome's advice. This letter too, carried by a certain monk Paul, went astray; so that rumors from Rome reached Jerome at Bethlehem that Augustine was attacking him. Further correspondence ensued between the arrogant and suspicious Jerome—see Wiessen (note 21 above) for examples of his tone—and the respectful but persistent Augustine, until in 403 Augustine sent copies of his two former letters, including the one which Profuturus had failed to deliver. In his accompanying letter 71 (= Hier. Epist. 104) Augustine brought up (§ 5) the now famous incident at the African town of Oea (modern Tripoli), in order to drive home the practical dangers of departing from the familiar versions of the LXX. After the reading of Jerome's new version of Jonah from the Hebrew, a great tumult arose in the congregation, especially from the Greeks who claimed that the reading was false in one respect to what they all knew by heart. The bishop was compelled to submit the question to some Jews. And they, whether out of ignorance or malice (here Augustine indicates his sympathy for Jerome!), reported that the Hebrew rolls were in accord with what the Greek and (Old) Latin texts said. Then the bishop, fearing to lose his hold on the congregation, had announced publicly that the new reading was at fault. Thus, Augustine concluded, even you can sometimes make a mistake. But, he adds, we all appreciate your great efforts in translating the Gospel from the Greek.

[1.10] Towards the end of his letter of the following year (112. 22 = Aug. 75. 22), in which Jerome replied, soberly and at length, to Augustine's criticisms, he reverts to the episode at Oea and acknowledges that the word in question was *hedera*, which he had substituted for *cucurbita*. This point, he says, had come up many years before through a person whom he calls, curiously, both Cornelius and Asinius Pollio. Here he is alluding to the ponderous jesting (which we will examine later, 1.23) with which, in his Commentary on Jonah (dated to 396 by Antin, see note 18) he had introduced his serious explanation of his procedure in translating verse 6 of chapter 4. We can conflate the two passages, following the Commentary but enclosing supplements from the letter within pointed brackets.

In place of *cucurbita* or *hedera* in the Hebrew (roll) we read *ciecion,*
which in Syriac or Punic is called ciceia. It is a kind of bush or shrub (genus virgultii vel arbusculae) having (broad) leaves like those of the grape vine (pampinus) and a very dense shade. Supporting itself by its own trunk,\(^2\) it grows very copiously in Palestine, especially in sandy places, and marvelously, if you have cast a seed on the ground, it is warmed quickly to germinate and rises to a tree, and within a few days what you had seen as a blade of grass (herba) you now see as a shrub (arbuscula). For this reason we too, at the time when we were translating the prophets [i.e. 391–94, see note 18], desired to write this very word of the Hebrew tongue (expressed more clearly in the letter: “When translating word for word, if I had desired to set down ciceion, no one would understand it, . . .”), since Latin speech had no word for this kind of tree [but see 1.12 below]. But we feared that the grammatici would find an opportunity to comment and would chatter about “Indian beasts” or “Boeotian mountains” or other marvels of that sort, [and so] we followed the old translators who also rendered the word as hedera, which in Greek is called κισσός,\(^3\) since they had nothing else to say.

Here the parallel explanation in the letter continues the multiple condition which began in the insertion above (ending “no one would understand it”) with:

if I should write cucurbita, I would be saying what is not in the Hebrew, [and therefore] I actually wrote hedera, so as to agree with the other translators.

The letter then adds a little joke about the Jews’ testimony to the bishop at Oea (see below, 1.14).

[1.11] The Commentary continues:

Let us then examine the story, and before its mystical sense [see below, 1.29] let us study its literal meaning. [The plants] Cucurbita and hedera are of such a nature that they creep along the ground (ut per terram

\(^2\) Here Antin notes (p. 111) that the words suo trunco se were supplied by Martianay (1704) and Vallarsi (1734–42) from the letter, where the phrase is fitted to sustinens less awkwardly than in the Commentary: cito consurgit in arbusculam absque ullis calamorum et hastilium adminiculis, quibus et cucurbitae et hederae indigent, suo trunco se sustinens.

\(^3\) I.e., the old translators of the Hebrew, knowing only that the word ciceion represented some kind of shade-producing plant, rendered it as kissos, which came over into Latin as hedera. The very first sentence of the explanation in the letter actually named Aquila as one of the translators who used the Attic form k Pittos. Deelbrueck (see note 20) notes that Field’s edition (1871–75) of the fragments of Origen’s Hexapla cites Symmachus for κισσός but places Aquila and Theodotion under Rcusin as reading κικέων. See Jerome’s preface In Ezram (as cited by Cavallera [see note 21], II. 108), referring to these three Ebionite translators as collected in Origen’s Hexapla.
reptent) and do not seek higher places unless they are supported by poles or props (furcis vel adminiculis). How then, when the prophet was unaware of it, did cucurbita, springing up in a single night, offer him a shady place (umbraculum) when by nature it had no capacity to spring aloft (in sublime consurgere) without sheds (pergulis) or canes (calamis) or upright shafts (hastilibus)? Whereas ciceion, while it provided a miracle in its sudden growth and showed the power of God in the safeguard of the green shady place (in protectione virentis umbraculi), [simply] followed its own nature.

A few sentences later (Antin, p. 213), Jerome shows his affection for ciceion in the phrase “our modest little tree (nosta arbuscula modica), quickly springing up and quickly withering.”

[1.12] Evidently Jerome was proud of his knowledge of the three plants. His reason for rejecting cucurbita (= kolokynthia) in this context appears to be clear, and he could claim support from Pliny if he needed it. Compare the sentence above (1.07), vires sine adminiculo standi non sunt, with the sheds (pergulae), the adminicula and other props in both the Commentary (1.11) and the letter (note 22). As for hedera (= kissos or kittos), probably the common English ivy, as we call it, or what Linnaeus called Hedera Helix, he could rely on general knowledge for its need of external support. But on ciceion, suo trunco se sustinens, he made at least one mistake: the Romans did have a name for it. See Pliny, Nat. XV. 25, discussing the oils produced from trees:

Next comes the oil [whose processing and use in lamps he describes subsequently] from cici, a tree which is very common in Egypt [cf. κίκη, an Egyptian word in Hdt. II. 94]—some call it crotan [cf. κροτέων Tpr. HP I. 10, 1, III. 18. 7, from the resemblance of the oil-bearing seeds to insect ticks, κροτέως as in Dsc. I. 77], others sili [attested only here, but cf. σίσλη Κέκρων, Dsc. IV. 161], others sesamon silvestre [only here,

24 The plant (see 1.08 above and note 20) is known in Germany as Wunderbaum (Stadler in the RE under “Ricinus”), but there it is only an ornamental shrub, planted annually, whereas in really warm climates, as in the Sudan and Abyssinia but probably not in Palestine, it grows to be a tree 12–15 meters high: see Antin’s long note (p. 111) quoting P. Fournier, who approves Jerome’s account as perfectly just, especially on the point of rapid growth when water is present and equally rapid withering when it is not.

25 This is implied by Pliny when he mentions (XVI. 152) a rigens hedera which alone among all the kinds of ivy can stand without support, though he adds, curiously, ob id vocata cissos. For helix as the name of a prominent species of hedera, see Pliny XVI. 145–49. Hence Linnaeus capitalized his specific epithet; it is a noun and not an adjective.
but cf. *s. agrestes*, Dsc. lat. IV. 156 = gr. IV. 161[26]—and there not long since; also in Spain it comes forth suddenly (repente provenit) with the height of an olive-tree, with pithy stalks (caule ferulaceo), leaves like those of grape vines, seeds like those of graceful and yellow grapes. Our people call it *ricinus* from the resemblance of the seed (to the insect *ricinus*, as above). The seeds are boiled in water and the floating oil is skimmed off; but in Egypt..."

[1.13] Other Romans, then, were familiar with the nature of the castor-oil plant under its Egyptian name *kiki* or its Latin name *ricinus* (= Greek *κρότων*). And Jerome should not have said that the Greeks had no other word than *kissos* for *ciceion* (i.e. *qiqayôn* in the modern transcription; see note 23). Of course St. Jerome was genuinely concerned to get at the literal and spiritual meaning of the original Hebrew, but this part of his explanation does not ring true, and it did not convince St. Augustine, as we will see (1.18). I cannot help suspecting that Jerome had some other reason for rejecting *cucurbita* besides its need for external support—an objection which applies also to *hedera*, as he freely admits; that he substituted *hedera* as equivalent to Greek *kissos* in the belief that Aquila or others of the early translators mentioned by Origen had rendered the Hebrew correctly; and that only afterward, when he had learned from his Palestinian informants about the nature of *ciceion*, did he come up with this device, in which he ignored Pliny's evidence, whether deliberately or through pardonable forgetfulness, and also transferred that artificial *umbraculum* of verse 5 (which Jonah had built for himself, 1.05) to the natural shady place or shade (*umbra*) made by his shrub *ciceion* in verse 6 (above, 1.11). But he underestimated the power of the tradition in which the congregation at Oea and many others (as we will see, 1.19) visualized the rapidly climbing *cucurbita*—and not any *hedera*—as attached to the *umbraculum* of verse 5, a bower or trellis as in Pliny and Columella.

[1.14] Returning to letter 112, we note that where we left off (above, 1.10) Jerome continues:

But if those Jews of yours, whether in malice, as you say [see 1.09], or in ignorance, said that the reading in the Hebrew rolls agrees with what is contained in the Greek and Latin books, it is clear that either they could not read Hebrew writing or told a wilful lie in order to make the *cucurbitarii* seem ridiculous.

[26] These references come from J. André's invaluable *Lexique des termes de botanique en latin* (Paris 1956). I have checked with those in *LSJ*. 
The substantivized adjective occurs nowhere else, but Souter\textsuperscript{27} follows the \textit{TLL} in seeing here the people who grow gourds (\textit{i.e.} the fruits of the plant \textit{cucurbita}). They would be ridiculous, from Jerome's point of view, because, poor fellows, they had to support their plants on poles or trellises, which his \textit{ciceion} did not require. For the largest and best fruits were those which hang down from the plant as it climbs upward: see Pliny and Columella cited above (1.07), and add Pliny, \textit{Nat. XIX. 61}:

Quaedam iacent crescentque, ut cucurbitae et cucumis; eadem pendent, quamquam graviora multo iis quae in arbore gignuntur;

and XIX. 73:

Cibis, quo longiores tenuioresque, et gratiores [sunt cucurbitae], et ob id salubriores quae pendendo crevere.

Compare the riddle of Symposius headed \textit{Cucurbita} (no. 440).

[1.15] Columella tells us (XI. 3. 50) that if we are producing commercial fruit we should choose seeds from the neck of the stored \textit{cucurbita}, \textit{quo prolixior et tenuior fructus eius nascatur, qui scilicet maius ceteris invenerit pretium}. Diocletian's Edict (6. 26, 27)\textsuperscript{28} lists two grades of \textit{cucurbitae} (both at the same price), the first ten to a bundle, the second twenty to a bundle. They are followed, incidentally, by two grades of \textit{cucumeres} (28, 29) with the same distinction (10 to 20), and two grades of the evidently larger \textit{melopepones} (two to four) and one grade of \textit{pepones} (four to a bundle), all of them at the same maximum price. (For the Latin names of the fruits see above, 0.11, and for their Greek equivalents, below, 2.01.)

[1.16] At this point we may diverge to add the culinary uses of \textit{cucurbita} to the medicinal uses already noted (1.02, citing Pliny, \textit{Nat. XX.} 16–17 as an example which could be extended by other passages on its dietary value: Cels. II. 20, 24, 27; Anthim. 56, and for specific remedies, Scrib. Largus 39; Pliny, \textit{Nat. XXVIII.} 205; Chiron., \textit{Mulomed.} 61. 18 [Oder] and several other late medical and veterinary writers cited by the \textit{TLL}). While the elder Pliny had some doubts about the digestibility of the fresh fruit (compare Celsus, II. 18. 3), he does say (XIX. 71) that as food (\textit{cibus}) it was \textit{saluber ac lenis pluribus modis}. Commenting on this recommendation, André notes\textsuperscript{29} that

\textsuperscript{27} A. Souter, \textit{A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.} (Oxford 1949). Cavallera (above, note 21), p. 504, thinks \textit{cucurbitarii} refers to the Christians, "le terme hbreu ne rpondant d'aucune manire la "citrouille" [] des Septante."

\textsuperscript{28} See now the excellent edition of S. Lauffer, \textit{Dioskletians Preisedikt} (Berlin 1971).

\textsuperscript{29} Again (see note 26) J. André, \textit{L'alimentation et la cuisine à Rome} (Paris 1961), 42.
Apicius (III. 4. 1–8, IV. 5. 3) has no fewer than nine recipes involving *cucurbitae*, including one for “gourde farcie.” The younger Pliny (Epist. I. 15) includes *cucurbitae* among the plain home-grown foods on his own table, which his friend Septicius had avoided, in spite of the good conversation he would have had there, in order to dine elsewhere on imported delicacies like *ostrea, vulvae, echini*, and *Gaditanae (fici)*. We can compare Gellius (XVII. 8. 2) on the philosopher Taurus at Athens whose sober dinners usually consisted entirely of a pot of Egyptian lentils (see André, 39) mixed with a finely chopped *cucurbita*. That Roman aristocrats generally regarded *cucurbita* as cheap food is shown in Martial’s epigram (XI. 31) on a certain Caecilius, mockingly called *Atreus cucurbitarum* because he cut them up into a thousand parts like the sons of Thyestes, so that with the help of his baker and butler he could serve up an entire dinner composed of gourds in various shapes, forms, and disguises, all at the cost of a single penny (as). But by the fourth century the fruits were a familiar article of diet for everyone. Compare Arnob. Nat. IV. 10 and VII. 16, Diocletian’s Edict above, and Augustine, Serm. 247. 2 and C. Faust. (CSEL 25) VI. 4, where he twice personifies the fruits *cucurbitae* and even speaks of the person who breaks his fast on a Sabbath and steals into a garden to cut down the fruits from their vines as a murderer, *homicida cucurbitarum*—surely an echo of Martial’s mocking phrase above!

[1.17] Soon after Jerome’s long reply in letter 112 (= Aug. Epist. 75), he dispatched another letter (115 = Aug. 81), much shorter and rather apologetic, at the close of which he hoped that if Augustine had read his Commentary on Jonah he would not take up again that ridiculous question of *cucurbita* (see 1.08). Then in a final sentence he adds, “But if the friend who first attacked me with the sword has been repulsed by my pen, your sense of humanity and justice will blame him if he attacks me again, but if he does not reply, you will allow us to joust (ludamus) on the field of the Scriptures without mutual injury.” As Cavallera saw (see note 17, I, p. 304), the “friend” must be Rufinus of Aquileia, who had attacked Jerome in his *Apologia* (two books in 401) and had been repulsed after Jerome’s two-book *Apologia* by a vitriolic third book (401 or 402). The quarrel between the two former friends had been deplored by Augustine (Epist. 73. 6 = Hier. Epist. 110. 6) but continued on Jerome’s part even after the death of Rufinus in 411.\(^{50}\)

[1.18] Then in 405 St. Augustine finally replied in a long letter (Epist. 82 = Hier. 116) to St. Jerome, reviewing all the points at issue between the two of them and firmly rejecting Jerome’s contentions in his letter 112 (see 1.09 above). At the end of the letter (§ 35) the bishop of Hippo informs the solitary scholar at Bethlehem, as politely as possible, that he will not allow Jerome’s version of the Hebrew to be read in churches,

lest we introduce something new contrary to the authority of the LXX and thus create a great stumbling-block for the understanding of Christians, whose ears and hearts have been accustomed to hear that version which was approved even by the apostles. Whence that bush (virgultum) in Jonah, if in the Hebrew it is neither hedera nor cucurbita but something else which stands firmly upright on its own trunk and requires no props (adminicula) for its support, I should now prefer to be read as cucurbita in all Latin versions, for I do not think the LXX would have used this word unless they knew the plant was something like it.

And Augustine closes (Epist. 82. 36) by urging Jerome to write back his own opinion of all this, while promising to take good care in the future that his letters to Jerome would reach him before anyone else, who might divulge their contents. Here Augustine apologizes for the misadventure of the letters carried by Profuturus and the monk Paul (see above, 1.09). But if he really expected any admission from St. Jerome, he was disappointed. So far as we know, Jerome did not answer this letter, though some years later he did join forces with St. Augustine “in a common battle against the Pelagian heresy” (Wiessen [above, note 21], 240).

[1.19] Here we should note that Jerome’s Commentary on Jonah had also been read by Rufinus, and that he had referred to that virgultum in much the same context as St. Augustine and only a few years before him. This was in the course of his Apologia of 401, where Rufinus was defending himself against charges brought by Jerome and was raising the counter charge that Jerome’s translations from the Hebrew were introducing new elements to the confusion of Christians whose ears, in Jerome’s own words, for four hundred years had been filled with versions based on the LXX, but now were being told to set aside familiar things like the story of Susannah as untrue and the song of the three holy children as not worthy to be sung in church. And with cutting sarcasm he adds:

Now after four hundred years the truth of the Law comes forth to us as purchased from the Synagogue. Now that the world has grown old and all things are hastening toward their end, let us write on the
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tombs of our ancestors, so that they themselves, who had read
otherwise, will know that Jonah did not have the shade of a *cucurbita*
but of *hedera*, and again, since that is the wish of the Legislator, not
*hedera* either, but of a different shrub (*alterius virgultii*).\(^{31}\)

As Vallarsi saw, Rufinus was referring to the sculptured scene of
Jonah sleeping under gourds (*sub cucurbitis dormantis*, i.e. the fruits
hanging down from a leafy vine stretched on supports over his resting
body) which was often found in the tombs of early Christians. The
sculpture ought to be changed, Rufinus suggests, and the dead ought
to be warned by an inscription that Jonah was not resting under the
shade of a *cucurbita* but of the *hedera*. Vallarsi refrained from noting
the further correction made by Jerome in his Commentary on the
shrub, and of course he toned down Rufinus’ scornful *Legislator* to
the conventional *S. Doctor*, but Vallarsi and Rufinus were quite right
in pointing to the numerous scenes of “Jonah resting” in early
Christian art, especially as sculptured in relief on sarcophagi of the
late third century, and Jerome must have been mortified by this
public reminder of his unfortunate neglect of a good Christian custom.
Nowhere does he even allude to this charge, but I suspect that it did
supply one motive for his continued attacks on Rufinus even after
his death.

[1.20] My Figure 8 is reproduced (by permission of the Hirmer
Fotoarchiv München) from the Praeger paperback edition (New York
1963) of *Art of the Byzantine Era*, by D. T. Rice, his Figure 8. It is a
detail from an ivory diptych, one leaf of which is now in the Ravenna
Museum, having come from a monastery at Murano, where it had
served as a book cover.\(^{32}\) On the bottom panel of this leaf (see Rice’s
Figure 7) the story of Jonah is represented in two scenes, Jonah
shown being cast overboard from a ship on the right, and on the
left, resting with “the whale beside him,” according to Rice’s caption
(actually the snapping mouth resembles rather an Egyptian crocodile).
In his text (p. 18) Rice admires the leaf as

illustrative art at its peak. One would associate such competence with
a great city, such as Alexandria; the angular poses and the expressive
gestures are distinct from what was being done at Constantinople.

\(^{31}\) *Apologia contra Hieronymum*, II, 39 in the new (1961) critical edition by M.
Simonetti, but chapter 35 in Vallarsi (p. 391) and Migne, *PL* 21, p. 614. The sarcastic
comment is not mentioned in Murphy’s summary of chapters 32–36, p. 147.

\(^{32}\) See also his *Masterpieces of Byzantine Art* (Edinburgh Festival Society, 1958), no.
6: Ivory Book Cover, early 6th century, Ravenna, Museo Nazionale. Here Rice refers
to the places where parts of the other leaf may be found; and he assigns this work
either to Palestine or Egypt.
And in the detail, where the hanging gourds certainly resemble those of Fuchs' *Lang Kürbsz* (his p. 211, my Figure 5), my botanical consultants, Dr. Frederick Meyer of the U.S. National Arboretum in Washington and Prof. Charles Heiser of Indiana University, made no difficulty about identifying the plant as the bottle-gourd vine, now called *Lagenaria siceraria* (Molina) Standley (see above, 0.08). They agreed on the shape of the gourds and the general posture of the plant, while Heiser added that the leaves as shown resembled his own drawing of leaves (his Figure 1) in his article, "Variation in the Bottle Gourd."

[1.21] But there is difficulty if we regard this scene and the many others of "Jonah resting," mostly without the "whale," which are known in paintings from catacombs or from sculptured sarcophagi,\(^{34}\) as illustrations of the Biblical story. In the first place, Jonah is usually shown lying down on a couch or cushion, either by the sea or in some countryside where he is surrounded by animals or other rustic figures, not sitting down or standing before his shed somewhere east of Nineveh, long after his release from the great fish. In the second place, he is regularly shown naked, without clothing of any kind. These features have been explained in various ways. Anthropologists and historians of religion have compared other versions in classical and oriental folk tales of what most scholars now believe was a very old and widely diffused story\(^{35}\)—though Jerome and his Christian contemporaries of course accepted it as a unit, literally the word of God expressed through the historical prophet—and have found traces in Rabbinic and Islamic sources\(^{36}\) of tales in which Jonah lost his

---


\(^{34}\) See the collections made long ago by J. Wilpert, *Le pitture delle catacombe romane* (2 vols., 1903) and *i sarcofagi cristiani antichi* (3 vols., 1929–36). Antin (see note 18), in his note on "l'iconographie cémétique" on p. 33, observes that in the paintings Jonah is shown naked and lying down in his shady spot some 33 times, being cast up by the monster about 26 times, and being thrown overboard and swallowed by the monster about 15 times. I thank the director, Miss Rosalie Green, of the Index of Christian Iconography at Princeton University, which of course includes much more than Wilpert's paintings, for giving me (in 1976) the following count of the three leading scenes: Jonah cast overboard, 240 examples; Jonah cast up on land, 330; and Jonah resting under the gourd-vine, 250 examples, mostly before A.D. 700.


\(^{36}\) See Delbrueck's 1952 book (above, note 20), pp. 22–24. I add that Delbrueck believed that the richly decorated and so-called *Lipsanothek* (i.e. a reliquary containing *leipsana* or remains of the dead), which he was describing, was originally a kind of
clothing as a result of being roasted inside the whale and needed a period of rest and recreation after that exhausting experience.\textsuperscript{37} Archaeologists and historians of art, however, have looked for classical themes in literature (metrical epitaphs) and plastic art (sarcophagi and other memorials) which expressed the hope for a happy life after death, so that Jonah’s nudity on the sarcophagi is explained by the copying of antique pagan models (in which the heroes of mythology were regularly nude) in ateliers of the third century which catered to the pseudo-rustic tastes of wealthy city-dwellers, Christian and pagan alike. Engemann and others have pointed to a terra cotta plaque in the Louvre which shows a nude Dionysus sleeping in a posture remarkably similar to Jonah’s on a sarcophagus in Berlin.\textsuperscript{38} It was only necessary to change the bunches of grapes in the arbors above Dionysus to gourds, and the sleeping figure becomes Jonah.

[1.22] Possibly it was these scenes on sarcophagi to which Rufinus (1.19) referred, but closer relationship to the canonical story has been seen in catacomb paintings which show Jonah reclining in the usual posture but under a four-posted pergola from whose rafters the gourds dangle.\textsuperscript{39} On the other hand, the dangling gourds by themselves, without visible reference to Jonah, can be seen in fragments of sculpture found in catacombs and engraved below and to the left of a late third-century inscription commemorating a certain Galatilla.\textsuperscript{40} Can these gourds have been intended as a visual symbol of the “sign of Jonah” promised long before (Mt. 12:40)? I doubt it.

treasure-chest for an aristocratic lady of the first half of the third century. Like the much later ivory at Ravenna, it does not belong to sepulchral art.


\textsuperscript{38} See J. Engemann, \textit{Untersuchungen zur Sepulkralsymbolik der späteren römischen Kaiserzeit} (Münster, 1973; Ergänzungsband 2, \textit{Jahrb. f. Antike u. Christentum}), esp. 70–84 and Taf. 33 c (side of a sarcophagus in Berlin, Staatliche Museen) and 35 a (terra cotta plaque in the Louvre). The central part of the sarcophagus and the whole of the plaque can also be seen in Tafel 8 (c and a respectively) which illustrates Stommel’s article (above).

\textsuperscript{39} See Ferrua’s 1962 article (above, note 37), figure 5 (p. 12). Antin’s note (above, note 34) also refers to “un Jonas sous pergola” in an earlier article (by Josi) in the same \textit{Rivista} 5 (1928), 198.

\textsuperscript{40} Ferrua, p. 47, figs. 27–29. The inscription (figure 29) is a fragment from the catacomb at Pretestato.
This is only one of the many things we do not know, and I close this unsatisfactory commentary on Rufinus’ criticism by saying that I know of no artistic representation at all of Jerome’s *ciccion* and only one of his *hedera*, and that one very late. A pair of drawings in a fourteenth-century manuscript *Biblia pauperum* shows Jonas (so labeled) emerging from the mouth of the great fish with a branch of ivy leaves at the right side of the picture. As expected, he is nude, but he is also bald as a baby, though he had a good head of hair in the drawing at the left where he is shown, wrapped in a cloak, being shoved into the mouth of the monster.41 Here the reading of St. Jerome’s Vulgate is preserved, but the long artistic tradition which represented Jonah resting after his ordeal is almost unanimous in preferring the bottle-gourd plant, what Linnaeus called *Cucurbita lagenaria*, as providing him with shade.

[1.23] Returning to Jerome’s Commentary, I reproduce Antin’s text (which hardly differs from Vallarsi’s in Migne, except for the punctuation) of the “ponderous jesting” (above, 1.10) which precedes his serious explanation for his change of *cucurbita* to *hedera* in verse 6 of chapter 4: *In hoc loco*, he says,

quidam Canterius de antiquissimo genere Corneliorum sive, ut ipse iactat, de stirpe Asinii Pollionis, dudum Romae dicitur me accusasse sacrilegii quod pro cucurbita hederam transtulerim: timuit videlicet ne

si pro cucurbitis hederae nascentur unde occulte et tenebrose biberet non haberet.

Et revera in ipsis cucurbitis vasculorum quas vulgo saucomarias vocant, solent apostolorum imagines adumbrari ex quibus et ille sibi non suum nomen adsumpsit. Quod si tam facile vocabula commutantur ut pro Corneliiis seditiosis tribunis Aemilii consules appellantur, miror cur mihi non liceat hederam transferre pro cucurbita. Sed veniamus ad seria. . . .

41 See Abb. 4 in an article by E. M. Vetter and W. A. Bulst, pp. 127–38 in the Heidelberg University magazine, *Ruperto-Carola*, bd. 46 (Juni 1969). Through hints in Schmidt and Steffen (above, note 35), the authors trace the loss of Jonah’s hair to a medieval variant in the myth of Heracles’ rescue of Hesione. See Tzetzes, *Schol. ad Lycophr.* 34, and Frazer’s note in the Loeb *Apollodorus* (I, p. 207): “Tzetzes says that Hercules, in full armour, leaped into the jaws of the sea-monster, and was in its belly for three days hewing and hacking it, and that at the end of the three days he came forth without any hair on his head.”
[1.24] *Dudum* in line 3 means “recently” (as Antin notes), i.e. shortly before the composition of the Commentary in 396 but after the publication of the translation from the Hebrew in 391–94 (see above, note 18). This squares with the *ante annos plurimos* of Jerome’s letter (112. 22) of 404, in which he blames a person whom he calls both Cornelius and Asinius Pollio (see 1.10), clearly the same person who is graced here (line 1) with the ridiculous nickname Canterius (line 1, or as in Vallarsi, Cantherius). See Antin’s notes for the degrading connotations of the four names here, also Piganiol in Antin’s note on our line 13, where *seditiosi tribuni* is so outrageously applied to the patrician Cornelli that the reader knows that Jerome must be inventing freely. His purpose in creating all this business of names, apart from his usual technique as a satirist (see Wiessen [note 21], esp. 200–12), is revealed in lines 12–16 above: if words can be changed so readily in these names, why shouldn’t I be allowed to change *cucurbita* to *hederae*? In line 11 Jerome implies that his critic on this occasion, which he reports only by hearsay (*dicitur*, line 3), was a cleric who had taken his new name from one of the apostles. One thinks of the monk Paul who carried Augustine’s second critical letter (above, 1.09) to Rome rather than to Jerome in Bethlehem, but his misadventure did not happen until after 398. And it seems likely that Jerome had no specific person in mind. See Cavallera (note 21 above), II, 106–09, who notes Jerome’s expressions in various prefaces for the unnamed people who criticized him for preferring Hebrew texts to the LXX, but also that later on he named Palladius as the chief calumniator.

[1.25] As usual in his attacks on the clergy, Jerome’s first charge (lines 5–8) involves luxurious living. His critic was afraid that if *hederae* were grown instead of *cucurbitae* he would not have anything from which to drink in secret and in some dark corner. Ivy would offer cover for clandestine tippling but not a container for the wine—precisely the function which gave the plant its modern names. In the two sentences which precede Columella’s directions for choosing seeds for the production of the longer cylindrical fruit (see above, 1.07 and 1.15), he tells us (XI. 3. 49) that seed chosen from the middle part of the stored *cucurbita* will produce fruit of larger size (*increments vastioris*), and that these fruits are quite suitable for use as containers (*ad usum vaso rum*), like the *cucurbitae* from Alexandria, once they have been dried out (*cum exaruerunt*). In the parallel passage in verse (X. 383–88; see above, 1.07 for the preceding lines in which *cucumis* and *cucurbita* are characterized together), Columella had recommended the same choice of seed as above for the production
of larger fruit with swelling belly, and here he mentions more uses for the product (385–88): sobolem dabit illa capacem / Naryciae picis, aut Actaei melis Hymetti, / aut habilem lymphis hamulam, Bacchove lagoenam, / tum pueros eadem fluviis innare docebit. From the woody rind of the dried fruit (see Pliny below) can be made a container for pitch, a vessel for honey, a water-bucket, or a bottle for wine; or even air-tight floats with which boys learn how to swim. Hence Linnaeus (Species plantarum [1753], 1010) gave the epithet lagenaria in the margin opposite his first species of the genus Cucurbita, citing Morison’s Historiae Oxoniensis pars secunda (1680) for an illustration and the name Cucurbita lagenaria, flore albo.\(^{42}\) And the common English name for the plant is Bottle-Gourd (no doubt in use long before Morison), the Germans call it Flaschenkürbis, and the Italians Zucca da vino, dal collo, or (from floats smaller than Columella’s) da pescare.

[1.26] Pliny’s discussion of kitchen-garden plants (hortensia, see his § 73, cited below) begins (XIX. 61) by noting the posture of the fruits cucurbitae and cucumis (plural, cited above, 1.14) and distinguishing their physical composition: cucumis cartilagene et carne constat, cucurbita cortice et cartilagine; cortex huic uni maturitate transit in lignum. (Note this as a second unique feature [see note 42] of Cucurbita lagenaria.) It continues the characterization of these two important plants in a long discussion (64–74) in which Pliny describes now cucumis, now cucurbita, but mostly the two together (see 1.07 above), but on the uses of cucurbita he is quite clear (XIX. 71): cucurbitarum numerosior usus [sc. quam cucumerum], et primus caulis in cibo, atque ex eo [sc. partes, i.e. fructus] in totum natura diversa [i.e. the parts (fruits) which come after the stalks, being of a different nature altogether]; nuper in balnearum usum venere urceorum vice [i.e. pitchers or hamulae for carrying water in baths], iampridem vero etiam cadorum ad vina condenda [i.e. jars for storing wine]. And a little later (73) he notes how those fruits which were not cut down for eating (compare Aug. C. Faust. cited above, 1.16) when green (and the rind was still soft; compare 71: cortex viridi tener, deraditur nihilominus in cibis) are prepared to serve as containers: eas quae semini non serventur ante hiemem praevidi non est mos; postea fumo siccatur condendis hortensiorum seminibus et rusticae supellectili. That is, after the onset of cold weather when the fruits have stopped growing and the rinds are becoming hard and woody (61 above), they are cut down; later they (the empty rinds) are dried in smoke in order to form storage jars for the seeds of kitchen-garden plants and homemade utensils. Compare Columella

\(^{42}\) Bauhin in his famous Pinax (1623) had also noted the white flower as a distinctive feature of the plant, which he called Cucurbita oblonga, flore albo, folio molli.
on *cucurbitae* from Alexandria (above, 1.25). Some of the possibilities latent in that *rustica supellex* and all the steps in the modern process are indicated in the unsigned article on "Gourd" in the *Britannica* (11th edn.):

The remarkable fruit [of *Lagenaria vulgaris*] first begins to grow in the form of an elongated cylinder, but gradually widens toward the extremity, until, when ripe, it resembles a flask with a narrow neck and large round bulb; it sometimes attains a length of 7 ft. When ripe, the pulp is removed from the neck, and the interior cleared by leaving water standing in it; the woody rind that remains is used as a bottle; or the lower part is cut off and cleared out, forming a basin-like vessel applied to the same domestic purposes as the calabash (*Crescentia*) of the West Indies; the smaller varieties, divided lengthwise, form spoons.

[1.27] The drying of the gourds by means of smoking is not mentioned here, nor by Lucian (*Vera Hist.* II. 37) when he describes how the *Kolokynthiapeiratai* make their 60-cubit long πλώκα κολοκύνθινα by drying out a gourd (surely not a pumpkin here!), and then hollowing it out and stripping it of its contents, but whether or not the emptied rinds were hung in a smokehouse, they certainly must have been hung up to dry somewhere under cover. The drying rinds of *cucurbitae* would have been a familiar sight in many an ancient household, even in the kitchens of wealthy city-dwellers, and I suggest that this explains the remark of Psyche's envious sister (Apul. *Met.* V. 9) when she complains that her own husband is older than her father, balder than a *cucurbita*, and weaker than any male child. For the surface of *Lagenaria vulgaris*, unlike that of other cultivated curcubits, is described by botanists as smooth and glabrous. Probably that is also the point of the indignant remark of the porter (*Met.* I. 15), "You may want to die, but I don't have the head of a *cucurbita* so as to die for you." The rind of a drying gourd might look like a head, and its emptiness would certainly suggest thoughtlessness or stupidity, as critics from Weinreich to Eisenberg have insisted.43 I do not deny this, and I can add one other place in which *cucurbita* is coupled with emptiness in a derisory context. This is in the Latin translation of the important work *Contra Haereses* of St. Irenaeus, the probably Syrian-born bishop of Lyons in the late second century, just about 200 years before St. Jerome and almost contemporary with Apuleius. In a paragraph of his first

43 The best modern analogue, I think, is provided by P. Robert, *Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française* (Paris 1966) when he notes under the word *Carafe*, which means ordinarily "vasé destiné à contenir un liquide," that it is used in popular speech of an "homme sans intelligence": "Quelle carafe!" people say.
book (I. 11. 4 in Massuet’s numbering), Irenaeus undertakes to parody a fundamental tetrad of Valentine’s gnostic aeons (series of emanations):

There is a certain royal Proarchê (pro-principle) which is Proanennoêtos (pro-inconceivable), a Proanypostatos (pro-unsubstantial) virtue, Propropylindomenê (pro-prostrating itself). With it there is a virtue, which I call cucurbita; with this cucurbita there is a virtue, which in itself I call perinane (absolute void). This cucurbita and perinane, since they are a unity, have issued (emiserunt), without sexual action (cum non emississent), a fruit that is visible on all sides, edible, and tasty, and common speech calls this fruit cucumis. With this cucumis is a virtue of the same power as itself, which in itself I call pepo. These virtues, cucurbita et perinane, et cucumis, et pepo, have issued the remaining host of Valentine’s ridiculous pepones.

The reason why Irenaeus chose these three names from the vegetable world, which he rightly asserts are much more credible than Valentine’s, being in everyday use and understood by everyone, is revealed towards the end of the next paragraph, where (p. 107 in Harvey) the last word is used in its Homeric sense in what Harvey saw was probably a parody of II. II. 235: O pepones, sophistae vituperabiles et non veri. The fruit pepo, then (see above, 0.10), was the melon (πέπων), cucumis the cucumber (σκίνος), and cucurbita the bottle-gourd (κολοκύνθη). And I can see no reason for his equating perinane with cucurbita unless he thought that the sight of drying and emptied gourds would be as familiar to people everywhere as they evidently were to his fellow Syrian Lucian.

[1.28] Here we do have a second passage, replacing the one in Petronius which we have removed (above, 1.04) from Eisenberg’s note (above, 0.02), in which cucurbita might be interpreted as Dummkopf. But our object here is to note the frequency and familiarity of the word in all its meanings, and we return now to the discussion of St. Jerome’s jesting preface to his serious explanation (above, 1.23). “And in fact,” he resumes in lines 8–11, “people are accustomed to engrave the likenesses of the apostle (from whom he drew the name that is not his own), in ipsis cucurbitis vasculorum quas vulgo saucomarias vocant.” Jerome had just been referring to the cucurbitae which could be used as vessels to hold wine (see above, 1.26), but these were made of the woody rinds of bottle-gourds and could not hold the

---

44 Page 106 in the edition by W. Wigan Harvey (Cantabrigiae 1857). For the eastern origin of Irenaeus and the date of his Greek work, see Harvey’s preliminary observations, cliii and clxiii, and clxiv for the use by Tertullian of the Latin translation, which must have been made immediately.
elaborate engraving of the beechwood cups pledged by Menalcas in Vergil, *Ecl. 5.* 37–39, much less the chasing or engraving of the well-known metallic vessels here called *vascula.* I think Antin (above, note 18) was right in translating “*sur les panses de ces vases,*”45 though he lets the relative clause, which he renders “*nommés communément saucomariae,*” follow “*ces vases*” directly. But the antecedent of *quas* is not *vasculorum* but *cucurbitis,* and if the reader will turn back to Pliny’s names for the two kinds of *cucurbita* (and apparently of *cucumis* too, above, 1.07), he will find that the first was the climbing plant, called *genus camararium* because it reached up to the vaults or *camarae.* In place of that strange and hitherto unexplained word *saucomarias,* which Antin said he found in all the MSS he had seen (none of them earlier than the ninth century), we should surely read *camararias.* Then in that case, when Jerome said *quas* (i.e. *cucurbitas*) *vulgo camararias vocant,* his authority for that *vulgo* would have been simply Pliny; compare above, 1.03. But for some reason (see above, 1.13) Jerome refused to admit that the plant which provided shade for Jonah was a *cucurbita.*

[1.29] And there is one more jest which St. Jerome could not resist making as he began his mystical interpretation: *Ad personam vero Domini Salvatoris.* . . . (Antin, 112). He quotes his version of Isaiah 1:8 (“And the daughter of Zion will be left like a booth [*tabernaculum*] in a vineyard and like a lodge in a cucumber-field”) and comments on the phrase *velut casula in cucumerario,* “let us say, since we have not found [the word] *cucurbita* in any other place in Scripture, that wherever *cucumis* grows, there usually grows *cucurbita* also.” What is asserted as fact is rather Jerome’s inference from Pliny’s sometimes confusing account (see above, 1.07 and 1.26); here we should add Pliny’s directions for the annual planting of both *cucumis* and *cucurbita* (XIX. 69), which are also named together in the parallel passage of Columella, XI. 3. 48. The inference would be supported by several

45 See the article on “burette” in the *Dict. d’archéol. chrét. et de liturgie* (Gabriol–Leclercq–Marrou), t. 2, col. 1354. Fig. 1747 shows a circular bronze bottle shaped much like the water-canteen which hikers suspend over a hip, except that one side is completely flat while the other swells out to a greater extent. The neck is much longer than on a canteen. Antin refers at the end of his note 3 (p. 110) to this vase, found in a tomb at Concevreux; but he does not mention the fact that Leclercq thought that its local designation as “*gourde*” was scarcely appropriate. But the swelling side, which is what Jerome calls *cucurbita vasculi* is not unlike a vertical half of a pyriform gourd as seen in Fuchs’ p. 209 (my Figure 4). No date is given for this vessel, but others are known from the fourth or fifth century, slender and with long necks, made of terra cotta, with painted surface and various scenes and symbols.
other passages, especially in poetry, where, if the one plant or its fruit is mentioned, the other trails along immediately; see Prop. IV. 2.43; Priap. 51. 17; Colum. X. 234 and 380. Thus Jerome makes a jocular concession to his reader. He will not leave *cucurbita* altogether out of consideration, though he has removed it from the text of Jonah, the only place in Scripture where he had found it. But since a derivative of *cucumis* is found in Isaiah, and since *cucurbita* regularly goes along with *cucumis*, the reader is free to suppose that Isaiah was also talking about *cucurbita*. What is really notable here is that in introducing his concession (*Ad personam . . . Salvatoris, ne penitus propter φιλοκολόκινθος cucurbitam relinquamus. . . . Et dicamus . . .*) Jerome has coined a new Greek word which has not been noticed in *LSJ* and which Antin (above, note 18) thought (112, note 3) was a ridiculous word, echoing the *Apocolocyntosis* of Seneca. It is possible that Jerome had been reading Seneca’s skit, but altogether unlikely that he had been reading Roman history in the Greek of Dio Cassius, our only source for the word (see above, 0.01). On the other hand, he was perfectly capable of forming a new Greek word, which on the analogy of *φιλόσοφος* and countless others must mean, simply, “a lover of κολόκινθη,” i.e. of the fruits which supply tasty food, not so very different from the *cucurbitarii* or “growers of cucurbits” in *Epist.* 112 (above, 1.14). In other words, it is on account of some reader who may be a cucurbit-lover that Jerome does not abandon *cucurbita* altogether. And actually on other occasions, when he was not discussing the Hebrew text but its spiritual meaning (see above, 1.06 on the preface, Antin 54, and at Antin 107 on 4. 5 and 115 on 4. 9), Jerome himself uses the word *cucurbita* of Jonah’s shade-plant, accommodating his vocabulary to his readers’ preference.

[1.30] For most of the time in St. Jerome and his contemporaries the word *cucurbita* denotes a commercially grown, edible fruit: compare especially Jerome’s *cucurbitarii* in *Epist.* 112, φιλοκολόκινθος at Antin 112 (just above), *cucurbitae camarariae* (no longer saucomariae) at Antin 109 (above, 1.28), Diocletian’s Edict (above, 1.15), and Augustine’s *homicida cucurbitarum* (C. Faust. VI. 4, 1.16 above). On one occasion, however (see 1.25 above), Jerome alluded to the wine-bottles which, according to Columella and Pliny, could be made, along with other homemade utensils (rustica supellex), from the woody rinds of mature fruits after they had been emptied of their contents and thoroughly dried (see 1.26)—passages from which Linnaeus drew the specific epithet (*Cucurbita*) *lagenaria* and in which Candolle recognized the plant which Seringe called *Lagenaria vulgaris*. And we have suggested that it was the familiar sight of the smooth-skinned bottle-gourds,
hanging dried and empty from the rafters, which lies behind Apuleius’ figures (Met. 1. 15 and V. 9) and Irenaeus’ coupling of *cucurbita* and *perinane* (see above, 1.27). Jerome also knew the use of the implement which we call a cupping-glass (see 1.01) and he, following Pliny (1.02), called a *medicinalis cucurbita*—a linguistic transfer owing to the similarity of its shape to that of the gourds when small (1.03). And next we saw (1.04) that *cucurbitae* in Petronius (39. 12) is probably a figurative application of the transferred name of the implement to people whom Trimalchio and his guests considered obnoxious.

[1.31] So far we have been noting the cases in which *cucurbita* refers primarily to a part of the plant, its fruit. But in the sections which follow (1.05–1.22) *cucurbita* refers to the whole plant. According to the Old Latin translations of the book of Jonah, made from the Greek versions by the LXX, this was specifically the bottle-gourd vine, the plant which grew up rapidly and provided grateful shade for Jonah, only to be withered through the agency of a worm at God’s bidding. But in his new translation from the Hebrew text, St. Jerome had substituted the word *hedera*, at the same time declaring that the plant was not really the broad-leaved ivy but a different shrub, called *ciceion* in the Hebrew, which grew frequently in Palestine and could rise upward without external support. Various people had protested vigorously against the substitution of something else for *cucurbita*, which they thought was most appropriate to the performance of the plant in the traditional story. St. Augustine had not been convinced (1.18 above) by Jerome’s explanation, and Rufinus had ridiculed it (1.19), pointing to the importance of the plant *cucurbita* as a symbol in sepulchral iconography. I have stated reasons (1.12–13) for doubting certain points in Jerome’s explanation—not that he was wrong about the reading of the Hebrew text or the nature of the plant *ciceion*—and I have voiced a suspicion that he had some other reason for rejecting the traditional *cucurbita*. This would be, I now think, that the gourd was one of the garden-products which were sought out by luxury-loving clerics who should have been content with ordinary bread (*cibarius panis*) and plain drinking water instead of delicate cococotions like *contrita holera betarumque sucus*; see the passage (Epist. 52. 12) from the letter to Nepotianus which Wiessen (above, note 21) cites (p. 79) as an example of true satire for a Christian purpose, the reformation of the clergy. Jerome does not mention *cucurbitae* here in his list of delicacies (*caricae, piper, nuces . . . simila, mel, pistatia, tota hortorum cultura*), but they are prominent in Arnobius’ lists (Nat. IV. 10 and VII. 16) of strange foods favored by pagan superstition. It is also possible that Jerome knew about and
recoiled from the purgative property of Pliny's *cucurbita silvestris* or *colocynthis* (above, 1.02). If so, there is irony in his recommendation of the plant *Ricinus communis*, the oil from whose seeds was used at the time (see Pliny above, 1.12) mainly for burning in lamps but now as a purgative. (And Galen among ancient physicians knew and extolled this cathartic use of the plant called *kiki*; see Kühn [Galeni Opera, xii, p. 26], who translates: *Ricini fructus quemadmodum purgat, detergit ac digerit*). But we cannot know about this, and our object here has been merely to show that all the connotations of the word *cucurbita* in Jerome were known also to Pliny and others in the time of Seneca, and that very few of them were pejorative. It can be said that the plant which Linnaeus called *Cucurbita lagenaria* was regarded then—as it still is—as a provider of goods and services for man.

II. Athenaeus on κολοκύντη

[2.01] Candolle had said (see above, 0.12) that Greek authors do not mention the plant *Lagenaria vulgaris*, though he recognized this plant in Roman descriptions of *cucurbita* which stressed the woody nature of the matured fruits' rinds and their use for homemade utensils. But we have just seen that the word *cucurbita* in the Old Latin versions of the book of Jonah translates κολόκυνθα in the LXX, that Jerome himself invented the term φιλοκολόκυνθος referring to a lover of *cucurbitae*, that Lucian (Vera Hist. II. 37; see above, 1.27) shows how the *Kolokynthopeiratai* made their κολοκύνθινα πλοία from the dried and emptied rinds of fruits which are evidently identical with the *cucurbitae* described by Pliny and Columella, and that the Latin translation of Irenaeus' work (above, 1.27) uses the successive terms *cucurbita*, *perinane*, *cucumis*, and *pepo*, presumably rendering the terms of the original Greek parody of Valentine's tetrad, which would be κολοκύνθη, διάκενον (or a new coinage περιδιάκενον), σίκνος and πέτων.

And here we can add the Greek names of the fruits whose prices were set by Diocletian's Edict (6. 26-32, see note 28 and above, 1.15): *cucurbitae*: κολοκύνθαι; *cucumeres*: σίκνοι; *meloperones*: μηλοπέτονες; *pepones*: πέτωνες. And the glosses (references in the *TLL*) regularly have *cucurbita* for κολοκύνθη or κολοκύνθα and, vice versa, κολοκύνθη or κολοκύντα for *cucurbita* (or *cucurbita*), except that there are a few traces of the Scholium on Iuven. 14. 58: *cucurbita sīkā*—which is quite correct: see 1.01 and note 14.

[2.02] Clearly, then, κολοκύνθη and *cucurbita* were lexical equivalents at least from the second century on. But we can trace their equivalence
much farther back through various passages in Athenaeus. He made
a critical distinction (II, 59 a), which we have noted (above, 0.11)
was the basis for the definition in the Thesaurus of Stephanus and
thence in the successive editions of Liddell and Scott until it was
changed in the new edition (LSJ). "The people of the Hellespont," he
said, "distinguish long gourds, which they call σικώα, from the
round ones, which they call κολοκύνται." This is supported by a
sentence in Aristotle, who says (Hist. An. IX. 14, 616 a 22) that the
(supposed) floating nest of the (mythical) halcyon is shaped approxi-
mately like the sikyai which have long necks. For, although the generic
word for gourds in the Attic dialect was κολοκύντη (Athen. II, 59 c;
compare the heading κολοκύνται at 58 f) there were exceptions, as
in Aristotle, in various authors quoted by Athenaeus, 46 and in a third-
century papyrus from El Fayûm preserved at the Sorbonne. 47 Here,
in lines 18–21, an agent reports to his superior that the oil-dealer
Mares had brought to him a certain person who had two sikyai and
. . . a lēkythos, in which . . . (the rest is illegible). Hombert translated
σικώας β' as "deux calabasses"; LSJ explain the word as "gourd used
as a calabash," quite reasonably in view of Pliny's and Columella's
containers (cucurbitae, above, 1.25; note Columella's Alexandrian
cucurbitae) for water and wine. Thus we now have documentary
evidence from the pre-Christian era that gourds of a certain shape
were in fact bottle-gourds, fruits of Lagenaria vulgaris. And referring
back to the nickname Σικώας in Athenaeus VI, 257 a (above 1.04),
citing the third-century historian Clearchus and to the discussion of
cucurbita when applied to the cupping-instrument (1.02–03), we
cannot doubt that the word sikya, in this application, was also a
linguistic transfer or Übertrag from its use as applied to a bottle-gourd
of a certain shape. If we suppose that the critical shape was similar
to that of a cucumber, then it is likely that σικώα is an arbitrary
feminine variant of the older word σίκυας (or σικνός) or σίκυς (attested

46 Euthydemus of Athens (Athen. II, 58 f) called kolokynthē an "Indian sikya"
because the seed was imported from India; Menodorus, a student of Erasistratus and
friend of Hikesius (Athen. II, 59 a), said that among kolokynthai there was the Indian
kind, also called sikya, which was usually boiled, and the kolokynthē proper, which was
also baked (καὶ ὀπτᾶρα), and in a significant passage from the poet Nicander of
Colophon (to be discussed a little later), Athenaeus (IX, 372 c) assures us that
Nicander referred to kolokynthai though he called them sikyai.

47 No. 391, first published in 1925 by M. Hombert, Rev. belge de Phil. et d'Hist. 4,
652–60, no. 8, and reprinted by F. Bilabel in the third volume of the Sammelbuch
(1927), no. 7202, and thus cited by LSJ.
for Alcaeus, Athen. III, 73 e); Frisk places the three words side by side in his etymological dictionary.\textsuperscript{48}

[2.03] Thanks to a papyrus published in 1931 and not noticed in \textit{LSJ} until its 1968 \textit{Supplement}, we now have documentary evidence that the gourd called \textit{kolokynthē} (or \textit{kolókynthē}) could also provide a homemade utensil and therefore should be identified as the fruit of \textit{Lagenaria vulgaris}. It comes in a new compound, \textit{kolokyntharētaiouna}, defined in the \textit{Supplement} as “scoop or dipper made of a gourd,” which stands in line 7 of No. 78 in the \textit{Papyri Ilandanae} (in fasc. 5, 1931). The word is clearly anapaestic, like some other words for rare objects in earlier and later lines of the papyrus, and the \textit{Nachträge} of the editors suggest that the versifier was Parthenius rather than Callimachus, in whose works such doubled words are rare. Frisk and Chantraine both give this new compound prominence in their discussion of \textit{kolokynthē} as \textit{Lagenaria vulgaris}; see above, 0.05 and note 8.

[2.04] Another passage in Athenaeus, also headed \textit{kolokynthē} (IX, 372 b), can be connected with Pliny’s \textit{cucurbita}, i.e. \textit{Lagenaria}. Here Athenaeus tells of the party’s wonderment when fresh \textit{kolokynthai} were served to them in wintertime. There follows an extended passage from the \textit{Horae} of Aristophanes (Kock 1, 536–38) which notes the appearance in midwinter markets of many kinds of comestibles and flowers out of season, including \textit{σικνοὶ, βότρυς} and, later on, \textit{kolokynthai} and \textit{γογγυλίδες}, to the amazement—or disapproval—of moralizing gods, one of whom comments sarcastically that Athens has been made over into Egypt. Again the guests wonder (Athenaeus resumes, 372 d) how they could be eating \textit{kolokynthai} in the middle of January, for they were fresh (\textit{χλωραῖ}) and retained their natural flavor. Then they remembered that cooks knew of tricks to preserve such vegetables, and Ulpian, when pressed by Larensis to recall the practices of the ancients, quotes some lines from the \textit{Georgica} of Nicander of Colophon (frg. 72 Schneider), telling how \textit{sikyai} (he really means \textit{kolokynthai}, Athenaeus makes Ulpian say) should be cut into strips, sewed together on a string, dried in the open air and then hung over smoke, so that in winter the servants may have enough to eat, filling their capacious pot with strings of well-washed \textit{σικνή} and other vegetables.\textsuperscript{49} This

\textsuperscript{48} See note 8 above. In the same way, the \textit{kolokynthē} of Dioscorides (IV, 176, see 1.02 and 0.03 above) is to be considered an arbitrary variant of \textit{kolókynthē}.

\textsuperscript{49} My paraphrase owes less to Gulick’s translation (see above, 1.04; Gulick was confused also in his notes on the heading \textit{kolokynthē}) than to Gow’s (\textit{Nicander}, ed. A. S. F. Gow and A. F. Scholfield; Cambridge 1953), where the fragment is also no. 72. Gow uses “gourds” to translate both \textit{kolokynthai} and \textit{sikyai} and in his first index identifies both words botanically as \textit{Cucurbita maxima}, following (see his Introduction, p. 25)
method of preserving kolokyntai for later consumption can be compared with a sentence in Pliny (XIX. 74) which follows directly after his sentence (quoted above, 1.26) about the smoking and drying of the gourds destined for seed-containers and *rustica supellex*. “A means of preserving them (i.e. *cucurbitae*) for food has been discovered,” and he goes on to describe two methods, the first of which, in brine (*muria*), can also be applied to *cucumis*; compare the *Geoponica*, XII. 19. 15 on σίκνοι and 17 on κολοκύνται. For the second method I give Rackham’s translation (Loeb Pliny, 5, 1950) of Mayhoff’s Teubner text (1892):

but it is reported that gourds also can be kept green in a trench dug in a shady place and floored with dry hay and then with earth.

This is not exactly Nicander’s method, but what matters is that the successive authors, Nicander, Pliny, and Athenaeus, were all referring to methods of preserving the young edible gourds in a dry state for eating at a later date: *usque ad alios paene proventus*, says Pliny, and his preceding sentence was one of those by which Candolle recognized the fruit of *Lagenaria vulgaris*. We can add that a contemporary of Athenaeus, the physician Galen of Pergamum, also commended the dried flesh of kolokynthai, the seeds having been removed, for pleasant eating in winter: see his essay, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, in Kühn’s edition, vol. 6, p. 559; also in another essay (Kühn 6, p. 785), after the flesh had been cut into small pieces and dried so that it would not rot.

[2.05] In defense of Candolle’s failure to recognize *Lagenaria vulgaris* in any Greek source that was available in his time, it can be said that the statements of Theophrastus in his *De historia plantarum* (Loeb edition by Hort, 1916) and *De causis plantarum* (Loeb edition by Einarson and Link in 1976) have been more baffling than illuminating on the botanical identity of his plants, especially those for which he uses the names sikyos, sikya, and kolokytē (-nthē once, at C.P. II. 8. 4). Kolokytē is paired frequently with sikyos but sometimes with sikya, and on two occasions (H.P. I. 13. 3 and VII. 2. 9) all three words occur together: ὁ σίκνος καὶ ἡ κολοκύντη καὶ ἡ σικύα. Thus there was some reason for Dyer (see note 9) to make a distinction between kolokytē and sikya and for Hort to adopt it in his botanical index for the three words, respectively “Cucumber (*Cucumis sativus*), Gourd (*Cucurbita maxima*), and Bottle-gourd (*Lagenaria vulgaris*)”. Previous scholars

Thistle-Dyer in LSJ, not without expressing some doubt in general and in the index under kolokytē adding Emmanuel’s guess: *Citrullus colocynthis*, i.e. the Bitter Apple!
indeed had diverged widely in their identifications, as may be seen in the index of Wimmer’s Didot edition (1866). For the three names above the index gives the interpretations of K. Sprengel (as deduced from his translation of and commentary on the H.P., Altona, 1822) and of C. Fraas (Synopsis plantarum florae classicae . . . München, 1845). In tabular form they read:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sikyos</th>
<th>kolokyntē</th>
<th>sikya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spr.</td>
<td>Melone, i.e.</td>
<td>Gurke, i.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cucumis Melo L.</td>
<td>Cucumis sativus L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>Cucumis sativus L.</td>
<td>Cucurbita Pepo L.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we may note the comment of Sprengel in his Altona edition on H.P. VII. 1. 2 (which is echoed, more emphatically, in Hehn’s Kulturpflanze [7th edn., 1902], p. 310; see above, 0.08) and even by Schiemann (above, 0.06, p. 237):

Indessen ist es sehr schwer, mit Bestimmheit sich über diese Bedeutungen [i.e. of sikyos and kolokyntē, also sikyos pepōn (see above, 0.10 and 1.27)] zu erklären, da die Alten die Namen häufig verwechseln.

This was in 1822, and Sprengel went on to cite passages from Athenaeus, Dioscorides, Galen, and the Geoponica. Then, a century later, even as Schiemann was writing in 1932, the changes of name, apparent in quotations in Athenaeus and Galen from Diocles of Carystus and Speusippus, and in Theophrastus himself, were being exploited by Steier in the article “Melone” in the RE, bd. 29 (1931), cols. 562–67, in order to suggest that the sikya of Theophrastus might indeed be the Melon, Cucumis Melo, as in Fraas above. This is, of course, possible, but Steier nowhere refers to the still earlier and usual meaning of sikya as cupping-instrument (see above, 1.02) and in fact at col. 563 he is quite mistaken when he thinks that the phrase ῥι Ῥηγάλαι σικύα in the Hippocratean Corpus (Art. 48, Littre 4, p. 214) refers to a plant or the product of a plant (melon). He has failed to notice that the next word in the phrase is προσβελλομεναί, the regular term (see above, 1.02) for the attachment of a cupping-instrument. The truth seems to be (above 2.02) that the word sikya in the sense “cupping-instrument” was transferred from an arbitrary variant of sikyos which indicated a bottle-gourd of a certain shape, and that Theophrastus was careless in applying it, apparently, to a plant distinct from Lagenaria. For at C. P. 1. 10. 4 he speaks of the weakness in climbing of “the so-called sikya” (τῆς σικύας καλομένης), and here Einarson and Link, who follow Hort and LSJ in relating sikya to the bottle-gourd, comment on the oddity of the “so-called”: 
perhaps, they say, it was thought to be named from sikya, a cupping iron, although the cupping iron was actually named from the gourd. [2.06] All this was slippery business, but now that we have documentary evidence from the papyri that the gourds called sikya (see 2.02) and those called kolokyntai (2.03) were slightly different products of essentially the same plant (i.e. Lagenaria), I think it is safe to say that nothing in the prose writers before Athenaeus indicates that either of these names must refer to something else. With this in mind we can proceed to examine some of the contexts in Athenaeus which draw from the comic poets. We begin with one of the two which became proverbial (see above, 0.02). In his second book, p. 59 c, Athenaeus cites a line from Epicharmus (frg. 154, Kaibel): οὐγιώτερον θὴν ἐστὶ κολοκύντας πολύ. This is cited as a proverb by Zenobius (VI. 27), and we know from Demetrius On Style (De eloc. 127 and 162) that Sophron (frg. 34, Kaibel) had also used the expression in a comic exaggeration (hyperbole). Manuscripts vary with respect to the form of the comparative (οὐγιώτερ-, οὐγιώτερ-, or οὐγιέστ-) but the gender is regularly neuter, and we can probably set aside as too late and somehow confused the masculine form in which the Suda (Adler 3, 1945) under kolokyntē gives the proverb: κολοκυντής οὐγιέστερος. Lexicographers have attempted explanations based on Epicharmus, usually joining his expression with the other proverb. Thus Liddell and Scott (6th edn., 1869) say, under kolokynthē defined as the round gourd or pumpkin (see above, 0.10): “proverbially of health, from its fresh juicy nature (citing Epicharmus), as a lily was of death . . . (citing Diphilus).” LSJ, however, place the two proverbs under the κολοκύνθα ἀγρία of Dioscorides (IV. 76), which it rightly defines (see above, 1.02) as colocynth, Citrullus Colocynthis, explaining it as “symbolic of health, from its juicy nature, οὐγιώτερον κολοκύντας Epich. 154, Sophr. 34; as a lily was of death, ἡ κολοκύντην ἡ κρίνον living or dead, Diph. 98, cf. Men. 934.” The assignment of both proverbs under Colocynthis or Bitter Apple seems very strange, and in my next paragraph I will try to show that the second expression (from Diphilus and Menander) belongs under Lagenaria as usual, but I think the assignment of the first proverb is correct, though not exactly as a symbol of health. The Sicilian dramatists, especially Sophron who mimed everyday life, may have shown a mother urging a reluctant child to take a purgative or some bitter potion, and saying, “Drink this. It’s good for you, healthier than the plant kolokyntē.”

This of course would be long before Dioscorides, using the new form in short alpha, separated the species called ἀγρία from κολοκύνθα ἐδώμος (II. 134, Wellmann). See again my Figure 6 (Fuchs 212) for the small globular fruits of Coloquint or Bitter Apple.
Indeed, first because it was not the plant but the juice of the fruit of *Citrullus Colocynthis* which was so promotive of health, and secondly because the comparative degree of the adjective ὑγιῆς "healthy in all respects" is substituted for the comparative degree of ὑγιεινὸς "healthy for you, wholesome." But this substitution evidently took hold in the speech of comedy, for *LSJ* cite the expressions ὑγιειστερὸς ὑμφακὸς *Com. Adesp.* 910 and ὑγιειστερὸς κροτῶνος, *Men.* 318 (where Strabo, VI. 1. 12, had Ἐρώτωνος). Here ὑμφαξ is the unripe, bitter-tasting grape, and κροτῶν is the bush or tree, *Ricus communis*, from whose seeds our castor oil is prepared (see above, 1.12 and 1.31). But then Aelian, *Rust. Epist.* 10, combines the expressions of Menander and Sophrion, using the proper adjective: ὑγιεινότερος ἔσται κροτῶνος δὴπον καὶ κολοκύντης. Hercher (*Epist. Graeci*, p. 19) renders the first noun correctly as *ricinus* and the second as *cucurbita*, which is correct if we add Pliny's *silvestris* (see 1.02 above); and the reference is clearly to the wholesome purgatives derived from the two plants. But we end this paragraph by noting that Aelian's fictional farmer has been advising a friend to castrate an oversexed boar which has been a nuisance on his farm, and then, after explaining in some detail how he would treat the wounded animal and restore it to health and better behavior in the future, he inserts the comic expressions as above. But in this context ὑγιειστερὸς would have been the proper word! It would seem that Aelian was more interested in correcting the style of his predecessors than in the consistency of his own style.

[2.07] For the other proverb we have two full lines (Diphilus, *frg. 98*, Kock) preserved by Zenobius (IV. 18):

ἐν ἡμέραις αὐτῶν ἐπτὰ σοι, γέρων,
θέλω παρασχῶν ἡ κολοκύντην ἡ κρίνων.

The same contrast, ἢτοι κρίνων ἡ κολοκύντην, is said (*Prov. Coisl.* 253) to have been used by Menander and is counted by Kock as his *frg. 934*; compare Meineke's *frg. 1033*. The speaker in Diphilus appears to be a trusted servant or friend who had undertaken to accompany the elderly man's son on some dangerous mission and now promises to bring him back within seven days as (figuratively) either a κολοκύντη or a κρίνων. Since the paroemiographers (see also Diogenian. V. 10 and *Apostol.* VIII. 45) all refer to the ancient practice of arranging lilies over the dead (see, e.g., *Vergil, Aen.* VI. 883), so that the usually white lily (*Theophr.*, *H.P.* VI. 6. 8, *Theocr.* 11. 56) would symbolize death, it is reasonable to suppose that somehow the flower of the plant κολοκύντη here symbolizes life, and the expression means (see
LSJ above) "living or dead." I cannot explain how the symbolism arose, but it is pertinent to remember that the flower of the Lagenaria, alone among the cucurbits, was white. See above, note 42; and note that Whitaker and Davis (above, note 11), who use the name "White-Flowered Gourd" rather than the traditional "Bottle-Gourd," describe its flowers (p. 17) as "white, showy, and borne singly on very long peduncles that rise above the foliage." The long stem, which can be seen clearly in Fuchs' woodcut (his p. 211, my Figure 5), and the pretty white flower would invite comparison with the lily and make some sort of symbolic contrast almost inevitable.

[2.08] A few other passages in Greek literature make some positive contribution towards our conclusion that kolokynë usually denotes the "White-Flowered Gourd" known in Latin as cucurbita. Aristotle (Hist. animal. II, 591 a 16) says that among fish only the saupe or salp (η σάλπη) is captured with a gourd (θηρεύσαυ κολοκύνθη). D'Arcy Thompson in the Oxford Aristotle (4, 1910) suggests in his note that the gourd was not the bait, but a float used to support the line until the fish was exhausted. He refers to a modern authority on fishing, but he might have compared Columella's line (X. 388, cited above, 1.25) about the floats which help boys learn to swim. Martial's epigram about Atreus cucurbitarum (XI. 31, see above, 1.16) reveals the aristocratic Roman disdain for what they regarded as cheap food. The same attitude is expressed much later in an epigram (A. P. XI. 371) by Palladas, the gloomy schoolmaster of Alexandria and pagan contemporary of Jerome, who, I suspected (see above, 1.31), felt otherwise: cucurbitae were among the luxury foods which the plain clergy should avoid. But Palladas derides a wealthy host who desires to display his silver plate at a banquet but serves on it only poor fare, for which he uses a novel expression, βρότων τήν κολοκυθιάδα. Patton in the Loeb Anthology (1926) translated it "pumpkin pie," perhaps following Dyer's guidance in Hort's Theophrastus (1916) but also reflecting a similar disdain, which was affected, formerly at least, by the British in general, for a favorite American dish.

[2.09] Returning to the contexts in Athenaeus, we note some others which can be interpreted in terms of Lagenaria vulgaris (for nothing

\[51\] The ancient tradition (see the paroemiographers) focused primarily on τὸ τὴν κολοκύντης ἔθος, but rather as symbolizing τὰ ἀδηλὰ, since (they say) it was uncertain whether it would come up as far as a lily or would bear fruit. Only afterward do they continue with the arrangement of lilies over the dead, adding the quite unsupported assertion that the ancients also arranged the flowers of kolokynë over the healthy. This may be an inference from the other proverb, which has certainly influenced modern lexicographers.
prevents us; see above 2.06) rather than *Cucurbita maxima*; and in them we will find nothing very surprising or derogatory about the fruits that are indicated. The first of these is from the comic poet Hermippus (frg. 79, Kock): τὴν κεφαλὴν ὅσην ἔχει, ὅσην κολοκύντην. This was the first of several quotations by which Athenaeus showed (II, 59 c) that Attic writers used only the one word (*kolokýntē*) for all the varieties of gourd, some of which others called sikya (above 2.02). Many have seen in the notable size of this person’s head a reference to the large globular fruit which we call *pumpkin* and the Germans *Kürbis* (see, e.g., Weinreich cited in note 1 above), but of course the large pyriform bottle-gourd (see my Figure 4), viewed upside down, would fit the verbal picture here equally well and even better the famous picture of Pericles sketched by Cratinus (frg. 71, Kock, from Plut. *Pericl. 13*), “the squill-headed Zeus with the Odeum on his head.” In neither passage, moreover, is there any hint of ridicule for a large-headed man as being thereby empty-headed or stupid.

[2.10] Next after Hermippus, Athenaeus cites (59 c) a line from the comic poet Phrynichus (frg. 61, Kock): ἡ μακρὰ τι μικρῶν ἡ κολοκύντιον, noting that he uses the diminutive hypocoristically. In fact the context shows rather more affection for *kolokýntē*, as being a favorite comestible like *maza*, than any indication of size. Gulick translates “pumpkin,” but this could be a small fresh gourd or, perhaps, a slice of one, dried and smoked as described by Nicander (above, 2.04). The diminutive form *Kολοκύνθιον* was also applied as a nickname (*epiklēsis*) to a certain Theodotus who held high office in the court of Justinian (Procop. *Anecd. IX. 37*). This was cited by Weinreich among the passages in which there was a connotation of stupidity, but the diminutive may well have been affectionate and need mean no more than in Phrynichus—something as good as a barley-cake. There is another possibility, which I pass over quickly, that the long neck of the bottle-gourd (see Aristotle cited above, 2.02, and the smaller dangling gourd seen in the center of my Figure 8) was perceived as phallic in shape and may have led to the colloquial and obscene meaning which the word *colocynthia* evidently has in the sixth line of the Oxford fragment of Juvenal’s sixth satire, that is, a *vir membrosus* or *moechus*, according to Todd.

52 Compare the smaller grade (20 to a bundle) of *cucurbita = kolókυνθα* in Diocletian’s Edict, 6. 27 (above, 1.15). Lauffer in his notes cites a true diminutive from an account book, *P. Ryl. IV. 629. 166 (317–24 A.D.): kolokυνθων (br.) σ’."

55 In the third part of his article on the *Cucurbitaceae*, *Class. Quart. 37* (1943), 108–11. Todd rejects the evidence on certain ancient medical implements, made from the emptied necks of small dried gourds and certainly phallic in shape, which
Theodotus' nickname, it is not unknown for diminutives to be applied καρ' ἀυτίφασιν (compare Robin Hood's Little John) or for subordinates to boast, affectionately and proudly, of their leader's sexual prowess (compare the word of Caesar's soldiers for him, Suet. 51). And in any case, this has nothing to do with pumpkins.

[2.11] Lastly, we may examine the Aristophanic taunt (Nub. 327) λημᾶς κολοκύνταις, since Kilpatrick (above, note 2) has brought it up, interpreting the noun in the usual way as "pumpkins" and connecting it with Seneca's word apocolocyntosis. The phrase is colloquial exaggeration, like our "to weep buckets," since λημᾶ in the Hippocratic Corpus (Vet. med. 19, Progr. 2) denotes the humor or rheum that gathers in the corner of the eye (so LSJ, translating the phrase "to have one's eyes running pumpkins"). But the large pyriform bottle-gourds would fit the exaggeration just as well, and if we think of the urcei made from Pliny's cucurbitae (above, 1.26) or the κολοκυνθαρβτανα of the papyrus (above, 2.03), then they would fit perfectly both with our expression and with a proverb cited by Hesychius (Δ 862, Latte, 2, p. 593), which combines Lucian's phrase (C. Indoct. 23) χύτρας λημᾶν (cf. Diogenian. V. 63) with this of Aristophanes.

III. Apocolocyntosis Reconsidered

[3.01] The conclusion which we may draw from all these references in Greek literature from the fifth century b.c. through the fourth Christian century (and beyond) is that the fruits of the White-Flowered Gourd, whether called kolokynthai or sikyai, were very well known both as edible fruits and as the source from which various kinds of utensils could be made. No literary evidence shows that the fruits were what we call pumpkins or squashes,54 and only one proverbial expression (see 2.06) suggests that the word kolokyntë sometimes referred to the Bitter-Apple, classed by modern systematists as one of the Cucurbitaceae and containing in its juice a drastic purgative.

---

54 The rebuke given to the future emperor Hadrian (Dio, Epit. LXIX. 4: ἀπελθε καὶ τὰς κολοκύντας γράφει) has been understood (see Coffey, Lustrum, 6, 248) as referring to pumpkins, but nothing shows that it must be so interpreted, and it has been translated as "gourds." The same is to be said of the appearance of kolokynthai among other vegetables with swelling body (δύκας) whose meaning, when seen in dreams, is discussed by Artemidorus (l. 67).
The Bothwells (0.10 above) were led astray by the botanical definition in *LSJ* and by the equivalence in England of the words *pumpkin* and *gourd*. And Wasson was quite right (0.05) in asserting the view held by botanists of the American origin of the pumpkins and squashes.

[3.02] A few papyri from Egypt will bring the plant called κολόκυντα (or κολοκύντη) a little closer to Rome and the time of Seneca. In this respect the Zenon papyri, all of the third century B.C., are especially notable. At this time a plant called *kolokintha* was much cultivated in Egypt for its edible fruit, regarded as a vegetable (λάχανον): e.g. *kolokyntas* (*PSI* 6, 553.14), last in a long line of comestibles owned by Zenon in Arsinoë, preceded just above line 14 by a heading, λάχανα παντοδατά. Others of the Zenon papyri are brought to our notice by the article in *LSJ*: *PCair.* Zen. 292. 132 and 139 (seeds of *kolokynitē* handed out to Zenon’s peasants), 300. 3 (I am to report τοὺς περιτυκνότας σίκινον ἡ κολοκυνταν ἡ κρόμμινον), and especially 33. 14 (ἀμπέλων ... κολοκυνθ[υν]ης] in a list of fruit-trees and vines taken as a gift from the orchard of Lysimachus). While none of these is indicated specifically as *Lagenaria*, as the sikhai of the Sorbonne papyrus (above, 2.02) and the *kolokynthartha* of the *Pap.* *Iandanae* certainly are, they are at least significant in that the colocynthine vine would hardly produce a pumpkin (*Cucurbita maxima*), as *LSJ* would have it.

[3.03] And now, thanks to the great kindness of Professor Wilhelmina Jashemski of the University of Maryland, I can report positive evidence from the area of Naples, a region which, like Egypt, was familiar to Seneca, that the plant which botanists now call *Lagenaria siceraria* (Molina) Standley (see above, 0.08) was cultivated there in antiquity and that its fruits, which are still grown there and are popular as food, are depicted in at least two paintings on the walls of houses excavated at Herculaneum. Mrs. Jashemski, whose twenty years of research as historian and archaeologist on *The Gardens of Pompeii, Herculaneum, and the Villas Destroyed by Vesuvius* have recently been crowned by the publication (New Rochelle, N. Y. [Caratsas Bros.], 1980) of a magnificently planned and illustrated book titled as above, has allowed me to see and copy a color photograph taken by her husband Stanley in the summer of 1971. It is not included in the illustrations of her book, and cannot be satisfactorily reproduced here, but I can give a verbal description which has been checked both by Dr. Jashemski and her botanical assistant, Dr. F. G. Meyer of the National Arboretum in Washington, who for some years has been trying to help her identify all of the plants in carbonized material, wall-paintings, mosaics, and sculpture. Before doing this, it will be well to note that an earlier report on the plants seen in the paintings,
published by Dr. Orazio Comes in the 1879 commemorative volume,\textsuperscript{55} had mentioned some other \textit{Cucurbitaceae}, including \textit{Cucurbita Pepo} alongside several of \textit{Cucurbita lagenaria}. Drs. Jashemski and Meyer have not been able to locate any of these paintings either in the Museo Nazionale or in situ on the walls of houses, or in the many published collections of paintings and mosaics from that source. Dr. Meyer believes that all of them, called by Comes \textit{Zucca} and described as yellow or yellowish in color and in varying shapes which nevertheless agree well with those known from modern specimens, were varieties of \textit{Lagenaria}. In other words, none of the pictures listed by Comes can be used as evidence for the pre-Columbian existence in the Old World of \textit{Cucurbita Pepo} or \textit{Cucurbita maxima}.

[3.04] Both of the paintings still visible on walls at Herculaneum show small gourds, brownish or yellowish in color, standing in glass bowls, in company with other objects, as if ready for eating or cooking. The one of which I have a photograph is a panel on the south wall of the portico in the Casa di Cervi (IV. 21).\textsuperscript{56} Inside the glass bowl, vividly portrayed in three curving and high-lighted zones, which seems to stand on the lower shelf of a two-tiered open cabinet seen in illusory perspective as if fixed to the wall, there can be seen an elongated gourd with curved, narrow neck (which extends outside the wide mouth of the bowl) and slightly bulbous lower end, and another vegetable object, fully bulbous in shape, which props up the lower end of the gourd. To the left of the bowl are seen two more gourds apparently resting flat on the shelf, though deterioration of the wall and painting has obscured the lower left corner of the cabinet. Similar deterioration at the lower right corner makes it uncertain whether or not another globular object is to be seen there. A leaf is visible but unidentifiable. Drs. Jashemski and Meyer think that the globular object inside the bowl may be a pear, but they are sure that the two globular fruits shown on the upper shelf are cherries

\textsuperscript{55} See pp. 177–250 in \textit{Pompeii e la regione sotterrata del Vesuvio nell' anno LXXIX} (Napoli 1879). The article was also issued as a separate in 1879 and was noticed (not without some doubts as to the accuracy of its findings) by Candolle, Fischer-Benzon, and others; later a German translation, \textit{Darstellung der Pflanzen in den Malereien von Pompeji}, was published at Stuttgart in 1895 and was summarized by the expert botanist L. Wittmack in an article, pp. 38–66 in a Beiblatt, no. 73 (1903), to the \textit{Botanische Jahrbücher}, preceding his own report on the carbonized seeds and other remains of plants found at Pompeii and stored in the Museo Nazionale at Naples. Wittmack did not recognize any seeds of \textit{Cucurbitaceae}.

\textsuperscript{56} Dr. Jashemski locates the other one (in a letter dated Oct. 2, 1977) on a wall of the Samnite house (V 1–2). It "shows two gourds in a glass bowl. The gourds are brownish in color, but Fred agrees that they are \textit{Lagenaria}"
(because their stems are joined in this and similar paintings elsewhere),
despite the fact that they appear to be as large as the (?) pear below
them (since cherries are disproportionately large in numerous other
paintings). Dr. Meyer assured me in a letter dated March 17, 1976:

The plant [i.e. Lagenaria siceraria] is most certainly still cultivated in
Italy. In fact, it is a widely eaten vegetable in the Naples area. I saw
it grown in the environs of Pompeii, I have photographs of it, and
we had it served to us in our restaurant one day. The same plant is
cultivated in the U.S.A., but only as a curiosity.

He went on to tell of a snake-gourd six feet long which he was asked
to identify and later saw covering the lady's back fence; with this we
can compare Pliny's 9-foot cucurbita (see above, 1.07). And, he added,
"It is the only white-flowered gourd I know of, and on this character
alone, it is easily identified."

[3.05] It is well to be reminded here of the varied and sometimes
fantastic shapes of the gourds (fruits) of this plant, which must have
been familiar to Seneca and the Romans of his time, whether they
called it kolokyntē, as likely in the Greek-speaking areas of southern
Italy and Egypt, or cucurbita as elsewhere. According to Heiser in his
article, "Variation in the Bottle-Gourd" (see above, 1.20, and note 33),
the largest fruit produced in his experimental fields, which used
seeds procured from companies located in various parts of the world,
was of the pyriform type (from Ghana, but see Fuchs' cut p. 209 and
my Figure 4) and weighed 150 pounds (this from a letter to me
dated June 7, 1976), but there were snake types ("Variation," p.
123), cylindrical forms (see Fuchs' cut p. 211 and my Figure 5),
bottle types and others whose use as containers was known to
Columella, Pliny, and St. Jerome (above, 1.25) but is now dwindling
("Variation," p. 121) with the coming of tin cans, glass, and plastic. 57
The gourds that can be seen in the paintings at Herculaneum resemble
in shape the gourds that hang over Jonah's shoulder in my Figure
8, except that there is a more pronounced curve to the neck of the
one in the glass jar, but in size they must be considerably smaller,

57 Whitaker and Davis (above, note 11) describe (p. 5) the archaeological materials
found at Huaca Prieta on the coast of northern Peru and dated to the fourth
millennium B.C., as having been "used for containers of various sorts, e.g. work
baskets, water bottles, dippers, jars, dishes, etc. Many fragments were found that had
evidently been used as scoops or ladles. Some of the forms with long necks were
used as fish-net floats. Others were used as rattles for ceremonial purposes, and still
others were made into whistles." If one asks how the modern investigators knew
what the prehistoric gourds were used for, the answer must be from the uses to
which contemporary people put similar objects.
representing edible fruits whose rinds were still soft (see Pliny, *Nat. XIX. 71*, cited above, 1.26). And this shape and size may well have been responsible for the phallic impression which Todd (above, 2.10 and note 53) thought led to the obscenity of *colocyntha* in the Oxford fragment of Juvenal. It would also fit well with Wagenvoort’s specification (see above, 0.04) of the implement which in his theory replaced the radish in the traditional punishment of adulterers. And it would not be very different from the critical shape which we supposed (above, 2.02) led to the arbitrary variant of *sikyos* (i.e. cucumber) which was transferred to the implement called *sikya* in Greek; though it was the bulbous end of a small bottle-gourd (see Fuchs p. 209 and my Figure 4) which we compared (1.02) to the bronze cupping-instruments which Pliny and St. Jerome called *medicinales cucurbitae* because of their resemblance to the fruits of the plant (above, 1.03).

[3.06] Returning at last to Seneca’s coinage, I think we have shown that the word *kolokyntê* would mean to him and his readers, not the product of any plant, such as a pumpkin or *Riesenkürbis* or *Cucurbita maxima*, but primarily the plant itself, a species of *Lagenaria* which was very well known to them as an annual plant grown from seeds and cultivated in Italy as well as Greece for its food, for the medicinal value of the fruits and other parts of the plant, for the usefulness of the containers and other household goods which could be made from the dried and woody rinds of the fruit, for the aesthetic pleasure, even to the *populus minatus* of the city (see especially the moralizing passage in Pliny, *Nat. XIX. 51–59*), of watching a seed develop rapidly into a trailing or climbing plant with beautiful white flowers, and which, if it reached the top of a fence or trellis, would provide the further service of welcome shade in the summer. It was the manifold utility of this familiar plant, coupled with its very humble and ordinary status, which in my former essay\(^{58}\) I thought would apply, metaphorically at least, to the whole of the satire and especially to its end, the final degradation suffered by Claudius. Rejected by decree of the Olympian senate, he is escorted by Mercury back to Rome and then, eventfully, to the underworld. At length he is brought to the infernal bar and condemned by Aeacus to play at dice with a perforated

\(^{58}\) *Some points of Natural History in Seneca’s* *Apocolocyntosis,* pp. 181–92 in *Homenaje a Antonio Tovar* (Madrid 1972). Reviewing other hypotheses about the title, I had rejected Todd’s theory (in the second part of his article [pp. 103–08] in *Class. Quart. 37*, 1943) that Claudius was represented as a dice-box (*fritillus*) incarnate, on the grounds that this figure, though quite possible if we think with Todd of a small husk of *Lagenaria vulgaris*, is forgotten at the very end of the satire.
fritillus—a novel penalty obviously suggested by the myth of the Danaids but peculiarly fitting for Claudius. But Claudius has just begun to serve this sentence when in rapid succession (the point emphasized by Athanassakis, see above, 0.03) he is claimed by Caligula as a former imperial slave but then disowned and donated like a hot potato (as we would say) back to Aeacus, who gives him in turn to his freedman Menander (the Athenian dramatist?) to serve as his secretary for hearing lawsuits. This ending, I suggested, could symbolize the opinion held of Claudius during his lifetime by the senatorial aristocracy. He was industrious, learned (in a dull way) and decorative if somewhat undignified, and though capricious (like the fantastic shape of some of the gourds) still useful—but to the wrong people, the un-Roman rabble in the provinces, the newcomers in the city who were displacing the old aristocrats, and above all to the freedmen who were really his masters. Here Claudius was being made over, not really into a god (apotheosis) but into something like a bottle-gourd vine (apocolocyntosis), immortalized and perennial.

[3.07] This interpretation of the word as a figurative designation (i.e. the deified Claudius is like an immortal gourd-vine) will seem a bit feeble and lacking in satiric bite to those who believe, I think rightly, that Seneca’s motive for his merciless exposure of the physical peculiarities, as well as the weaknesses of the deceased emperor’s character, was quite personal. No doubt he desired to be avenged for the painful exile which Claudius had inflicted on him. This was well expressed in Wagenvoort’s interpretation (above, 0.04) of the title. But once we accept Dio’s word ὄνομάσας (0.01) as indicating a formal, written title for a work in which there is no actual transformation, it becomes necessary to look for something satiric or derogatory in the underlying κολοκύντη = cucurbita, as Eisenberg has done (0.02), and to set aside both the normal meanings of these words and the titles which are actually found in the manuscripts. I therefore suggest that apocolocyntosis was not the formal title, but an off-hand characterization uttered by Seneca somewhat later and in answer to a question (see above, 0.13), at a time when he was beginning to regret his flattery of Nero and to feel, once his old grudge had been satisfied, that Claudius had not been so bad after all. Seneca was soon to extol clementia as a moral virtue and he might have been transferring from books to men that quality which the younger Pliny (Epist. III. 5. 10) admired in his uncle: dicere etiam solesbat nullum esse librum tam malum ut non aliqua parte prodesset.
Editor's Note: The following items should be added to the list of Professor Heller's publications printed in *ICS* VIII (1983), pp. 168–72:

Figures 4 and 5. *Lagenaria vulgaris* Seringe. Fuchs, *Vivae Imagines* (1549), pages 209 and 211.
Figure 6. *Citrullus Colocynthis* (L.) Schrader. Fuchs, page 212.
Figure 7. *Cucumis Melo* L. Fuchs, page 405.
Figure 8. Jonah resting under the gourd-vine. Detail from an ivory book-cover in Ravenna. Rice, *Art of the Byzantine Era*, Figure 8; by permission of Hirmer Fotoarchiv, München.
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Longus and the Myth of Chloe

BRUCE D. MacQUEEN

It had been a very difficult night for the Methymnean expedition. True, they were laden with spoils, and they even had a captive: an uncommonly beautiful shepherdess named Chloe. But when they tried to rest for the night, scarcely a mile from the scene of their easy victory over the unarmed and unprepared Mytilenean shepherds, their sleep was disturbed by terrifying prodigies and portents. Daybreak brought no relief, and the entire army was on the verge of panic.¹ Then their general-in-chief, Bryaxis, fell suddenly asleep at midday; and when he awoke, his report was strange and unsettling. He had seen a vision of the god Pan, who had upbraided him for his and his soldiers’ depredations. To disturb the peace of Pan’s favorite pasturelands was bad enough, and worse to desecrate the grotto of the Nymphs; but the worst crime of all was to lay violent hands on Chloe, “παρθένον εξ ἂς Ἐρως μῦθον ποιήσαι θέλει.”² Pan’s orders to Bryaxis had been peremptory and unambiguous: on pain of instant annihilation, he was to release Chloe and all the livestock his army had seized. Bryaxis, still shaking from the vividness of his dream-vision, ordered that all these things be done as the god had commanded. And so it was that Chloe, accompanied by all the sheep and goats (whose horns had sprouted ivy in honor of the occasion),

¹ Pun intended.
² Longus, Daphnis and Chloe II. 27. All quotations from Longus are taken from the Teubner edition of M. D. Reeve (Leipzig 1982); further references will be incorporated into the text.
returned home unscathed, to the limitless delight of her lover, Daphnis, and the happy satisfaction of her family and neighbors.

Longus' \textit{Daphnis and Chloe}, unlike the other Greek romances,\(^3\) is not replete with vividly dramatic episodes, a fact which makes this scene, the abduction and rescue of Chloe, all the more striking. Nowhere else in all of \textit{Daphnis and Chloe} is the irony with which Longus handles the familiar conventions of the romance more obvious. Any reader of Chariton, or Heliodorus, or Achilles Tatius will at once recognize the familiar motif of the abducted heroine; but no sooner has Longus led us into this familiar territory than he confounds us by introducing a god to rescue Chloe, and by surrounding the narrative with patently Dionysian imagery.\(^4\) So striking indeed is the Dionysian flavor of this and other passages that some scholars (particularly Kerényi, Merkelbach, and Chalk) have taken the mysteries to be at the very core of \textit{Daphnis and Chloe}; that is, they have argued that the course of the two lovers' erotic education parallels or represents the experiences of an initiate into one or another of the mystery cults. But criticism on Longus has moved, by and large, in other directions, and the "initiation" thesis has found few new adherents in more recent years.\(^5\)

It is certainly not the central purpose of the present study to resuscitate (or, for that matter, to euthanize) the initiation thesis. But it seems to me that, in the process of moving beyond an obsession with mystical symbolism, at least one important clue to Longus'

\(^3\) I deliberately beg (or rather postpone) the question of whether or not \textit{Daphnis and Chloe} is a romance, not because I consider the matter unimportant, but rather because the issue transcends the scope of this article. See the discussions of the romance/novel problem by William E. McCulloh, \textit{Longus}, Twayne World Authors Series 96 (New York 1970), p. 22 and pp. 79–90; Arthur Heiserman, \textit{The Novel before the Novel} (Chicago 1977), p. 4 (including note 2 on page 221) and pp. 130–45; the second chapter of Ben Edwin Perry's \textit{The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins}, Sather Classical Lectures 37 (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1967); and J. W. Kestner, "Ekphrasis as Frame in Longus' \textit{Daphnis and Chloe}," \textit{Classical World} 67 (1973), p. 168.


\(^5\) For a detailed refutation of the initiation thesis, see M. Berti, "Sulla interpretazione mistica del romanzo di Longo," \textit{Studi Classici e Orientali} 16 (1967), 343–58; M. Geyer, "Roman und Mysterienritual," \textit{Würzberger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft} n. f. 3 (1977), pp. 179–96; and Heiserman, pp. 140–45. No one denies the presence of religious symbolism in \textit{Daphnis and Chloe}, but most critics now see this as ancillary to Longus' literary methods and goals.
intentions has been, if not left behind, at least excessively demystified. Pan, it will be recalled, tells Bryaxis in Book II that Eros wishes to make a μῦθος of Chloe. For Kerényi, Chalk, and the others, to make a μῦθος of Chloe is to make her an initiate. More recent scholarship has either reinterpreted the phrase παρθένον ἐξ Ἡς Ἑρως μῦθον ποιήσαι θέλει, or passed over it. To Heiserman, for example, the μῦθος of Chloe is the text of Daphnis and Chloe itself, which makes of μῦθον ποιήσαι a fairly sophisticated example of romantic irony. But I wish to argue here that the phrase means rather more than that; that it is, in fact, fully as programmatic as the initiation theorists supposed. Specifically, I hope to show here that Longus proceeds, in a very specific and traceable way, to make of Chloe, not an initiate, but rather, quite literally, a μῦθος.

The first step in the process of discovering what the μῦθος of Chloe really means is to make a connection that, to my knowledge, no previous study of Daphnis and Chloe has made. Few aspects of Longus' work have generated as much critical comment as the three αἰτία that appear at I. 27, II. 34, and III. 23. In each of the three stories (respectively, those of Phatta, Syrinx, and Echo), a mortal maiden or Nymph is transformed after a confrontation with some sort of male antagonist. Several things seem to be agreed upon by all: first, that these stories, though they appear to be digressive and are homologous to the learned digressions found in the other romances, are in fact closely bound to the development of the plot; that there is an increasing level of violence in the stories; and that Chloe is in some sense to be identified with all three "mythical" heroines. There has also been some recognition that all three αἰτία occupy similar structural positions in their respective books. But no one seems to have

---

6 See Chalk, p. 45.

7 See Heiserman, p. 138. "Romantic irony," as used here, means the calling into question, by the text itself, of that "willing suspension of disbelief" necessary to the operation of fiction, usually by a deliberate breaking or manipulation of the point of view. Despite the name, romantic irony (so called from its prevalence in the Romantic novels of early nineteenth-century Europe) is not commonly found in the other Greek romances, but it is definitely a salient feature of Longus' style. For the concept of romantic irony, I am indebted to a public lecture by Professor Lilian R. Furst, entitled "Irony and Romantic Irony," delivered on April 6, 1983, in West Lafayette, Indiana. For further discussion, see Prof. Furst's forthcoming book, Fictions of Romantic Irony.


9 See the articles by Deligiorgis and Kestner.
realized or developed the possibility that the phrase παρθένων ἐξ ἡς Ἐρως μῦθον ποιήσαι θέλει is a direct allusion to the three αἰτία. The implications of this perception for the interpretation of Daphnis and Chloe are, in my opinion, profound. My intention here is to work out those implications; more specifically, to show, by a close examination of the structure of Daphnis and Chloe, how Longus uses the replication of framing devices in Books I through III to create the μῦθος of Chloe in Book IV.

The analysis of narrative structure is fraught with peril for the incautious critic. A safe course must somehow be steered between the Scylla of imposing an a priori structural scheme on the text and the Charybdis of perversely refusing to see what is manifestly there. The present study attempts to find that safe course in an inductive, rather than deductive, approach. My contention is that Longus repeats certain groups of themes and images in essentially chiastic order, so that a kind of frame is created around each μῦθος: that is, ring composition. Certain of the correspondences out of which these rings are built are obvious; others become apparent only when the structure of surrounding rings invites us to look for correspondence. Some readers will certainly refuse to accept one or another of the correspondences I will list, and others will just as certainly find some that I seem to have omitted or overlooked. But the overall scheme is, I believe, sound enough that it does not stand or fall upon one or two correspondences.

Two further caveats seem to be in order. In no way do I mean to suggest that Longus' structure is a rigid or perfectly symmetrical one; those who might want geometrical or numerological precision and significance will be disappointed. Nor would I care to argue that the structural scheme I will outline here is anything more than a device. I am not a structuralist. In and of itself, it means nothing that Longus uses ring composition. Rather, the structure points to certain thematic relationships that a strictly linear, diachronic reading of Daphnis and Chloe might fail to reveal; and, in so doing, that structure gives us the key to the novel.

My procedure will be as follows: for each of the first three books, I will begin by presenting a schematic diagram of the ring that frames the μῦθος of that book. I will then proceed to briefly explain any of the correspondences listed in the diagram that are either especially
difficult or especially interesting. What we will see in Book IV is that the episode of Lampis' abduction of Chloe and her rescue by Gnathon is framed by the narrative in a way that is precisely parallel to the ring pattern established in the first three books. Once the narrative has thus suggested that we juxtapose that particular episode to the μυθοι of Books I–III, the significance of the second abduction and rescue of Chloe, which might easily be overlooked in all the excitement of the recognitions and reconciliations in Book IV, should become clear.

BOOK I

A. Chloe watches Daphnis bathe (24. 1).\(^{11}\)
B. Daphnis and Chloe play games (24. 2–3).
C. Daphnis teaches Chloe to play the pipe (24. 4).
D. The grasshopper is captured and sings (26. 1–2).
E. The myth of Phatta (27. 1–4).

D'. Daphnis is captured and cries out (28. 1–2).
C'. Dorcon teaches Chloe to play the pipe (29. 1–2).
B'. Daphnis and Chloe bury Dorcon (31. 2–3).
A'. Daphnis watches Chloe bathe (32. 1–4).

The beginning and ending of this ring are clearly marked by parallel incidents. At 24. 1, Chloe sees Daphnis taking a bath in the stream, and the sight of his naked body, which had earlier caused her to fall into that peculiar affliction of which she does not yet know the name, moves her with its beauty:

\[\eta\ \mu\epsilon\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \gamma\mu\mu\eta\nu\ \omicron\omega\alpha\kappa\ η\ \Delta\alpha\phi\nu\nu\ \epsilon\pi\ \alpha\theta\rho\omega\nu\ \epsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\pi\tau\tau\to\ \tau\ \kappa\alpha\lllos,\ \kappa\ai\ \epsilon\tau\kappa\kappa\tau\mu\nu\ \mu\pi\eta\delta\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\tau\tau\nu\ \mu\epsilon\mu\psi\alpha\sigma\theta\tau\alpha\iota\ \delta\nu\iota\kappa\mu\iota\eta\iota\ \ldots\]

At 32. 1, the situation is reversed, and Daphnis, for the first time, sees the perfection of Chloe's undraped form:

\[\kappa\ai\ \epsilon\alpha\tau\eta\ \tau\omicron\tau\omicron\ \pi\rho\\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\ \Delta\alpha\phi\nu\nu\delta\omicron\ \omicron\rho\omega\nt\omicron\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\sigma\alpha\ma,\ \lambda\epsilon\nu\kappa\nu\ \kappa\ai\ \kappa\alpha\theta\arg\omicron\ \\
\upsigma\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\lllos\ \kappa\ai\ \omicron\theta\iota\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\ \omicron\ \kappa\ai\ \omicron\omicron\delta\omicron\ \omicron\omicron\ \omicron\delta\omicron\ \omicron\omicơnumber

The connection between B and B' is admittedly tenuous; I have included it here because at 31. 3, Daphnis and Chloe place on the grave of Dorcon the garlands they had made at 24. 2.

The correspondence between the grasshopper’s intrusion (D) and

\(^{11}\) Arabic numerals in parentheses refer to the relevant passages of the text.
that of the pirates (D') may also seem tenuous, but becomes clearer if both passages are read carefully. Indeed, this correspondence is not original with me: Deligiorgis was the first to point out how the grasshopper and the pirates frame the αἰτίων of the wood dove (i.e. Phatta, Greek φάττα).\textsuperscript{12}

To the exegesis of the μυθος itself I have little to add.\textsuperscript{13} The maiden Phatta is confronted by a male antagonist; she vies with him, is overcome, and is then transformed by divine intervention into a bird, who continues to mourn her loss in her song. That Chloe is to be identified with this hapless girl is made abundantly clear by the way the story is introduced: ἕν παρθένος, παρθένε, οὕτω καλὴ καὶ ἐνεμε βοῦς πολλὰς οὔτως ἐν χλη... (I. 27. 2). As Deligiorgis has noted, the motif of cattle trained to obey musical commands, which is central to the αἰτίων, plays a prominent role in the narrative that follows; and the fact that Chloe rescues Daphnis by playing a certain tune upon the shepherd's pipe thus further identifies her with Phatta.\textsuperscript{14}

**BOOK II**

A. Pan keeps his promise (28. 1–3).

B. Daphnis and Chloe are reunited in the fields (30. 1).

C. A goat is sacrificed to Pan (31. 2).

D. Chloe sings and Daphnis plays (31. 3).

E. The old men brag about their youth (32. 3).

F. Daphnis and Chloe entreat Philetas to play (33. 1).

G. Tityrus is sent to fetch the pipe (33. 2).

H. The myth of Syrinx (34. 1–3).

G'. Tityrus returns with the pipe (35. 1).

F'. Philetas plays the pipes (35. 3).

E'. Dryas dances a Dionysiac dance (36. 1–2).

D'. Daphnis and Chloe dance the parts of Pan and Syrinx (37. 1–2).

C'. Philetas offers his pipe to Daphnis (37. 3).

B'. Daphnis and Chloe are reunited in the fields (38. 3).

A'. Daphnis and Chloe exchange oaths of fidelity (39. 1–6).

\textsuperscript{12} Deligiorgis, pp. 1–2.

\textsuperscript{13} See Philippides, pp. 195–96; Heiserman, p. 136; Chalk, p. 40.

\textsuperscript{14} Deligiorgis, p. 4.
The opening and closing of this ring are not so apparent as in Book I. Still, there are important connections between A and A'. Pan's intervention and rescue of Chloe is preceded and announced by the Nymphs, who appear to Daphnis in a dream, and assure him that Pan, despite the fact that Daphnis and Chloe have paid him no attention, will save Chloe.\(^{15}\) We have already seen how dramatically Pan keeps his promise. At 39. 1, however, Chloe alludes to the fickleness of Pan (θέος ὁ Πᾶν ἐρωτικός ἐστι καὶ ἀπιστος); and since Daphnis had already identified himself with Pan in the mimetic dance at 37. 1, Chloe feels justified in asking him to swear an oath of fidelity. At both A and A', then, the issue of male fidelity is raised. No resolution occurs here, however; indeed, Daphnis will, after a fashion, break his oath, and the consequences of his sexual infidelity, though not at all what one might expect, will prove to be profound.\(^{16}\)

Daphnis is a goatherd, and so the goat offered to Pan at 31. 2 in thanksgiving for Chloe's deliverance is "his" animal in a more or less totemic sense. The offering up of the goat to Pan (C) is answered by the transmission of potency, symbolized in Pan's instrument, the σύριγξ, to Daphnis.

The correspondence D–D' is based on the complementary roles played by the two lovers making music together.\(^{17}\)

At 32. 3 (E) and 36. 1 (E'), old men recall their youth. In the first instance, the old men of the vicinity exchange stories of their youthful exploits; in the latter, Dryas, Chloe's presumed father, dances the kind of dance no one expects an old man to do.\(^{18}\)

Others before now have noted that the αἴτιον of Syrinx introduces an element of violence—more specifically, the threat of rape—that is, or seems to be, missing from the Phatta story in Book I.\(^{19}\) The very explicit identification of Daphnis and Chloe with Pan and Syrinx at 37. 1 brings this threat to bear directly on Chloe. Chloe responds by demanding an oath of fidelity from Daphnis; but it is clear that she does not fully understand the nature of the threat that hangs over her. On one level, indeed, Chloe had already faced the threat of rape at the hands of the Methymneans.\(^{20}\) But her subsequent behavior gives no hint that she really knows any more now about

\(^{15}\) *Daphnis and Chloe* II. 23. 4.

\(^{16}\) See below.

\(^{17}\) This depends, of course, on our understanding "music" as broadly as the Greeks understood μουσική.

\(^{18}\) Dryas' dance reminds one of the absurd and almost pathetic behavior of the aged Cadmus and Tiresias in the first episode of Euripides' *Bacchae*.

\(^{19}\) Philippides, p. 196; McCulloh, pp. 65–66.

\(^{20}\) Philippides, *ibid*.
the sexual nature of male aggression than she knew before. Otherwise, much of what follows in *Daphnis and Chloe* would have little point.

**BOOK III**

A. The rams pursue the ewes (13. 1).

B. Daphnis and Chloe try to consummate their relationship (14. 1).

C. Lykainion asks Daphnis for help (16. 1–4).

D. Lykainion propositions Daphnis (17. 1–3).

E. Lykainion teaches Daphnis a lesson (18. 3).

F. Lykainion explains why Daphnis should not yet apply the lesson he has learned (19. 2–3).

G. Daphnis decides not to use his knowledge on Chloe (20. 2).

H. A ship sails by, carrying fresh fish for the tables of the rich in Mytilene (21. 1–4).

I. Daphnis knows what an echo is, but Chloe does not (22. 1).

J. Daphnis tries to learn the tunes (22. 1).

K. Chloe hears the echoes (22. 2).

L. Chloe promises ten kisses (22. 4).

M. The myth of Echo (23. 1–5).

L'. Chloe pays her debt (23. 5).

K'. Daphnis' voice echoes (23. 5).

J'. Daphnis practices piping (24. 2).

I'. Daphnis knows how to consummate their relationship, but Chloe does not (24. 3).

H'. Suitors come for Chloe, bearing rich gifts (25. 1).

G'. Dryas stalls the suitors (25. 3).

F'. Myrtale explains why Daphnis cannot marry Chloe yet (26. 4).

E'. The Nymphs appear to Daphnis and give him instructions (27. 2).

D'. Daphnis asks for Chloe's hand in marriage (29. 2).
C'. Dryas goes to ask Lamon and Myrtale to allow the marriage (30. 2).

B'. Daphnis acts like a husband (33. 1–3).

A'. Daphnis fetches the apple, over Chloe's objections (34. 1).

The correspondence A–A' depends upon our perception of the sexual overtones of the scene at 34. 1, wherein Daphnis fetches an apple from the very top of a tree and brings it down to Chloe—who, it should be noted, would rather he had not. Both the description of the apple (καὶ ἐν μῆλον ἐπέκειτο ἐν αὐτοῖς ἄκροις ἀκρότατον, μέγα καὶ καλὸν καὶ τῶν πολλῶν τὴν εἰνωθεὶν ἐνίκα μόνον . . . III. 33. 4) and Chloe's attempt to prevent Daphnis from plucking it are reminiscent of a fragment of Sappho's:

οὗν τὸ γλυκύμαλων ἐρέθεται ἄκρω ἐπ' ἕσσῳ,

ἄκρων ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ, λελάθοντο δὲ μαλαδρότης,

οὐ μὲν ἐκλελάθειτ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔδύνατη ἐπίκειθαι.\textsuperscript{21}

At both A and A', then, males are in pursuit of females.

The correspondence B–B' is suggested by the contrast between the ignorance and ineptness Daphnis displays at 14. 1, and the self-aware confidence of his conduct at 33. 1.

Deligiorgis was the first to point out the correspondence H–H'.\textsuperscript{22} Twice already men have come from the sea to plunder, pillage, and kidnap; indeed, the sea seems to have no other symbolic function in Daphnis and Chloe than to import trouble. This particular ship may seem to pose no threat to the lovers' tranquillity; but it is not long before suitors come to Dryas for Chloe's hand, and the threat of separation adumbrated by the ship at 21. 1 becomes real. This correspondence is further strengthened by the contrast struck in both passages between Daphnis' servile status and the wealth of his real or potential rivals.

Both I and I' develop a theme that dominates the psychological development of Daphnis and Chloe after Daphnis' encounter with Lykainion at 18. 3.\textsuperscript{23} In both passages, Daphnis knows something that Chloe does not. In fact, the kind of essential equality that existed between them before has been disrupted by Daphnis' initiation, guided

\textsuperscript{21} Fr. 105a (Lobel–Page). The resemblance is noted by McCulloh, pp. 75–76; Philippides, p. 197; and others.

\textsuperscript{22} Deligiorgis, pp. 3–4.

\textsuperscript{23} See D. N. Levin, "The Pivotal Role of Longus' Daphnis and Chloe," Rivista di Studi Classici 25 (1977), pp. 5–17; Chalk, p. 44, seems to understand Lykainion's function, but not the effect her lessons have on the relationship between Daphnis and Chloe. See also McCulloh, p. 67.
by Lykainion, into the mysteries of sexuality. The superior knowledge that Daphnis displays at I and I' reflects the knowledge of sex he has chosen, temporarily, to conceal.

The immediate frame for the myth of Echo in Book III is very similar to the framing of the Syrinx story in Book II: in both instances, someone makes a promise before the story is told and fulfills it afterward.

The σπαραγμός of Echo is the most violent by far of the three αἵτια. As Chalk and others have noted, Longus' version of the myth of Echo, which is utterly different from the more familiar Ovidian version, resembles the σπαραγμοὶ of Orpheus or Zagreus. That Chloe is to be identified with Echo in some sense is made clear in several ways: first, she has already been identified with the heroines of the first two αἵτια, Phatta and Syrinx; secondly, Echo, like Chloe, τρέφεται ὑπὸ Νυμφών . . . (23.1); and finally, the bloodshed of the σπαραγμός recalls Lykainion's admonition that Chloe, being a virgin, will cry out and bleed (19. 2–3). All this could easily lead us into a psychoanalytical jungle from which we might not easily extricate ourselves; and indeed, it is not the purpose of the present study to work all this out. Suffice it to say, that Chloe is admonished by this story (and, implicitly, by its teller) to yield her virginity gracefully when the proper time comes.

And this leads, finally, to Book IV and the μῦθος of Chloe:

BOOK IV

A. Chloe flees to the woods in fear (14. 1).

B. Daphnis looks like Apollo tending Laomedon's sheep (14. 2).

C. Daphnis and Chloe feast together (15. 4).

D. Daphnis is promised to Gnatho (17. 1–19. 2).

E. Astylus fetches Daphnis and presents him to his father; he is richly dressed for the first time (20).

F. Dionysophanes tells how he came to expose Daphnis (24. 1–4).

G. Rumor reports that Dionysophanes had found a son (25. 3).

H. Daphnis dedicates his pastoralia (26. 2–4).

I. The myth of Chloe (27. 1–32. 2).

24 Chalk, p. 42; Deligiorgis, pp. 3–4; McCulloh, p. 66.
H'. Chloe dedicates her *pastoralia* (32. 3–4).

G'. Mytilene rejoices that Dionysophanes has found a son (33. 3).

F'. Megacles tells how he came to expose Chloe (35. 1–5).

E'. Chloe is fetched and presented to Megacles, dressed in fine clothes for the first time (36. 1–3).

D'. Chloe is given to Daphnis in marriage (37. 1–2).

C'. Daphnis and Chloe feast together (38. 1).

B'. A temple is built to Eros the Shepherd (39. 2).

A'. Chloe learns the lesson (40. 1–3).

It was to be expected, and should now be apparent, that the pattern of concentric rings established in Books I through III is carried through here into Book IV. Once again, Longus uses paired motifs and images to convert a linear, diachronic narrative into a synchronic frame. The ring begins and ends, as it should, with Chloe. At 14. 1, she flees to the woods in an excess of childish, maidenly fear at the advent of such an important personage as Dionysophanes. At 40. 1–3, however, she learns at last ὅτι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης γενόμενα ἕν ποιμένων παίγνια.

The correspondence B–B' is based on the image of a divinity in an unusual guise. At 14. 2, Longus alludes to the well-known story of Apollo tending Laomedon's sheep; the whole point of the story is the incongruity of the God of Light serving as a shepherd. At 39. 2, we encounter another divinity who is almost as unlikely a shepherd as Apollo: Eros. The contrast between the pederastic "marriage" contemplated by Gnathon, which indeed precipitates the dénouement of *Daphnis and Chloe*, and the long-awaited marriage of the two young lovers at 37. 1, which is the fulfillment of the plot, is an important one. Eros always has two sides, two natures: one fertile and benevolent, the other appetitive and brutish. It may well be that Longus' final statement about Eros is that human happiness depends upon the channeling of the power of Eros into constructive, perhaps


26 Note also the incongruity of Pan the Soldier.

27 Chalk, pp. 46 and 51; Heiserman, pp. 141–42.
(pro)creative, outlets. In this connection, it may be of importance that Gnathon later redeems himself by rescuing Chloe from the clutches of Lampis.

Nothing, to my mind, makes Longus’ penchant for the chiastic arrangement of narrative details more obvious than the sequence EF–F'E'. At 23. 2, Daphnis, now dressed as the young nobleman he has been discovered to be, is presented to his new-found father, Dionysophanes; chapter 24 consists of the latter’s account of how he had come to expose his infant son. But the sequence of narrative and presentation is exactly reversed in the case of Chloe: Megacles tells the assembled company (at 35. 1–5) how he, too, had once been compelled to expose a child; only when his story is over, however, is that child, Chloe, presented to her real father (36. 1). Like Daphnis, before, she is now seen resplendent in the rich dress of the class to which she was born.

In Books I through III, the immediate frame of the μῦθος has been rather obvious. Any reader who has caught on to Longus’ methods cannot fail to notice the careful parallelism of the events narrated at H and H': εὗτος ὁ Δάφνις συναθροίσας πάντα τὰ ποιμενικὰ κτήματα διένεμεν ἀναθήματα τοῖς θεοῖς . . . (26. 2); . . . καὶ ἀνετίθει καὶ Χλοὴ τὰ ἑαυτῆς . . . (32. 3). And it is precisely the carefulness of that pairing that isolates and defines the aitiov of Book IV: the μῦθος of Chloe. For if we assume that the correspondence H–H' is the immediate frame, then the portion of the text that intervenes is in the precise structural position in Book IV occupied by the aitia of Phatta, Syrinx, and Echo in Books I–III. This observation virtually demands that the passage 27. 1–32. 2 be set into juxtaposition to those aitia. Such a juxtaposition produces some remarkable results:

1. In Books I–III, the aitiov centers on a young unmarried woman; Phatta is a shepherdess, and Syrinx and Echo are nymphs. Chloe is a young unmarried woman, a shepherdess who, as an infant, was found in a grotto sacred to the Nymphs, and who has clearly been under their special protection.

2. In Books I–III, the female protagonist is threatened by a male antagonist. Phatta is confronted by a young boy who sings more sweetly than she does, while the two nymphs are both pursued.

28 Chalk, p. 51; Philippides, p. 199; Mittelstadt, “Love, Eros,” pp. 320–32. Like Heiserman, p. 131, I do not find Longus’ ideas about Eros especially original or profound; unlike him, however, I do not believe that a concern with “ideas” as such informs Daphnis and Chloe, for reasons that will become apparent.

29 See Deligiorgis, whose remarks on framing adumbrate much of the present discussion.
by Pan. Chloe is abducted by the brutish Lampis, a disappointed suitor.

3. In Books I–III, there is a moment when all seems lost, and the male aggressor is on the point of victory. The anonymous shepherd boy in Book I enjoys unalloyed victory, but Pan is ultimately disappointed in his hopes; similarly, Lampis seems about to gain his prize when Gnathon, quite unexpectedly, redeems himself by saving Chloe.

4. The female protagonists in Books I–III are all transformed as a result of their various encounters with male aggression. All three become "musical"—they make pleasing sounds. All are common, not to say ubiquitous, natural phenomena. The transformation of Chloe is somewhat more complex. Dryas, Chloe’s presumed father, is motivated by her abduction to present the γυνηρίσματα he had found with her when she was a baby; her true identity remains a mystery, but it is clear that she is no shepherd’s daughter. The last obstacle to her marriage to Daphnis has been removed, and the nature of her “musical” transformation is revealed. She will become a wife.

All this seems to suggest that a γυνη is somehow to be compared to a dove, a reed pipe, or an echo. The point of connection, it seems to me, is music, or, more specifically, the delight induced by music. As noted above, all three transformed maidens become sources of sweet sounds, and it is precisely through their confrontations with male aggression that they become so. Chloe, as a result of her particular confrontation with male aggression, becomes a married woman, a wife, whose primary function in life (at that time and place) will be to please her husband. To Daphnis, then, she is a κτῆμα τερπνόν. Put baldly:

wife : husband :: music : hearer

That a Greek wife was her husband’s κτῆμα, an asset to be possessed, would be a self-evident truth to any ancient Greek audience. That the marks of her excellence would be the delight she gave her husband is less obvious; indeed, such an assumption might seem to rest on shaky ground. Even a passing reference to Pomeroy’s well-

50 Deligiorgis, p. 6.

51 Recent experience has taught me that a disclaimer of sorts may well be necessary here. Whether or not one approves of the view of marriage and the role of wives here ascribed to Longus, such a view is entirely consonant with the prevailing attitudes in antiquity on this matter. Those who are offended by all this have a quarrel with Longus, not with me.
known book on the role of women in ancient Greece will suggest that a wife, even a "good" wife, was not necessarily expected to give erotic pleasure to her husband, who would presumably look elsewhere for that.\textsuperscript{32} But, as Mittelstadt points out, by the second century of our era new ideas were emerging.\textsuperscript{33} The other Greek romances had long since set the pattern of erotic attraction culminating in marriage. So Longus cannot really be credited with any fundamentally new vision of marriage.

But there is still something quite new about the μύθος of Chloe, the building of a narrative around the transformation of a girl from παρθένος to γυνή. It has already been suggested by others that Longus dwells upon precisely that aspect of erotic development so much taken for granted by the other romances: the flowering of attraction into erotic passion.\textsuperscript{34} What is prelude in most of the other romances has here become the primary theme. Thus marriage is not \textit{(pace Chalk et al.)} a metaphor for initiation, but rather the reverse: initiation is a metaphor for marriage. The evocations of and allusions to the mysteries that pervade \textit{Daphnis and Chloe} are, structurally and thematically, subservient to the theme of marriage.

This is not to say, however, that the final significance of the μύθος of Chloe lies in the transformation that marriage represents. Marriage is not the "privileged layer" of interpretation, but rather points beyond itself to the theme with which, I would contend, \textit{Daphnis and Chloe} is most closely concerned: the theme of literature. For the κτήμα τερπνόν that Longus promises in the Prologue and delivers in Book IV is not a wife for Daphnis, but a novel for us, the readers.

\ldots \text{τέσσαρες βιβλίους ἔξεποντας ἄναθημα μὲν "Ερωτι καὶ Νύμφας καὶ Παινί, κτήμα δὲ τερπνὸν πάσον ἀνθρώπων, δὲ καὶ νοσοῦντα ἀκαίρετα, καὶ λυπούμενον παραμυθήσεται, τὸν ἔρασθέντα ἀναμνῆσαι, τὸν οὐκ ἔρασθέντα προσαφέως.} (Prologue 3)

Another member, then must be added to the earlier analogy:

music : hearer :: wife : husband :: story : reader

What binds together music, wife, and story is the figure of Chloe: a wife-to-be, who is identified with a series of musical maidens, and becomes a μύθος.

One of the great problems for any writer of narrative in antiquity was the problem of validation. Ancient readers were simply not prepared to accept out-and-out fiction; only in comedy did an author


\textsuperscript{33} Mittelstadt, "Love, Eros," pp. 305 ff.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.
enjoy any sort of freedom in contriving a plot. For the Roman comic poets, who clearly felt compelled to follow plot lines borrowed from the Greeks, even that freedom was, if not denied, at least abridged. And when prose fiction first began to appear in the Greco-Roman world, it did so rather fearfully and quite tentatively at first. In the “Ninus Fragment,” we see traces of a fictional plot, but the story, oddly, is built around well-known mythological characters. The first romance to survive intact, Chariton’s Chaireas and Kallirhoe, purports to be a “true” story, and the heroine is made out to be the daughter of the Syracusan στρατηγός Hermocrates. Achilles Tatius’ Leukippe and Kleitophon is a first person narrative, ostensibly told to the authorial persona by Kleitophon. One might argue that Longus, too, feels compelled to find some external point of reference in order to validate his narrative. His work is presented as an extended ἔκφρασις; and there is also the ἐξηγητής consulted, the Prologue says, by the author. But the fact remains that Longus, in the Prologue, clearly represents his work as his own creation—ἐξεσωμησάμην, he says, “finxi.” The story derives its validation, not from any mythical or historical (or pseudohistorical) datum, but from itself, from its own construction. In fact, the whole structure I have described above shows that Longus has chosen to make his own myth. Whatever we may think of the result, the fact remains that mythopoesis (or, to be more precise, the separation of mythopoesis from tradition) is the essence of that newness which the term “novel” connotes, and constitutes an essential beginning for the conception of fiction.

What the μῦθος of Chloe finally means, then, is the emancipation of fiction. The judgment of McCulloh, that Daphnis and Chloe is “the last great creation in pagan Greek literature,” takes on a deeper significance perhaps unsuspected by McCulloh. The great writers of both Greek and Roman literature derive their power, then and now, from their ability to evoke from their respective cultural traditions a voice that speaks to and from the collective psyche, which is embodied in that tradition. When Longus, in Greek, and Apuleius, in Latin, almost simultaneously develop the project of writing narratives that are not derivative from tradition, we are clearly standing at the threshold of a new era.

It is, then, precisely in the manner of its formation that the significance of the μῦθος of Chloe lies. There is conscious irony in Pan’s telling Bryaxis that Eros will make a μῦθος of Chloe. For it is

55 I leave aside the issue of contaminatio, which would not be an issue if the observation just made were not sound.
56 McCulloh, p. 15.
indeed Eros, within the fictive frame of reference, who controls the action, but it is Longus who has made the μῦθος. Chloe becomes the wife of Daphnis, but it is we, the readers, who have the κτήμα τερπνόν, which is *Daphnis and Chloe* itself. When we see further how Longus has used three "myths" (in the ordinary sense) to make a fourth of his own creation, we begin to see how and why Longus, far from immersing us in a story, maintains a certain distance from it all. He does not hide his brush strokes, because that would defeat his purpose. What we are really seeing is not a simple tale of incredibly simple children, but the very act of literary creation, and the genesis of fiction.

*Purdue University*
Chariton and Coptic

GERALD M. BROWNE

Knowledge of Coptic, its linguistic analysis and the literature that survives in it, furthers our understanding of two passages in Chariton, removing the need to tamper with the text of the first, and supporting emendation of the second.

(1) 7. 5. 5 (p. 105. 4 Blake) οὗτη δὲ ἥν ἡ ῶλιρόν ἀπαντήσασα πρώτη Περσίδων.

Cobet proposed insertion of ή, paleographically easy but linguistically unnecessary. The pattern of expression, ἥν . . . ἀπαντήσασα, invites comparison with that studied by H. B. Rosen, “Die ‘zweiten’ Tempora des Griechischen: Zum Prädikatsausdruck beim griechischen Verbum,” Museum Helveticum 14 (1957), pp. 133–54. Thanks to the efforts of H. J. Polotsky, whose work serves as the basis for Rosén’s investigation, we know that Coptic employs two special constructions in order to give prominence to an element of a sentence other than its verb; the choice between these constructions depends on whether the emphasis is on an adverbial phrase (resulting in a so-called “second

1 W. E. Blake, Charitonis Aphrodisiensis de Chaerea et Callirhoe amatoriarum narrationum libri octo (Oxford 1938).

2 See especially Études de syntaxe copte (Cairo 1944), of which pp. 20–96 deal with “les temps seconds” and include a sketch of the cleft sentence (57–65). Polotsky expanded his treatment of the latter in “Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Kopptischen,” Orientalia 31 (1962), 413–30, which appeared after Rosén’s article. Both of Polotsky’s studies are reprinted in his Collected Papers (Jerusalem 1971), pp. 102–207 and 418–35, respectively.
tense") or on a subject or object (resulting in a cleft sentence). Thus, if in the hypothetical utterance

\[ \text{πρώμε οὔνη 2Ν ηη1} \]

The-man stays in-the-house

special prominence is to be given to the adverbial phrase, the following transformation appears:

\[ \epsilonρε \text{πρώμε οὔνη 2Ν ηη1} \]

The-fact-that-(is) in-the-house the-man-stays

I.e. It is in the house that the man stays (Second Tense)

If, in the same utterance, the emphasis falls upon the subject, a different construction is used:

\[ \text{πρώμε π(ε) ετούνη 2Ν ηη1} \rightarrow \text{πρώμε πετούνη 2Ν ηη1} \]

The-man-is who-stays in-the-house

I.e. It is the man who stays in the house (Cleft Sentence)

Rosén shows convincingly that Ancient Greek too has a means of shifting emphasis away from the verb (apart from use of particles and modification of word-order), viz. replacement of the verb with a periphrasis involving εἰμι and a participle. E.g. ὁ ἄνθρωπος μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ may be converted into ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐστι μένων ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, which can mean either "it is in the house that the man stays" (cf. Herodotus4 I. 146. 3 ταῦτα δὲ ἢν γνώμενα ἐν Μιλήτῳ "it was at Miletus that these events took place")\(^5\) or "it is the man who stays in the house" (cf. III. 63. 4 οἱ μάγοι εἰσὶ τοι ἐπανεστῶτες "ce sont les mages, qui se sont soulevés contre toi")\(^6\). Regarding this second Herodotean passage, Rosén writes: "der von den Herausgebern gemachte Zusatz von \(\langle\text{o}\rangle\) nach \(\text{τοι}\) ist also [i.e. after a list of similar passages] nicht angebracht" (147). The structural similarity between \(\text{oι \ μάγοι εἰσὶ τοι ἐπανεστῶτες}\) and \(\alphaὐτὴ δὲ \ ήν \ Καλλιρόη ἀπαντήςασα\) in Charton is striking, and the latter passage no more requires \(\langle\text{η}\rangle\) after \(\text{ἡ}\) than

---

3 For numerous examples of both second tenses and cleft sentences in Coptic, see the studies of Polotsky cited in the preceding note, and see also notes 4 and 7 below.

4 Rosén concentrates on Herodotus, but on pp. 151–53 he suggests that his observations apply to Ancient Greek in general; cf. also Acts 25:10 ἵστῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος; Καῖσαρός εἰμι, rendered in Coptic as

\[ \epsilonίαςἐρατ 21 \ \piβημα \ ήππρο \]

"it is at the court of Caesar that I stand" (see Polotsky, Études, p. 44); for ἵστῳ ... εἰμι note Rosén's remark "dass ... kein Zwang besteht, die beiden Komponenten der zusammengesetzten Form zu juxtoponieren. Auch die Ordnung der Komponenten ist beliebig" (p. 137). See also note 7 below.

5 Rosén, p. 146; the translation is by Rawlinson (Rosén, p. 141).

6 Rosén, p. 147; the translation is by Legrand (Rosén, p. 141).
does the former need τοι (οι). For Chariton’s usage elsewhere, note especially 8. 6. 9 (p. 122. 5) αὐτὸς γὰρ ἦν πεπιστευμένος τῶν ἄλλων στόλων ἀπὸ Κύπρου.7

(2) 7. 5. 9 (p. 105. 22–23) καὶ εἴθυς ἐγένος ἐγένετο ὁ λόγος.

Hercher conjectured ἐγένετο for the manuscript reading ἐγένετο. A precise parallel in support of ἐγένετο appears in the Coptic Gnostic Treatise On the Origin of the World (Nag Hammadi Codex II 116. 3–4):

\[ \text{ΠΤΕΥΝΟΥ ΑΠΕΕΩΔΑΧΕ ΑΨΗΝ ΠΟΥΕΡΓΟΝ} \]

immediately her word became a deed.

The use of Perfect I in Coptic shows that its Vorlage had ἐγένετο; ἐγένετο would have resulted in

\[ \text{ΠΤΕΥΝΟΥ ΝΕΡΕΕΕΩΔΑΧΕ ΑΨΗΝ ΠΟΥΕΡΓΟΝ} \].8

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

7 Cf. also St. Athanasius, Vita Antonii (Migne, PG 26 [1887] 912 A 14–15) ὁ δὲ κύρος ἦν αὐτῶν φυλάττων, which the excellent Coptic translation (for which see my article in Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 12 [1971], pp. 59–64) renders as a cleft sentence:

\[ \text{ΠΧΟΕΙΤ ΑΕ ΠΕΝΤΑΑΡΕΣ ΕΡΟΙ} \]

“and it was the Lord who guarded him” (G. Garitte, S. Antonii vitae versio sahidica, CSCO 117, Scrip. capt. 4. 1 [1949], 53. 14–15).

Until recently the biblical poetry of late antiquity has received little attention from scholars. The major reason for this neglect has been

1 A number of monographs on individual authors appeared around the turn of the century—mostly on the problems of the biblical text forms used or the imitation of pagan poets—but with one exception—a largely descriptive work on the Genesis paraphrases (Stanislas Gamber, Le livre de la Genèse dans la poésie latine au Vᵉ siècle [Paris 1899])—no work of synthesis was produced. Only recently have a number of works begun to supply this need. Two German studies deserve special mention, Klaus Thraede’s article on the “Epos” in the Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum 5 (Stuttgart 1962), cols. 983–1042, and Reinhart Herzog’s Die Bibelepik der lateinischen Spätantike: Formgeschichte einer erbaulichen Gattung, of which at the time of writing only volume one has appeared (Munich 1975), dealing with Proba, Juvenecus, the Heptateuch paraphrase and Paulinus, C. 6. Jacques Fontaine’s Naissance de la poésie dans l’occident chrétien: esquisse d’une histoire de la poésie chrétienne du IIIᵉ au VIᵉ siècle (Paris 1981) contains a chapter on Juvenecus, pp. 67–80, and a survey of the other biblical poets, pp. 241–64. For the Old Testament paraphrases a pair of articles by Kurt Smolak should be mentioned: “Lateinische Umdichtungen des biblischen Schöpfungsberichtes” in Studia Patristica, vol. 12, Papers Presented to the Sixth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1971, pt. 1, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 115 (Berlin 1975), pp. 350–60, and “Die Stellung der Hexamerondichtung des Dracontius (laud. dei 1, 118–426) innerhalb der lateinischen Genesispoesie,” in Antidosis: Festschrift für Walther Kraus zum 70. Geburtstag (Vienna 1972), pp. 381–97. More summary treatments are contained in J. M. Evans, Paradise Lost and the Genesis Tradition (Oxford 1968), pp. 107–42; Charles Witke, Numen Litterarum: The Old and the New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great, Mittel lateinische Studien und Texte 5 (Leiden 1971), pp. 145–232, and Dieter Kartschoke, Bibeldichtung: Studien zur Geschichte der epischen Bibelparaphrase von Juvenecus bis Otfrid von Weissenburg (Munich 1975), pp. 15–123. In addition, a number of more
aesthetic: the perceived opposition between the form of the poems, derived as it is from pagan epic, and their biblical content; form and content have been felt to be in irreconcilable conflict. But, in fact, this blend of Christian and classical was very much in accordance with contemporary taste. In this respect the biblical poems are typical of much of the literature of late antiquity. To appreciate the poems properly, therefore, they must be seen against the intellectual background of the time, not in the light of aesthetic preconceptions derived from the study of classical literature or the biblical original. Such an open-minded approach is likely to be doubly fruitful. Scholarship, by concentrating on the interplay between Christian and classical in the biblical poems, can hope to learn much about the reception of the classical tradition in the Christian West, and at the same time introduce some light and shade into the almost uniformly dark picture of the biblical epic that has hitherto been presented. The present article draws attention to a group of passages in the Old Testament poems which illustrate their twofold inspiration (classical and Christian).

The passages in question are Claudius Marius Victorius, Alethia 2.

specialized studies by German, Dutch, and Italian scholars have contributed to the understanding of individual works.

The present article elaborates on remarks made in my Ph.D. dissertation, The Hexameter Paraphrase in Late Antiquity: Origins and Applications to Biblical Texts (Urbana 1978), pp. 322–23. In the present article I have preferred the term “first sighting” theme to “distant views” theme, as being more accurate, if less suggestive. A revised version of the dissertation has recently been published; Roberts, Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity, ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 16 (Liverpool 1985), but it omits the pages which deal with the “first sighting” theme.

Cf. the references collected and discussed by Herzog, pp. 1x–lxv. Domenico Comparetti, Vergil in the Middle Ages, trans. E. F. M. Benecke (2nd ed. 1908; repr. Hamden, Conn. 1966), pp. 158 and 160, expresses with unusual clarity the traditional attitude of scholars to these poems: “Christianity was never at its ease when arrayed in the forms of ancient poetical art, and the ability of its various poets could never do more than slightly diminish the strangeness of its appearance. Not unfrequently indeed the contrast between the matter and the form would have been positively ridiculous to anyone not blinded by the fervour of religious faith,” and “To versify the Gospels meant . . . to take away from the simple narrative its own proper poetry by tricking it out in a way repugnant to its nature. . . . Poetry was merely looked upon as versified rhetoric.”

I am here thinking of criticisms which contrast the fetching simplicity of the biblical narrative with the rhetorical elaboration of the poetic version, interpreted as tasteless mutilation of the original. Cf. the second passage from Comparetti cited in the previous note.
6–26 and 2. 528–39; Avitus, *De spiritalis historiae gestis* 3. 197–208; and Dracontius, *Laudes Dei* 1. 417–26. (The poem of the African poet Dracontius, though primarily non-biblical, contains in the first book a lengthy version of Genesis 1–3, as an illustration of God's mercy towards the human race.) All four passages have in common that they describe reactions to a strange, new environment. *Alethia* 2. 6–26 and Avitus 3. 197–208 describe the first parents' reaction to their expulsion from Paradise; *Alethia* 2. 528–39 Noah's reaction to the new world after the Flood; and *Laudes Dei* 1. 417–26 the first parents' fearful response to the onset of night. Each passage may be described as paraphrastic amplification of the biblical text. In accordance with the principles of the paraphrase the sense of the original is retained; its elaboration is rather a matter of *elocutio* than *inventio*—the poet takes his point of departure from the biblical text and seeks to give more forceful expression to the spiritual content of the text. Since the discussion will initially center on the two passages from the *Alethia*, I quote them here.⁸


⁵ The date of composition of the *De spiritalis historiae gestis* is not definitely known. The last decade of the fifth century is the period most commonly given. For the title see Avitus, *Ep.* 51 (80. 21–22 Peiper) "*De spiritalis historiae gestis etiam lege poetamis lusi.*

⁶ Dracontius was a contemporary of Avitus. The *Laudes Dei* is generally thought to have been written in the first half of the last decade of the fifth century (see P. Langlois, "*Dracontius,*" *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 4 [Stuttgart 1959], cols. 253–54, who nevertheless believes a later date is possible).

⁷ On the need to retain the sense of the original see Quintilian 1. 9. 2 "paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et breviare quaedam et exornare *salvo modo poetae sensu permittitur,*" speaking of a prose paraphrase of verse. Provided that an expansion of the original text introduced no material alteration therein and could be classified as stylistic enhancement rather than fresh invention, no contravention of paraphrastic principles was involved. Stylistic amplification might be broadly interpreted to include, for instance, lengthy digressions, which were viewed as an ornament of style. The *progymnasmata* were largely exercises in such rhetorical amplification. Among them figured the ethopoeia, which, we shall see, influenced the paraphrastic amplifications here discussed. On the theory of the paraphrase see further Roberts, *Biblical Epic*, pp. 5–36.

Postquam sacratis decedere iussus uterque sedibus ac regnis genitalia contigit arva et propria stetit exul humo, miserabile, quali ore rudes stupeant tam barbara rura coloni, quae non frugiferò distincta stipite vernant. Nec species iuvat ulla soli, sed bruta coacto pondere congeries nec lecta mole locata est. Ardua caute rigent, silvis depresso laborant, plana latent herbis, horrescunt edita dumis.

Heu quibus haec spectant oculis, quo pectore cernunt, quorum animis paradisus inest! Neque causa doloris una subest, quod cunctorum iam plena malorum se pandit facies, sed, quod meminere bonorum. Nunc honor ille sacri nemoris maiore sereno irradiat, nunc divitias cumulatius edit silva beata suas, nunc pomis dulcor usus nectareusque sapor, vivis nunc floribus halat tellus9 et absenti tristis perstringit odore. O quam non eadem meritis, paradise, rependis! Te magis exellt conlatio deteriorum et peiora facis, miseris quae sola supersunt.

At dominus, mundi sortitus regna secundi, cuncta Noë gaudens oculis ac mente capaci accipit atque animum nequit exsaturare replendo et cupidó raptim perlustrans omnia visu ut nova miratur. Noto fulgentior ortu et mage sol rutilus, ridet maiore sereno laeta poli facies et desperata virescunt fetibus arva novis. Sed adhuc versatur imago ante oculos tantae semper memoranda ruinae, inter aquas quid pertulerint, quid munere sacro et non pertulerint, fremeret cum verbere saevo pontus et inlisas contemneret arca procellas.

Homye,10 in his dissertation on the Alethia, has noted the thematic similarity between these passages. He sees them as inspired by two philosophical topoi, later taken over by Christian exegesis. The first is that of man as the contemplator mundi/caeli; the notion that by visual contemplation of the universe, and especially the heavens, man

9 For the correptio of the final syllable of tellus see also Alethia 3. 561.
10 Homye, pp. 34–55, where the evidence for these philosophical topoi will be found.
may ascend to the spiritual contemplation of God. This idea, as Homey shows, goes back to Hellenistic philosophy, but was adapted by Christian writers to their own concept of the divine. The second philosophical \textit{topos} derives from attempts to explain the existence of evil in the world; evil, it is said, exists so that man may have a yardstick of comparison the better to appreciate what is good. Here Homey quotes \textit{Alethia} 2. 25–26:\footnote{Ibid., pp. 49–50.}

\begin{quote}
Te magis extollit conlatio deteriorum \\
et peiora facis, miseris quaet sola supersunt.
\end{quote}

The influence of such concepts, especially the former, certainly cannot be ruled out. As Homey effectively shows in his dissertation, the influence of philosophical doctrines, as filtered through Christian exegesis, is all-pervasive in the \textit{Alethia}. Indeed, it is clear from elsewhere in the poem that Claudius Marius Victorius was familiar with the notion of man as \textit{contemplator mundi/caeli} (1. 153–58 and 423–31). But neither philosophical \textit{topos} accounts for the feature that the two \textit{Alethia} passages, and the passages in Avitus and Dracontius, have in common: that is, that each describes the reactions of a spectator (or spectators) when confronted for the first time with a strange environment. Nor does the function of the passages correspond to that of the philosophical \textit{topoi}. Claudius Marius Victorius is not concerned to stress the relationship between the contemplation of nature and the contemplation of God; still less does he seek to justify the existence of evil. As Homey recognizes,\footnote{Ibid., pp. 50, 53, and 55.} the passages serve a literary function: to amplify the changes experienced by the first parents and Noah and thereby lend emotional force to the narrative.

The passages serve the purpose of rhetorical amplification. It is in rhetorical rather than philosophical \textit{topoi}, therefore, that their inspiration should be sought. A parallel may be found in a group of ethopoeiae of the form "what would 'someone' say on first seeing 'something'." Hermogenes\footnote{The authenticity of Hermogenes' \textit{Progymnasmata}, which I here cite, is doubtful; cf. Hugo Rabe, \textit{Hermogenis Opera, Rhetores Graeci}, vol. 6 (Leipzig 1913), pp. iv–vi. There is no reason to deny, however, that the work accurately reflects educational practice of late antiquity.} recommends the subject "what would a farmer say on first seeing a ship?" (21. 12–13 Rabe; cf. Priscian's translation of Hermogenes, 558. 17–18 Halm).\footnote{Accius' \textit{Medea} (381–96 Warmington = Cicero, \textit{N.D.} II. 35. 89) contained a speech on this subject, which in turn appears to derive from a narrative motif in Apollonius of Rhodes' \textit{Argonautica} IV. 316–22.} Perhaps the closest
parallel, however, is a subject referred to by Aphthonius (fourth century), "what would an inlander say on first seeing the sea?" (35. 5–6 Rabe); an exercise on this subject is preserved among sample exercises attributed to Nicolaus of Myra (1.389.5–24 Walz). Like the passages in the biblical epic, such ethopoeiae concern the first sight of an unfamiliar object or environment. The speaker of the ethopoeia may be expected to feel a sense of alienation, or psychological distance, from his new environment, just as the first parents and Noah do in the passages under discussion. Such subjects undoubtedly appealed to the student and rhetor because of the imaginative effort required to put oneself in the situation of the speaker and because of the opportunity offered to invent striking new turns of thought in describing the observer’s reaction to the strange environment.

It seems probable, then, that the first sighting theme was suggested to the biblical poets by this class of ethopoeiae, with which they would be familiar from the schools. Claudius Marius Victorius was, as we know, a rhetor in Marseilles (Gennadius, De viris illustribus 61). The biblical poets’ choice of narrative rather than direct speech to convey their characters’ reaction to the new environment can be attributed to two factors. The first is a probable reluctance to introduce speeches not sanctioned by the biblical original; Claudius Marius Victorius certainly avoids such non-biblical speeches (only two examples), although Avitus is freer in this respect. More importantly, the use of narrative rather than direct speech permitted greater visual immediacy (ἐνάργεια). Ancient theory recognized that such visual immediacy worked particularly strongly on the emotions, and that it could be achieved by the description not only of visual detail, but also of the effect a sight had on an observer. Both Claudius Marius Victorius and Avitus often use such psychological description as an affective technique.


16 For the affective force of ἐνάργεια, the vivid description of visual detail, see Quintilian VI. 2. 32: "ἐνάργεια, quae a Cicerone inlustratio et evidentia nominatur, quae non tam dicere quam ostendere, et adfectus non aliter quam si rebus intersimus sequitur"; for the description of a spectator’s reaction as achieving the same purpose see Quintilian VIII. 3. 70 “contingit cadem claritas (sc. ἐνάργεια) etiam ex accidentibus: ‘mihi frigidus horror/memra quatit gelidusque coit formidine sanguis’ [Aen. III. 29–30] et ‘trepidae matres pressere ad pectora natos’ ” [Aen. VII. 518].

Let us turn now to the procedures used in such “first sighting” themes. The only example available is the exercise attributed to Nicolaus of Myra on the subject “what would an inlander say on first seeing the sea?”, a subject which Aphthonius (35. 4–6 Rabe) classes among ἡθικαὶ ἡθοποιίαι, that is ethopoeia designed to reveal the ἡθος (the characteristic frame of mind) of the speaker. Thus, in the exercise of “Nicolaus,” the landlubber reveals his naïveté when confronted with an unfamiliar element, the sea: “I was at a loss to understand the marvel (τὸ θαυμάσιον κρίνειν ἡπόρηκα, 1.389.10 Walz). The biblical poets, on the other hand, employ the “first sighting” theme for purposes of πάθος; to reveal the emotions of the observer in a particular situation. But one technique is common to “Nicolaus” and the poets: the use of comparison. As might be expected, the landlubber, confronted by the sea, compares it to elements that are familiar to him, the air and land: “it does not maintain the character of air, for it is not elevated overhead: it cannot remain motionless like the earth” (ἀέρος φύσιν οὐ διασέσωκεν, οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς φερόμενον αἱρεταί μένειν οὐκ οἴδεν ὀσπέρ ἡ γῆ, 1.389.11–13 Walz). In a similar fashion the observers in the biblical poems compare their strange, new environment with the familiar one it has replaced. Such a comparison naturally engenders the “Kontrast von äußerer Wirklichkeit und innerer Vorstellung, die aus der Erinnerung schöpft” noted by Homey.18 The objective reality of the new situation contrasts with subjective reminiscence of the former state. The biblical poets exploit the emotive possibilities of such a contrast, although, as we shall see, the subjectivity of the observers’ reaction is stressed more by Avitus than by Claudius Marius Victorius. It should be remembered, however, that in instituting this comparison they are conforming to standard rhetorical procedure for the first sighting theme.

As already noted, Homey explains Alethia 2. 25–26,

Te magis extollit conlatio deteriorum
et peiora facis, miseris quae sola supersunt,

as a reference to a philosophical argument justifying the existence of evil: by comparison with evil man appreciates the good. I have already suggested that I find this explanation implausible, if only because the

---

18 Homey (above, note 4), p. 53.
present context shows no concern with the justification of evil. If we are to judge by Avitus 3. 203 "utque hominin mos est, plus, quod cessavit, amatur," the notion that "absence (or rather loss) makes the heart grow fonder" was a proverbial one.\textsuperscript{20} The phrase \textit{conlatio deteriorum}, which Homey cites in support of his argument, is susceptible of another, and I believe a better, interpretation. \textit{Conlatio} (collatio) is a technical term of rhetoric (cf. the passages cited in the \textit{Thesaurus Linguae Latinae} 3: 1579. 14–33).\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Collatio} involves the comparison of one thing with another on the basis of similarity (Cicero, \textit{Inv.} I. 30. 49 "collatio est oratio rem cum re ex similitudine conferens") or, in later theory (Quintilian V. 11. 30–31), dissimilarity. Such comparisons may be viewed as argument and thus included in \textit{inventio} or as stylistic adornment and included in \textit{elocutio} (Quintilian VIII. 3. 77). Thus in late antiquity, Cassiodorus, in his Psalm Commentary, commenting on Ps. 11:7, says "quod schema græce syndesmos dictur, latine collatio, quando sibi aut personae aut causae sive ex contrario sive ex simili comparantur" (CCL 97: 120. 144–146). Comparison was also a recognized means of rhetorical amplification, one of the four \textit{genera amplificationis} (Quintilian VIII. 4. 3 and 9–14). That Claudius Marius Victorius consciously uses comparison in the passage quoted as a means of rhetorical amplification is clear from a second rhetorical \textit{terminus technicus} in \textit{Alethia} 2. 25, the verb \textit{extollit}. The \textit{Thesaurus} quotes ample evidence for this technical usage (\textit{ThLL} 5.2: 2038. 55–75). It is especially common in the context of rhetorical

\textsuperscript{19} Homey (p. 53) does not suggest this is the case, but speaks of the literary exploitation of the philosophical \textit{topos}: "Die 'conlatio' macht es technisch möglich, zwei kontrastierende Landschaftsbilder ohne Überleitung dicht nebeneinander zu stellen..." Economy of explanation favors my interpretation of \textit{conlatio deteriorum}; a literary procedure is explained by literary considerations.

\textsuperscript{20} The closest parallel I have noted is A. Otto, \textit{Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer} (Leipzig 1890), p. 113, no. 533; Pubilius Syrus 103 "Cotidie est deterior posterior dies"; Seneca, \textit{Phaedra} 775–76 "horaque/semper praeterita deterior subit," reminiscences, according to Otto, of the Greek proverb \textit{αι γὰρ τὰ πέρον ἔσχος} (Diogenian. 2. 54; Macarius 1. 31). Cf. also Hans Walther, \textit{Proverbia sententiaeque latinitatis mediæ æevi: lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters in alphabetischer Anordnung}, \textit{Carmina mediæ æevi posterioris latina}, 2, 6 vols. (Göttingen 1963–69), 3: pp. 114–15, no. 16558b "nescit habens, quod habet, donec desistat habere" and 16565 "nescit homo vere, quid habet, nisi cessat habere." The notion of \textit{conlatio} is, it is true, missing from the Avitus passage (cf. Homey, \textit{Studien zur Alethia}, p. 54, note 17), but note the grammatical comparatives in the proverbs cited by Otto.

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Alethia} 2. 25 is listed in the \textit{Thesaurus Linguae Latinae} 3: 1578. 81–82, as an instance of the non-technical use of \textit{collatio} in the sense of "comparison." I hope my argument will demonstrate that the technical, rhetorical sense of the term was uppermost in Claudius Marius Victorius' mind when he composed the passage in question.
elaboration, and is indeed found twice in Quintilian’s discussion just quoted (VIII. 4. 9 and 15). The first passage concerns the use of comparison as a means of amplification:

Quae [amplificatio] fit per comparationem incrementum ex minoribus petit. Augendo enim quod est infra nescesse est extollat id quod superpositum est.

Quintilian is here speaking of a comparison based on similarity rather than contrast, as in the Alethia passages, but it is clear that a subject can be “elevated” either by comparison with something that is similar, but inferior, to it or with something that is opposite to it. In the latter case the comparison serves not only to amplify the superior but also to diminish the inferior. This is the rhetorical principle that underlies Alethia 2. 25-26.

We are now in a position to analyze the function and development of the first sighting theme in Claudius Marius Victorius and his successors in the biblical epic. Alethia 2. 6-26 describes the first parents’ reaction to their expulsion from Paradise. It proceeds by means of a comparison based on the contrast between their barbarous new environment and the luxuriant vegetation of Paradise, thereby diminishing the former and amplifying the latter (as indicated by the use of the comparatives maiore, cumulatius and dulcior, 19-21). Each description is filled out with ephrastic detail in accordance with Quintilian’s precept (VIII. 4. 14) “quae si quis dilatare velit, plenos singula locos habent”—in Butler’s translation “all comparisons afford ample opportunity for further individual expansion, if anyone should desire so to do.” But, as we have seen, the comparison is not introduced merely to amplify the description of Paradise. It is here used, in a fashion typical of the first sighting theme, for affective purposes: to indicate the emotional state of the observers. The whole passage is designed as an ἡθοποιία παθητική, albeit narrative in form. The poet frequently refers to the emotions of the first parents (stupeant, 9; iuvat, 11; doloris, 16; tristes, 23; miseris, 26—cf. miserabile, 8, which sets the tone for the passage). The arrangement of the passage follows the sequence of the first parents’ emotions: initial shock at their new environment (8-14), which calls to mind the splendor of Paradise (15-18), described in ephrastic detail (19-23). The final three lines act as a summarizing conclusion (24-26). Homey has rightly noted that the element of subjective remembrance lends particular affective force to the description of Paradise. The ephrastic detail contained in both descriptions serves a similar purpose (note especially the many words with strong emotive connotations: bruta, rigent, laborant, horrescunt, beata, vivis).
Two sections in this passage deserve further comment. The first is 2. 6–8:

Postquam sacratis decedere iussus uterque
sedibus ac regnis genitalia contigit arva
et propria stetit exul humo . . .

The phrase “genitalia contigit arva” presents some problems. The compilers of the Thesaurus (ThLL 6.2: 1813. 51–53) hesitate over the correct interpretation: “homo e paradiso pulsus, arva quae ei fruges procreant? an: quibus ipse procreatus erat?” As Staat rightly emphasizes, 22 if genitalia anticipates the future fertility of the land, it is out of place in a passage that stresses the barrenness of the first parents’ surroundings. The second alternative must be the correct one. Staat further draws attention to the tradition that Adam was created outside Paradise, into which he was introduced by God after his creation (cf. Gen. 2:8 and 15). 23 The phrase is naturally used, then, by Claudius Marius Victorius of the land outside Paradise, into which the first parents are now driven. It is all the more surprising therefore that Staat misunderstands the phrase “propria stetit exul humo.” He translates “van het eigen erf verbannen,” and in the notes specifically takes propria humo to refer to Paradise. But the phrase propria . . . humo is an evident reference to man’s creation de humo terrae (cf. Gen. 2:7, quoted by Isidore, Etym. 11. 1. 4, in the form “Et creavit Deus hominem de humo terrae”). Claudius Marius Victorius was undoubtedly familiar with the frequently repeated etymology of homo from humo natus, an etymology already known to pagan antiquity, although dismissed by Quintilian (I. 6. 34) as false. 24 By Staat’s own argument, the phrase propria . . . humo can only refer to the land outside Paradise. The translation of the phrase in question must be “he was an exile in his own land.” The land is his own (propria) because he was born from it. Such a paradox (propria : exul) is very much in the manner of Claudius Marius Victorius. The interpretation is further confirmed by the parallelism with the phrase “genitalia

22 Staat (above, note 8), pp. 31–35.
23 Ibid., p. 33.
24 For this etymology see Thesaurus Linguae Latinae 6.3: 2871. 50–63 and 3122. 48–55. F. H. Colson remarks in his note on the Quintilian passage, M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber I (Cambridge 1924), p. 87, that “this derivation appears to be found (apart from later and Christian sources) only in Hyginus, Fables 220, the date of which is very uncertain.” Cf. also Servius ad G. 2. 340.
contigit arva." I suspect that the poet intended the phrase *propria... humo* to explain the otherwise rather opaque *genitalia... arva.*

The second section worth attention is 2. 13–14.

Ardua caute rigent, silvis depressa laborant,  
plana latent herbis, horrescunt edita dumi.

Staat comments on the "artistic construction" of these verses. The combination of formal regularity with inconcinnity in detail is very much to the taste of the period. We need only compare a line from another Gallic poet of the early fifth century, the pagan Rutilius Namatianus (*De reeditu suo* 1. 38): "plana madent fluvis, cautibus alta rigent." The two passages are similar in language (the words italicized) and construction (note especially the artfully varied word order in the individual cola). The sentence in the *Alethia* reads like an attempt to imitate and outdo the pagan poet. This is not impossible since the two poets were contemporaries and both probably from Gaul. It is more likely, however, in the light of the opposite religious convictions of the poets, that the similarity is attributable to the common literary taste of late antiquity, as it was transmitted to both pagan and Christian by the schools of grammar and rhetoric. The description of landscape

25 *Arva,* "fields," is a bold metonymy for the earth from which Adam was created. I suspect the poet was influenced by the desire to incorporate a Virgilian reminiscence (*Geo.* III. 136, *genitali arvo*), a reminiscence that was all the more attractive because it was capable of a specifically Christian interpretation. The incorporation of such pagan poetic locations into a new context not infrequently occasions some awkwardness of expression. Examples are given by A. Hudson-Williams, "Virgil and the Christian Latin Poets," *Papers of the Virgil Society* 6 (1966–67), pp. 19–20, and Thraede, *Studien zu Sprache und Stil des Prudentius*, Hypomnemata 13 (Göttingen 1965), p. 15, note 34. The phrase *genitali arvo* is used figuratively by Virgil of the mating of horses and by Ausonius (Ecl. 7. 11) of childbirth; in Juvenecus (4. 65) *genitalibus arvis* means "native land" (parallels cited by Hovingh *ad loc.*).

26 Staat (above, note 8), p. 40.

27 The parallel has escaped the attention of previous commentators. Hovingh, *ad loc.*, following Heinrich Maurer, *De exemplis quae Claudius Marius Victor in Alethia secutus est* (diss. Marburg 1896), p. 117, notes only the parallel with Valerius Flaccus 4. 671, *ardua cautae* (to which should be added Seneca, Ag. 539, *ardua ut cautae*).

28 The *De reeditu suo* is thought to have been written in the second decade of the fifth century. According to Alan Cameron, "Rutilius Namatianus, St. Augustine and the Date of the *De Reditu,*" *Journal of Roman Studies* 57 (1967), pp. 31–39, Rutilius set out from Rome on the journey described in his poem in October 417. Vollmer, "Rutilius Claudius Namatianus,* RE,* ser. 2, 1.1 (Stuttgart 1914), col. 1253, remarks of Rutilius' *Nachleben:* "Des R. Gedicht hat keine weite Verbreitung gefunden; nicht einmal bei einem Landsmann wie Venantius Fortunatus findet man seinen Namen oder Spuren seiner Verse."

29 Rhetorical influence on the *De reeditu suo* is widespread; cf. Vollmer, cols. 1250–51.
in each case has all the appearance of being stylized and conventional; it is a part of the poetic lingua franca of the period.

The second passage in the *Alethia* (2. 528–39) follows a pattern similar to the first.\(^{30}\) Again it exploits a comparison based on contrast; the account begins with a description of the new environment, which calls to mind the old (535–36); the superior environment is described with grammatical comparatives (*fulgentior, mage rutilus, maiore*) and ecphrastic detail. Only in one respect does the passage differ. It is now the new environment, the world after the Flood, that is amplified by comparison with the previous state of things. The relationship is the reverse of that in the earlier passage, where it was the first parents' previous existence that was amplified. There is a corresponding change in the emotional tone of the passage. In the description of the first parents' reaction to their expulsion from Paradise the word *miserabile* (2. 8) was the key word; here it is *gaudens* (2. 529, cf. also *cupido . . . visu*, 531; for emotive language *miratur, ridet, laeta, desperata, ruinae, saevo*).

Avitus, like Claudius Marius Victorius, uses the first sighting theme of the first parents' expulsion from Paradise (3. 197–208).\(^{31}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tum terris cecidere simul mundumque vacantem} & \text{ inrant et celeri perlustrant omnia cursu.} \\
\text{Germinibus quamquam variis et gramine picta} & \text{et virides campos fontesque ac flumina monstrans,} \\
\text{illis foeda tamen species mundana putatur} & \text{post paradise tuam; totum cernentibus horret} \\
\text{utque hominum mos est, plus, quod cessavit, amatur.} & \text{200} \\
\text{Angustatur humus strictumque gementibus orbem} & \text{terrarum finis non cernitur et tamen instat.} \\
\text{Squalet et ipse dies, causantur sole sub ipso} & \text{205} \\
\text{subductam lucem, caelo suspensa remoto} & \text{astra gemunt tactusque prius vix cernitur axis.}
\end{align*}
\]

The passage was evidently written with the corresponding passages in the *Alethia* in mind. The phrase "celeri perlustrant omnia cursu"

\(^{30}\) In addition to the parallels in construction discussed in this paragraph, note also the verbal reminiscence *maiore sereno* (2. 533 = 2. 19; cf. Homey, [above, note 4], p. 50, note 3).

recalls Alethia 2. 531 “cupido raptim perlustrans omnia visu”\(^{32}\) and the apostrophe of Paradise (3. 202) is paralleled by Alethia 2. 24–26 in an identical context. But, unlike the earlier poet, Avitus describes the new environment in favorable terms (199–200).\(^{33}\) It is only by contrast with Paradise that it seems ugly. The comparison Avitus introduces is based on similarity not opposition. In a manner analogous to the argumentum a minore the beauty of Paradise is amplified by comparison with an ideal landscape (199–200), which yet seems mean after the first parents’ former existence (201–203).\(^{34}\)

The comparison then shifts ground to one based on opposition (204–208). The new and old environments are now compared, not as in the Alethia, by means of successive descriptions, but in a single description of the new environment, which yet refers allusively to the former (angustatur . . . strictum . . . subductam . . . remoto . . . tactusque prius). We have seen that it is characteristic of first sighting themes in the Alethia for an element of subjective reminiscence to be present in the description of the former environment. This subjectivity extends in Avitus to the description of the new world outside Paradise. The reader is already alerted to the fact that the spectators’ impression of their new environment does not correspond to objective reality by the contrast between vv. 199–200 and “Illic foeda tamen . . . putatur” (201). This theme is picked up and developed in the second

\(^{32}\) Salvatore Costanza, Avitiana I: I modelli epici del “De spiritalis historiae gestis” (Messina 1968), p. 81, compares Silius Italicus 2. 248–49 “cursu rapit . . . membra/ et celeri fugiens perlustrat moenia planta.” Hoving on Alethia 2. 531 cites Virgil, Aen. IV. 607, omnia lustras, VI. 887, omnia lustrant; Avienus, Arat. 27, omnia luretrans; Claudian, VI Cons. Hon. 412, omnia lustrat; In Rufin. 2. 496–97, visu . . . lustrat; Ovid, Met. VII. 336, omnia visu; and Statius, Theb. V. 546–47, omnia visu/lustrat. Two further passages from the Achilles of Statius may be compared: I. 126, “lustrat Thetis omnia visu,” and I. 742, “interea visu perlustrat Ulixes.” In the light of these many parallels it may seem rash to suppose a reminiscence of the Alethia in the passage of the De spiritalis historiae gestis. The thematic similarity between the two passages, however, lends some credibility to this suggestion. I have argued elsewhere (Biblical Epic, pp. 102–104, 123 and 218) that Avitus was influenced in the choice and treatment of his subject by the Alethia.

\(^{33}\) The description is perhaps somewhat in conflict with that contained in God’s malediction of Adam (3. 157–66)—in spirit if not in letter. The former passage, however, concerns the earth’s suitability for cultivation, the latter its immediate appearance.

\(^{34}\) For this form of amplification by comparison see Quintilian VIII. 4. 9, quoted above. Quintilian maintains a distinction between this and the argumentum a minore, although the distinction seems to lie in function rather than thought (VIII. 4. 12, “Illic enim probatio petitur, hic amplificatio”). For the comparison a minore used to arouse pathos see Macrobius, Sat. IV. 6. 1, “nempe cum aliquid proponitur quod per se magnum sit, deinde minus esse ostenditur quam illud quod volumus augeri, sine dubio infinita miseratio movetur.”
half of the passage. On the one hand, the limit of the earth is not seen, yet seems to press in on the first parents (204–205); on the other hand, the heavens are hardly visible (206–208), although the world here being described is that of everyday human existence in which, as the reader knows, the heavens are clearly visible. Avitus emphasizes that the picture of the new environment contained in lines 204–208 is not based on visual observation but on the psychological reaction of the first parents. Their mental state is mirrored in their sense of oppression at the shrinking of earth’s confines (204–205) and their sense of alienation at the removal of the heavens (206–208). As in the Alethia, the narrative ethopoeia reflects the emotions of the first parents (cf. gementibus . . . causantur . . . gemunt). But Avitus is not simply content to use objective description of the new environment as a counterpoint to the first parents’ emotions. Rather the description itself is distorted by and thereby subjectively embodies the emotions. Here, still more than in the Alethia, we might invoke the notion of man as the contemplator mundi/dei; man’s sin has led to his expulsion from Paradise and consequent alienation from the universe. He no longer sees the world correctly. But the theme of man’s relationship to nature is an important one throughout the De spiritualis historiae gestis and goes beyond the single idea of man as the contemplator mundi.\textsuperscript{36}

The last passage to be discussed is Dracontius, \textit{Laudes Dei} 1. 417–26.\textsuperscript{37}

\begin{quote}
Mirata diem, discedere solem
nec lucem remeare putat terrena propago
solanturque graves lunari luce tenebras,
sidera cuncta notant caelo radiare sereno.

Ast ubi purpureo surgentem ex aquore cernunt
luciferum vibrare iubar flammaque ciere
et reducem super astra diem de sole rubente,
mox revocata fovent hesterna in gaudia mentes;
\end{quote}

35 Avitus makes little attempt to avoid verbal repetitions of the form gementibus (204) . . . gemunt (208); cf. in the present passage cernentibus (202), cernit (205), cernitur (208). The verb causor in the sense of conqueror is confined to late Latin.

36 Man’s relationship to nature is at the center of Books 4 and 5, as it is of 1–3. In each of the last two books human sinfulness precipitates a natural catastrophe, the Flood and the drowning of the Egyptians in the Red Sea.

37 I follow the text of Friedrich Vollmer, \textit{Dracontii De Laudibus Dei . . .}, \textit{Poetae Latini Minorres} 5 (Leipzig 1914), which differs from his earlier text in the \textit{Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi}, 14 (Berlin 1905), only in the spelling luciferum for Luciferum. The edition of Francesco Corsaro, \textit{De laudibus dei libri tres} (Catania 1962), has not been available to me.
temporis esse vices noscentes luce diurna
coeperunt sperare dies, ridere tenebras.

The episode has no sanction in the biblical text. Dracontius alone of the biblical poets thinks to describe Adam and Eve's reaction to the first nightfall. Here there are not one, but two comparisons involved, both between contrasting environments. The first is between the daylight and night (417–20), the second between night, as described in lines 417–20, and the new dawn (421–23). Dracontius thus introduces temporal progression into the first sighting theme, which had been treated statically by Claudius Marius Victorius and Avitus. The progression is a cyclical one (from light to darkness to light) which is reflected in the emotions of the first parents (424–26).

More detailed analysis will illustrate how Dracontius manipulates a standard rhetorical theme to serve his Christian purpose. By transposing the creation of Eve to the sixth day (360–401), the poet has legitimized the assumption that a day passed between the creation of the first parents and the temptation and Fall. Rather than simply using a formula of time to indicate the passing of the day, Dracontius employs poetic idiom and reminiscence to describe nightfall and the coming of a new dawn. Line 420, as Vollmer notes, is a conflation of two lines of Virgil: Aen. III. 515 "sidera cuncta notat tacito labentia caelo" and III. 518 "cuncta videt caelo constare sereno." The description of dawn is a typical poetic periphrasis, with its reference to the morning star (luciferum), synonymic amplification (vibrare iubar flammasque ciere) and imperfect tricolon (422–23; the construction is varied in the final member). The successive verbs of emotion and perception (putat [sc. propago], 418; solantur, 419; notant, 420; cernunt, 421; fovent, 424) emphasize, however, that the sequence of events is seen through the eyes of the first parents. There are, in fact, two parallel sequences described in this passage: in the natural world from light to darkness to light again; and in the emotions of the first parents from wonder to despair (relieved, it is true, by the light of the moon and stars, but note the emotive word graves) to confident rejoicing. The interconnection between the two processes is made clear in the final line (426, "sperare dies, ridere tenebras"), which not only ends the passage in epigrammatic form (isocolon with antithesis), but also recalls the beginning of the section ("mirata diem,

38 For references to the rising and setting of stars and other heavenly bodies in such poetic periphrases of time see Quintilian 1. 4. 4, "qui (sc. poetae) . . . totiens ortu occasuque signorum in declarandis temporibus utuntur." The association of iubar with the morning star is traditional, going back to Ennius, Ann. 559 (Warmington; cf. Thesaurus Linguae Latinae 7.2: 571. 80–84 and 572. 18–50).
discedere solem”) in rhythm and vocabulary. The return of daylight can now be confidently expected when night falls; darkness is no longer an object of dread (graves . . . tenebras, 419), but of scorn (ridere tenebras, 426). Smolak, in an article on the hexaemeron paraphrase in Dracontius’ Laudes Dei, righty detects Christian light symbolism in this passage. The dispelling of darkness by light always had soteriological connotations for a Christian reader. Dracontius shapes the whole episode round the antithesis between light and darkness. By emphasizing the first parents’ reaction to the alternation of light and dark, and the eventual triumph of light, he elaborates the passage into a vignette of Christian edification.

The passages cited from the Old Testament paraphrase illustrate the interplay in the biblical epic between Christian patterns of thought and traditional rhetorical modes of expression. The first sighting theme, derived from the school exercise of ethopoeia, is employed by three Old Testament poets to give expression to Christian emotion. Each passage proceeds by comparison, a technique that, as we have seen, is characteristic of this theme. But, if the procedures are traditional, the passages depend for their unity on characteristically Christian thought and feeling. The contrasts between Paradise and the world outside Paradise, between the world before and after the Flood or between night and day already carry a strong emotional connotation for the reader, which each poet tries to direct and enhance by means of modes of expression derived from the pagan schools. Such a complex relationship between Christianity and the classical tradition is characteristic of much of the biblical poetry of late antiquity. To dismiss the poems on the grounds of the irreconcilable conflict between Christian content and classical form is to dismiss from the very start what the biblical poets have attempted to achieve. As I hope will be clear, an appreciation of the contributions made to these poems by the two cultural traditions is likely to lead to a more nuanced view of the biblical epic as a whole and a readiness to admit the possibility of something other than conflict between the

59 Both lines contain a weak third-foot caesura preceding the word dies/diem. In both the penultimate word is an infinitive, though of different metrical pattern.

two traditions. No one should expect an aesthetic equivalent of the biblical text; that, given the methods used, would be impossible. But neither should the biblical poems be dismissed simply as rhetorical exercises whose subject happens to be biblical; that would be radically to underestimate the contribution to the poetry of Christian thought and feeling aroused by the biblical text to be paraphrased.

Wesleyan University
APPENDIX

Graduate Studies in Classics
Have They a Future?*

This topic is propounded for your consideration existentially, as part of a personal puzzlement, and not simply as an abstract thesis suggested by a disinterested love of "truth." This confession may perhaps justify a personal and existential beginning.

My first serious training in Classics was at Exeter College, Oxford. As is well documented, Oxford in the latter half of the nineteenth century was divided by a great debate. The protagonists were Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln College, and Benjamin Jowett, Master of Balliol. Pattison had noted the enormous strides that were being made in contemporary Germany by a university system which set a premium on the seminar, on research papers, on publications, on science. Jowett, the head of a famous and influential College, saw the aim of education as the equipping of soldiers, statesmen, civil servants to run Britain and the Empire. To that task Pattison's German model had, he believed, little relevance. His Oxford contemporaries agreed with him. It took the Great War of 1914–18 with all its traumas, and ultimately the arrival in Oxford of Eduard Fraenkel, to alter old ideas about the place of the Classics in the education of a gentleman.

Old ideas die hard, especially in Oxford. In a recent conversation, the new Kennedy Professor of Latin at Cambridge, formerly Fellow

* This paper was presented by the Editor in his capacity as Chairman of the Midwest Conference of Classics Chairmen to the annual meeting of the Conference at Northwestern University in October 1984. The privately expressed approval of some scholars, and the imminent appearance of a Latin translation by Glareanus in *Hermes Americanus*, suggested that the publication of a revised version of the original might be timely.
of Exeter College, Oxford, reminded me that he was probably the last of the "undoctored" generation of dons who went straight into College fellowships with nothing more than their B. A. degrees, and who acquired any more specific and technical training for their profession "on the job." Let it be freely admitted that many of them acquired it very handsomely!

American education never quite made the mistake that Oxford made, in spite of its often markedly Anglophilic nature. Basil Gildersleeve is so clearly the product of German discipline. So is the systematic thoroughness of Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses*, even the old Lewis and Short, all the outgrowth of the best interaction between American energy and German guidance. The protracted seminar, the lengthy, footnoted term paper, the "publish or be damned" mentality; these are among the first shocks administered to the migrant from the British to the American campus. Of course, as one looks at the awful record of British economic incompetence since 1945 and indeed since Pattison's day, this American seriousness is salutary and necessary. Paradoxically, I now want to ask if it is going to destroy the Classics.

Classical studies are in the last resort concerned with the understanding of the literatures of Greece and Rome. I make this anodyne statement because I have heard a colleague murmur in approval of someone that he was "thoroughly acquainted with the literature," when in fact what he meant was that someone had read a lot of articles about a particular aspect of one author. But even this anodyne statement carries with it some revolutionary implications. It means, for example, that Classics is not primarily archeology, or even the study of Greco-Roman civilization, except insofar as both these occupations offer sidelights on the literatures, on the authors. My anodyne statement certainly means that codicology, paleography, textual criticism and all the rest of that invaluable discipline of *ekdosis* are ancillary to the understanding of the texts. It takes a profound awareness of literary possibilities to justify a single conjecture in a major author by this time. The first rule is: leave the transmitted text alone until you understand it!

I want now to advance a second anodyne statement. This one I justify (as I could have justified my first) by reference to the Alexandrian Museum. If we think of the first and even second generations of Alexandrian scholars—Philetas, Callimachus, Apollonius of Rhodes, Eratosthenes—the amazing thing is that so many of them were poets as well as scholars. Callimachus indeed took issue even with Plato, and said that he was incapable of judging poetry. We grasp something of his views on Pindar by studying the opening of the third book of
the *Aetia*. By studying the end of the *Argonautica* we know where
Apollonius thought the *Odyssey* ended. For these scholar-poets, learn-
ing was the handmaid of literary creativity.

A vastly important corollary follows from the belief evinced by
these early Alexandrians that scholarship and creativity are not to be
divorced. This is that the evidence of poets about what authors mean
is just as important as the evidence of more formal literary history
and scholarship. Where poetic genius is transcendent, the evidence
is correspondingly superior. The greatest commentator on Virgil is
Dante, the greatest commentator on Ovid—Shakespeare. Dante’s
*Comedy* is a paradoxical work to have emerged from the “searching”
of the *Aeneid* to which its author refers. It is paradoxical because, as
scholars, we bring certain expectations about epic to high and
continued poetry which Dante’s oddly named *Comedy* flouts. But
Dante quite decidedly rejected conventional expectations when he
declined Giovanni del Virgilio’s invitation to write a conventional
eulogistic epic, and declined it in an *Eclogue*. Poor fellow, he evidently
had not read K. Ziegler’s *Das hellenistische Epos* might be one rejoinder,
for then he would have understood what he was missing. Another
rejoinder might be that, when he used an *Eclogue* to reject conventional
epic, he was being faithful to the truest essence of the Virgilian
tradition by repeating the pattern of Virgil’s own sixth *Eclogue*. And
when he wrote a *Comedy*, with its metamorphoses, its *communia verba*,
its lyricism, its topsy-turvy world, its prophetic time, its vatic indigna-
tion, its visionary and alogical glories, perhaps he was telling us
something about the understanding of the *Aeneid* which was missing
from the handbooks of scholars and officially constituted defenders
of tradition such as Vida or J. C. Scaliger, who praise Virgil’s poem
for its splendid diction and ideal characters, letting enthusiasm blur
judgment. There would not have been need for R. Heinze’s *Virgils
epische Technik* which, elementary though it is, marks an epoch in the
return to grasping what Virgil did, if Latinists had read more Dante,
more Milton.

It can be seen that I am pleading for a view of classical study
which cannot be limited by arbitrary dates like 410 or even 1453.
Every new author of merit affects the way in which the existing
canon of authors is perceived, since his novelty adds a fresh dimension
to understanding. There is a continuous work of criticism of the
“Classics” going on therefore, but it is not by professional scholars.
Only a classical training which is a humanistic training will open our
eyes and ears to this perpetual dialogue.

Professional scholars sometimes behave as if every item of infor-
mation about the ancient world were of equal importance. The only
thing is to define an area of expertise so far unexplored by the majority, so that one need not fear challenge or anticipation. This is quite mistaken. We are not limiting our view of antiquity when we spend our time on its major authors, for what makes them major is precisely their imaginative range. The energy given over to Corippus or Flavius Merobaudes is only worthwhile if it can be shown how these two poets illustrate and respond to a continuing tradition. Otherwise, the class would be infinitely better employed reading Boccaccio or Ariosto.

It follows that a definition of classical scholarship is needed which does justice to the Alexandrian ideal of the scholar-poet. A large part of our audience comes these days from an educational background which is anti-foreign. At a recent conference on “The International Dimension of the University” a speaker explained how the U. S. Foreign Service washes out any quirky concern with alien cultures which its recruits may have picked up. A Ph. D. in Turkish, we were told, who has the luck to get a job with the Service, soon finds out that, if he is to attract attention and promotion, he must be a regular golf-playing, partying citizen. After a few years his knowledge of Turkish is growing pretty dim. Then he is ready to move up. Eventually, he hardly remembers where Turkey is. Then he is really hot.

Another speaker remarked that big corporations rarely find it worth their while to hire American experts, say, in Arabic. The Corporation is not interested in Arabic per se, only in business prospects. If there is any tiresome insistence on the local language, a local hiring will be made. The Corporation is content to be interpreted to the native culture always by foreigners, through foreign eyes.

In that case, I really can’t see the point of the kind of scholarship which fixes attention on minutiae and refuses any sort of concession to contemporary, English-speaking society. First of all, such an attitude ill equips us for teaching courses to undergraduates who are heading towards jobs that will be anything but academic, and whose eyes are set on professional goals. If we know why we are studying Latin and Greek, we can easily give an account of our stewardship. If we are only interested in settling hoti’s business, we shall be tongue-tied on the podium. I have distantly heard of departments that carry professors like this, around whom the rest of the faculty must tiptoe because they are engaged in serious research, and must not be interrupted by the vulgar concerns of students from agriculture or engineering. I am not sure it is fair to the rest of the faculty, and
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not sure either how much chance younger academics with similar attitudes have of getting jobs in this day and age.

I'm not even sure that what such people do is "serious research." Does "serious" mean "divorced from the concerns of contemporary men and women"? The anti-foreign bias of which I spoke presumably arises from just such a perception of other cultures, that they and those interested in them are irrelevant to the way we live here. Should we train our students to reinforce that perception? Won't it eventually have dire consequences in State Legislatures?

Such an attitude clearly ill equips our students for jobs outside the traditional academic fields. The former Headmaster of Eton, Dean C. A. Alington, once defended the study of the Classics on the grounds that, without them, we have no adequate knowledge of what men have done and thought and suffered. But how many seminars on Thucydides take the imparting of that kind of moral awareness as their aim? How quickly do we get bogged down in the Tribute Lists and the topography of Syracuse! Surely those things are important, but only as ancillaries to the larger vision, the record of human idealism, folly, ambition, greed, endurance. But a student who has learned not to be afraid of wrestling with Thucydides' contorted Greek, who is not surprised by human behavior either for good or ill, who knows the value of measuring difficulties before an enterprise is under way, and who believes that a good rule is to get there firstest with the mokest, who has suffered in the stone quarries with the Athenian captives and has made up his mind not to add to the sum of human misery by maltreating his colleagues and his clients: such a recruit might be treasured by a Corporation that had not the slightest interest in the Classics in themselves. And a student who thought of the Classics as an introduction to human behavior might not regard himself as leaving his proper sphere if he were to enter the Corporation's service.

I want to follow therefore the Socratic maxim of going where the argument leads. Nobody more than I curled his lip with greater disdain of those old academic fogies who in our day still bleated about the true, the good and the beautiful. What an amazing contrast to their datedness was afforded by the bustling Eduard Fraenkel, who at Corpus began lecturing while still outside in the corridor, who knew all the answers to all the questions, who poured scorn on his adversaries, who once said to a brilliant undergraduate: "Mr. X, you have read books of which most of the dons here have not even heard the names." But in my old age I no longer see the question in such black and white terms!

Fraenkel himself, of course, was much given to quoting Petrarch
or Shakespeare to illustrate a point, and his insomnia was regularly solaced by reading Dante. His dogmatism in the lecture-room was largely inspired by his feeling that it really mattered what a particular passage meant. It would be utterly unfair to align him with the representatives of "pure" scholarship, to whom every last paring of Augustus' fingernails is as valuable as his views on poetry. What he wanted, like his master Wilamowitz, was an informed commitment to classical literature, but still a commitment.

It was from another, not German but German-trained professor (and Fellow of Exeter College), Constantine Trypanis, that I first heard the name of Werner Jaeger and his theory of the "Third Humanism." Jaeger wrote at a time when Germany was reeling under the effects of the defeat of 1918 and the disappearance of the monarchy. He believed that classical studies should have an effect on public behavior, even on public policy. Although he went into exile soon after Hitler's accession, he has been criticized as some sort of embryo Nazi. But there is a nucleus of truth in his theory that classical studies cannot be content with being a matter of mere intellectual curiosity. When we read about the fate of Achilles or Oedipus, we will be reading utterly differently from the Greeks themselves if all that happens is that we get an idea for an article. Plato did not expel the poets from his Republic because they inspired notes in Classical Philology! I say this of course with all due respect.

Perhaps it is here that we can most fruitfully reconcile the two opposing poles, as they have sometimes seemed, of Wissenschaft and humanitas. The greatest scholars have certainly been the masters of a learning which puts one to shame. But they have not typically deployed that learning on trivialities. I am thinking of someone like Eduard Norden, or, in a somewhat different area, Leo Spitzer or E. R. Curtius. In his commentary on the sixth book of the Aeneid, Norden at times translates bits of Virgil into Greek verse to make his point. Even Fraenkel sent an article to Housman preceded by some quite elegant Greek elegiacs. There is a critical moment at which scholar and poet coalesce. Callimachus described it as an encounter with Apollo. Do our students feel that we have encountered, and been changed by, Apollo? Are they changed in their turn? Do they think of Classics, thanks to our example, not just as litterae, but as litterae humaniores?

As with most wars, we can in the end see that the issues are not quite so clear-cut as my original account of the debate between Pattison and Jowett may have suggested. Pattison was right to call attention to the superior role of the German system in a world where economic empires would replace those won by the sword. Jowett
however was not wrong when he urged that Classics of all disciplines could never become merely another area of research, along with Home Economics or Veterinary Science. The classicist should be someone who understands where our civilization came from and what it is all about; but what it is all about now, not what it was all about in an age long dead. It seems to me that a classicist trained to be alert to this double dimension will both be able to take his place in the classroom in front of students who are fully aware of the modern world (at least in their own estimation), but not of any other, for he will have some allegiance to both: and to find a job in industry or business, because he will be able to relate in a human way to those around him, thanks to his training as a humanist.

I also think that, even in pure scholarship, such a classicist will make more progress in understanding than his blinkered rivals. Here, I would like to cite once again a passage from Machiavelli:

When evening comes, I return home and enter my writing-room. At the door I take off these everyday clothes, full of mud and filth, and dress in royal, courtly garments. Clad fittingly, I enter the ancient courts of the men of old, and there find a kindly welcome. There I feed on that food which alone is mine, and for which I was born. There I am not ashamed to converse with them, and to ask the reasons for their actions. And they, in their humanity, give me answer, and for four hours I do not feel any vexation, I forget every toil, I do not fear poverty, I lose my dread of death, I transform myself entirely into them.

(Letter to F. Vettori, December 1513).

Machiavelli was a philosopher, historian and poet. He has given an adjective to most modern languages, and perhaps part of his fruitful dialogue with the ancients was his familiarity with their language. He asked the right questions because, inspired by umanità, he wasn’t continually glancing at his watch and the right-hand page of his Loeb. And again, I don’t mean to deny that Renaissance authors used translations. But the unerring judgment with which even a genius who was no scholar, William Shakespeare, seized on the essence of the classical experience in order to reflect it back in his ideas and language suggests that these children of a humanistic age meant something different by “reading” a text from the hasty perusal which is too often for the modern scholar the preliminary to getting down to the real meat of the encounter, the interpretative article which tells the rest of us what to think. I don’t know what is going to happen to the endless articles poured out in our day about this small point and that. I sometimes wonder what they have to do with humane education.
But what concrete proposals stem from all this? The first is that we should revive a German tradition which has been curiously neglected in the Midwest, and that is the peregrination of students from campus to campus in search of outstanding teachers. A system should be devised which permits the exchange of graduate students between Classics Programs, so that, without losing credit or ultimate allegiance to their home Departments, students who are unencumbered by family ties can know what is being offered in other Universities and take advantage of it in some way that will mean no extra financial burden. It is not a question of encouraging transfers or poaching, simply a matter of broadening horizons.

Secondly, areas of research should always be treated within the larger context of civilization and its traditions. We should take our commitment to modern foreign languages seriously. More basically, we should ask our students to demonstrate fluency with Latin and Greek, not just constipated sluggishness and inaccuracy. I believe I heard that some classical journals refuse to publish articles in Latin. It is outrageous. In the age of the taperecorder there is a golden opportunity to put back the aural/oral dimension of classical literature which is disastrously missing from some of our commentaries. Where are the plays which Renaissance students would have put on in the original? No doubt there were some unintentionally hilarious moments. But at the end of it, the more gifted at least could certainly write very convincing Latin!

Thirdly, collaboration with sister departments on campus should be the norm. Perhaps as a result of this some areas of purely classical research interest will lie neglected. I don't think this is very important in a time when, if we don't do something, all areas of classical research may lie neglected. Many classicists bring very poor critical principles to bear on the texts they read, so that one has to keep re-establishing the point, for example, that a poetic and a real "I" are not necessarily the same, or that consistency is not necessarily as important a virtue as persuasiveness, or that the author's intention is his work of art, and not something which he may or may not have said to his barber. Do we take kindly to the idea that a seminar in the English Department might be a useful introduction to a course in Latin elegy?

One of the sister departments with which communication has been shamefully neglected in traditional views of classical education is Religious Studies. Secular Greek scholarship can facilitate the understanding of the New Testament, for example, in the appreciation of rhythms (what the Formalists call "sound gesture") and subtle tense usages. And awareness of religious vocabulary can do much to illumine what so-called pagan authors are trying to say: for example, when
they use "weight" as a synonym for "glory," or employ the notion, so essential to the Roman way of looking at the world, of metamorphosis, of the present as bigger and better than the past. Lucan makes Caesar test the will of heaven by putting out to sea in Amyclas' boat in the teeth of several gales. He makes him dine at the scene of Pharsalia in view of his defeated foes. These are religious ideas. Thucydides says that the bravado of the Athenian fleet about to leave for Sicily filled spectators with thambos. This word is also religious. An increasingly secular age like ours is in danger of losing a whole dimension from the picture which the ancient world presents.

Another point of contact between classical study and the most pressing contemporary reality is Arabic. A book like *The Genius of Arab Civilization* (MIT Press, 2nd edn. 1982) opens one's eyes to the zeal with which Arab scholars assimilated and advanced Greek mathematics, astronomy, medicine, philosophy, in spite of the difference of language. When I was standing in the little cathedral square of Syracuse a year or two ago, outside a church which still rests on the pillars of a Greek temple, our guide gestured towards the Archbishop's palace and remarked that the Library was crammed with unread Arabic manuscripts. As late as the eighteenth century the classical languages were Latin, Greek, Hebrew and Arabic. What did the nineteenth century do to us?

*Satis superque.* My title asked: will graduate studies in Classics survive? I hope not, if we mean by that the continuance of the worst features of the present. Will *litterae humaniores* survive? We must bend our energies to the task of ensuring that they do, for without them nothing is left.
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